United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2013 No. 148

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 28, 2013, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2013

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 22, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

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

As the people's House returns, we give You thanks for those most responsible for the resolutions reached this past week and for the reopening of government, which has meant so much to the families of those who have chosen to serve their Nation by their work in government.

As all return, the Capitol is in mourning for the loss of two men of the House, former Speaker Tom Foley and Representative BILL YOUNG. Both men, a Democrat and a Republican, were known to be giants in the people's House, and their passing has deprived our Nation of experience and wisdom in Congress at a time when it is needed.

Bless all the Members with wisdom in good measure—pressed down, shaken together, and running over—that the legacy of these great legislators might be carried on for the benefit of all.

May all that is done here in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California 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.

THE PRESIDENT MUST ANSWER THIS QUESTION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the President has some very serious questions to answer.

Will he tax the American people if they cannot or choose not to buy health insurance from a Web site that doesn't work?

Will he insist upon penalizing them for withholding their personal information from a government database already rife with privacy concerns?

Will he continue to demand patience, blame technical glitches, and dismiss legitimate concerns from the American public while ObamaCare's broken launch dominates headlines?

Will he give lenience to those in his administration who are responsible for these failures?

It is true that ObamaCare's individual marketplace launched just 3 weeks ago; but 3 weeks or not, the American people would like some assurance. If government can't get its act together administering health insurance, will Americans get taxed for opting out?

The fair answer is certainly ''no.'' I hope President Obama agrees.

Printed on recycled paper.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Republican government shutdown is over, and the threat of the default has been averted for now; but no one is relieved.

The crisis should never have happened. The shutdown really hurt our economy. Standard & Poor's estimated that it cost the country $24 billion, and there is something even worse: each threat of shutdown and default slows economic growth by sowing uncertainty, dampens consumer confidence, and cuts jobs and income.

The Wall Street Journal today ran an article this morning titled, ''A Confidence Shutdown.'' Reporter Gerald Seib wrote:

> Washington's misadventures have extracted a historically high toll on America's confidence.

''A historically high toll,'' he wrote.

How high? At no other time did consumer confidence plummet as far as it did in the Republican shutdown except for prior to the 2003 war in Iraq and the 1990 Persian Gulf war.

The American people don't want a government that is shut down; they want a government that is on their side.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 17, 2013 at 11:48 a.m.:

That the Senate disagree to House amendment. S. Con. Res. 8.

That the Senate agree to conference requested by the House;

That the Senate appointed conferees.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, October 16, 2013:

H.R. 2775, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–68)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, October 17, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, I hereby certify that absent a suspension of the limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Treasury would be unable to issue debt to meet existing commitments.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The communication is referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the whole number of the House is 431.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PAUL BROWN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 185) to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the ''Paul Brown United States Courthouse''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 185

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''Paul Brown United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Paul Brown United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 185.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 185 would designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

During World War II, Judge Paul Brown enlisted in the United States Navy. In 1950, he graduated from the University of Texas School of Law and started a law practice in Sherman, Texas. In 1953, he served as an assistant United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas and later as the United States attorney. In 1985, he was appointed by President Ronald Reagan to serve as district judge for the Eastern District of Texas. He served as a district judge and then as a senior district judge until his death in 2012.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for his leadership on this legislation.

I think it is fitting to honor the service of Judge Brown to this Nation by naming this courthouse after him. I support passage of this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 185, which designates the United States courthouse in Sherman, Texas, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

Judge Brown was a highly respected member not only of the Federal judicial community but also in the Sherman, Texas, community. After serving in the U.S. Navy in World War II, he returned to Texas to continue his education and received his law degree from the University of Texas Law School in

1950. In 1953, Mr. Speaker, he was appointed as an assistant United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas.

In 1959, President Eisenhower appointed Judge Brown as the United States attorney in the Eastern District, where he served until 1961. He returned to private practice in Sherman from 1961 to 1985 and enjoyed a reputation as an outstanding civil litigation lawyer. President Reagan later nominated him to become a Federal judge in the Eastern District of Texas in 1985.

Judge Brown presided over cases that involved bank and savings and loan failures of the 1980s and early 1990s, as well as many intellectual property and patent cases. Judge Brown was also a prominent member of the community, serving as a board member of Medical Plaza Hospital, president of the Sherman School Board, and president of the Optimist Club of Sherman.

Judge Brown assumed senior status in April 2001 and later died in 2006 after 21 years of distinguished service on the Federal bench. This designation is a fitting tribute to his career as a veteran and respected jurist.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 185.

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

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of H.R. 185, as has been stated, a bill designating the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

Judge Brown was an outstanding Federal judge who passed away on November 26, 2012, after 21 years of very distinguished service. Judge Brown was my good friend, a respected judge, and beloved member of the Sherman, Texas, community.

Judge Brown represented the finest qualities of jurisprudence. Hanging on his wall in the Sherman Federal Courthouse were Socrates' four qualities for a good judge: to hear courteously; to answer wisely; to consider soberly; and to decide impartially. Judge Brown embodied all of these qualities, and he dispensed justice accordingly. He was highly regarded, well-respected, and was a role model for many.

Judge Brown was the youngest of a family of six raised on a farm in Pottsboro, Texas. He graduated from Denison High School and, although underage, he was able to get his parents' consent to join the United States Navy when World War II broke out. He served on a minesweeper in both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters and as a part of the occupation forces in Japan. He was discharged as an electrician's mate 2nd class in June 1946.

He returned to his studies and received a law degree in 1950 from the University of Texas before being recalled to Active Duty in the Korean war. He saw combat aboard a minesweeper which was sunk by mines. He received an honorable discharge in December 1951.

Judge Brown worked as an assistant U.S. attorney in Texarkana under U.S. attorney William Steger, who would become his mentor, good friend, and eventually fellow colleague on the bench. He served as assistant U.S. attorney from 1953 to 1959, and then followed in Judge Steger's footsteps as U.S. district attorney from 1959 to 1961.

While in Texarkana, he met and married Frances Morehead, and the two returned home to Sherman, where he practiced law for a number of years. In 1985, Senator Phil Gramm recommended him to President Reagan for a new judge's position created by the Eastern District of Texas, and he was confirmed that year. He held court in Beaumont, Paris, Sherman, and Texarkana, and as the caseload grew, he eventually presided over the Sherman courthouse exclusively.

Premier cases over the years included intellectual property, patent cases, and criminal cases precipitated by the bank and savings and loan failures of the 1980s and 1990s. In recent years, he noted the increase in drug cases and expressed his regret that in spite of all the efforts that have been made to prosecute drug dealers, the Nation is not making much progress in curtailing the use of drugs. No matter what type of cases came before him, Judge Brown always enjoyed the work and ran an efficient and orderly courtroom. His personal ethics and judicial integrity were remarkable, and his reputation for punctuality is legendary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of a great American, outstanding public servant, and respected jurist. This bill has the support of the Federal judges in the Eastern District, and I ask for your support of H.R. 185, to designate the United States courthouse in Sherman, Texas, the Paul Brown United States Courthouse.

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today in support of H.R. 185 in this 113th United States Congress, being brought before us by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. HALL, which will honor an esteemed gentleman from Sherman, Texas, the Honorable Paul Brown.

Judge Paul Brown was a great Texan and a Great American, having served his country with valor in the U.S. Navy in both World War II and in Korea.

Judge Brown was a civic leader, having served Texas and the United States as Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas. He was nominated by President Eisenhower to serve as U.S. Attorney in Tyler, Texas, and he served his state well on his appointment by President Reagan as Eastern District Judge, where he finished his career after twenty one years of service as a Senior Judge.

His devotion to his community and his faith guided him, as he remained engaged with local, state, and legal initiatives throughout his life.

Judge Brown's life and record of distinguished service to our country and to Texas serves as a textbook example of what it means to have been a member of The Greatest Generation. His long and distinguished service in the courtroom serves as a template for all officers of the court, and his commitment to his family and his community provides a brilliant illustration for all Texans and Americans about what it means to serve one's fellow man.

This courthouse we are naming today will remind us of Judge Brown's loyalty to his country, his community, and to The Great State of Texas, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 185.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROTECTING STUDENTS FROM SEXUAL AND VIOLENT PREDATORS ACT

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2083) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require criminal background checks for school employees, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2083

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 ''Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act''.

SEC. 2. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

(a) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each State educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) shall have in effect policies and procedures that—

(1) require that a criminal background check be conducted for each school employee that includes—

(A) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

(C) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

(D) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 19 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919);

(2) prohibit the employment of a school employee as a school employee if such employee—

(A) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under paragraph (1);

(B) makes a false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

(i) homicide;

(ii) child abuse or neglect;

(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

(iv) spousal abuse;

(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

(vi) kidnapping;

(vii) arson; or

(viii) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed on or after the date that is 5 years before the date of such employee's criminal background check under paragraph (1); or

(D) has been convicted of any other crime that is a violent or sexual crime against a minor;

(3) require that each criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) be periodically repeated or updated in accordance with State law or the policies of local educational agencies served by the State educational agency;

(4) upon request, provide each school employee who has had a criminal background check under paragraph (1) with a copy of the results of the criminal background check;

(5) provide for a timely process by which a school employee may appeal, but which does not permit the employee to be employed as a school employee during such appeal, the results of a criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) which prohibit the employee from being employed as a school employee under paragraph (2) to—

(A) challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information produced by such criminal background check; and

(B) establish or reestablish eligibility to be hired or reinstated as a school employee by demonstrating that the information is materially inaccurate or incomplete, and has been corrected;

(6) ensure that such policies and procedures are published on the website of the State educational agency and the website of each local educational agency served by the State educational agency; and

(7) allow a local educational agency to share the results of a school employee's criminal background check recently conducted under paragraph (1) with another local educational agency that is considering such school employee for employment as a school employee.

(b) TRANSFER PROHIBITION.—A local educational agency or State educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) may not knowingly transfer or facilitate the transfer of any school employee if the agency knows, or has substantive reason to believe, that such employee engaged in sexual misconduct with an elementary school or secondary school student.

(c) FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(1) CHARGING OF FEES.—The Attorney General, State Attorney General, or other State law enforcement official may charge reasonable fees for conducting a criminal background check under subsection (a)(1).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.—A local educational agency or State educational agency may use administrative funds received under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) to pay any reasonable fees charged for conducting such criminal background check.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms ''elementary school'', ''secondary school'', ''local educational agency'', ''State'', and ''State educational agency'' have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) SCHOOL EMPLOYEE.—The term ''school employee'' means—

(A) an employee of, or a person seeking employment with, a local educational agency or State educational agency, and who, as a result of such employment, has (or will have) a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students; or

(B) any person, or an employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services with an elementary school or secondary school, local educational agency, or State educational agency, and such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that results in unsupervised access to elementary school or secondary school students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2083.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2083, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act.

A report released by the Government Accountability Office in December 2010 examined 15 cases where individuals with histories of sexual misconduct were hired or retained as teachers, support staff, volunteers, and contractors. In 11 of these 15 cases, those individuals had previously targeted children.

Despite the fact that States have varying policies intended to protect children from sexual predators in schools, the GAO determined the policies were largely inconsistent and insufficient. According to the report, States don't consistently perform pre-employment background checks, and when they do conduct these checks, they are not always fingerprinted or connected to the national criminal database.

There is widespread agreement on both sides of this aisle that more must be done to protect students. We have worked with our colleagues to advance legislation that will ensure that every school employee—from the cafeteria workers, Mr. Speaker, to the administrators, to the janitors, to the teachers, principals, and librarians—that everyone is subject to a complete background check that includes the FBI fingerprint identification system and the National Sex Offender Registry.

Today, we have an opportunity to finish the fight by sending this bill, the Protecting Students From Sexual and Violent Predators Act, to the Senate.

H.R. 2083 will require States that receive funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to have policies and practices in place that ensure each school employee is subject to a complete national criminal background check. Mr. Speaker, a similar provision was offered by two of my colleagues and good friends, both from Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MEEHAN. That provision was included in the House-passed Student Success Act from last month.

□ 1715

The Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act is commonsense legislation that will help ensure students in schools across the country are safe from sexual criminals. So all that being said, Mr. Speaker, I simply urge at this time my colleagues to support H.R. 2083.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. ROKITA for presenting the bill and Mr. FITZPATRICK for his work on the legislation. I appreciate their assistance.

Mr. Speaker, when parents send their children to school each morning, they expect them to come home safe from harm. Day in and day out, millions of teachers, staff, and administrators do their utmost—sometimes in downright heroic ways—to put their students' safety first. But despite these efforts, there remains a steady stream of stories from across the country involving students who have been abused by someone in a position of trust in their schools.

Just this past summer, a music teacher in a Silver Spring, Maryland, elementary school was found to have sexually abused 15 minors over an 8-year period.

In my home State of California, a teacher was convicted of throwing a 5-year-old boy with a disability onto a classroom floor and kicking him and was transferred to another school for the following year, but was not fired due to legal limitations. The superintendent of the school district acknowledged that police were not informed after that horrible incident. To make matters worse, even after her conviction, this person was allowed to keep a desk job through the rest of the school year, still had her credentials, and could simply move to a new school to teach, putting more children at risk.

We should be doing everything we can to prevent these abuses. A very fundamental place to start is to not employ predators in our schools in the first place.

After I requested an investigation in 2010, the Government Accountability Office uncovered a wide range of cases in numerous States of convicted sex offenders who had previously targeted children, working in schools side by

side with children. In some cases, these schools had unknowingly hired sex offenders. This happened because State laws are inconsistent in how they require schools to conduct background checks of their employees and what types of crimes are covered.

In other cases, the Government Accountability Office found that districts knowingly passed on a potential predator and abuser to another school or school district, allowing the offender to resign instead of reporting him. Although every State requires some background checks, the checks are not always thorough. GAO found that some States only require checks for licensed teachers, but not other employees. And some States don't require criminal history checks for contractors at public schools.

The GAO also found that at least half of the States lack any rules to ensure that child abuse allegations are not suppressed by school officials, and only a few States require schools to conduct recurring background checks on employees.

The significant differences in the ways schools screen prospective employees lead to gaps in student protection, but a child's safety shouldn't depend on the State in which they reside. A patchwork of State laws fails to protect all children, and that simply is not good enough. We need minimum national standards to keep children safe from sexual predators and other violent adults.

That is why I am proud to be the author of the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act, along with my cosponsors.

This bill closes the loopholes. It would create consistency across States in background-check policy, requiring public schools to conduct comprehensive background checks for any employee or applicant for employment with unsupervised access to children, using State criminal and child abuse registries and the FBI's fingerprint database, as well as to periodically update these checks.

Contractors in public schools with unsupervised access to students are also subject to these same background checks under this bill. It would prohibit school districts from hiring or retaining anyone who has been convicted of certain violent crimes, including crimes against children, crimes involving rape or sexual assault, or child pornography.

Schools must be places where faculty and students can focus on teaching and learning, without fear of emotional or physical harm. Keeping students safe requires a coordinated effort from teachers, principals, superintendents, community partners, and parents. The vast majority of school staff is trustworthy and works hard every day to support students' learning needs. I honor and respect their work, which is so central to the success of this Nation.

The criminal background checks required in H.R. 2083 are essential to ensuring that schools and school districts are doing everything they can to protect children.

Mr. Speaker, keeping children safe isn't a partisan issue; it is a moral obligation. And that is why I am pleased to see the strong bipartisan support from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this legislation. I want to thank the cosponsors in particular: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WILSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. COHEN.

Working with Chairman KLINE's and Mr. ROKITA's staff, we clarified several provisions from the original bill that I introduced in May, including that States must periodically repeat or update background checks on employees, based on State and local policy that is publicly transparent; school districts may share background check results with each other for the same employee; and school employees could appeal the results of a background check if it is inaccurate or incomplete and establish their employment eligibility if the check was corrected.

This bill is only as good as the quality of the background checks, and I will work with my colleagues to address issues related to ensuring that the checks are complete and accurate. Congressman ELLISON and Congressman BOBBY SCOTT have introduced legislation that seeks to support this goal, and I will work with them and others on these important worker protections if the bill moves forward in the Senate.

I want to thank again Chairman KLINE for working with us on sensible solutions that will protect children across the country. I also want to thank the respective staffs for their diligence and thoughtfulness in helping us to develop and move this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROKITA, and I rise in strong support of the legislation on the floor today. This bill, if passed by the House and Senate and signed by the President, will go a long way toward protecting students in our Nation's schools. I thank the ranking member, Mr. MILLER, for bringing this bill up today and for bringing to light an issue that is compromising student safety throughout our country.

H.R. 2083, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act of 2013, will ensure consistent and comprehensive school employee background checks in all States. The bill also includes language from a bill that I introduced, the Jeremy Bell Act. This piece of the larger bill blocks Federal funding to schools that knowingly hire or transfer teachers involved in sexual misconduct.

The Jeremy Bell Act is named after a 12-year-old West Virginia elementary school student who was sexually abused and murdered by his principal, a man that had a long record of sexual misconduct, but who was allowed to transfer and leave schools without punishment and without informing new districts.

In a 2010 Government Accountability Office investigations report, it was found that inconsistent State laws regarding background checks facilitated the hiring and transferring of sexual predators in our schools. If, by cutting off funds to schools that knowingly ''pass the trash,'' we can save one student from Jeremy's fate, then this bill has succeeded. Overall, this bipartisan bill includes student safety measures, including requiring background checks for school employees, a commonsense method to better protect our children in their schools.

In testimony submitted at a field hearing I held in Philadelphia last Congress, Roy Bell, Jeremy's father, expressed his outrage and his sadness that our education system had failed to protect the life and innocence of his 12-year-old son. Unfortunately, Jeremy's father passed away this weekend. It is on his behalf and on behalf of all parents and students that I will continue to work to pass legislation that protects our students.

Today, I ask my colleagues to consider this legislation and its impact on families across our Nation. Mr. Speaker, I encourage quick passage of H.R. 2083 by both Chambers and for it to be signed into law by the President. I thank the chairman and Mr. MILLER for their work on this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for his comments and for his support of this legislation.

I had a couple more speakers who were supposedly coming to the floor, but at this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize that all of us who are parents or Members of Congress, no matter what walk of life we may travel in, want to make sure that our children are safe, are well taken care of, and that the people who care for them at their schools are qualified to do so and don't present a danger to them.

At the same time, I think it is important that we recognize that when we

put barriers to employment that are lifetime bans, that are not sensitive to certain realities as relates to people overcoming criminal backgrounds, and when we put prophylactic rules that don't account for particular offenses in a nuanced way, we do run the risk of doing a good thing, but doing too much of a thing, and thereby leading to some unexpected and unwanted results.

I have had the privilege of talking to Ranking Member MILLER about some concerns I have about the bill before us today. I think that the concerns are well within Mr. MILLER's frame of mind, and he and I have talked and he has indicated to me that he is willing to work with me to refine the bill to the degree that we can ensure the protection and safety of our children in school, but at the same time make sure that we don't set up precedents that create unwarranted and unnecessary barriers to employment.

At this time I don't think I need to go into the details of each of those. Suffice it to say that if the gentleman would agree that we did talk and we are going to work together on refining the bill as best we can, I would appreciate that.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I would say that I spoke to you this morning, and we will obviously continue to work with you. We have tried to draw the line at serious felony violent crimes that people have participated in with respect to the ban. In terms of drug arrests or whatever, there is a 5-year window that we have started, and we will be glad to continue that conversation.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you very much.

I also just want to point out that we have talked about inaccurate information, and it is important that we make sure that the records that we are using are the right records and accurate records.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is why an appeals process is included in this legislation.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Today's debate has only underscored again the importance of moving forward with this sensible and responsible legislation. Not only will the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act ensure all school employees undergo a complete background check; it will also help States implement policies and practices that prohibit the hiring of anyone who refuses to consent to a background check, makes a false statement in connection with the check, or has been convicted of a violent or sexual crime against a child.

There is absolutely no reason we shouldn't all stand united in support of this critical legislation. So once again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2083.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, in 2010, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that some school districts had unknowingly hired sex offenders due to inconsistent state laws that do not require comprehensive background checks for all adults who have contact with children in schools. In other cases, the GAO found that districts knowingly passed a potential predator to another school district by allowing the offender to resign instead of reporting him. Significant differences in the ways schools screen prospective employees lead to gaps in student protection. A child's safety should not depend on where that child resides.

The 2010 GAO report investigated a number of cases across the country, including one in my home state of New York. In this case, a public school employed a maintenance worker for five months until the results of a criminal history check conducted after he had already reported to work revealed that he had been convicted of raping a 21-year-old woman at knifepoint behind a school.

In 1982, the offender had been sentenced to 12 to 25 years in prison and classified as a level 3 sex offender, meaning that the offender is at high risk for repeat offenses and is a threat to public safety. In 2008, the school hired him ''conditionally,'' meaning he was allowed to report to work prior to the completion of a state criminal history check. School officials told GAO investigators they do not always perform these checks prior to employment because they considered the process both cost and time prohibitive.

The school fired the offender in November 2008 when the state criminal history check was completed; within two years he was incarcerated for failure to comply with sex offender registration requirements. The Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act would have prevented this potentially disastrous hiring from ever taking place thanks to its prohibition of hiring or retaining anyone who has been convicted of certain violent crimes, including crimes against children, crimes involving rape or sexual assault and child pornography.

In many of the cases GAO investigated, previously convicted sex offenders working in schools eventually used their access to children in school to once again commit crimes against children. Although the New York maintenance worker was terminated after five months and did not abuse children in the school during that time, there is no acceptable amount of time for our children to be exposed to such horrific risk.

Children have the right to a safe school environment where they can learn and thrive. There is so much more that this body must do to ensure this right—most importantly the enactment of legislation to prevent gun violence—but passage of the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act is a necessary step towards securing students' safety in school.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and a proud co-sponsor of the legislation, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2083, the ''Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act.''

I support this legislation because it is a focused and targeted measure which ensures student safety in public schools against violent adults by implementing full background checks.

A deficiency in background checks for screening prospective employees poses a threat to the safety of children in schools.

Inconsistent state laws and regulations that do not require comprehensive background checks for all adults who have contact with children in schools has led to some districts unknowingly hiring offenders.

This is unacceptable. As a nation, we owe it to our kids and to ourselves to prevent our children from being exposed to an unsafe learning environment.

This legislation directly affects the communities I represent as 21% of all paroled sex offenders in Texas reside in Harris County. Failure to screen those we permit to interact with our children in schools allows violent or sexual predators the opportunity to abuse our children.

We have a responsibility to protect children and ensure them a safe, healthy learning environment.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2083 seeks to reduce the inconsistencies in state laws and regulations by requiring comprehensive background checks for all adults who have contact with children in schools.

The bill makes clear that best practices for reducing the prevalence of sexual and violent predators must include prohibiting public schools from hiring or retaining anyone who has been convicted of certain violent crimes.

Additionally, the bill requires periodic updating of background checks for all current employees, and ensuring that schools report to local law enforcement when offenders apply for a position.

Approximately 1.8 million adolescents in the United States have been victims of sexual assault. Risks posed by predators on on campus put children at risk and are barriers to their academic and social growth and development.

Students have a right to feel safe, and parents have a right to expect that the individuals they entrust their children with will protect them from physical harm.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas, which I am proud to represent, understand the value and importance of a safe environment for students to learn and grow.

So do I. That is why I strongly support H.R. 2083. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

[From the Huffington Post, June 3, 2013]

KELLY ANN GARCIA ALLEGEDLY HAD SEX, WENT TO SEX SHOP WITH STUDENT SHE CLAIMED TO BE MENTORING

(By Steven Hoffer)

An English teacher in Texas is accused of having sex with a pupil she claimed to be mentoring.

Kelly Ann Garcia, 29, appeared in court on Thursday to face charges surrounding her alleged sexual relationship with a 16-year-old Hastings High School student, KHOU reports.

Police say Garcia would meet the victim after school dismissal, despite not being her assigned teacher.

On March 21, Garcia allegedly took the victim to Starbucks and revealed an erotic dream she had about her. One week later, the Houston-area teacher texted the teen to say that she had broken up with her boyfriend. The following day, the pair met and ''kissed passionately,'' according to the New York Daily News.

The intimacy of the alleged relationship escalated over the following weeks. On one day, authorities say Garcia took the student to a sex shop.

''The allegation is that they did in fact drive to a store and purchase a sex toy and drive back to the defendant's apartment where they engaged in sex,'' said prosecutor Markay Stroud, according to KHOU.

The student bragged to classmates about her alleged sexual encounters, which led another student to notify school administrators, according to reports.

''She seemed nice at the time. She said she wanted to mentor my daughter, and I took her for her word. Now I'm just not as trusting in people,'' the teen's mother told KHOU last week.

Garcia is charged with sex assault of a child and indecency with a child, according to CBS Houston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2083, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

PROMOTING ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP FOR CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE ACT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3205) to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3205

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 ''Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
TITLE I—ADOPTION INCENTIVES GRANT PROGRAM
Sec. 101. Extension of program through fiscal year 2016.
Sec. 102. Improvements to award structure.
Sec. 103. Renaming of program.
Sec. 104. Limitation on use of incentive payments.
Sec. 105. Increase in period for which incentive payments are available for expenditure.
Sec. 106. State report on calculation and use of savings resulting from the phase-out of eligibility requirements for adoption assistance; requirement to spend 20 percent of savings on post-adoption services.
Sec. 107. Preservation of eligibility for kinship guardianship assistance payments with a successor guardian.
Sec. 108. Effective dates.
TITLE II—EXTENSION OF FAMILY CONNECTION GRANT PROGRAM
Sec. 201. Extension of family connection grant program.
TITLE III—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION
Sec. 301. Improving the collection of unemployment insurance overpayments through tax refund offset.

TITLE I—ADOPTION INCENTIVES GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF PROGRAM THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2016.

Section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(5), by striking ''2008 through 2012'' and inserting ''2013 through 2015''; and

(2) in each of paragraphs (1)(D) and (2) of subsection (h), by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2016''.

SEC. 102. IMPROVEMENTS TO AWARD STRUCTURE.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD.—Section 473A(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively.

(b) DATA REQUIREMENTS.—Section 473A(c)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''NUMBERS OF ADOPTIONS'' and inserting ''RATES OF ADOPTIONS AND GUARDIANSHIPS''; and

(2) by striking ''the numbers'' and all that follows through ''section,'' and inserting ''each of the rates required to be determined under this section with respect to a State and a fiscal year,''.

(c) AWARD AMOUNT.—Section 473A(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''paragraphs (2) and (3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)''; and

(B) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (C) and inserting the following:

''(A) $2,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of foster child adoptions in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of foster child adoptions for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year;

''(B) $4,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of pre-adolescent child adoptions in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of pre-adolescent child adoptions for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year who have attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age; and

''(C) $8,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of older child adoptions in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of older child adoptions for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year who have attained 14 years of age; and

''(D) $1,000, multiplied by the amount (if any) by which—

''(i) the number of foster child guardianships in the State during the fiscal year; exceeds

''(ii) the product (rounded to the nearest whole number) of—

''(I) the base rate of foster child guardianships for the State for the fiscal year; and

''(II) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 473A(g) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(g)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (8) and inserting the following:

''(1) FOSTER CHILD ADOPTION RATE.—The term 'foster child adoption rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of foster child adoptions finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.

''(2) BASE RATE OF FOSTER CHILD ADOPTIONS.—The term 'base rate of foster child adoptions' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the foster child adoption rate for the State for fiscal year 2007; or

''(B) the foster child adoption rate for the State for the then preceding fiscal year.

''(3) FOSTER CHILD ADOPTION.—The term 'foster child adoption' means the final adoption of a child who, at the time of adoptive placement, was in foster care under the supervision of the State.

''(4) PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTION RATE.—The term 'pre-adolescent child adoption rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of pre-adolescent child adoptions finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, who have attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age.

''(5) BASE RATE OF PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTIONS.—The term 'base rate of pre-adolescent child adoptions' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the pre-adolescent child adoption rate for the State for fiscal year 2007; or

''(B) the pre-adolescent child adoption rate for the State for the then preceding fiscal year.

''(6) PRE-ADOLESCENT CHILD ADOPTION.—The term 'pre-adolescent child adoption' means the final adoption of a child who has attained 9 years of age but not 14 years of age if—

''(A) at the time of the adoptive placement, the child was in foster care under the supervision of the State; or

''(B) an adoption assistance agreement was in effect under section 473 with respect to the child.

''(7) OLDER CHILD ADOPTION RATE.—The term 'older child adoption rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of older child adoptions finalized in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year, who have attained 14 years of age.

''(8) BASE RATE OF OLDER CHILD ADOPTIONS.—The term 'base rate of older child adoptions' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the older child adoption rate for the State for fiscal year 2007; or

''(B) the older child adoption rate for the State for the then preceding fiscal year.

''(9) OLDER CHILD ADOPTION.—The term 'older child adoption' means the final adoption of a child who has attained 14 years of age if—

''(A) at the time of the adoptive placement, the child was in foster care under the supervision of the State; or

''(B) an adoption assistance agreement was in effect under section 473 with respect to the child.

''(10) FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP RATE.—The term 'foster child guardianship rate' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the percentage determined by dividing—

''(A) the number of foster child guardianships occurring in the State during the fiscal year; by

''(B) the number of children in foster care under the supervision of the State on the last day of the preceding fiscal year.

''(11) BASE RATE OF FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIPS.—The term 'base rate of foster child guardianships' means, with respect to a State and a fiscal year, the lesser of—

''(A) the foster child guardianship rate for the State for fiscal year 2007; or

''(B) the foster child guardianship rate for the State for the then preceding fiscal year.

''(12) FOSTER CHILD GUARDIANSHIP.—The term 'foster child guardianship' means, with respect to a State, the exit of a child from foster care under the responsibility of the State to live with a legal guardian, if the State has reported to the Secretary—

''(A) that the State agency has determined that—

''(i) the child has been removed from his or her home pursuant to a voluntary placement agreement or as a result of a judicial determination to the effect that continuation in the home would be contrary to the welfare of the child;

''(ii) being returned home or adopted are not appropriate permanency options for the child;

''(iii) the child demonstrates a strong attachment to the prospective legal guardian, and the prospective legal guardian has a strong commitment to caring permanently for the child; and

''(iv) if the child has attained 14 years of age, the child has been consulted regarding the legal guardianship arrangement; or

''(B) the alternative procedures used by the State to determine that legal guardianship is the appropriate option for the child.''.

SEC. 103. RENAMING OF PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The section heading of section 473A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 473A. ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 473A of such Act is amended in each of subsections (a), (d)(1), (d)(2)(A), and (d)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 673b(a), (d)(1), (d)(2)(A), and (d)(2)(B)) by inserting ''and legal guardianship'' after ''adoption'' each place it appears.

(2) The heading of section 473A(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(d)) is amended by inserting ''AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP'' after ''ADOPTION''.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON USE OF INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.

Section 473A(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(f)) is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting '', and shall use the amount to supplement, and not supplant, any Federal or non-Federal funds used to provide any service under part B or E'' before the period.

SEC. 105. INCREASE IN PERIOD FOR WHICH INCENTIVE PAYMENTS ARE AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURE.

Section 473A(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673b(e)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''24-MONTH'' and inserting ''36-MONTH''; and

(2) by striking ''24-month'' and inserting ''36-month''.

SEC. 106. STATE REPORT ON CALCULATION AND USE OF SAVINGS RESULTING FROM THE PHASE-OUT OF ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR ADOPTION ASSISTANCE; REQUIREMENT TO SPEND 20 PERCENT OF SAVINGS ON POST-ADOPTION SERVICES.

Section 473(a)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(a)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

''(8)(A) A State shall calculate the savings (if any) resulting from the application of paragraph (2)(A)(ii) to all applicable children for a fiscal year, using a methodology specified by the Secretary or an alternate methodology proposed by the State and approved by the Secretary.

''(B) A State shall annually report to the Secretary—

''(i) the methodology used to make the calculation described in subparagraph (A), without regard to whether any savings are found;

''(ii) the amount of any savings referred to in subparagraph (A); and

''(iii) how any such savings are spent, accounting for and reporting the spending separately from any other spending reported to the Secretary under part B or E.

''(C) The Secretary shall make all information reported pursuant to subparagraph (B) available on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services in a location easily accessible to the public.

''(D) A State shall spend an amount equal to the amount of the savings (if any) in State expenditures under this part resulting from the application of paragraph (2)(A)(ii) to all applicable children for a fiscal year, to provide to children of families any service that may be provided under this part or part B, and shall spend not less than 20 percent of any such savings on post-adoption services. Any such spending shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, any Federal or non-Federal funds used to provide any service under part B or E.''.

SEC. 107. PRESERVATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.

Section 473(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 673(d)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) ELIGIBILITY NOT AFFECTED BY REPLACEMENT OF GUARDIAN WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.—In the event of the death or incapacity of the relative guardian, the eligibility of a child for a kinship guardianship assistance payment under this subsection shall not be affected by reason of the replacement of the relative guardian with a successor legal guardian named in the kinship guardianship assistance agreement referred to in paragraph (1) (including in any amendment to the agreement), notwithstanding subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and section 471(a)(28).''.

SEC. 108. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2013.

(b) RESTRUCTURING AND RENAMING OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 102 and 103 shall take effect on October 1, 2014, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) TRANSITION RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount payable to a State under section 473A of the Social Security Act for fiscal year 2014 shall be an amount equal to ½ of the sum of—

(A) the total amount that would be payable to the State under such section for fiscal year 2014 if the amendments made by section 102 of this Act had not taken effect; and

(B) the total amount that would be payable to the State under such section for fiscal year 2014 in the absence of this paragraph.

(c) PRESERVATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH A SUCCESSOR GUARDIAN.—The amendment made by section 107 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF FAMILY CONNECTION GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF FAMILY CONNECTION GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 427(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 627(h)) is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2016''.

TITLE III—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

SEC. 301. IMPROVING THE COLLECTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE OVERPAYMENTS THROUGH TAX REFUND OFFSET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 303 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) In the case of a covered unemployment compensation debt (as defined under section 6402(f)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that remains uncollected as of the date that is 2 years after the date when such debt was first incurred, the State to which such debt is owed shall take action to recover such debt under section 6402(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today to urge support for H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act.

Obviously, I look old enough to be a grandfather, and I am a proud grandfather of six. Two of my grandchildren are adopted grandchildren. I was a foster grandfather. My daughter and her husband were foster parents for a while, and they ended up finding two children that they really wanted to include as part of their family.

These two children today are 9 and 10, and soon to be 10 and 11 here in the next few months. They were 3 months old when they came into the house as foster kids and now are adopted and a part of not only my daughter and her husband's family, but a part of the entire family. The Reichert household has been blessed with their presence, and they have a hope for a successful future with a loving family. This is what this bill is all about, to encourage parents across this country to adopt foster children.

I also had the opportunity, as the sheriff in King County and as a detective in King County, to watch from a very close view of what foster homes looked like. As I walked into those homes as a police officer and as a detective, I questioned how some of these places could even be foster homes. There were foster kids running away from home and ending up on the street and not having a place to call their own, not having a place where they could go to have Thanksgiving, to have Christmas, bouncing from one foster home to the next, not knowing who to call Mom or Dad. We have got to fix that. We need to encourage parents across this country to adopt our foster children, to give them that opportunity.

The other good thing about this bill is it is bipartisan. In fact, I can't think of a more important or more bipartisan topic than promoting adoption for our children. That is why we are here today. This is an area where both parties have worked together to improve outcomes for children, and it has been working.

In the 10 years from 1987 through 1997, the number of children in foster care rose dramatically, climbing from 300,000 to 537,000. That surge in foster care caseloads is one of the reasons Congress, led by current Ways and Means Chairman DAVE CAMP, passed the Adoption and Safe Families Act in 1997. That law was designed to ensure more foster children were quickly adopted when they couldn't return and live safely with their parents.

The Adoption Incentives program, created as a part of that law, was one key measure to encourage more adoptions of children from foster care. In short, it rewards States if they increase the number of children living in foster care for adoptive homes. It worked. Since the passage of the Adoption and Safe Families Act, foster care caseloads have fallen dramatically. After peaking at 567,000 in 1999, foster care caseloads have fallen almost 30 percent. At the same time, adoptions from foster care increased in the late nineties and remained much higher than before the 1997 law's passage.

Today, we are here to support H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care, which will build upon the successes of the Adoption Incentives program. This legislation extends that program and improves the way we reward States that help more children leave foster care for loving, adoptive homes.

First, it improves the formulas behind these awards to make sure that even as foster care caseloads continue to come down, States continue to get awards for moving children into adoptive homes.

Second, it continues to promote the type of adoptions that have proven hardest to achieve by adding a special award for the adoption of teenage children. We should never give up on trying to find lifelong homes for these children, and this legislation steps up the incentives for States to do just that.

Third, we add a new award for guardianship, which is an important development in the child welfare world that is allowing thousands of children to leave foster care and live safely with relatives. This bill also requires States to focus funds on post-adoption services, which help children and families after adoptions have been finalized.

Finally, the bill would extend for 3 years the Family Connection Grant program that is focused on helping children in foster care reconnect with family members. Because funding for that program needs to be offset, we included a commonsense pay-for, which builds on a current procedure for recovering overpayments of unemployment insurance benefits. Under current law, States may offset Federal income tax refunds to collect these overpayments, and two-thirds of States do that today. This legislation would require all States to use this procedure, which will increase overpayment recovery and results in this legislation reducing the deficit by $24 million over the next 10 years.

As chairman of the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee with jurisdiction over this program, I am pleased to report that the process behind developing this bill has been totally bipartisan and open. First, we held a subcommittee hearing in February featuring nonpartisan experts on adoption and child welfare. We then worked together with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to develop draft legislation, which was made publicly available in early August. We then worked together to incorporate that public feedback, improving in many ways the legislation that Chairman CAMP and I and Ranking Members LEVIN and DOGGETT introduced on September 27.

I want to thank the subcommittee's ranking member, Mr. DOGGETT, who joins me on the floor this evening, as well as Chairman CAMP and Ranking Member LEVIN, for their support of this legislation and for their help throughout this development. This will move us a step forward and closer to ensuring that more children living in the United States live in permanent, loving homes, and receive the support they deserve.

I invite all Members to join us in supporting this important bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Thank you, Chairman REICHERT and Chairman CAMP.

Mr. Speaker, abused and neglected children in the foster care system are among the most vulnerable children in our communities. These children have the same needs, desires, and dreams as all young people. They need a safe and loving home. They want and deserve the opportunity to learn, to grow, and to fully experience life. A successful adoption provides foster children with these necessities and gives them the opportunity to achieve their full God-given potential.

Investing in the success of our foster children is not only good for them; but in so many communities, it is the difference between those young people becoming a community asset and a community liability. It is about reducing future unemployment, homelessness, teen pregnancy, and incarceration.

This bill contributes to our continuing efforts to address these issues and to provide permanent homes for abused and neglected children. I am pleased that Mr. LEVIN and I could work with Chairman CAMP and Chairman REICHERT to develop this bipartisan legislation to not only extend some important programs, but to make a number of positive changes. Mr. REICHERT has outlined some of these. I would add attention to a provision that I authored to help ensure that children don't lose assistance simply because their guardian dies.

As a longtime member of the Congressional Coalition of Adoption and a member of the Foster Youth Caucus, I am pleased that we could take these steps in the right direction on a bipartisan basis to help these young people. The legislation both continues and improves the incentives now provided to the States when they increase the rate at which foster children, who cannot return home, find an adoptive family. These new incentives will now be even more focused on the promotion of adoption of older foster children, who are sometimes a bit more difficult to place and who have found difficulty in securing a permanent home.

Additionally, for the first time, the bill will reward States for helping youth leave foster care to live with a permanent legal guardian. Recognizing the importance of maintaining the link between family and children in foster care, the legislation also extends a relatively new, but expiring, program known as the Family Connection

Grants. These grants go out on a competitive basis to local organizations and State agencies to support various approaches for improving connections between foster families and their children, including linking grandparents to supports and services when they become the primary caregivers for children who would otherwise be in foster care.

Another provision that I care about greatly is strengthening of the requirement that adoption funding be spent on promoting adoption rather than being diverted to other purposes. Most notably, this legislation requires States to fully reinvest the funds into post-adoption services and other child welfare activities when these amounts were made available by an increase in Federal funding for adoption support.

In total, this legislation will continue the progress we have made over the last 15 years in moving foster children into permanent homes. In my home State of Texas, San Antonio has been viewed as a particular model of success for adoption. Each month, Bexar County hosts an adoption day event that allows families to complete their adoptions in a single day. These are proceedings that have allowed children to have shorter stays in foster care and to move more quickly into stable homes. Judges in Bexar County understand that they are responsible for getting children who experience abuse and neglect into a safe foster environment and are responsible for placing that child with a permanent family if it does not become safe for the child to return home.

These improvements in the local adoption system have been encouraged and utilized by important local child advocates like District Judge Peter Sakai and CASA San Antonio. They have allowed for faster and more efficient placement of foster youth into permanent families.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this bipartisan effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee for yielding and for his leadership on this very important issue.

I rise in support of this legislation, which is designed to encourage the adoption of more children from foster care.

I spent much of my career promoting adoption of children by loving parents because every child deserves a loving and safe home. As an attorney in private practice, I worked with parents and children in the foster care system. Those sorts of experiences provided much of the background for changes in landmark adoption legislation I and my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee crafted in 1997 called the Adoption and Safe Families Act. That legislation streamlined the adoption process to help more children in foster care quickly move into permanent adoptive homes. It also for the first time offered incentives to States to safely increase the number of children adopted from foster care.

It worked. In the decade following that legislation, the number of U.S. children adopted from foster care increased by 71 percent. In the years since, adoptions have continued to remain higher even as the foster care caseload started to decline.

□ 1745

Overall, almost 300 children have been adopted as a result of the increases in adoptions since 1997. One study even estimated that the Federal Government saved $1 billion over 8 years by ensuring children were adopted instead of remaining in foster care.

That is the successful incentive program this legislation extends and updates. We add a new award for States that increase adoptions of older children, who are the hardest to adopt and have the worst outcomes if they ''emancipate'' from foster care without a family to call their own. We also add a new award for increases in guardianship, when family members step up to care for their nieces and nephews, grandsons and granddaughters. And this bill ensures States maintain their commitment to post-adoption and related services so that children may truly have a family forever.

I note that this legislation is fully paid for by a simple and real reform requiring States to reduce Federal income tax refunds when someone wrongly gets an overpayment for unemployment benefits. Those savings not only cover the cost of this legislation, but reduce the deficit by $24 million over the next 10 years. That is a win-win for children, for families, and for taxpayers alike.

The bottom line is this: children in foster care deserve a place to call home, not just for a few months or years, but for good. We have already seen great progress in increasing adoptions since the Adoption Incentives program was created in 1997, and it is our hope that we can continue this progress with this bill.

I thank my colleagues who joined me in introducing this legislation: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. REICHERT of Washington State, and Mr. DOGGETT of Texas. They are all leaders on this issue in the committee and this House, and I value their help in developing and advancing this legislation.

I would also like to recognize the public comment we received in crafting this bill. A draft bill was posted on the Ways and Means Committee Web site in August, and the public was given a month to provide their thoughts on how to ensure more children are adopted. The bill we are considering today incorporates many of those suggestions, and we are grateful for the public's comments and their participation in this process.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill in the House, and I hope the Senate will act as soon as they can so we can continue to move even more children from foster care into permanent, loving homes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, surely no Member of the House has expressed more interest in this subject than the founder of the Foster Youth Caucus, our colleague from California (Ms. BASS), to whom I yield 3 minutes.

Ms. BASS. Thank you, Ranking Member DOGGETT.

I rise today in support of the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act.

First, I would like to commend Chairman CAMP and Chairman REICHERT and Ranking Members LEVIN and DOGGETT for their great work on this legislation and their ongoing commitment to our Nation's foster youth. As the cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth and the Congressional Caucus on Adoption, I sincerely appreciate your leadership and partnership on this issue.

Since 1997, when the Adoption Incentives legislation became law, we have seen a significant reduction of the number of kids in foster care and, more importantly, an increased number of kids in forever families; yet there are still over 400,000 children in our Nation's child welfare system, many awaiting the stability and love of a permanent family.

Unfortunately, studies show that foster youth, especially those who ''age out,'' are much more likely to experience poverty, unemployment, homelessness, incarceration, and compromised health after they leave foster care. Each year, nearly 30,000 teenagers age out of foster care without a permanent family. We know that this is unfair and unacceptable. We must strengthen policies that help to find forever families for our Nation's foster children, especially our older youth.

I would like to focus my remarks on one of the noteworthy aspects of the bill—the enhanced support for legal guardianship. By making this investment, we will ultimately help more kids find permanent families, often with relatives.

Today's foster care system looks much different than the child welfare system of previous decades. While children continue to be placed in foster homes with strangers or in group homes, more than half are placed with a relative caregiver, a grandmother, aunt, uncle, or older sibling. In fact, in my district in Los Angeles, relative caregivers are the largest foster care providers. Research shows that foster placement with relatives is good for children. They often allow children to stay in their schools, receive continued support from their community and culture, and feel connected to families that continue to love them.

Despite the importance of relative caregivers, they face unique obstacles. Becoming a caregiver changes lives in every way—physically, emotionally, and financially. Stable middle class families or seniors who live on their life savings are often pushed to the brink of poverty because they have accepted the unexpected financial burden of caring for a child. As a Nation, we should take the extra steps needed to support family members that heroically step up to care for children in times of need.

Additionally, I strongly support the Family Connection Grants reauthorized in this bill. These grants help to strengthen families, support kinship care, and prevent youth from entering or reentering foster care.

Before my time in elected office, I was honored to advocate for kinship and guardianship resources alongside relative caregivers at the Community Coalition's Kinship in Action program. Today, I am greatly encouraged that the bill before us encourages permanent families of all kinds, supporting both adoption and guardianship throughout the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3,000 Hoosier children are currently eligible for adoption while living in foster care. Now, I know all of us can agree that these children and the over 100,000 children in the United States eligible for adoption deserve a stable, permanent, and loving home. While there is no doubt our foster care programs provide an essential service, I strongly believe, as a proud father of four young children and as someone who used to provide free legal services to those wanting to adopt, that there can be no substitute for the care a loving family can provide.

Whether it is living with a family member or being adopted into a new family, we must do everything in our powers to see that children everywhere receive the best upbringing possible. This legislation represents a step forward in finding these children caring and supportive homes. By extending the Adoption Incentives program, we effectively encourage and incentivize States to help adopt more children out of foster care so these children can lead happy, healthy, and successful lives.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the managers of this bill, the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Texas, my colleague from, we would say on the floor, the great State of Texas.

This is a very important measure that I have had an opportunity to engage in. A couple of years back—I would say more years than I would like to remember—former Congressman Mike Andrews and myself were cochairs of the Foster Grandparents Program in Houston, and it drew me to the importance of both foster care and adoption.

I have also spent some time with Senator MARY LANDRIEU, who, as many know, is a very strong advocate of the idea of adoption and legal guardianship for children in foster care.

One of the new phenomenons that we are seeing more and more is the phenomenon of aging out for foster care children; and so I rise today to support H.R. 3205 and compliment the cochairs of the Foster Care Caucus, of which I am a member, Congresswoman BASS and cochair MARINO, and really ask my colleagues to support this important initiative. I am very proud to cosponsor this legislation; and as a cochair and founder of the Congressional Childrens Caucus, now almost 20 years, I would like to say I strongly support it.

The more times that we can say something positive about children in a bipartisan way on the floor of the House, the more of a national statement and commitment is seen by those who are in the various venues in our States and county government and city government who work every day to protect our children. Foster care serves our children and families in a temporary placement by providing suitable, permanent living. Most children are placed in foster care temporarily due to parental abuse and neglect.

In Harris County, my county in Texas, 2,388 children were taken into protective custody in 2011. The average number of children in foster care each month in Harris County is 5,300. 2,440 children in Child Protective Service custody were placed in permanent living in Harris County in 2011.

This is the right direction to go. As of September 30, 2012, 1,740 children in the Houston region are still waiting to be adopted; and, on average, children stay in the system for almost 3 years before either being reunited with their families or adopted.

What a wonderful statement to know that there are families or adults that love you. Many times, those adoptions are amongst family members. Many times, the grandparents take the children. Let's thank them, because that was the program I was involved in, to give R and R, rest, to the grandparents who foster care for many, many children.

Frequent moves, different schools, our children need loving care. They need stability. Many times these foster parents provide that kind of stability. Many foster children have been separated not only from their parents, but from their siblings, and this can be very detrimental socially, emotionally, and psychologically.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. So this legislation, which reauthorizes and restructures the Adoption Incentives Grant Program, will help enhance, cultivate, and advance the foster care system by making it a program that is beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, I was not able to come to the floor for H.R. 2083. I also, as a cochair of the Congressional Childrens Caucus, focusing on the abuse of children, want to salute and support the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act and ask this floor to support both of these initiatives, because when we speak for children, we speak for America.

I hope that we will also see, soon, antibullying and prevention legislation on the floor, Mr. Speaker, to make that public statement.

I thank the gentleman for his yielding, and I want to salute Little Audrey's in Houston for the work they have done for the children in Houston, Texas. Thank you, Alma, very much for the work you have done.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Adoption and Foster Care Caucuses and as Chair of the Congressional Childrens Caucus, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3205, the "Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act."

I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this bill because it promotes adoption, protects children and provides grant funding for the foster care system.

Foster care serves our children and families as a temporary placement until a suitable permanent living arrangement is made that best fits the child.

Most children are placed in foster care temporarily due to parental abuse or neglect. In Harris County, 2,388 children were taken into protective custody in 2011. The average number of children in foster care each month in Harris County is 5,300.

In addition, 2,440 children in Children's Protective Service (CPS) custody were placed in a permanent living arrangement in Harris County in 2011. With court approval, 28.3 percent of the children were returned to their own families, 26.5 percent were placed with relatives, and 34.4 percent were placed in adoptive homes.

As of September 31, 2012, 1,740 children in the Houston Region are still waiting to be adopted (1,503 in Harris County).

On average, children stay in the system for almost three years before either being reunited with their families or adopted. Children have on average three different foster care placements.

Frequent moves in and out of the homes of strangers can be profoundly unsettling and quite difficult for children, and it is not uncommon to hear of children who have been in 20 or 30 different homes during their time in foster care.

Many foster children have been separated not only from their parents, but from their siblings, which can be very detrimental to a child socially, emotionally and psychologically.

Many children in foster care unfortunately have to undergo multiple placement changes several times while in foster care due to a wide range of factors such as licensing standards violations, court rulings, behavioral

issues, or changes in the foster home or facility.

In my home city of Houston, CPS does a remarkable job increase in providing placement options that will better match the needs of each individual child that goes through the foster care system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3205 reauthorizes and restructures the adoption incentives grant program. These grant funds will help enhance, cultivate, and advance the foster care system by making it a program that is beneficial while effectively serving children. These resources will give children in foster care the opportunity to flourish in whatever living placement they are given.

Adoption is more than just a legal process, it is an emotional, social and psychological process in which children who have been removed from their biological parents become full and permanent legal members of another family. Adoption has many facets and touches people in different ways.

This bill promotes adoption and will help ensure that people who are willing and able to serve will have the necessary information and means to become legal guardians of foster children in need of placement.

Mr. Speaker, children are our hope for a better tomorrow, but it is up to us to promote adoption so that children may have legal guardians who will properly care for them and help them know the joy and security that comes with being a member of a loving family.

For these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 3205. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, hopefully the Senate will respond to our strong show of bipartisan support by moving this legislation this year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD letters of support for this legislation from Christian Heritage, Center for Family Finding and Youth Connectedness, Seneca Family of Agencies, The Donaldson Adoption Institute, Hillside Family of Agencies, and Voice for Adoption.

I want to echo the words of Mr. DOGGETT. I hope the Senate does act on this.

There are three things that I would like to just highlight as we wrap up this evening's discussion on foster care, three things that this bill does: one, it cuts the deficit; two, amazingly, in this time of partisanship, this is a true bipartisan moment that we all ought to stop, pause, and take recognition of.

This is about children. It cuts the deficit, and this is one that we can all come together and support. Why? Because it is for our kids. It is for the kids across America who need a home.

I mentioned two of my grandchildren who are foster children, were foster children, are now adopted, but they were even more special. They were drug-addicted babies, crack cocaine, heroin, and meth, and these kids today have a home.

As a grandparent, standing on the sidelines of a soccer game watching Emma and Briar play soccer, knowing where they came from, the moms lived on the streets, drug-addicted moms, these kids have hope. They have a future. When the game is over, they run to the sidelines and they yell, ''Papa.'' It is the greatest feeling in the world.

We owe that kind of life to every foster child.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CHRISTIAN HERITAGE,
September 30, 2013.

Chairman DAVE CAMP,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: I am writing in support of the Fostering Connections Grants that support Family Finding research and the Adoptions Incentives program.

Kevin Campbell, founder of Family Finding; the State of Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services; and Christian Heritage, a nonprofit, faith-based organization, have been working together in a collaborative effort to find permanency for children who have been languishing in Nebraska's foster care system.

The principles of Family Finding are: 1. Every child has a family and they CAN be found, 2. Loneliness can be devastating, even dangerous, and is experienced by most children, 3. A meaningful connection to family helps a child develop a sense of belonging. and 4. The single factor most closely associated with positive outcomes for children is meaningful, lifelong connections to family.

Mr. Campbell began working with the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services and Christian Heritage in April of this year. We have already learned the following: 1. Families for Nebraska's children in foster care are larger than we had initially believed. 2. More family members are willing to offer relationships of support than previously believed. 3. More fathers are willing to come forward and offer support to their children than originally anticipated, and 4. Family members have been willing to make offers of legal permanency EVEN for youth with the most complex needs.

How effective are the Family Finding services in Nebraska? To date, 100 percent of the children whose cases have completed Phase Three (of six phases) now have a Lifetime Network of Unconditional Support consisting of five or more family members, and 82 percent of the children who have completed Phase Three have at least one person identified who is willing to provide permanency. This program is tremendously successful and we urge your support of continued funding for the Fostering Connections grants

Respectfully yours,

GREGG NICKLAS,
Co-CEO.

FAMILY FINDING,
Oakland, CA, September 30, 2013.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OFFICE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVE CAMP AND HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: I am writing to lend my support to the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, which would reauthorize the existing program as well as provide more resources and flexibility for states working toward improved permanency for children in the foster care system.

As I outlined in my recommendations to the United States Senate Committee on Finance in April, the Adoption Incentive Grants and other fiscal rewards have clearly increased the number of adoptions from and reduced the number of children in foster care. This suggests that incentives made available to states that reward results have significant impact. A focus on adoption rates will incentivize states to work toward adoptions and legal guardianships in an environment of declining foster care caseloads.

Extending the Family Connection Grants is also a critical component of the Act. Family Connections Grants are currently supporting the development of innovative practice models which incorporate Family Finding with trauma-informed practices—models that attend to grief and the multiple losses that children experience by entering and remaining in care, and other key family involvement strategies such as Family Group Decision Making and Safety Organized Practice—to better serve children in foster care. These investments serve as incubators which promote innovation and are necessary to advance practice, as current funding does not allow for or support such experiments. As Brian Samuels, Commissioner of the Administration on Children, Youth and Families, stated, two of the primary keys to attaining safety, permanence and well-being for children and youth in foster care are the promotion of healthy relationships and the prioritization of kinship care. The Family Finding approach squarely targets and successfully achieves these goals.

In my work across the county providing training, consultation, and technical assistance to local child welfare agencies, statewide child welfare entities, and private, nonprofit organizations, I am convinced that there is urgent need to continue to invest in innovations in practice that respond to the continued growth in the presence of older adolescents in the out-of-home care system as well as the increase in the number of youth aging out of care. Significant progress in learning has come about through the original discretionary grants, This is not the time to stop our efforts on behalf of these youth and families.

Thank you for considering reauthorizing the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act. Every day that a child is in care is a crisis for that child, and legislative efforts that work toward reducing length of time in care, improving adoption and legal guardianship rates, and connecting children and youth to family members are of utmost importance.

Sincerely,

KEVIN A. CAMPBELL,
Founder, Center for Family Finding and Youth Permanency.

SENECA,
Oakland, CA, September 30, 2013.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OFFICE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DAVE CAMP AND HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: I am pleased to provide this letter in support of the Promoting Adoption and Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act. We believe this bill is an important step in continuing progress toward ensuring every child grows up with a committed and loving family and we value the leadership the Committee has shown in pursuing this goal.

Seneca Family of Agencies was founded in 1985 with a dedication to providing unconditional care to the most struggling youth served by California's child welfare system. Recognizing that far too many youth with significant mental health challenges were growing up in institutional settings lacking any connection to their family and communities, Seneca was formed to provide youth with the consistent and caring therapeutic

environments and relationships that promote their healing from histories of dramatic trauma and loss. Each year our agency serves thousands of children and families, with the mission to help children and families succeed through their most difficult times.

As our agency and both state and federal policy have evolved, our practice of unconditional care has grown to include many of the services that are supported with the Promoting Adoption and Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, including post-adoption support services and Family Finding efforts. Most recently, our agency has been the recipient of a federal Family Connections Grant to provide integrated Family Finding and Family Group Decision Making services in collaboration with the San Francisco Human Service Agency. This grant has been an integral component of efforts to further promote stable and permanent placements of youth with parents and relatives system-wide. Still in the early stages of implementation, the project has already elicited important lessons on how to effectively embed permanency-focused services within large public systems of care. These lessons have influenced practice within our agency and San Francisco County more broadly. Dissemination of this information to the national human service community has already begun. Projects funded by the Family Connections grants, such as these, have important potential to test innovative practices and influence the national community with practices that promote permanency and youth wellbeing.

We appreciate the value the Committee on Ways and Means has placed on supporting the wellbeing and stability of foster youth. The Promoting Adoption and Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act encourages the alignment of resources with widely embraced values and goals that every child deserves to be loved and cared for by safe and stable families and we are pleased to offer our support of this important bill.

Sincerely,

KEN BERRICK,
CEO/President,
Seneca Family of Agencies.

THE DONALDSON ADOPTION INSTITUTE,
New York, NY, September 30, 2013.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

HON. MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: The Donaldson Adoption Institute is delighted to support the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act (H.R. 3205). The Adoption Institute is an independent, nonpartisan policy and education nonprofit organization that conducts research and analysis in order to improve federal and state adoption-related laws, policies and practices. Our ''Keeping the Promise'' initiative, for instance, aims to expand an essential tool to enable children in foster care to join, and remain in, permanent, safe and loving families: adoption support and preservation services.

The Adoption Institute is pleased that H.R. 3205 reauthorizes the Adoption Incentives program through FY2016, restructures awards to incentivize increasing adoptions of pre-adolescent and older children, and establishes a new award for increases in the rate of children leaving foster care for legal guardianship. We also applaud the mandate that states report savings resulting from the adoption assistance-income eligibility delink and reinvestments in child welfare, as well as spend a minimum of 20 percent of savings on post-adoption services for children adopted from care.

We appreciate the Committee's bipartisan efforts, solicitation of expert testimony, and consideration of comments on the August draft proposal that it notes ''informed several changes made to the bipartisan legislation introduced.'' We also are glad to see that the House schedule indicates that the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act may be considered this week on the House Floor.

We are communicating the Institute's support of H.R. 3205 to our stakeholders and asking them to contact their Members for their support as well.

Thank you for your leadership; it is truly a testament to the Committee's commitment to the over 100,000 children still waiting in temporary care for permanent families. Please feel free to contact us if you would like additional information.

Sincerely,

ADAM PERTMAN,
Executive Director,
Donaldson Adoption Institute.
RUTH MCROY,
Board Member,
Senior Research Fellow.

HILLSIDE,
Rochester, NY, October 7, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP, Chairman,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. SANDER LEVIN, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. DAVE REICHERT, Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Resources
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES CAMP, LEVIN, REICHERT, DOGGETT: Hillside Family of Agencies is pleased to extend our support and appreciation to members of the Ways and Means Committee for your recent bipartisan bill, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act (H.R. 3205). Thank you for your joint effort to reauthorize and improve the federal Adoption Incentives Program. The Committee has a long history of bipartisan leadership on child welfare issues and we commend you for your continued work on behalf of vulnerable children and families.

Hillside Family of Agencies is a leading provider of child welfare, mental health, youth development, juvenile justice, special education, and developmental disabilities services, including more than 120 services to children and families at more than 40 locations across Western and Central New York and in Prince George's County, Maryland.

In the United States today, more than 102,000 children in foster care are waiting to be adopted. At the same time, thousands of families across the country are willing to open their hearts and homes to adopt children from the child welfare system. Hillside Family of Agencies works to bring children and families together through our Adoption and Family Finding efforts. We operate under the philosophy that all children deserve permanency and that each child has the right and potential to have a safe, loving, forever family. We are committed to building collaborative relationships with families, professionals, and communities to create a sense of urgency in providing permanence so that every child is able to know and grow within a family of their own.

The long term success of families who adopt this nation's waiting children is dependent upon their ability to meet the needs of those who have experienced prior abuse and/or neglect. Families must have access to community resources that enable them to meet the significant emotional and behavioral challenges that children who have suffered from early and repeated trauma often bring to their families. For this reason, Hillside Family of Agencies has been a strong advocate for increased investments into permanency efforts children and youth in foster care, and for accessible, comprehensive post adoption services for all adoptive families. We have had considerable experience and success in finding adoptive families for children in foster care and in supporting those families when funding is available for post adoption services.

Hillside Family of Agencies is especially grateful for the Committee's recent actions to: Reauthorize the program and include a greater emphasis on adoption rate increases; Establish a greater incentive for states who increase permanency for older youth in foster care; Establish, for the first time, an incentive for increased guardianship placements; Require HHS and states to calculate savings from the Title IV–E adoption assistance ''de-link,'' resulting from the Fostering Connections Act of 2008; Require not less than 20 percent of states adoption assistance ''de-link'' savings be invested into post adoption services; Extension of the Family Connection Grants.

We appreciate the process that the Committee undertook over the past several months to identify potential areas of improvement, both through the holding of oversight hearings and the solicitation of public feedback on the draft proposal that was shared in August 2013. We applaud your work to incorporate improvements suggested by thoughtful and concerned stakeholders.

Adoption is permanent, irrevocable, and lifelong. Hillside Family of Agencies is committed to supporting families and keeping them intact throughout their lifetimes. On behalf of the children and families we serve, we thank you.

Sincerely,

DENNIS RICHARDSON,
President and CEO,
Hillside Family of Agencies.

VOICE FOR ADOPTION,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP, Chairman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DAVE REICHERT, Chairman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. SANDER LEVIN, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT, Ranking Member,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES CAMP, LEVIN, REICHERT, DOGGETT: Voice for Adoption (VFA) is pleased to extend our support and appreciation to members of the Ways and Means Committee for your recent bipartisan bill, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act (H.R. 3205). Thank you for your joint effort to reauthorize and improve the federal Adoption Incentives Program. This Committee has a long history of bipartisan leadership on child welfare issues and we commend you for your continued work on behalf of vulnerable children and families.

VFA is an advocacy organization whose mission is to raise awareness of the needs of the 102,000 children in foster care who are waiting to be adopted and the families that adopt from public child welfare. We believe that every child deserves a family; as a nation we must ensure that children's safety and permanency is always paramount. Secondly, we must ensure that families who commit to loving and raising children who have experienced prior abuse and/or neglect are equipped to meet the significant emotional and behavioral needs that their children can sometimes present. For these reasons, VFA has been a strong advocate for

both, increased investments into permanency—especially for the longest waiting children and older youth in foster care—and for greater post-adoption services.

VFA's members are especially grateful for the Committees recent actions to: Reauthorize the program and include a greater emphasis on adoption rate increases; Establish a greater incentive for states who increase permanency for older youth in foster care; Establish, for the first time, an incentive for increased guardianship placements; Require HHS and states to calculate savings resulting from the title IV–E adoption assistance ''de-link'', resulting from the Fostering Connections Act of 2008; Require not less than 20 percent of states adoption assistance ''de-link'' savings be invested into post-adoption services; Extension of the Family Connections Grants.

We would also like to thank you for the process that the Committee took over the past several months to hear about ways that this program could be improved, both through holding oversight hearings and soliciting public feedback on the draft proposal that was shared in August 2013. We applaud your work to incorporate improvements suggested by stakeholders and we look forward to working with you going forward.

Sincerely,

NICOLE DOBBINS,
Executive Director.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3205.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Suspending the rules and passing:

H.R. 185, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3205, by the yeas and nays; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, de novo.

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

PAUL BROWN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 185) to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the ''Paul Brown United States Courthouse,'' 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—402

Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
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
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—27

Aderholt
Blumenauer
Broun (GA)
Calvert
Campbell
Cárdenas
Cicilline
Davis, Danny
Fincher
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Marino
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent
Palazzo
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Shimkus
Van Hollen
Wilson (SC)

□ 1856

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING ADOPTION AND LEGAL GUARDIANSHIP FOR CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3205) to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

YEAS—402

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

NOT VOTING—28

Aderholt
Blumenauer
Broun (GA)
Calvert
Campbell
Cárdenas
Cicilline
Davis, Danny
Fincher
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Marino
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
Nugent
Palazzo
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Shimkus
Van Hollen
Wilson (SC)

□ 1906

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HARPER. 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 275, noes 116, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—275

Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel

Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—116

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Clarke
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Crowley
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Duckworth
Ellison
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Renacci
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sires
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert
Owens

NOT VOTING—37

Aderholt
Amodei
Blumenauer
Broun (GA)
Calvert
Campbell
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Davis, Danny
DeLauro
Eshoo
Fincher
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Grimm
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Jeffries
Kelly (PA)
Marino
McCarthy (NY)
Nugent
Palazzo
Pearce
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Schock
Schweikert
Shimkus
Simpson
Van Hollen
Wilson (SC)

□ 1915

Mr. BARBER and Ms. LEE of California changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY, FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 383

In tbe House of Representatives, U.S., October 22, 2013:

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Thomas S. Foley, former Member of the House for 15 terms and Speaker of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred First, One Hundred Second and One Hundred Third Congresses.

Resolved, That in the death of the Honorable Thomas S. Foley the United States and the State of Washington have lost a valued and eminent public servant and citizen.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 384

In the House of Representatives, U.S., October 22, 2013:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable C.W. Bill Young, a Representative from the State of Florida.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of applicable accounts of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 2248

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 2248, 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 (Mr. PITTENGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

C.W. BILL YOUNG DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3302) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the ''C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3302

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

SECTION 1. NAME OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER, BAY PINES, FLORIDA.

The Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the ''C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''. Any reference to such medical center in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material they may have on H.R. 3302.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today is bittersweet as we mark both the passing of a congressional stalwart,

Chairman C.W. BILL YOUNG, and pay a fitting tribute by naming the Bay Pines Veterans Medical Center in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, while the raw numbers themselves may speak volumes for his dedication to America, it is his personal qualities that I admire the most. When I came to Congress in 2001, BILL YOUNG was one of the first Members that welcomed me here. It was on this floor, in this Chamber, that BILL YOUNG introduced me to the Members of this House the night I was sworn in. Since then, I came to regard him not only as a mentor or a colleague but, more importantly, a personal friend.

Chairman YOUNG served the 13th District of Florida and the people of the United States for over 42 years. He was the senior member of the Florida congressional delegation and was the senior Republican in both the House and in the Senate. Counting his years in the Florida Legislature, BILL YOUNG served over 50 years in public service and worked with eight Presidents.

BILL will be most remembered for his devotion to America's defense and especially to the men and the women in the Armed Forces. Having served in uniform for 15 years as a member of the National Guard and Reserves, BILL was the go-to guy on defense issues here in the House. He dedicated his legislative and personal energies to improve the quality of life for the men and the women who serve; and, as a result, those who wear the uniform and face our foes have improved base housing, better medical care, increased pay, and the best equipment.

Members know BILL best for his work as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee from 1999 to 2005, and he continued to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense until the time of his passing. But BILL YOUNG was much more than a defense expert. He had also been a leading advocate for increased medical research.

BILL worked to double Federal medical research funding and funding to increase immunization rates for preschoolers, to improve public health programs, and to find cures for Parkinson's and Alzheimer's diseases. Just one example, the C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research program registry lists more than 9 million volunteer donors for patients with leukemia and other life-threatening diseases. That simple list has provided the gift of life to more than 50,000 individuals.

To completely describe the contributions of a man who served in this body for over 42 years would take hours. So with that, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire Florida delegation and all those who knew and served with him in this House and in the other body, I offer our most sincere condolences to his wife, Beverly, and his sons Rob, Billy, and Patrick. He was your husband and father. To us, BILL was a friend we will miss dearly.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of my favorite songs is ''May the Work I've Done Speak for Me.''

I rise today to pay tribute to Chairman BILL YOUNG, whose passing we mourn and whose dedication to American servicemembers is well known to his fellow Floridians, as well as to all who serve in this House.

Taking care of our Nation's men and women in uniform was his passion. He often called them ''kids'' because he cared for them as deeply as if they were his family.

Chairman YOUNG was an officer and a gentleman. He served for 9 years in the American National Guard. During his decades in Congress, he and his wife, Beverly, regularly visited the hospitalized combat troops in Florida and here at Bethesda. They helped arrange travel for military family members, or those who were having trouble paying the bills. Here in the House, at the Appropriations Committee, and in any other ways he could find, he was tireless in his work on behalf of servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

I worked with him when we were trying to finish the new courthouse in Orlando. This was just after the Oklahoma City bombing and all the new security requirements that were added to protect the buildings and the people in them.

The project was $19 million over budget, but the chairman came to what must have been the longest town hall meeting held here in the Capitol. Everyone had to say the chairman was a gentleman as always and wanted what was best for the people of Florida, regardless of party.

This was the case also when it came to funding for research. Chairman YOUNG knew how important cutting-edge research is and made it a priority to find the funding to help future generations of Americans.

Every year, BILL YOUNG was a keynote speaker at the Memorial Day program in Bay Pines. He initially worked with President Gerald Ford and the Appropriations Committee in 1976 to replace the original hospital building. At one point, he went so far as to personally show the President where the building was and how badly it was leaking. He was very proud of the new hospital, which opened in 1983. He was thrilled when they named the road encircling it Bill Young Road.

The VA Medical Center at Bay Pines has many services to completely serve today's veterans. There are all the health services that any hospital would provide; but, in addition, there are services for caregivers, dental services, extended care and services for seniors, along with programs that help homeless veterans.

□ 1930

In addition, the women veterans healthcare program at Bay Pines focuses on wellness education, preventive health care, disease management, and care for the emotional well-being of women veterans.

Today, we will go one step further in honoring the man who made the VA Medical Center at Bay Pines a reality. Today, we take the step of naming the whole facility after BILL YOUNG. It is a most appropriate tribute—to name the center whose mission it is to coordinate the care for wounded men and women who serve in their life and that was their mission.

Mr. Speaker, as we say good-bye to our friend and colleague Chairman BILL YOUNG, with this bill we can honor his service in the way I know he would appreciate most deeply—having his name associated daily and directly with the highest level of care for our military veterans.

I want to thank Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman MILLER for bringing it before us today, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the dean of our delegation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that the gentleman from Florida, Chairman MILLER, has given me some time; and I am so pleased to support his bill that he has gotten the entire Florida delegation, working in a bipartisan manner, to honor this good man and warm friend, Congressman BILL YOUNG.

BILL was a true patriot and a tenacious public servant, dedicating his life to his constituents in Pinellas County.

As you heard from some of our previous speakers, his accomplishments are so varied and many: creating a national bone marrow registry; improving the quality of life for Active Duty personnel, our National Guard, our Reserves, our veterans; protecting thousands of jobs in his area; preserving MacDill Air Force Base; improving Florida's environment. These are just some of BILL's many accomplishments.

BILL was always willing to lend a helping hand to members of our entire State delegation with projects that were important in our local community. For example, he helped me to find the funds to dredge the Miami River, to protect Homestead Air Reserve Base after it was devastated by Hurricane Andrew.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. But, more importantly, he was the consummate gentleman. He was principled. He was honest, maintaining civility with his colleagues, a trait that we no longer honor as we should. BILL was an example for all of us here in Congress. It was my privilege and my high honor to serve with him. What a great privilege.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

BILL YOUNG was my friend. BILL YOUNG was a gentleman in every sense of the word. BILL YOUNG was an example for us all. I will have the privilege of speaking on Thursday, at his request, at his funeral. BILL and I served on the Appropriations Committee for 23 years together; then I left when I became majority leader.

BILL YOUNG was, as I said, a gentleman who cared about each and every individual in this House. More than that, he cared for each and every person who served in uniform in our Armed Forces; and he and Beverly displayed that, as Congressman MILLER has said, on a weekly, daily basis.

I am a Democrat; BILL was a Republican. It didn't make any difference. He was an American, I was an American, and we served our country together. No one served it better than BILL YOUNG. He chose to see our differences as slight and our common purpose as great. He always chose civility over partisanship.

He was a skilled legislator on behalf of the people of Pinellas County, Florida, on behalf of Florida, on behalf of his country, on behalf of the members of the Armed Forces and the defense of this country. He was a champion of our men and women in uniform, veterans and their families, all of whom, wherever they lived, he viewed as his constituents. This bill to rename the VA Hospital in Bay Pines, Florida, which I am proud to cosponsor, is a fitting tribute to his devotion to our veterans and our troops.

Though he represented Florida longer than any Member of this House in history, BILL was originally from a hardscrabble coal mining town in Pennsylvania. It was there he learned many lessons about the hardships facing working families and the need to ensure that opportunities would be within their reach, and he never forgot that.

He was a great Member of this body, a very powerful Member of this body, an extraordinary, influential American. But to all of us, he was BILL; to all those he came in contact with, he was BILL. He was a person who understood the needs, the fears, the aspirations, the hopes of his people and the people of our country.

My thoughts are with Beverly, with BILL YOUNG's family, and with the people of Florida's 13th District. This House has lost a great Member.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it is absolutely fitting that we take this step and name our veterans hospital on the west coast of Florida after a great American, a patriot, a hero for our veterans—BILL YOUNG.

Probably more than anyone in the House of Representatives or Congress, I have known BILL YOUNG, I think, longer. He and I were both aides to the first Republican Congressman since the Civil War, Bill Kramer. He was an aide before I was, but we met and worked together more than 40 years ago.

So I rise tonight not only as a colleague, but as a personal friend and political ally of a great human being, someone who put his heart and soul into his position, who loved our servicemen and -women, and his great legacy will be all he has done to honor their memory.

Tonight, we honor his memory with renaming Bay Pines veterans hospital for BILL YOUNG, my friend.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the legislation before us this evening to rename the Bay Pines Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Florida the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center. I am honored to join over 200 of my House colleagues as an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, a great tribute to one of our dearest colleagues.

Indeed, BILL YOUNG will be forever known as one of the strongest supporters of our military and veterans in the history of this Congress. His staunch and unyielding support of our military and our veterans is legendary.

Likewise, he was a true champion for his district, and a fount of knowledge about the chronicles of the U.S. House of Representatives.

BILL YOUNG will be missed in Washington, as well as in Florida. He, along with the late Congressman Jack Murtha, were not only great friends and mentors to me, but their wives, Beverly and Joyce, were also friends and mentors to my wife, Vivian.

Chairman Murtha and Chairman YOUNG were neither Democrat nor Republican when it came to our national defense. Regardless of which was the chairman or ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, the men and women of America's military would be taken care of. I am proud to have served as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense under both of these great leaders.

With BILL YOUNG's death, the Nation has truly lost one of the few remaining statesmen. Our thoughts and prayers are with Beverly and the entire family. Congress and our Nation have lost one of its greatest statesmen. I have lost a dear friend and a mentor.

While we could use every word in every language spoken by mankind, we would not have enough words combined to adequately thank BILL YOUNG for his service. But I am pleased to join my colleagues in passing this resolution to rename the Bay Pines Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Florida the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

It has been said that you make your living by what you get; you make your life by what you give. BILL YOUNG gave so much to so many for so long. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia alluded to over 200 cosponsors. I would announce to the House tonight that we had 379 original cosponsors of this piece of legislation.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, whose district abutted Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

379 cosponsors, what a testament. What a wonderful man. What a great man.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support this legislation. Over the past five decades, Chairman YOUNG selflessly served Florida and the Tampa Bay area, leading many initiatives to promote economic growth, create jobs, of which his contributions to the military and veterans in particular are immeasurable.

In the 1970s, the chairman played a significant role in winning critical funding for the Bay Pines Veterans Affairs Medical Center, which allows the facilities to support almost 100,000, Mr. Speaker, of our heroes in our area today. With this funding, Bay Pines was able to increase the size of its campus, replace the hospital, and now offers a wide variety of services to these veterans in their backyard because of Chairman YOUNG.

Chairman YOUNG has left behind a rich legacy in support of our heroes, especially those in the Tampa Bay area. By renaming this important facility in his honor, we will provide a lasting monument to remember a great friend, Chairman BILL YOUNG.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), whose district butts up to Congressman BILL YOUNG's district.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding the time and for her dedication to the Nation's veterans as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of designating the Bay Pines VA Medical Center in Pinellas County, Florida, the Congressman C.W. Bill Young VA Medical Center. I am very proud to cosponsor this bill, and I would like to thank Chairman MILLER of Florida, Congresswoman BROWN, and all of our colleagues for honoring BILL YOUNG with such a designation.

I have been fortunate to serve alongside BILL YOUNG for the 7 years that I have been here. Seven out of the 43 years that Mr. YOUNG served in the Congress, we represented St. Petersburg and the Tampa Bay area together. And I know I speak for my predecessors, Jim Davis and Sam Gibbons, who also passed last year, when I say that Congressman BILL YOUNG was a

gentleman and an outstanding partner for the interests of the Tampa Bay area and the State of Florida.

It is very appropriate that we honor BILL YOUNG by naming the Bay Pines VA Medical Center after him. He was a fixture at the Bay Pines Veterans Day and Memorial Day ceremonies every year. But more importantly, he was a fixture when there was no ceremony, when he would visit wounded soldiers in the hospital or at their homes, when there was no fanfare, and he just determined that it was just his desire to ensure that the servicemembers and their families received the care that they deserved and that they had earned.

□ 1945

Many facilities at the MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa are state of the art due to Mr. YOUNG's extra attention. I am very grateful for the help he provided to me when MacDill and the soldiers and civilians who worked there were in need. For example, in the past year, he boosted our efforts in ''MacDill Means Mobility'' when we tried to expand the mission at the base. When I brought to his attention that the Department of Defense was not assisting former servicemembers and their families who qualified for Medicaid health services, he helped cut through the red tape.

Many also will point to his expansive earmarks and great legacy in the Tampa Bay area in a variety of ways: our drinking water reservoir is the Bill Young Reservoir; medical research initiatives at the University of South Florida; programs at St. Petersburg College; programs at Eckerd College. We are so proud that Mr. YOUNG initiated the national bone marrow donor program at All Children's Hospital in St. Petersburg.

It was decades ago, through Congressman YOUNG's leadership, that the Bay Pines VA Medical Center in St. Petersburg was created. Bay Pines is now the fourth-largest veterans hospital in the country. It serves veterans all across west central Florida and employs many talented caregivers.

So it is a fitting tribute to this remarkable American to name the Bay Pines VA Medical Center in his honor, and I am proud to cosponsor the resolution. Congressman YOUNG was a model statesman. His kindness, sincerity, and dogged advocacy for our Nation's men and women in uniform and veterans will be missed.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Chairman MILLER for bringing this important piece of legislation forward. We literally could be here days speaking about the many accomplishments of Chairman YOUNG, and those days would not suffice.

I got a chance to work with him on the Appropriations Committee. I will tell you that so many times I went to him for advice, for help. BILL YOUNG was one of those people that you always went to when you needed help, when you needed advice. He was such a wise man.

As I just said, since we would never have enough time to talk about all of his great accomplishments—and you have heard not only about his accomplishments but just the fact that he was an incredibly honorable, caring, wise—''statesman'' is the word that comes to mind.

Since my time is limited, I just want to echo something that I heard. I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, who said it. But somewhere I once read that ''to be a great man, you first have to be a good man.'' If there is anybody that that phrase reminds me of, it is BILL YOUNG.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), and I would like to thank Chairman MILLER—we have worked together. I thank the gentleman so very much. I want to acknowledge as well the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you for allowing me to share with you this evening my comments, appreciation, and respect that I have for BILL YOUNG.

First of all, I would like to say what everyone else has said. What a great American. What a great patriot. What a great public servant.

BILL, may you rest in peace.

Congressman YOUNG, Chairman YOUNG was on the floor of the House just a few weeks before he passed. I think that is important to note, that he was working every single day to make America better. He loved soldiers and veterans. He loved their families. It is highly appropriate for him to have his name so honored as a named veterans hospital.

I want to say that it is particularly important to note that Congressman YOUNG was able to speak to kings and queens and generals and people of high places. But he was best when he was talking to everyday people, to the soldiers that he loved.

He came from humble beginnings. Starting with his mother, a single parent, losing his home early in life, living in a hunting camp. You would think that he would not be the generous-hearted person that he is today. But he was really what America is all about, the American Dream.

I remember his commitment to our soldiers and his easy ability to work across the aisle as someone who advocated for soldiers suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. I want to let his family know how dedicated he was to providing extra resources to the thousands upon thousands of soldiers who returned from Iraq and Afghanistan who needed extra help with post-traumatic stress disorder.

He was very kind to those of us who were concerned about breast cancer and women in the United States military who may have experienced breast cancer.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Florida.

He has worked with me over the last two sessions, Mr. Speaker, in providing extra funding for post-traumatic stress disorder to a center that is in Houston, Texas, but also dealing with additional research on triple-negative breast cancer that might have an impact not only on the military population of women but also with women around the Nation. BILL was like that, if I might. Congressman BILL YOUNG, Chairman BILL YOUNG was like that, always extending, always sharing.

He has a special place in my heart because my late mother is from St. Petersburg, Florida. But I would say that he should have a special place in the hearts of all Americans because if you ever want to see exemplified a grand and stately gentleman who had nothing in his heart but the love and respect and admiration for this Nation, it was our dear friend, the Honorable BILL YOUNG.

To his family, I say to them, we love him, and we extend our deepest sympathies. Thank you, my dear friend. You have served well. I hope that you will rest well.

May God bless him, and God bless his family.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank Chairman MILLER for this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the chorus of people remembering our friend from Florida, BILL YOUNG, the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Chairman YOUNG, as you know, spent five decades of his life in this Chamber fighting for a better America for both his constituents and our country. As the dean of the Republican Conference, he was a leader and of counsel to colleagues young or old, Republican or Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, I am the newest member of the Defense Subcommittee of Appropriations. I was fortunate to receive his mentorship. I learned from his fearless, unparalleled support of our troops and our veterans, and I admired his outspoken and unwavering commitment to what was in their best interest. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran myself of over 30 years, I was also a beneficiary of his incredible support of those who wear the uniform.

While his presence will be forever missed, the Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center will serve as a small and fitting reminder that this institution, our men and women in uniform, and America are undoubtedly better off because of BILL YOUNG. I am proud to support it.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, could you please tell me how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman has 10½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the Speaker.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill.

For more than 40 years, BILL YOUNG served his district and this institution with integrity and honor after having served our country in the Army National Guard for nearly a decade.

As chairman of the Appropriations Committee, his leadership and advocacy for our men and women in uniform and our veterans was unsurpassed. In a time when political culture too often devolves into hostility, and ''compromise'' is a dirty word, BILL YOUNG was always a gentleman who consistently reached across the aisle.

He would share with me his visits with his dear wife, Beverly, to wounded warriors to bring them comfort. How happy those visits made him.

It was such a pleasure to serve with him, and he will be truly missed. Renaming this VA facility in his memory is a tribute to his legacy.

You will be missed, my dear friend. Rest in peace, God bless you, and God bless America.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and am prepared to close.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank Chairman MILLER for organizing this tribute to Chairman YOUNG.

In closing, I often say when you are born, you get a birth certificate; and when you die, you are going to get a death certificate; and that little dash in between is what you have done to make this a better place.

I don't know anyone who has done more than Chairman BILL YOUNG. It has just been my honor having had the opportunity to serve with him. His leadership for the Florida delegation—I mean, we have gone through some tough times. But I can tell you, he has always been a gentleman.

When I first began, I said that one of my favorite sayings is to let the work I have done speak for me. Clearly he has done his work, and as Paul said, he has fought a good fight, and he has kept the faith. He has done his job. It has been left up to us to continue his great work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to thank all the Members on both sides of the aisle for their kind words they have said of our friend from Florida, BILL YOUNG. I sincerely hope that the words give Beverly, Rob, Billy, and Patrick some measure of consolation.

While we will no longer have BILL's personal and wise counsel to go to, that beautiful veterans medical center will bear his name. It will give witness—witness to his many years of service to America and her defenders.

I want to thank my good friend from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for her help in bringing this bill to the floor and the over 375 cosponsors that we have brought on this piece of legislation.

I respectfully ask all Members to join us in supporting this piece of legislation, H.R. 3302, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I heard from my friend, former Congressman Norm Dicks, today, and he asked me to submit this statement on his behalf. He had the privilege of serving with Chairman BILL YOUNG for over thirty years on the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee, and said this about him:

> Chairman Young did more for the men and women in the armed forces than anyone in Congress. Bill and Beverly made weekly trips to Bethesda and Walter Reed to see our wounded warriors and offered personal help to their families. Bill Young believed in bipartisanship; the Defense Subcommittee almost always reported the Defense Appropriation bill with all Members, Democrats and Republicans, in full support. Bill was a great American, a great leader, and a great friend and he will be truly missed.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker I rise today in honor of CHARLES WILLIAM YOUNG, better known to his colleagues and constituents as BILL. I am deeply saddened Congressman YOUNG, a man who put all others before himself, has passed—he will be sorely missed.

Although I only had the pleasure of working with BILL for a short time, I benefitted greatly from his leadership and the strong example of service to the United States and Florida that he set. Congressman YOUNG leaves behind a long history of dedicated service to his constituents and the veterans of America.

BILL saw the nation through, some of her most tumultuous times, and throughout all of it—he worked tirelessly to make sure our nation's veterans were taken care of. He was a constant fixture at VA medical centers in Florida and in the Washington, D.C. area always making sure the veterans were receiving the best possible care.

I proudly join my colleagues in renaming the Bay Pines VA Medical Center the C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center as a small token of the nation's gratitude for his dedicated service.

I urge my colleagues to pass this small gesture of our gratitude without objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3302.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICA'S BUDGETARY ISSUES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, the shutdown stalemate was unacceptable. The impasse should have been resolved weeks before October 1 when the House began passing funding bills through regular order. I argued that the strategy of defunding the health care law would not succeed, considering most of its programs are funded through mandatory spending. I did, however, believe that forcing the debate was necessary in order for Congress to actually start dealing with the challenges we face.

The President's health care law is, without a doubt, one of those challenges, Mr. Speaker. The law was sold as a way to lower insurance costs and expand access. But in reality, it is reducing access, breaking the budget, and harming consumers.

We forced the Senate to join us in addressing our larger budgetary issues—including debt and deficits—which undoubtedly will lead us back to a discussion of this flawed health care law.

This debate would never have taken place if Senate Leader REID had his way. Considering the ongoing failures with the ObamaCare exchange, it is certainly a debate we will now be able to have. The American people deserve as much.

□ 2000

FINDING MIDDLE GROUND

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this presentation. We had one of those very important moments to recognize the long service of one of our colleagues.

As we listen to those eulogies, I think all of us should be reminded of the awesome responsibilities that we share here in the House of Representatives. BILL YOUNG, obviously, felt those responsibilities deeply. He carried them out for an extraordinary length of time—43 years. We are thankful for his service, for his memory, and also for what he has taught us about perseverance and steadfastness and also, as you can tell from the various eulogies, about working across the aisle.

Working across the aisle and finding the middle ground is what I want to spend some time on tonight.

Like my 434 colleagues, when we finished voting last Thursday, we all left this Chamber, I think, in a rather somber mood, realizing that 16 days had passed and our government was shut down and there was the likelihood of damage to America and Americans.

When we got home, I suspect all of us—and I know this certainly was my case—were confronted by our constituents. They were not happy. In fact, they were angry. They were angry that their government—the government of the strongest, most powerful Nation in the world—wasn't operating because

its legislative body had failed. And we had failed to find the common ground; we had failed to protect this Nation and Americans.

It was a grand debate over the Affordable Health Care Act, then it morphed into some other kind of concerns, and ultimately wound up somewhere about the deficit and about the default. At the end of that process, I don't think Americans really much cared what the debate was about. What they cared about was the very nature of our government and whether it would be able to operate.

It was a heavy toll. It was a heavy toll on our Nation. It is estimated it was well over a $24 billion hit to the economy; and I know in my own district, there was a tremendous hit. As I got off the plane here in Washington, D.C., as I was returning today from California, at the airport, ready to fly back to California, was the chancellor of the University of California-Davis. She caught me as I got off the plane, and she expressed her deep concern for the university and its operations.

Research projects that were under way simply stopped.

Sitting next to me on the airplane coming out was a woman who was running a health and nutrition program for the U.S. Department of Agriculture that was associated with the University of California-Davis. It was shut down for 16 days, and just the enormous challenge of shutting down and starting back up, the loss of efficiency and the lost research that took place.

Those kinds of problems are repeated throughout my district. At Travis and Beale Air Force bases, over a thousand civilian employees were furloughed. In Lake County, the county family service center which provides support for victims of child abuse, domestic abuse, and rape had to reduce its services.

As I mentioned, the University of California and the U.S. Department of Agriculture weren't able to operate. Farmers who needed to get loans at the service center couldn't get them—right in the middle of the harvest season. Companies that needed licenses from the Department of Commerce to export advanced technology had all of their orders on hold; and, undoubtedly, some of them were lost.

In the far north of California, the wildlife refuges were closed during the opening of the duck season and also the antelope and deer season. In my own district in Dixon, an annual ''stand down'' for struggling veterans had to scramble for money to cover the Department of Labor loan that was not made available. The Small Business Administration was unable to approve business loans.

The entire economy of the United States lost over $24 billion. The economic growth of the Nation probably lost as much as half a percentage point. And for what?

It is hard to even begin to describe what the argument was all about over the Affordable Care Act—an act that is now providing health care services to over 4 million young men and women who are able to stay on their families' health insurance, for seniors who are getting preventive health care services. It goes on and on.

But here we are, once again. We got past all of that. Where do we go tomorrow?

Well, tomorrow we begin once again the struggle to define this government's future and, really, to define the future of America. I am going to spend a few moments talking about that struggle because on January 15 there will be yet one more crisis point—a focal point upon which the issues of government will be leveraged one way or the other.

We have seen five such crisis points in the last 3 years, and each one a crisis building up to a point where the American economy doesn't know what to expect and therefore does not make the critical investments, does not attempt to grow, because they don't know what the economic and political future will be.

We are going to endure that not just once in the next 3 months, but twice. January 15 will be the first opportunity for the next crisis—a crisis that will be about opening government or not. Because, once again, it will be a funding crisis. Will we be able to appropriate the money to operate the Federal Government? Less than a month later, on February 7, there will be one additional debt crisis. Once again, a default cliff will be reached.

And so the American economy, like a racehorse at a gate, hearing the trumpet, looking for the gate to open, ready to get out there and charge down the track, the American economy will face once again that gate slamming shut on it. Even as it wants to grow, even as that great American racehorse economy wants to head down the track, that gate has the potential of slamming shut. The uncertainty will be there once again.

We have got to end these fiscal crises. It is in the interest of Democrats and Republicans to end these manufactured crises and to put in place a long-term, stable policy that allows this government to make the critical investments to grow the economy, to put in place a tax policy that is sensible and long range and helps to balance the budget, that makes the necessary cuts to those programs that are not essential, and maintains and even enhances those that are essential.

Let me put up on the board just for a moment some of the numbers that we are dealing with over the next couple of months. I don't say this is the best chart. It is actually a bit confusing, but I think we need to try to understand the numbers.

This number, $1.203 trillion, was what President Obama suggested be the Federal budget for the year 2014. Back in 2010, the actual amount was $1.188 trillion. That is what we actually budgeted and spent that year. That was 2010. So there was some growth that the President recommended for the Federal budget.

What actually happened was quite different. What actually happened is down here in these lower numbers.

This year, the House Republican budget, otherwise known as the Ryan budget, called for $1.095 trillion, which is significantly under the President's budget. In 2011, the debt crisis came up once again and the August 2011 compromise said that we would spend $1.066 trillion in the 2014 budget. The Senate actually said we would spend $1.058 billion.

What did we actually do? What we actually did last week was to authorize an expenditure of $986 billion—a huge difference of some $217 billion less than recommended by the President.

What does this number mean? This number means that across this Nation vital programs in the military, vital programs in education, in health care, in agriculture, and in every activity of the government, except those of Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid, were substantially reduced. That put an enormous drag on the economy. So not only was the economy faced with a 16-day shutdown, but it was also faced with a shallow and less robust Federal Government, laying off people all across this Nation. For the University of California at Davis, it meant that $40 million of research programs were not funded. Simply stopped.

This kind of effect on the Nation's budget or the Nation's economic activity is going to continue. And in the year ahead, economists predict that it will continue to cause a slowdown in the growth of the economy, lowering tax revenues, actually increasing the deficit, and creating higher unemployment—or at least not reducing the unemployment rate in this Nation.

We need to change that. We need to set in place a different policy. And here is where I want to go with this discussion. What is it that we really need to do to grow the American economy, to make sure all of the rungs on the economic ladder are in place and providing the opportunity for every American to have a decent job?

Hardworking Americans want to go to work. They want to have a job where they can support their family, where they can meet their own personal and family needs and participate in their communities in a meaningful way with a good, middle class job. There are ways that we can do that. One of them is what we call the Make It In America agenda.

The Make It In America agenda involves seven different policies, such as international trade policies. Instead of giving away our jobs to some foreign country, making sure that our trade programs actually encourage economic growth at home, not encourage economic growth in China. Also, that there be a tax policy that ends unnecessary tax loopholes and rebates for those companies that are profitable.

For example, of the top 20 American corporations, about half of them pay little or no corporate income tax. The tax system is set up in such a way that they are able to avoid their fair share of the cost of government.

□ 2015

So we need to make sure that the tax policies of the United States are wise, that they support economic growth, that they don't provide unnecessary tax breaks and loopholes to those individuals and corporations that don't need them. I will give you one example of such a huge tax loophole:

The five biggest oil companies in America together receive somewhere between $4 billion and $5 billion in reduced taxes every year. This is the most profitable industry in the world. Why are they getting subsidies? Why are we subsidizing them? Why is the American taxpayer subsidizing the most profitable industry in the world, the oil industry? This is just one example of tax subsidies, tax breaks, that ought to be removed and seriously looked at. We could significantly increase the revenue to the Federal Government by eliminating these unnecessary, unwise, and quite foolish tax breaks and subsidies that many corporations and some individuals receive.

Energy policy is extremely important. We need a wise energy policy. Right now, the United States is in the midst of an energy boom. It is reducing the cost of energy. All across this Nation, we are seeing the effect of this in the coal industry as natural gas is replacing coal-fired power plants, reducing greenhouse gas emissions. All of that is a very, very good thing. Also, we need to continue to move towards sustainable energy, the green energy systems—wind, solar, hydroelectric, geothermal—and other kinds of sustainable energy policies.

I am going to skip down here to research because this is where we have a real opportunity to tie together the research agenda with the energy agenda. An example:

We know that most of the oil that is produced in the United States and is imported is used for the transportation industry.

Recently, the Transportation Department provided a grant to the University of California at Davis to do some research on sustainable transportation. The world's top scientists have concluded that there really is such a thing as climate change and that it poses a very serious threat to humanity. The most recent report came out less than a month ago and concluded that we are in for some very serious troubles ahead unless we are able to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, particularly carbon dioxide, a good deal of which comes from the transportation industry.

The good news is that we as the American public, through this government, can rise to the challenge, and communities, like the one I represent in Davis, California, are leading the way. The University of California at Davis has received a cutting-edge research grant for the research into transportation systems that are sustainable and that are not relying as much or at all on the carbon fuels, gasoline and diesel. So what are they—plug-in hybrids? Alternative fuels such as advanced biofuels, hydrogen fueling infrastructure and many other kinds of transportation—batteries and the like—are going to be part of this research.

The Department of Transportation asked the University of California at Davis to lead the National Center for Sustainable Transportation. This new consortium will consult policymakers as they implement real-world strategies to address climate change and other threats. In other words, by combining research and energy, we can move away from the dependence upon oil, particularly foreign oil, reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. So, as you go through this Make It In America agenda, certainly energy policy will be coupled with the research agenda.

Another part of this is labor. Is labor ready to accept the kinds of challenges that we are going to find in the new, modern manufacturing sector?

We need to invest in labor so that we have a well-educated labor force, and we need to invest in the reeducation of those men and women who have lost their jobs. Just two decades ago, we had nearly 20 million Americans in the manufacturing sector. Today, it is probably closer to 11 million. That means some 9 million Americans who once had jobs in the manufacturing sector are no longer employed in that sector. They need to be reeducated either in advanced manufacturing technologies or in other sectors.

The labor force is constantly evolving, and one of the roles of the Federal Government through the Department of Education and the Department of Labor and Commerce is to provide that reeducation necessary as one of the old manufacturing technologies moves, dies out and as new ones come along so that the labor force is able to move into those new jobs. So you see the combination of education and labor. These things work together.

On the educational side, it has been shown many, many times that an education really needs to start prekindergarten; yet one of the effects of sequestration, together with the government shutdown, was a significant reduction in prekindergarten education. In my district, some 6,000 young people were unable to participate in the Head Start program, not just for 16 days but for the many days out ahead, so they will enter kindergarten substantially behind their peers, providing an anchor to the economy as they move through their educational process, quite possibly becoming one of the high majority or the high percentage of students who drops out of high school.

As you move down this Make It In America agenda, we come down to one that is a fundamental investment, and that is the infrastructure system. We have a very high unemployment rate. There is no doubt about it. One of the ways to immediately employ Americans is to build the foundation for economic growth. These are all part of the foundation for economic growth. This is the concrete and steel when we talk about infrastructure. These are the roads, the airports, the railroads, the mass transportation systems, the sanitation systems, the water systems. So infrastructure becomes a critical part of any of the efforts that we need to make to rebuild America, to provide the foundation and to put Americans back to work.

There is some very interesting research that has come out of this, and here is a piece of it: for every dollar invested in infrastructure, $1.57 is pumped back into the economy.

So if, for example, the Federal Government were to undertake the robust infrastructure program that the President put forth a year ago and reiterated in his State of the Union speech this last February and if we passed legislation, as he wanted, to put $50 billion additional into the infrastructure program, the economy would not only be spending the dollar; it would be getting back $1.57 for every one of those $50 billion that the President wanted to put into America's infrastructure. Men and women would be working; the economy would begin to move forward more rapidly; and we would begin to see the kind of economic growth that this Nation needs to have, that the men and women who are unemployed or those who are seeking better jobs would want to have, and we would be laying the foundation for future economic growth.

We must keep this in mind. There are several things that could be done in this regard. One of them you just heard about during the brief interruption when the Rules Committee came here to put before this House tomorrow and in the days ahead the Water Resources Development Act. This used to be biennial legislation that Congress would pass every 2 years to put in place the water, resources, the development of levees, transportation systems, such as the locks and the rivers and the channels, the ports, other kinds of water transportation systems. You had water; you had sanitation systems; you had levees. All of these critically important infrastructure projects are in the Water Resources Development Act.

It has been 5 years since there has been a Water Resources Development Act, but we have a chance now to push forward in this House of Representatives in the next few days an extremely important infrastructure piece of legislation. The good news is there is a good chance we will do it. The bad news is it is inadequately funded. There is not sufficient money in that program to actually build the kinds of things that we must have.

So what are we going to do?

One of the solutions was again proposed by the President in his infrastructure program that he presented to Congress, which has really not been acted on yet—an infrastructure bank, a bank that has been in existence in Europe for almost 30 years now. It is a public-private partnership in which the government invests money and in which private investors can also invest. That money would then be available for those kinds of infrastructure projects that are cash flow projects—for example, a sanitation system, a toll road, a toll bridge, an airport, a water system. All of these kinds of infrastructures have fees associated with them, so there is a cash flow that is generated sufficient to pay off the loan that is made available through the infrastructure bank.

Such a program has been introduced here in the House of Representatives since at least the early 1990s. It doesn't exist—it has never been passed—although, every year, one or another Member of the House of Representatives has tried. I know Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO has introduced this for at least the last 15 years, but it has never been acted upon. You have to wonder why.

This seems to me to be eminently wise that we would create an infrastructure bank. The Federal Government can borrow money today. A 10-year note is just over, I think, 2.6 percent. That is really cheap money. Borrow that money. Put it in this bank. Loan it out at 2.8 percent to various cities, counties, water systems, and build the infrastructure. That is cheap money. It gives us a chance to get the economy growing, to employ people, to build the foundation for economic growth, and to raise taxes, not by increasing the tax rate but by people paying taxes because they are now working. What a novel idea—people who work pay taxes just as we ought to be doing. So these are a couple of ideas about how we can move the economy forward.

There is another piece of this Make It In America agenda, and it is this: H.R. 1524. I like this piece of legislation. It is one I have introduced. What it basically says is: if we are going to build those clean energy projects—the wind, the solar, the advanced fuel, the hydrogen systems—all of which are subsidized by your tax money, then your tax money must be spent on American made: American-made wind turbines, American-made solar panels. Let's Make It In America.

Why should we spend your tax money to buy steel from China to build the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge?

I am sure your answer would be we shouldn't, but we did—6,000 new jobs in China, zero in America. It was supposed to be 10 percent cheaper. It turned out to be 10 percent more expensive because there were flaws in the steel; the welds were not satisfactory. No, no. That is American taxpayer money. That American taxpayer money should have been used to buy American-made steel and to create a new, high-tech steel mill not in China, which is what happened, but, rather, in America. We ought to be buying American. We ought to be using our tax money to buy American-made goods and services, and that is exactly what this bill does. This is part of the Make It In America agenda.

I am going to show you one other little picture here. Normally, our trains don't run upside down, so let me make it right-side up:

This is an electric locomotive—brand new, made in Sacramento, California, by Siemens, the German manufacturing company, which is one of the world's biggest manufacturing companies. Why in the world are they making electric locomotives for Amtrak in Sacramento? Why are they doing that?

□ 2030

For years, Siemens has had a light-rail trolley manufacturing plant in Sacramento. In the American Recovery Act—the stimulus bill—there was some $600 million for the purchase of 80 locomotives to replace the aging locomotives on the east coast Amtrak lines. Added to that $600 million was a sentence that said, this money had to be spent only on American-made locomotives.

Siemens looked at that and goes: Hmmm, we can make locomotives in America—and they did, in Sacramento, California. Probably a couple of thousand jobs, suppliers from all over the Nation providing the parts—the electrical systems and the rest—for this locomotive, made in America, with American taxpayer money, because someone in the stimulus bill added a sentence to an appropriation and said, this money must be spent on American-made locomotives.

We can do that with every one of our expenditures—or at least many of our expenditures—using your taxpayer money on American-made goods and services, a very, very wise thing to do, which, incidentally, was first suggested by George Washington and Alexander Hamilton. So if you want to go back to the Founding Fathers, use some of their ideas where they said—Alexander Hamilton in a report to George Washington said that the Federal Government should use its purchasing power to support American industry—buy American, Make It In America, use American taxpayer money on American-made goods and services. Not a bad idea. We need to pass that kind of legislation here.

I am going to take just a few more moments and talk about one of the great challenges that we have. I am going to start with this man who seemed to understand what it took to rebuild and to move the American economy and society forward. This is actually on one of the monuments at the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial here in Washington, D.C. When I took my grandchildren down there not too long ago, I read this to them and explained to them why this was important during the Great Depression, and why it is important today.

Roosevelt said during the height of the depression that ''The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.'' The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, but rather it is we provide enough for those who have too little.

Most of us have an image of the Great Depression—the food lines, the hungry, the unemployed. America has gone through something not as desperate, but nearly so—the Great Recession, beginning in 2008. Millions of Americans lost their jobs—well over 8, maybe as many as 10 million. Even more lost their homes, and there was a lot of hurt upon our land.

We have been working now since 2008 to restore the American economy. The stimulus bill was one such way—the proposals of the President—to rebuild the American infrastructure, to educate our kids, and a host of other things, what he called the American Jobs Program—incidentally, not taken up by our colleagues here in the House of Representatives on the majority side. Nonetheless, he recommended different ways to address this fundamental issue.

How do we provide enough for those who have too little? How are we doing? How is America doing on meeting the challenge that Franklin Roosevelt laid out? The answer is seen in this chart and the answer is: not well at all. We are miserably failing to meet the challenge that Franklin Delano Roosevelt laid out during the Great Depression.

Here is what it is: of the economic growth from 2009 to 2012, the fraction of the growth that went to the top 1 percent—this is the new wealth that was generated by the American economy, the growth in the economy, the wealth, the growth in the economy—the top 1 percent got 95 percent of all of that wealth that was generated. The 99 percenters—99 percent of the American people—got to share 5 percent of the wealth that was generated by the economy.

This is a great tragedy. This is an unparalleled tragedy in the American economy. This is not just a 3-year period; this has actually been happening—not at the same horrible distribution that you see here—but it has actually been a phenomenon that has been going on in the American economy where the rich get richer and the great majority of Americans are standing still.

When I am not in my district and I hear people talk about their lives, they are talking about the fact that they are literally standing still economically. Poll after poll indicates that the American public knows and understands this. When asked how they are doing, they basically say they are just

treading water, they are not moving forward, they are just doing the very best they can to hang on, to keep their nose above the water, to not go under.

We have to address this phenomenon. This doesn't happen because of the weather, it doesn't happen because of God or some other mysterious force. This happens because of policy, policy that this Congress, together with the Senate and even the Supreme Court and the President, put in place, a policy that is skewing the nature of the American economy in such a way as to add great wealth to those who already have great wealth and little to those who have very little.

We need to adopt policies to change this. On the floor of the House of Representatives, there should be a piece of legislation to raise the minimum wage. $10 is a bare minimum. California—my home State—did that, raised the minimum wage to $10 and then a couple of steps will go on in the future, a couple of higher steps. That is good, that is good for everyone, even those businesses small and large that are going to pay that higher wage. What it does is to share the wealth that is generated by this economy, providing those at the bottom, those hardworking men and women that are at the bottom, the opportunity to sustain their families, to sustain their livelihood. That is but one.

If we make those critical investments that create economic growth, particularly education and job training, and put in place the programs that enhance manufacturing, we will see this begin to change, and we will see the 99 percenters begin to take their fair share of the wealth that they are generating. It is the men and women that toil, wherever they may be—in the Federal Government, in the State governments, in the manufacturing, in the fields of America—wherever they may be, those are the men and women that are creating wealth. I understand capital. It has a role in this, but capital and labor together. What we are seeing here is the men and women that toil are not getting the wealth that they helped to create.

This is a challenge. Tax policy is part of it. Policy such as minimum wage, the role of the labor unions putting pressure on the system so that the men and women that are working in those businesses are able to share more of that wealth. They are all part of this system, and we need to pay attention to it here on the floor.

So let's keep in mind the 99 percenters, who in the years 2009 to 2012 received 5 percent of the total wealth generated by the largest economy in the world—the American economy. Public policy means a lot.

Over the next several days, this Congress is going to deal with some profoundly important questions. The question of the role of the Federal Government—will we have another sequestration debacle on January 15? We could. The current sequestration, which the military is saying is a disaster for them, the education community, the research community, the transportation community, the health, the social welfare community, all say the sequestration is an unmitigated disaster.

They know, and the American public will soon know, that on January 15 the second shoe will fall and another $105 billion will be taken out of the economy beginning on January 15 unless this House of Representatives and the Senate, together with the President, come up with a viable alternative, one in which the growth of the economy can be assured, in which the continued austerity programs which are holding back an incredibly powerful resource called the American economy are put aside, and we put in place those policies that create economic growth. We have an enormous challenge.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3080, WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida (during the Special Order of Mr. GARAMENDI), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–251) on the resolution (H. Res. 385) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING GERARD L. LAROCHE

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the United States loses several hundred of our greatest, those heroes of the Greatest Generation, every day. I speak of the World War II veterans whose valor, courage, and sacrifice stopped the evil shadow of the swastika from falling across the whole of humanity.

One of those heroes we lost recently was Gerard L. LaRoche, a World War II veteran of D-Day and the Battle of the Bulge, Mr. Speaker. He was a Harvard-trained linguist who continued to serve his country after the war at the National Security Agency for many years.

Gerard went home to be with his savior on October 6. He was 93 years old.

Gerard was a Renaissance man. He was a translator, a language teacher, and a professor at several universities and colleges, a choral director, and a calligrapher. He was also a talented draftsman, Mr. Speaker, a violinist, a photographer, a recording engineer, and a furniture maker.

Gerard was born of French-Canadian parents in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1920, the oldest of eight children and the son of a noted calligrapher and schoolteacher who encouraged his artistic talents.

Mr. Speaker, in 1933, at age 13, Gerard entered the seminary of the Marist Order but left at 21 to study at Boston College, where he received his bachelor's degree and his master's.

□ 2045

He specialized in the study of romance languages, and then the outbreak of World War II came and interrupted his studies. He enlisted in the Army and served with the 2nd Armored Division, where he was at Normandy on D-Day Plus Six, and at the Battle of the Bulge. His ability to speak many forms of French soon landed him as an aide to help U.S. military brass communicate with the Belgians and the French. Through all this, he found time to make sketches of the villages, cities, and countryside in England and in Europe. He eventually continued his studies until he received his masters from Harvard in romance philology.

While stationed in the southwest of England, he met his future wife, his beloved Joyce Latchem, at a village dance just weeks before D-Day. They were married on October 18, 1947.

And now, Mr. Speaker, for a time at least, Gerard has left behind his best friend and loyal wife, Joyce; his daughter, Marianne; two sons, Jerome and David; six grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren. But they shall all meet again and gather together some day.

Mr. Speaker, Gerard LaRoche was a godly man, a devoted patriot and willing soldier, a committed husband, father, and friend. This national treasure will be missed, and we, his fellow Americans, are forever grateful to this noble champion of human freedom.

God bless Gerard.

OBAMACARE ORIGINATION CLAUSE

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to change subjects and talk about sometimes it is the water on the inside of a ship that sinks it rather than the water on the outside. Mr. Speaker, right now we have water on the inside of our ship because sometimes the Constitution itself is being ignored by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, the Supreme Court narrowly and specifically upheld the individual mandate at the heart of ObamaCare under Congress's general taxing power. The Court noted specifically:

> Even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with other requirements in the Constitution.

In short, Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was upheld as a tax. The Supreme Court did not and has not yet considered a challenge to the Affordable Care Act's taxing provisions on the grounds that it violated the origination clause in the United States Constitution, and it most certainly did exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, the origination clause is found in article I, section 7, of the Constitution and states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

In creating ObamaCare, Senator HARRY REID took an entirely unrelated bill, H.R. 3590 containing just 714 words that did not raise taxes, and then stripped it of everything but its bill number. He then put the 400,000-word ObamaCare that raised taxes in 17 different places in this empty-shell bill. Through this bit of legislative trickery, Mr. REID claims that ObamaCare originated in the House, when in fact every last provision of ObamaCare, including the largest tax increase in American history, all came from the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of procedure absolutely ignores and vacates the Founders' intent, and it renders the origination clause of our Constitution completely meaningless. If it is allowed to stand, the origination clause in the Constitution is a dead letter.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small or marginal issue. The principle behind the origination clause was the moral justification for our entire War of Independence. Its importance was expressed through the Virginia House of Burgesses, the Stamp Act of Congress, and the First Continental Congress, all of which petitioned the Crown and Parliament in England for redress of their tax grievances. It was with these realities in mind that the origination clause of our Constitution was written; and without it at the core of the Great Compromise of 1787, the 13 original States would never have agreed to ratify the Constitution.

When our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, they knew it was vital for the power to raise and levy taxes to originate in the people's House, whose Members are closest to the electorate with 2-year terms, rather than the Senate, whose Members sit unchallenged for 6-year terms and do not proportionally represent the American population, and already enjoy their own unique and separate Senate powers intentionally divided by the Framers between the two Chambers.

If we as Members of Congress, who took a solemn oath to defend and protect the Constitution, including its origination clause, fail to assert this right and responsibility as the immediate representatives of the people and those most accountable to them, we dishonor the Founders' memory and fundamentally abrogate our sworn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Mr. Speaker, this fall, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will hear an appeal in the case Sissel v. HHS as to whether ObamaCare violates the origination clause of the Constitution. I urge my colleagues to sign on to H. Res. 153 and to join me in an amicus brief that I will be filing with the court, along with 31 other Members of Congress currently, and this brief expresses our collective conviction that the passage of ObamaCare was and is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was the largest tax increase in American history. The United States Supreme Court specifically and officially ruled it a tax. Consequently, under NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, the House and the Senate in passing it in the manner they did categorically violated the origination clause without which the U.S. Constitution never would have been born in the first place.

It is now the duty of the judiciary to strike down ObamaCare as a clear violation of the origination clause. The failure to do so is an abrogation of their judicial oath to the Constitution and undermines their relevance as an institution.

It would also allow the Obama administration to blow yet another huge hole in the constitutional fabric of this noble Republic.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster said it this way:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and the Republic for which it stands, for miracles do not cluster, and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution for if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the court will take those words seriously; and I hope when they hear ObamaCare, they will do the right thing: they will simply read the origination clause and understand that if they let the President blow through this, if we walk away from this, we simply undermine our credibility and our oath and we render a critical part of the Constitution that was vital to this Republic ever coming into existence, we render that part of the Constitution, as I said earlier, a dead letter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I guess it all comes down to making sure we understand as a people that the Constitution was put here to protect three basic rights: the right to live; the right to be free; and the right to own property. And, hopefully, that will allow us to pursue our dreams in the best way we know how; but none of those things can occur if our national security is significantly undermined or threatened; and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is today so let me shift gears one more time.

SECURITY THREAT OF NUCLEAR ARMED IRAN

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the greatest security threat in the world today is that of a nuclear-armed Iran. And now, Iran is once again the news of the moment. As talks have begun between the United States and Iran, American leaders given the charge to protect America's national security must not be charmed by wolves in sheep's clothing.

When innocent civilians in Syria were mercilessly attacked by chemical weapons, the Obama administration was caught on its heels in a foreign policy quandary. America was reminded again that the United States must always be vigilant and embrace an international relations framework which enables proactive engagement rather than merely reactionary, crisis response.

I desperately hope these discussions will proceed in the context of the grave reality the human family will face if nuclear weapons fall into the hands of jihadists in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, to use the slightly altered words of our Secretary of State: in a world of terrorists and extremists, we ignore these risks at our peril. We simply cannot afford to have nuclear weapons become the IED or car bomb of tomorrow. Neither our country, nor our conscience can bear the cost of inaction. An action that will reinforce the prohibition against illegal nuclear weapons is an authorization of military force in Iran. We are talking about actions that will degrade Iran's capacity to use these weapons and ensure that they do not proliferate. With this authorization, the President will simply have the power to make sure the United States of America means what we say.

Now, I can't say actually unquote, Mr. Speaker, because those words were changed just slightly. Actually, these are indeed the essential words of Secretary Kerry's recent justification for attacking Bashar al Assad's regime. However, when he said ''Syria,'' I inserted ''Iran.'' And whenever he said ''chemical weapons,'' I inserted ''nuclear weapons.'' Mr. Speaker, if this is a line of reasoning the administration chooses to stand behind, then we simply cannot refute the parallel argument related to a nuclear Iran, which poses an exponential greater national security threat to the United States than chemical weapons in Syria.

Secretary Kerry asserted Mr. Obama ''means what he says.'' But, Mr. Speaker, if the world truly believed that this President means what he says, the chemical weapons crisis in Syria would never have occurred in the first place. Secretary Kerry said of the crisis in Syria that North Korea and Iran were closely watching our actions. Well, I don't disagree with him, Mr. Speaker, but the converse is actually far more true: Syria has been closely watching Mr. Obama's inaction toward North Korea and Iran since he became President. And, consequently, Assad felt he could use chemical weapons on innocent men, women, and children with impunity. The entire world now sees the U.S. under this President as all talk.

Mr. Speaker, our critical diplomatic policies must be backed by our unmovable will to back them up by all means necessary.

The popular concession this week is to embrace Iranian openness and regard their willingness to negotiate. But, Mr. Speaker, we know IAEA declarations have gone unanswered by this regime and diplomatic efforts, including 10 rounds of negotiations since 2011,

and they have borne no fruit. Decades have passed without a single concession coming from the world's leading sponsor of terror. In 2005, we saw North Korea, another rogue nation, petition for talks without ending their nuclear weapons program, and demanding U.S. concessions. How did they hold up their end of the bargain, Mr. Speaker? They have conducted three flagrant nuclear weapons tests. This, in spite of the fact that North Korea has been sanctioned virtually into starvation for nearly half a century.

Iran is closer than ever and racing toward a full nuclear weapons capability. The Iranian Government's intentions, actions, and capacity to develop nuclear weapons capability and sponsor international terrorism are terrifyingly clear. The time to regain our credibility with both our allies and foes alike in this region is now, before the situation devolves into a Syria-like situation, where we are frantically searching for solutions after the crisis has already begun.

To that end, I have introduced the U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act. This act will strengthen the United States negotiating position in the upcoming talks with Iran. It will also outline congressional priorities in any nuclear negotiations with Iran. A bad deal with Iran which does not definitively prevent a nuclear weapons capable Iran is worse than no deal at all.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I will just say this about a nuclear Iran. I understand that there are great challenges; but whatever the cost, whatever the cost to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran may be, it will pale in insignificance compared to the cost to our children and the entire human family of allowing the jihadist regime in Iran to gain nuclear weapons.

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

□ 2100

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the point being made by my friend, Mr. FRANKS from Arizona, about the origination clause. I have been talking about this for 3½ years of when the Senate took a House bill that provided a tax credit for first-time home buyers who were in the military or veterans, took out every single word and took that short little bill and expanded that by thousands of pages—my copy was around 2,500 pages—it had nothing to do with military or veteran home buyers. It had nothing to do with that. They inserted health care. We have found out since it is costing more; and if you like your doctor, you're going to lose your doctor, and if you like your insurance policy, there is a good chance you may lose it. Fortunately, not everybody is losing their doctor, but the promises have been badly broken. It turns out those people, including the head of this administration, were just flat wrong when they said, If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; if you like your insurance, you can keep your insurance.

For example, there is a story here from Kaiser Health News from Anna Gorman and Julie Appleby, dated October 21. I won't read all three pages, but this is what it points out:

> Health plans are sending hundreds of thousands of cancellation letters to people who buy their own coverage, frustrating some consumers who want to keep what they have and forcing others to buy more costly policies.
>
> The main reason insurers offer is that the policies fall short of what the Affordable Care Act requires starting January 1.

On further it says:

> But the cancellation notices, which began arriving in August, have shocked many consumers in light of President Barack Obama's promise that people could keep their plans if they liked them.
>
> ''I don't feel like I need to change, but I have to,'' said Jeff Learned, a television editor in Los Angeles, who must find a new plan for his teenage daughter, who has a health condition that has required multiple surgeries.

He liked his policy. She had a pre-existing condition. Now, because of ObamaCare, he has lost the insurance for him and his daughter, and he is going to have to find another plan, which will likely cost much more.

The article goes on and says:

> An estimated 14 million people purchase their own coverage because they don't get it through their jobs. Calls to insurers in several States showed that many have sent notices.
>
> Florida Blue, for example, is terminating about 300,000 policies, about 80 percent of its individual policies in the State. Kaiser Permanente in California has sent notices to 160,000 people—about half of its individual business in the State. Insurer Highmark in Pittsburgh is dropping about 20 percent of its individual market customers, while Independence Blue Cross, the major insurer in Philadelphia, is dropping about 45 percent.

The article further down talks about other notices and says:

> Blue Shield of California sent roughly 119,000 cancellation notices out in mid-September, about 60 percent of its individual business. About two-thirds of those policyholders will see rate increases in their new policies, said spokesman Steve Shivinsky.

The President, Jay Carney, this administration, Senators who quoted this, Democrats, leaders here in the House, owe millions of people an apology. They owe an apology to those who they told that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor, and people that were told that if you like your policy, you can keep it.

I know that our President has traveled the world apologizing for things he did not do that were done in prior generations, prior times in this country; but I think in order to keep credibility in this country, it is important that instead of apologizing for things you had nothing to do with, it is important to apologize when people trust you and you make promises and those promises turn out to be totally false.

I understand that the President's spokesman may have indicated today that they may need to suspend the individual mandate. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that after HARRY REID and the President refused to suspend the individual mandate—that was the third compromise we proposed before the shutdown. They said, Absolutely not, under no circumstances. Their actions made it very clear that they were saying, We are willing to shut this government down. We have already worked out the purchase and rental and the use of barricades to keep World War II veterans in wheelchairs from getting to see things they want to see. We have worked out barricades for the Martin Luther King, Jr., memorial, that so many come to Washington to see. We worked out barricades across the entire Lincoln Memorial plaza.

When I asked one park ranger the second day of the shutdown, how many they normally have out there, she said four. Actually, I've been there all hours of the day and night. I rarely see more than one or two in the area; yet I was shown a photograph that had mounted police, most of them on horseback in the picture, with a few of them standing around. It looked like there were at least 16 mounted police there to try to enforce the barricades at the World War II Memorial, which would violate the existing law that says in the event of a shutdown, you are not supposed to spend more money than you were before. Yet this administration, in order to make the hurt be felt across the country by veterans, by people who had their one-time vacation planned for a national park, this administration and HARRY REID were willing to shut down the government, rather than just suspend the mandate that individuals have to buy this insurance. Now they have got to buy it in the next few months. They have got to buy it. By their actions, they were saying, We are willing to shut the government down for over 2 weeks to keep from suspending that mandate to individuals. Yes, the President already issued what should be an illegal order saying that he was not going to enforce the mandate for Big Business under ObamaCare.

So this side of the aisle repeatedly said, Look, if you are going to suspend the mandate for Big Business—businesses with over 50 employees—then why not just agree to suspend for a year, the same amount of time you are giving to Big Business, do that for the individuals? Then, as the shutdown continued, we saw what a disaster, what a train wreck it was. The Democrats that called it a train wreck, a nightmare, they were exactly right. It was playing out in front of us, and still HARRY REID and this President said, We don't care. We are not suspending

the individual mandate. We are forcing individuals to do what we are not making businesses do. Even though it is in the law required for businesses to do it, that seemed like a pretty easy ask.

That was where we were in the negotiations, right before the last bill we passed about an hour after midnight on October 1, which I saw as basically capitulation. All right, all right, HARRY REID, Mr. President, we are not demanding that you suspend the individual mandate as you have done for Big Business, but here are our conferees, negotiators. It is what the Constitution anticipates, and it is what the law and the rules require.

HARRY REID, again, by his actions said, We would rather shut this down. We would rather have mounted police out there in the face of our veterans. And as we saw when veterans ultimately took barricades to the White House, we saw, for the first time in my memory, officers of the Federal Government in uniform who were supposed to protect Americans' rights, instead for the first time in my memory, being used, the first time in my lifetime that I can remember, to take away Americans' and specifically veterans' rights that they fought for for all Americans.

It is almost unthinkable. It is like a bad dream, the Federal Government hiring officers to take away Americans' rights. How far is this administration willing to go to make Americans hurt, to get the money they want? How ironic that leaders in this administration, going to the top, would use the term ''extortion.'' Extortion is when you do some action threatening someone with action if you don't give them all the money that they demand. I always thought when Jay Carney said that Congress is putting a gun to their heads to be paid for doing their job, that that didn't make sense because this is exactly the other way around.

Some of our Democratic friends are very good at taking action that is offensive to most Americans and then blaming their opponents for doing what actually they are doing when their opponents weren't even doing what was alleged. That is basically what we saw here, people saying Republicans in the House were using extortion. Hardly. The Constitution of the United States gives the Congress the purse strings, control over the money. What this administration said by their actions and made very clear is, We will harm World War II veterans, Korean veterans, Vietnam veterans; we will harm veterans by preventing them from getting to the cemetery in Normandy, being able to pull over and take a picture of Mount Rushmore, trying to take advantage of the Claude Moore farm that operates off of individual expenditures; they would put up barricades at a World War II Memorial that was built entirely with private funds that has a trust fund of millions of dollars that is used for operating expenses; they would go out of their way to spend more extra money just to make Americans' lives more difficult and unpleasant, all the while saying, We will never agree to suspend the individual mandate, the requirement that individuals buy a certain level of insurance or be fined the minimum of either $95 or 1 percent of their income tax, whichever is lower.

One of these days some of the fact-checking people will actually admit that I have been right and they have been wrong. Even with subsidies, people that make 133 percent of the poverty level are projected to come out of pocket potentially thousands of dollars, one, two, three—one projection that I had read before I talked about this ran $3,000 even after the subsidies.

□ 2115

And so, you know, all the mainstream media that is doing everything they can to protect the President, some are coming around and realizing: Wait a minute; there were a lot of things that weren't true. And I appreciate NBC making some of these stories the stories they should be.

But it is appalling what is happening to Americans, what is happening to the health insurance they once had. It is time for real reform. And as I have said from this podium, going back 3, 3½ years, a bill that starts out as a fraud is not likely to get better. And when you take a House bill, because of the origination clause, article I, section 7, all bills that raise revenue must originate in the House.

Now, it could and had been considered that ObamaCare was not a revenue-raising bill. But when Chief Justice John Roberts did the unthinkable and rewrote legislation that clearly defined itself as a penalty and rewrote that as a tax—even though at page 15 he made clear that it was a penalty; it wasn't a tax. It was penalizing people for not doing an act. So under the anti-injunction statute, it was clearly a penalty, not a tax. But then to save it, he had to actually do the unthinkable and say further in the opinion, actually, it is a tax, not a penalty.

Well, once he defined it as a tax, in order to rule it constitutional, then, clearly, that is a bill that raises revenue. Clearly, article I, section 7 kicks in, and a bill to raise revenue, which is what taxes do, must originate in the House.

I have heard people say, who have not done the legal research, well, the Supreme Court has decided many times that you don't have to have precisely the same bill when the Senate strikes language in the House bill and puts other language in it and sends it back, then it still originated in the House. Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that when you strike every single word of a bill, including the title about it being a tax credit for first-time home buyers in the Armed Forces or veterans, you even strike the title and substitute therein about a 2,500-page bill that is all about the government running health care, about getting health care records controlled by Washington, about creating navigators to get your personal information—which, actually, we have been told is just a dream for identity thieves because of how much information will be accessible, be stolen by hackers—you put all of that stuff in there, dictating about what has to be put in vending machines, notices that have to be put, requirements for restaurants—I think there is a requirement for restaurants, they may have to have a place specifically for nursing mothers—you put all of those in there, including issues—and I love the fact that women nurse babies. I think it is one the greatest gifts God gave, but that has nothing do with a tax credit for first-time home buyers in the military or veterans, so, clearly, that bill did not originate in the House. It originated in the Senate. When the only thing that is left of the bill that originated in the House is a number, like 3590, that is not a bill that originates in the House. It originated in the Senate.

And since we now know after the Supreme Court opinion that Chief Justice Roberts rewrote the law, which the Constitution simply does not allow, but the Supreme Court did it anyway—there are checks and balances. Congress could check the Supreme Court when they act unconstitutionally like that themselves. But he rewrote it to call it a tax after he called it a penalty, so that means it had to originate in the Senate. It did not originate in the House.

And what limited case law there is indicates it absolutely must be germane to the underlying bill, and that is not germane. There is no way that is germane to first-time home buyers. It is about the government controlling people's health care. It sets up a panel that will decide: Do you get a pacemaker or do you not get a pacemaker? You are too old for a pacemaker. You are going to die early because we are not going to let you have a pacemaker. Are you going to get the surgery you need?

You know, like people in England, Canada, others, again, I have had a number of people from England and Canada go, you know: Where are we going to go now when we need immediate treatment when you screw up the greatest health care system in the world?

It certainly needed reform. But what people need to understand is you can look at the entire history, recorded history of mankind, going back to the very beginning, when we knew what mankind was doing, and some medical historians say it was around 1900, 1910, 1912, maybe it was during World War I, 1916, '17, '18, maybe it was during the great influenza outbreak and protocols were established, but somewhere around that time, about 100 years ago, it has been said that for the first time in the entire human history you had a better chance of getting well than of getting worse after seeing a doctor. When you consider that just in 100

years this country has been at the forefront of saving lives, enhancing lives, improving quality of life, making incredible breakthroughs in medicine and health care—reforms were needed, but not the government taking it over and making it run like the Post Office, not the government taking it over and making it run like the Department of Education or Energy or Interior, that slows everything down, because when somebody needs heart surgery, they don't need the government in the process of slowing things down.

It is incredible what has been inflicted upon man by man, and the ObamaCare law is inflicting massive cost increases for most Americans, higher deductibles, running many doctors out of health care. It is time that this administration, if Jay Carney is willing to now say, after the President and HARRY REID shut down the government for over 2 weeks over a little temper tantrum that they did not want to suspend the individual mandate, that is what we were down to, and then after that, okay, just produce conferees—we have got ours; we will get an agreement hopefully by morning so most Americans will never even know the government was shut down—refused to even have conferees to work it out before morning because before that they weren't going to suspend the individual mandate. They would rather shut down the government indefinitely than allow individuals to have the same break that they gave to Big Business. I am a fan of Big Business as long as they treat people fairly and right. Most do.

But now to say, well, we may suspend the individual mandate, it means all the suffering this administration inflicted upon our veterans, on people on vacation, people that needed Federal services and didn't get them, on those whose loved ones were killed in Afghanistan, and this administration, though we gave them the power to pay the death benefits, wouldn't even do that, played games with their death benefits while they were grieving. This administration was willing to do all that, knowing we are probably going to have to do what the Republicans were asking anyway, but we will try to get—we know the mainstream media will blame it 100 percent on the Republicans. We know that is going to happen. They will give us cover, and so we can refuse something as reasonable as just suspending the individual mandate for a year, something as reasonable as just appointing conferees and working it out before morning. We can refuse to do those things because the mainstream media, MSNBC, CNN, they will give us cover, they will deceive the American public about who is at fault.

And I am wondering, if this administration goes about suspending the individual mandate that would have prevented there ever being a shutdown in the first place, which was the next to last thing we did before we just capitulated and said, all right, appoint conferees, if they are willing to do that now, I still have hope that even CNN will have to recognize that it was the President and HARRY REID that shut the government down, that inflicted pain and suffering upon the American people who needed Federal services for something that they were agreeable to do anyway.

We will see. But then again, this is the same administration who weaponized the IRS to go after conservatives. Here is a story from today at Watchdog.org, by Kenric Ward, ''IRS pays illegal immigrants $4.2 billion while stalling Tea Parties.''

It says:

On January 19, 2007, file photo, the U.S. Border Patrol detains a large group of suspected immigrants at the Arizona-Mexico border in Sasabe, Arizona.

While harrying and stalling Tea Party groups seeking nonprofit status, the Internal Revenue Service mailed $4.2 billion in child credit checks to undocumented immigrants.

Critics say midlevel IRS bureaucrats continue to abuse the Additional Child Tax Credit program by dispensing $1,000 checks to families in this country illegally.

''The law needs clarification that undocumented immigrants are not eligible,'' Senator Charles Grassley, Republican of Iowa, told Watchdog.org in a statement.

To make Congress' intent clear—that only legal U.S. residents are entitled to the Additional Child Tax Credits—Grassley cosponsored a clarifying amendment with Senator MIKE ENZI, Republican from Wyoming.

''Unfortunately, the majority leader, HARRY REID, Democrat from Nevada, cut off debate, so we weren't given the chance to offer our amendment,'' said Grassley, the top Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee.

So all the while—and I spoke to another Tea Party group this weekend, different races, all ages, even kids, very, very senior people, both genders, people from all walks of life were there, and out of hundreds of people at that event, there was only one who got more benefits from the government than he paid in.

□ 2130

That is the common thread I see with the vast majority of Tea Party people. They pay income tax. Those who identify with the Tea Party are a majority of those paying income tax, the 53 percent, 52 percent, whatever it is. They ought to be able to say something without being called all kinds of criminal names, without being slandered and libeled. They just want fairness, and they are not seeing it.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the shutdown and that this administration was willing to make the American people—World War II veterans and so many others—suffer, the survivors of the loved ones who died in Afghanistan, make them suffer, when all they had to do was suspend the individual mandate for a year—and they are talking about doing it anyway—the American people ought to be furious.

Like I say, I still hold onto that hope that springs eternal in the human breast that even the mainstream media will figure out who was actually at fault for the shutdown, when Republicans submitted compromise after compromise after compromise that included things the administration may do anyway. If we are going to get this country turned around, America is going to have to wake up to who is causing the problems and who isn't.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 23 on account of a death in the family.

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and October 23 on account of the death of a close family friend.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, October 16, 2013;

H.R. 2775. An act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that an October 16, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2775. Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 383 and House Resolution 384, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 23, 2013, at 10 a.m., for morning-hour debate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Thomas S. Foley and the late Honorable C.W. BILL YOUNG.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3328. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting designation for Funding for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism so designated by the Congress in section of 114(a) of the CR; (H. Doc. No. 113—67); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3329. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's ''Major'' final rule — Supervision and Regulation Assessments for Bank Holding Companies and Savings and Loan Holding Companies with Total Consolidated Assets of $50 Billion or More and Nonbank Financial Companies Supervised by the Federal Reserve [Docket No.: R-1457, Regulation TT] (RIN: 7100-AD-95) received October 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3330. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's ''Major'' final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule [Docket No.: R-1442; Regulations H, Q, and Y] (RIN: 7100-AD 87) received October 21, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3331. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Norwegian Air Shuttle ASA (Norwegian Air Shuttle) of Fornebu, Norway, pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3332. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report summarizing the FDA's activities since the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act was enacted in 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3333. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Utah; Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for Salt Lake County and Davis County [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0958; FRL-9786-3] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3334. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Section 110(a)(2) Infrastructure Requirement for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0451; FRL-9901-22-Region 3] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3335. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planing Purposes; State of California; PM10; Redesignation of Sacramento to Attainment; Approval of PM10 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for Sacramento [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0887; FRL-9901-29-Region 9] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3336. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; Stage II Requirements for Enterprise Holdings, Inc. at Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport in Boone County [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0271; FRL-9901-23-Region 4] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3337. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Emergency Orders [EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0600; FRL-9901-30-Region 6] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3338. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Prevention of Significant Deterioration Requirements for PM2.5 Increments and Major and Minor Source Baseline Dates; Colorado [EPA-R08-OAR-2009-0810; FRL-9901-04-Region 8] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3339. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Louisiana: Final Authorization of State-initiated Changes and Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-2013-0027; FRL-9819-8] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3340. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for California [OAR-2004-0091; FRL-9831-2] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3341. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Placer County Air Pollution Control District and Feather River Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0064; FRL-9833-1] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3342. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0508; FRL-9900-96-Region 9] received September 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3343. A letter from the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3344. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 09-13 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with NATO Alliance Ground Surveillance Programme; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3345. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Notification of the intention to exercise the authority under Section 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to authorize the drawdown to the Supreme Military Council (SMC) of the Free Syrian Army (FSA); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3346. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3347. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3348. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3349. A letter from the Executive Officer, District of Columbia Courts, transmitting modifications to the Jury Plan of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3350. A letter from the Archivist, National Archives, transmitting Archives' FY 2013 Commercial Activities Inventory and Inherently Governmental Inventory, as required by the FAIR Act and OMB Circular A-76; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3351. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2015, in accordance with Section 7(f) of the Railroad Retirement Act; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Appropriations.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on October 16, 2013 the following report was filed on October 21, 2013]

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3080. A bill to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–246, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[Filed October 22, 2013]

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1443. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recognize tinnitus as a mandatory condition for

research and treatment by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 623. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, with an amendment (Rept. 113–248, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1963. A bill to amend the Water Conservation and Utilization Act to authorize the development of non-Federal hydropower and issuance of leases of power privileges at projects constructed pursuant to the authority of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2463. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States (Rept. 113–250, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 385. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–251). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on October 21, 2013]

Pusuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on the Budget, Ways and Means, and Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3080 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[The following action occurred on October 22, 2013]

Pusuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 623 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pusuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2463 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 3300. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. VELA, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 3301. A bill to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RADEL, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HALL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KLINE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATTA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SALMON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SEWELL

of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YODER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 3302. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the ''C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. considered and passed.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 3303. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for regulating medical software, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. MENG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. BARBER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 3304. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ENYART, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3305. A bill to improve the circulation of $1 coins, to remove barriers to the circulation of such coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 3306. A bill to promote and expand the application of telehealth under Medicare and other Federal health care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3307. A bill to authorize microenterprise assistance for renewable energy projects in developing countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 3308. A bill to require a Federal agency to include language in certain educational and advertising materials indicating that such materials are produced and disseminated at taxpayer expense; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.J. Res. 97. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to applying laws equally to the citizens of the United States and the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GRIMM):

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the execution-style murders of United States citizens Ylli, Agron, and Mehmet Bytyqi in the Republic of Serbia in July 1999; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 383. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House on the death of the Honorable Thomas S. Foley, former Member of the House for 15 terms and Speaker of the House of Representatives for the One Hundred First, One Hundred Second and One Hundred Third Congresses; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H. Res. 384. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House on the death of the Honorable C.W. Bill Young, a Representative from the State of Florida; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H. Res. 386. A resolution recognizing the religious and historical significance of the festival of Diwali; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MENG, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. VELA, Ms. CHU, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BASS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. ESTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 387. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding sexually exploited and trafficked girls in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WATT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENYART, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BASS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H. Res. 388. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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. SHUSTER:

H.R. 3300.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to interstate compacts).

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3301.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 3302.

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

The United States Constitution, Article I Section 8

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3303.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3304.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

The Congress shall have the power ''to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.''

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 3305.

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

Article I, Section 8, (''The Congress shall have power to... coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of eights and measures.''

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 3306.

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

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3307.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3308.

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

Article I, Section 8—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.

Article I, Section 9—No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.J. Res. 97.

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

Article V of the Constitution.

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 15: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 94: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 274: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 292: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 366: Mr. PERRY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 411: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 435: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 494: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 495: Mr. COHEN and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 503: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 541: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 562: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 679: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 685: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 713: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 715: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TSONGAS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 721: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 724: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 763: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 787: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 920: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 921: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 940: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 996: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1008: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1019: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1020: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1037: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1083: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1091: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1094: Ms. BASS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1149: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1250: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1309: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1318: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1321: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1339: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1362: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1418: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1500: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1515: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1518: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1521: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1523: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1553: Mr. RADEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SCALISE, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1630: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1665: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1666: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1701: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1761: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1779: Mr. POLIS and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1795: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1796: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1801: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1812: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1821: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1845: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1852: Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1861: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1869: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1910: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1984: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1999: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2026: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2029: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2053: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2073: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2083: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2123: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2134: Ms. TIERNEY and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 2174: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 2194: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2195: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2249: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2274: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2310: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2311: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2330: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2350: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2376: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2377: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2415: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 2429: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 2480: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2485: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2504: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETRI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2575: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2662: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2692: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2697: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2702: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2725: Mr. RADEL, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2750: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2772: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2822: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2839: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERSON, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2846: Mr. COTTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 2856: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2863: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2866: Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2874: Mr. POLIS and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2894: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2902: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2903: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2908: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2920: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2939: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2959: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 2962: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2998: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3040: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 3050: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 3077: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3086: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr.

DOYLE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 3108: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3121: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 3135: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3143: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3146: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 3154: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3165: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 3169: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 3179: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. CUELLAR,.

H.R. 3205: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. JENKINS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 3209: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3211: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 3229: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3278: Mr. WOLF, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3286: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. SIMPSON.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. GARDNER.

H. Con. Res. 60: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 72: Mr. HOLT and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H. Res. 131: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Res. 254: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 284: Mr. LONG, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H. Res. 329: Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 359: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. PETERSON.

H. Res. 365: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GARCIA, and Ms. TSONGAS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

The amendment to be offered by Representative SHUSTER, or a designee, to H.R. 3080, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3205, the Promoting Adoption and Legal Guardianship for Children in Foster Care Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.