United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2013 No. 161

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 13, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VICKY HARTZLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, yesterday in Dayton, I hosted a community forum regarding the impacts of sequestration on Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in the Dayton community. We had a distinguished group of local leaders who participated in the event. The expert panel included Colonel Cassie B. Barlow, 88th Air Base Wing and installation commander; Jeffrey C. Hoagland, president and CEO of the Dayton Development Coalition; Chris Kershner of the Dayton Chamber of Commerce; and Carl Francis of Dayton Defense, a nonprofit group that is an advocacy group for the defense community in Dayton, Ohio. Each of these local leaders explained how sequestration has affected our community in 2013, and what the effect would be if the sequester continues. For a community like Dayton with such a strong relationship to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio's largest single-site employer, the message was devastating.

The Budget Control Act of 2011, which I voted against, was signed into law on August 2, 2011. The Budget Control Act established a series of spending caps and forced reductions designed to indiscriminately reduce government spending by nearly $2 trillion over 10 years. These forced reductions, also known as sequestration, greatly impact our national security by requiring the Department of Defense to reduce its budget by roughly $500 billion. Already in its second year, this poorly conceived and flawed process continues to compromise our defense capabilities and greatly impacts military communities like Dayton, Ohio.

Reducing Federal spending is important, but the sequester, as proposed by President Obama, applies 50 percent of the cuts to less than 18 percent of the spending. The Department of Defense represents less than 18 percent of overall Federal spending. Due to the President's sequester, this year roughly 14,000 Air Force civilian men and women have been furloughed in the State of Ohio as a direct result of the sequester. These forced furloughs have not only cost our State tens of millions of dollars in lost revenue but have negatively impacted nearly 30,000 men and women who work at Wright-Patterson and reside in our community. If allowed to continue, I fear the effects of sequestration will devastate the region and potentially result in a loss of 13,000 jobs. The loss of jobs, matched with reductions in spending, could cost our community in Dayton roughly $8.6 billion.

While it is important to note the impacts to Dayton, we must also take into consideration the impacts to our national security and the future of our country. The President promised sequester would not happen, and yet, the Department of Defense suffers under the effects of these drastic cuts. As many of the experts pointed out, sequestration will greatly compromise military readiness and modernization for years to come. Without a ready and able force, our military will no longer possess the capabilities necessary to rapidly and effectively respond to conflicts around the globe.

During recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, the various service chiefs have made numerous statements outlining the devastating effects. Of note, the Army has been forced to cancel all combat training center rotations for those brigade combat teams not slated to deploy to Afghanistan or to be part of the global response force. That means that we only have two out of 42 combat Army brigades fully trained and ready to deploy in a crisis.

The Navy has canceled multiple ship deployments as a result of the devastating budget cuts, including the USS *Harry S. Truman* Carrier Strike Group that was scheduled to deploy to the Middle East earlier this year. Due to the cuts in training and maintenance, we have had to reduce deterrent presence in order to retain the ability to surge our ships if needed in a crisis.

Important modernization efforts are also taking a hit as a result of sequestration. Air Force leaders have told Congress that ''modernization forecasts are bleak.'' These modernization efforts are critical as many of the assets in our current inventory are decades old.

Printed on recycled paper.

It is imperative that we find spending cuts to offset sequestration on the Department of Defense. Our military leaders have come to Congress on numerous occasions to explain the limitations the budget cuts are putting on our national security. It is legislative malpractice for this Congress to continue to put our Nation at greater risk. The President needs to come to this Congress with a proposal to offset sequestration in a responsible manner so the Department of Defense can be restored, our national security protected, and the community of Dayton, Ohio, no longer suffers the effects of sequestration.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to say that climate change is making extreme weather worse and costing us in lives and dollars.

Last week, Typhoon Haiyan, the strongest storm to make landfall in recorded history, struck the Philippines with sustained winds of almost 200 miles per hour. Thousands are reported dead and missing.

Haiyan, Sandy, Irene, Katrina, wildfires, floods, droughts.

If you flip a coin 20 times, it is possible that an honest coin will land on heads every time, but you should start to suspect that there is something wrong with that coin.

Sure, the recent extreme weather event might be coincidence, but as superstorms continue again and again, you should suspect that something is wrong with our climate. We should begin fixing our broken world, not be pretending that all is well.

This week marks the beginning of the 19th U.N. climate change conference in Warsaw, where representatives from more than 190 nations will be discussing climate change and how the world should be responding.

For international climate negotiations to succeed, the U.S. should take the lead, and leading internationally will require us to start here at home.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT FOR THE SIERRAS

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, this summer the biggest fire in the history of the Sierra Nevada Mountains burned 400 square miles of forest land. The fire left behind an unprecedented swath of environmental devastation that threatens the loss of not only the affected forest land for generations but sets events in motion that could threaten the surrounding forests for many years to come.

The fire also left behind as much as a billion board feet of dead timber on Federal land that could be sold to raise hundreds of millions of dollars, money that could then be used to replant and restore the devastated forests. In addition, processing that timber would help to revive the economy of the stricken region. But time is already running out. Within a year, the value of the timber rapidly declines as the wood is devoured by insects and rot. That's the problem: cumbersome environmental reviews and the litigation that inevitably follows will run out the clock on this valuable asset until it becomes worthless.

Indeed, it becomes worse than worthless—it becomes hazardous. Bark and wood-boring beetles are already moving in to feast on the dead and dying timber, and a population explosion of pestilence can be expected if those dead trees remain. The beetles won't confine themselves to the fire areas, posing a mortal threat to the surrounding forests in the years ahead.

By the time the normal bureaucratic reviews and lawsuits have run their course, what was once forest land will have already begun converting to brush land, and by the following year, reforestation will become infinitely more difficult and expensive.

Within 2 years, several feet of brush will have built up, and the smaller trees will begin toppling on this tinder. It is not possible to build a more perfect fire stack than that. Intense, second-generation fires will take advantage of this fuel, sterilizing the soil, eroding the landscape, fouling the watersheds, and threatening the surrounding forest for many years to come.

Without timely salvage and reforestation, we know the fate of the Sierras because we have seen the result of benign neglect after previous fires. The trees don't come back for many generations. Instead, thick brush takes over the land that was once shaded by towering forests. The brush quickly overwhelms any seedlings struggling to make a start. It replaces the diverse ecosystems supported by the forests with scrub brush.

For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 3188, which waives the time-consuming environmental review process and prevents the endless litigation that always follows. It authorizes Federal forest managers, following well-established environmental protocols for salvage, to sell the dead timber and to supervise its careful removal while there is still time.

The hundreds of millions of dollars raised can then be directed toward replanting the region before layers of brush choke off any chance of forest regrowth for generations to come. It is modeled on legislation authored by Democratic Senator Tom Daschle for salvaging dead and dying trees in the Black Hills National Forest, a measure credited with speeding the preservation and recovery of that forest.

This legislation has spawned lurid tales from the activist left of uncontrolled logging in the Sierras. Nothing could be further from the truth. This legislation vests full control of the salvage plans with Federal forest managers, not the logging companies. It leaves Federal foresters in charge of enforcing salvage plans that fully protect the environment.

The left wants a policy of benign neglect: let a quarter-million acres of destroyed timber rot in place, surrender the ravaged land to beetles, and watch contentedly as the forest ecosystem is replaced by scrub land. Yes, without human intervention the forests will eventually return, but not in the lifetimes of ourselves, our children, or our children's children.

If we want to stop the loss of this forest land and if we want to control the beetle infestation before it explodes out of control, the dead timber has to come out soon. If we take it out now, we can generate the funds necessary to suppress brush buildup, plant new seedlings, and restore these forests for the use and enjoyment of our children. If we wait for the normal bureaucratic reviews and delays, we will have lost these forests to the next several generations. That is a choice. Congress must make that choice now, or nature will make that choice for us.

HONORING PUERTO RICO'S MILITARY VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, Monday was Veterans Day, when our Nation pays tribute to those who have served honorably in the Armed Forces. Today, I rise to express my gratitude to the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from Puerto Rico, both those who are living and those who have left us.

Since World War I almost a century ago to Afghanistan today, American citizens from Puerto Rico have built a rich record of military service. If you visit any U.S. base, you will see warriors from Puerto Rico fighting to keep this Nation safe, strong, and free. They serve as officers and enlisted personnel; as special operators; in infantry, artillery, and armored units; as pilots and aviation technicians; in intelligence; on ships and submarines; in combat support positions; and in every military specialty.

In his book, ''Puerto Rico's Future: A Time to Decide,'' former U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh observed:

> Historically, Puerto Rico has ranked alongside the top five States in terms of per capita military service.

□ 1015

In the forward to that book, former President George H.W. Bush noted:

> This patriotic service and sacrifice of Americans from Puerto Rico touched me all the more deeply for the very fact they have served with such devotion, even while denied

a vote for the President and Members of Congress who determine when, where, and how they are asked to defend our freedoms.

As I address this Chamber, men and women from Puerto Rico are serving in harm's way in Afghanistan and other locations. Since the attacks of 9/11, island residents have deployed about 35,000 times in overseas contingency operations. Many have deployed on multiple occasions. Each time they go, they leave behind spouses, children, and parents. As veterans will tell you, military life requires enormous sacrifice from their loved ones, those quiet heroes who support our uniformed personnel who must live and work in their absence and who pray for their safe return. On Veterans Day, we honor not only those who fought, but their families, as well.

There is a frame on my office wall containing photographs of servicemembers from Puerto Rico that have fallen in the last 12 years. I often look at those photos, row after row of young faces, usually posing in their dress uniforms against the backdrop of the American flag. Those images make me sad, but they also give me strength. They inspire me to keep working for my people. They remind me what courage is and what sacrifice means. And they help me remember why representing Puerto Rico in Congress is the greatest honor I have ever known.

I have met many veterans from Puerto Rico. I have found that they value deeds over words. They expect their elected leaders to produce results, or at least to work tirelessly towards that end.

I am proud of the record we have compiled on behalf of veterans from Puerto Rico. We have obtained funding to renovate the VA hospital in San Juan, to improve existing clinics and build new clinics throughout the island, and to provide vehicles so that residents of our State veterans home can visit their families and travel to medical appointments. We also achieved Puerto Rico's inclusion in a Federal initiative to encourage the hiring of unemployed veterans.

And I am working to honor a military unit that perhaps best exemplifies the service that residents of Puerto Rico have rendered to this Nation. Congressman BILL POSEY of Florida and I have introduced legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment known as the Borinqueneers, a unit composed mostly of soldiers from Puerto Rico that overcame discrimination and won admiration for their performance in the Korean war. Our bill has nearly 160 bipartisan cosponsors, and there is a companion bill in the Senate that has also garnered strong support. I hope all my colleagues will join me in honoring this special group of veterans.

This Veterans Day, I renewed my commitment to fight for the men and women who have fought so valiantly for us, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart for their service. I do so again today.

COLLEGE STATION'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 75th anniversary of the city of College Station, Texas.

College Station has been and is the home to tens of thousands of Texas families, students, businesses, and residents throughout the years, and I am proud to offer my congratulations on this milestone.

College Station was an unincorporated community for over 60 years before officially being incorporated as a city on October 19, 1938.

In 1869, the Houston and Texas Central Railway was built through the area; and in 1871, College Station was chosen as the location for what would eventually become one of the largest public universities in the Nation, Texas A&M University.

The city got its name because the A&M campus was the focal point of community development at the time. In 1877, the area was designated College Station, Texas, by the postal service, deriving its name from the train station located to the west of the campus. Since incorporation in 1938, College Station's population has grown to over 97,000 today. Over the past 75 years, College Station has served as a vibrant, supportive, and safe community for thousands of families.

Texas A&M University is still the city's main focal point and the largest employer in the city. The university is rich in tradition and history; and due to its supportive fan base, sporting events bring in hundreds of thousands of tourists each year.

College Station is also the home to the George Bush Presidential Library and Museum, one of the region's most popular tourist attractions.

College Station is a fast-growing city with a thriving economy. It has recently been recognized as one of the Nation's best places for businesses, jobs, families, and retirees. College Station prides itself on having the fifth lowest property tax rate among similar-sized communities in the State of Texas, and the city was recently ranked No. 5 nationally on Forbes' list of the best small places for businesses and careers.

College Station is among the safest, the most family-friendly places in Texas, maintaining one of the best safety ratings in the State. College Station has also been a community that comes together and shows support when needed, whether it was the collapse of the Aggie bonfire in 1999 or the loss of one of our constables in August of last year. Our community comes together in the midst of terrible adversities to support one another.

The residents and leadership of College Station work hard to make their city one of the best places in Texas to work, live, and maintain an enjoyable and fulfilling life. It is my honor to represent the residents of this great city.

Madam Speaker, please join me in commemorating the city of College Station and its proud residents on their 75th anniversary.

Before I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country during these difficult times and for the military men and women and first responders who protect her. God bless the American people, and God bless College Station, Texas.

IN HONOR OF MARTYL LANGSDORF

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

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Martyl Langsdorf, who created the image of the now iconic Doomsday Clock for the June 1947 cover of the bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

The Bulletin was founded by a group of University of Chicago scientists who had worked on the Manhattan Project, including Martyl's husband, physicist Alexander Langsdorf.

Martyl's clock remains a singular reminder of the risks that we face from nuclear weapons and the effects of climate change.

A renowned landscape painter and longtime resident of Schaumburg, Illinois, Martyl died at the age of 96 on March 26, 2013, and will be remembered tomorrow at the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists' Fifth Annual Doomsday Clock Symposium here in our Nation's Capital.

Fittingly titled ''Communicating Catastrophe,'' the symposium will reflect Martyl's sensitivity to the urgency of existential threats and her brilliance in using art and design ''to move past the numbness and create new ways of feeling, just as we tap science for new ways of knowing,'' in the words of Bulletin Executive Director Kennette Benedict.

Martyl's legacy continues as members of the Bulletin's science and security board annually assess the state of world affairs and use the hands of the clock to signal humanity's capacity to meet challenges of nuclear weapons and climate change.

World attention to the Doomsday Clock confirms the impact of what designer Michael Beirut, in a 2010 tribute to Martyl entitled ''Designing the Unthinkable,'' called ''the most powerful piece of information design of the 20th century.''

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the late Martyl Langsdorf for raising the world's awareness about grave threats and also the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists for providing information and rational analysis that points to a safer world.

To close on a personal note, it was at one of Martyl Langsdorf's annual peony parties at her garden in Schaumburg, during a long conversation with wise old lawyer and Bulletin

stalwart Lowell Sachnoff, that was one of the first times I began seriously considering my own stepping away from my career in science to begin one in public service.

OBAMACARE CANCELATIONS

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, President Obama promised the American people that if you liked your health care plan, you could keep your health care plan. Period. No exceptions.

Now, as the ObamaCare exchanges have opened and enrollment has begun, there are hundreds of thousands of people in North Carolina who are finding that the President's promise doesn't hold true. According to the North Carolina Department of Insurance, over 183,000 policies have already been terminated, impacting over 473,000 people and their families across the State.

When ObamaCare supporters talk about the new health care law, they focus on the number of people who previously did not have health care and will now be covered. What you don't hear them talk about is the people who already had health care and are losing it now. They don't talk about the canceled policies and the alternative plans offered that are vastly more expensive and far from comparable. This is extremely misleading, Madam Speaker, and this administration has demonstrated a lack of transparency when it comes to the real impacts of ObamaCare.

Madam Speaker, I have heard from hundreds of constituents whose health care plans are going up in cost or being canceled altogether. A man in his sixties from Zebulon, North Carolina, wrote to my office that his wife's current plan, which costs $292 a month, will be discontinued because it does not comply with ObamaCare standards. She will be moved to a comparable plan that doubles her monthly payment. On top of the increased cost, the new plan is not tailored to their needs. The couple is in their sixties, retired, and their children are adults; yet their new plan includes newborn care, plus dental and vision for dependent children.

A constituent from Cary, North Carolina, wrote in with similar concerns. He and his wife currently pay about $715 a month for their health care plan and were informed that it was being canceled. Their new plan will cost them double annually and will no longer include vision care, but they are now both covered for maternity care. He wrote that his present policy is better and more suited for two people in their sixties, and ''it just doesn't seem quite fair that two people who have always been responsible and done without things in order to afford health care insurance and save enough to retire should now be faced with this.'' Madam Speaker, I agree.

Men and women of all ages across my home State and the country are feeling the negative impacts of ObamaCare. I received a letter from a mother in Wake Forest, North Carolina, who got a notice that her monthly premium for a family of four is going from $624 a month to $1,207 a month. This is as much as their mortgage payment. Now her family is forced to pay the steep increase or choose a plan that includes a smaller premium, but with fewer benefits and much higher deductibles. So much for keeping the health care plan she liked.

Another constituent from Cary wrote that a difference in cost between his current BlueCross BlueShield plan and the lowest option under ObamaCare is about $700 a month, tripling his current rate. How is this comparable to the plan he already has and now cannot keep?

Madam Speaker, these are real people who have real problems with ObamaCare. President Obama needs to listen to North Carolinians and American families across the country. Stories like this indicate that what President Obama said simply wasn't true. People are being forced into plans that include coverage they don't need or want, and they are not being able to keep the doctors and plans they had for years. ObamaCare gives little choice and puts many in an impossible financial situation.

Madam Speaker, this is simply not right. The American people want to be able to keep their doctors and health care plans that they were promised, and they were promised this by the President. That promise should be upheld.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we all have heard the promise over and over again:

> If you like what you have, you can keep it.

It is probably the most often repeated promise since Barack Obama has been President. For 5 years now, that promise has been made, and unfortunately, now millions of Americans are realizing that that promise has been broken over and over again. Over 100,000 Louisiana families are seeing that broken promise.

In fact, we had a social media site called Share with Steve where we asked people in Louisiana's First Congressional District to share their stories with me, and the stories that I have heard have been compelling and heartbreaking. In fact, I started sharing some of those stories with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. When Secretary Sebelius was before us in the House Energy and Commerce Committee just a little over a week ago, I shared some of those stories with her.

One of those stories was Shaun from Covington, and I read Shaun's story of the health care that he has now lost for his family because of the President's health care law. Of course, you have got Secretary Sebelius who is running the President's health care law and all of these broken promises that we are hearing about. I said, What would you tell Shaun, Madam Secretary, who has now lost the good health care he has for his family when you promised him that he would be able to keep that health care?

□ 1030

Unfortunately, all we got was a smug response from a bureaucrat in Washington, and her response to Shaun was, Well, you can just go shop around in the health care exchange.

Well, first of all, that is not the promise that she and the President made to Shaun. The President promised Shaun he could keep his health care if he liked it. And Shaun likes his health care and doesn't want to lose it and, even more, doesn't want to have to go to some Web site that doesn't even work to go buy a plan that his family doesn't need. What Shaun conveyed to me after that interaction with the Secretary was that what he is being presented now are options that are even more expensive and don't include the kind of coverage that his family wants.

So I think what is most insulting to Americans is not only now that they are losing that health care, that President Obama broke that promise, that sacred promise between a doctor and a patient, but now you are hearing this elitist Washington politician response where you have got these bureaucrats and politicians in Washington telling people like Shaun, We didn't think your plan was good enough.

So not only have they broken the promise, but now they are deciding what they think is good enough for a patient and their doctor. And so a family in a place like Covington, Louisiana, that I represent, or all around the country, that had good health insurance, that liked the plan that they had, is being told not only that they can't keep it, but that some Washington bureaucrat didn't think their plan was good enough, even though they thought their plan was good enough.

So this is what is wrong with government-run health care. This is why we fought this bill back in 2009 when it was going through the Energy and Commerce Committee and here on the House floor when you had then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI saying you have got to pass the bill to find out what is in it. Of course American families are now seeing what is in it, and they don't like what they are seeing in this bill.

Later this week, we are bringing up a bill on the House floor that I am proud to cosponsor that allows you to keep

the plan that you have if you like it. Of course, the President's promise really should have been if Barack Obama likes your plan you can keep it, because that is the only way you can keep your plan is if the Federal Government approves of it even if you like it and you lose it.

What we are also seeing, of course, over on the Senate side, and even here on the House floor, many people who voted for the President's health care law are acting as if they had no idea this was going to happen. Of course they knew this was going to happen. If you read the bill, you could tell that people would lose the good health care they liked. There were reports coming out in 2010 that said millions of Americans will lose the health care they like, and yet now you have Senators over there and even some House Members who voted for the President's health care law acting like they had no idea this was going to come to pass. Of course they knew that millions of Americans would lose the good health care that they like. They just didn't think maybe that people would realize that it was the President's health care law that caused it and hold them accountable. And so now people are starting to be held accountable, as they should.

But, Madam Speaker, there is a better way. In fact, I am proud to have led an effort to bring forward the American Health Care Reform Act, a true alternative to the President's health care law that actually starts addressing the problems to lower costs, to allow people to keep the good health care plans that they like, and to give people real options.

In fact, our bill has over 100 cosponsors now, including medical doctors who serve in Congress who helped draft this bill, who understand that the doctor-patient relationship should continue to be maintained and be that sacred relationship that it used to always be before the government started coming in between people's health care, before IRS agents started coming in between people's health care.

So this bill allows people to buy insurance across State lines, giving people real flexibility, real choice, real competition in health care, where people will be competing for your business to dramatically lower costs, to allow people to have the option to buy their own health care instead of going through their company, and they will be able to have the same tax benefits that a company gets. So if they buy a health care plan on their own that is better than what their employer provides, they will be able to deduct that cost, which they can't do today. It allows small businesses and even individuals to pool together and get the buying power of a large corporation. This is the way we should be doing this, Madam Speaker, not this government-run approach.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, millions of Americans are now experiencing firsthand the failures of a massive undertaking to roll out the Affordable Care Act. While well-intentioned, our colleagues who had a Democrat supermajority in the White House, the Senate, and this House pushed through a partisan bill ignoring warnings of those like myself who have worked in the health care field for decades.

Prior to being elected to Congress, I spent nearly three decades in a nonprofit health care setting, serving my neighbors who were facing life-changing disease and disability. When it was time to weigh in on public policy, Members like me were muzzled. We were told to pass a bill to see what was in it. Well, that is exactly what happened, despite our continued dissent.

Phones are ringing off the hooks in Members' offices. Constituents who have lost their health insurance policies and experienced unaffordable premium hikes are angry. They were made a promise by the President that they could keep their health plans. Now, reportedly, more than 5 million individuals have lost their policies. Undoubtedly, this is just the beginning of Americans not being able to keep the insurance that they like.

One of my constituents, Sam, from Erie County, Pennsylvania, has been affected. He has been on the same policy that has provided him with adequate coverage, exactly what he was looking for, for years. He no longer has access to that coverage.

Or Lisa and her husband, both self-employed and hailing from Punxsutawney in Jefferson County, Pennsylvania. They have five children—two in college, one in high school, and two working. After receiving notice that their effective and affordable health insurance policy was canceled, they have now been saddled with cost increases of over $20,000 a year.

How about John from Clearfield County, who emailed my congressional office this week after being informed by his insurer that, due to changes under the Affordable Care Act, his policy is now canceled. He owns a small business that no longer qualifies for the group plan under the law's requirements.

Then there is Sonya from northeast Pennsylvania, right on the shores of Lake Erie. She has had the same policy for the last 4 years, and it is being canceled. She stated that it is unfair she should have to buy more expensive insurance; not to mention, she says, it will cost much more over the long run when you factor in her new deductible.

Madam Speaker, this is an outrage. These are just several of countless examples—I want to say ''endless examples''—of real harm being experienced by hardworking Americans, my constituents, as a result of this flawed law.

Madam Speaker, the time I have been granted on this floor is not sufficient for me to share the growing number of voices from the Fifth District of Pennsylvania who are having their policies canceled and being forced to buy insurance that they can't afford, that they don't want and they don't need.

Those at the White House that masterminded this catastrophic attack on insurance affordability and choice released their preliminary numbers for winners and losers yesterday. Nationwide, roughly 100,000 have obtained insurance policies through the national and State exchanges combined. Many of these individuals, unfortunately, are now experiencing the sticker shock of significant costs when premiums and deductible expenses are combined and considered. The sad part is that these are the winners. That is just how bad this health care law is. Americans deserve access to health insurance that they choose and can afford.

Madam Speaker, a large block of Members in this body are standing up and putting forward solutions to these failures, including some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Senator MARY LANDRIEU, a Democrat from Louisiana, recently announced she would propose legislation to ensure all Americans could keep their existing insurance coverage under ObamaCare. But ''it's not just red-State Democrats,'' as Politico reports today. Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, a Democrat from California, yesterday announced she would support the bipartisan effort to allow Americans to keep the plans they know and like.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, these proposals that are being put forward by my Democratic colleagues mean that we would have to change the law. Unfortunately, Senate Leader REID doesn't like the optics of having this debate on its merits, even if it would help Americans keep the insurance they know and like, as the President repeatedly promised.

I want to thank the growing number of my colleagues for doing what is right and placing good policy before politics. This law is flawed. It is sinking by its own weight. Now we must act to fix its fatal flaws. If we don't, those who want to protect the political reputation of the White House will allow it to continue, no matter how much harm is caused upon the American people.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve better.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Rabbi Joshua Gruenberg, Congregation Beth El Yardley, Yardley, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our ancestors, Everlasting Spirit of the Universe, may it be Your will that the Members of this House faithfully represent all citizens of this great Nation. As they strive to govern this land, guide them, O Lord, with the pillars of humility and respect.

Help them to live up to the legacy of those who have come before and to always honor those men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice to keep this Nation strong and free.

Remind all citizens of our great Nation to put people over politics, to elevate democracy over dogma, to value discussion over discord, and to cultivate compromise instead of conviction.

Bless the Members of this hallowed body with the knowledge that what binds us together is stronger than what may pull us apart, that serving You is best accomplished by serving others.

Dear God, please allow Your blessing of health and of peace to envelop our great Nation.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WAGNER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING RABBI JOSHUA GRUENBERG

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and introduce a good friend and community leader in my home district, Rabbi Joshua Gruenberg, and to thank him for offering today's invocation.

Rabbi Gruenberg made the trip here to the Nation's Capital with his wife, Elissa, and his two children, Kayla and Samuel. I am proud and pleased to welcome the rabbi and his family to the House of Representatives.

Rabbi Gruenberg is the chief spiritual leader at Temple Beth El in Yardley, Pennsylvania. Since he joined the temple in 2011, I have gotten to know the rabbi quite well. He has participated in several of my local roundtable discussions on issues, including Israel and the Middle East, and has come down to Washington to visit with me and to offer counsel.

Rabbi Gruenberg is a warm and welcoming Bucks County leader. He has helped build on a strong foundation at Temple Beth El that will last for decades to come.

I am proud of the work he has done in our community and am privileged to call him my friend.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

OBAMACARE HURTS FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans have received cancellation notices for their insurance policies as a result of ObamaCare's failed legislation. The Wall Street Journal anticipates this number to reach 10 million by January 1.

Citizens living in the Second District of South Carolina are experiencing the brunt of the administration's deception. Becky from West Columbia is shocked that her world-class cancer care is at risk. Frank from Lexington will be forced to buy new health insurance with higher premiums of 33 percent. Joe from Aiken has been notified that his wife will be removed from their current health care plan January 1. He writes:

The only problem is that now we have two premiums to pay, two deductibles to meet, and an additional thing to worry about while we are trying to raise kids and be responsible adults.

These real-life problems are affecting all American families. We must stop the damage by passing the Keep Your Health Plan Act to assist families and promote jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our prayers are for the people in the Philippines for typhoon recovery.

TYPHOON HAIYAN

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the typhoon in the Philippines has left a wake of unimaginable devastation.

Those living in the areas hardest hit by the storm are embarking on the excruciating process of trying to pick up the pieces. Members of the San Diego region's large Filipino community are determined to send aid to their native country. They are collecting clothing, food, and encouraging cash donations.

The feeling of helplessness from my constituents that have family living in the area where the typhoon hit is profound. It is important that people understand where their efforts are most needed and where their donations will be best used.

It is in these difficult moments like this where we witness unbridled compassion and empathy, and I am pleased that the humanitarian efforts, which our military and aid communities do so well, are under way, and at least 13 other countries have joined the effort as well.

The help is not arriving as fast as those suffering from hunger, cold, illness, and homelessness need.

The Filipino Americans in our districts are looking to us to continue our role as leaders in humanitarian aid. Let's continue to help those most in need.

OBAMACARE HURTS THE HARDWORKING MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I have received far too many heartbreaking stories from the people of Missouri's Second District about how government-run health care is impacting their lives.

Today, I rise to put a face on the horrors of ObamaCare and tell Jim and Kim Curtis' story, who hail from Arnold, Missouri.

This is their story in their own words:

We, the working middle class, are the ones who are being hurt by this law. We struggle

every day to make ends meet. But now, because of ObamaCare, we received a notice from the insurance company that the plan we currently pay for does not meet the guidelines, and we will no longer be covered on January 1, 2014.

Now we have to find an extra $500 to $600 minimum per month to cover the insurance that is comparable to what we had before. I have no idea how we will afford that kind of money and pay our bills and mortgage each month.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one of millions of examples of real people being hurt by ObamaCare.

TYPHOON HAIYAN

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with the people of the Philippines in the wake of the devastation caused by Super Typhoon Haiyan.

I just returned yesterday from my district, Guam, where we have a large Filipino population trying to reach relatives, all to no avail. Remember, we are the closest neighbors to the Philippines.

The images that we see on TV are horrific and unimaginable. We are strong allies with the Philippines and have deep historic and cultural ties.

As we have done in the past, we will stand by our allies in need, and I commend the Obama administration for rushing to the aid of the Filipino people. Also, I commend the efforts of the Filipino community of Guam, the Government of Guam, and the local nonprofits and businesses for mobilizing to provide resources to their counterparts. Like Operation Tomodachi, we are rushing to the aid of the Philippines. This is how we demonstrate our commitment to the Pacific partners.

I appreciate and commend the efforts of our Federal Government to send significant resources to the impacted areas of the Philippines, and I urge this Congress to reaffirm this commitment to the Philippines and to support providing resources necessary to help them recover.

HERE A GLITCH, THERE A GLITCH

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare has been nothing short of a painful government illness.

On the first day Americans were due to enroll in their health care plan, they just couldn't do it. Errors flashed across their computer screens. It was a glitch here, a glitch there, everywhere a glitch, glitch, glitch.

Out of the 500,000 Americans that should have been enrolled by now, only a handful were able to sign up thanks to technical incompetence, negligence, and those glitches.

Americans will be penalized if they can't sign up, but how are you supposed to when the Web site doesn't work?

Computer glitches should take minutes to fix, not weeks. These glitches are just a sign of things to come when the government takes over America's health. If the government can't even get the Web site right, how will government get health care right for the American people?

ObamaCare has the compassion of the IRS, the competence of FEMA, and the efficiency of the post office.

And that's just the way it is.

TYPHOON YOLANDA

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Northern Mariana Islands know the terror when a typhoon strikes. We know how difficult are the days and months of recovery after, but none of us has known a storm with the power and intensity of Typhoon Yolanda.

So our hearts and our prayers go out to the people of the Philippines who are suffering through this terrible tragedy that swept down upon them.

We have families and friends there. Some, thank God, we know are safe. The fate of others we wait to learn and whether their homes are standing, whether they have food, water. All we know for certain is the people of the Philippines need our help. America is rising quickly to assist. Our government immediately committed $20 million. Disaster teams are on the way.

Much more will be needed from our government and from individuals alike, but I am sure we will all do whatever we can to assist the survivors who have lost so much and now face the long task of rebuilding their homes and lives.

OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the National Park Service released a draft general management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri's Eighth Congressional District. The general management plan seeks to limit my constituents' access to the rivers that they have enjoyed for generations.

This plan from the National Park Service would shut down public access points to the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional areas to be designated as Federal wilderness.

The outcry I have heard from my constituents is unanimous. They believe the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are already overmanaged and my constituents do not want the National Park Service to further intrude on their access to their public rivers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the park service to reject changing management practices on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways so that my constituents can continue enjoying their rivers.

OBAMACARE

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, many of my Republican colleagues are still obsessed with ending health care for the American citizen.

I come here today to tell you the administration, experts, and my colleagues in Congress are working on making sure that all Americans have insurance.

I say to you while they talk about ''glitch, glitch, glitches,'' yes, we are all disappointed with that. When they talk about the face of the stories, let me tell you that last week during our week at home, I held a tele-townhall conference, and many of my constituents called in and asked questions about the Affordable Care Act. Do you know why? Because they had a college student who can stay on their insurance. Do you know why? Because there were women who had pre-existing conditions now that can be covered. Do you know why? They were seniors. They were mothers. They were parents. That is what the Affordable Care Act is about.

So I say to you to listen closely, America, because the Affordable Care Act will make a difference, and that is what we should have in this wonderful America that we live in.

□ 1215

OBAMACARE'S CANCELATION NOTICES

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, since the Affordable Care Act was first introduced, President Obama claimed time and time again, if you like your insurance, you can keep it. Yet, over the last six weeks, I have heard from numerous constituents across western North Carolina that that, in fact, was not what they were experiencing; that, unfortunately, they had canceled policies because of ObamaCare.

Steve, a pastor in Hickory, received notice his plan with a premium of $695 was being canceled. His new plan's premium? $1,500.

Marsha in Claremont had her current plan canceled. The replacement plan was 133 percent more in cost.

Milton, a retiree from Denver, had his policy canceled. The replacement not only has higher deductibles and copays, but it also precludes him from seeing his current doctor.

I heard from Terri, a self-employed woman in Newton, whose premiums were $359 a month until ObamaCare canceled these plans, and her new premium is $759 a month.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join with us in passing the Keep Your Health Care Plan to hold the President to his word that, if you like your plan, you can keep it.

NOVEMBER IS NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month.

Over 5 million Americans nationwide are living with Alzheimer's, a disease that afflicts the victim but also the family, a disease whose origins are unknown but whose end is absolutely certain. It is a disease that takes your mind, your dignity, and, eventually, your life. In 2013, Alzheimer's will cost the Nation $203 billion. This number is expected to rise to $1.2 trillion by 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of the Western New York Alzheimer's Association and local advocate Nancy Swiston, who worked so hard this month and year-round to highlight the effects of Alzheimer's disease.

Alzheimer's disease is a public health crisis that can't be ignored. I urge my colleagues to raise awareness about Alzheimer's in their own communities and to support the bipartisan HOPE for Alzheimer's Act to improve diagnosis and treatment of Alzheimer's disease.

CONGRATULATING MONTANA CHAMPION OF CHANGE VANCE HOME GUN

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Vance Home Gun, a member of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes from Arlee, Montana.

Vance was recently recognized as the 2013 Center for Native American Youth ''Champion of Change'' for his work to preserve the Salish language in his school and his community. I had the opportunity to meet with Vance just last night and learned more about the work he is doing on the Flathead Reservation.

Vance was introduced to a Salish language camp by his aunt when he was just 11 years old and has been determined ever since to become a fluent speaker in his tribe's language. He has been working with tribal departments, organizations, and youth groups for the past 6 years to help preserve the Salish language. Vance teaches language classes at high schools and leads an organization that utilizes peer-to-peer methods to teach language and culture.

I commend Vance for his commitment to preserving and increasing awareness of this important part of his tribe's culture and history, and I congratulate him on his well-deserved award.

Vance Home Gun, well done.

ACA IMPLEMENTATION

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, despite my significant frustration with the rollout of the Affordable Care Act, I remain committed to increasing access to affordable health care for every Granite Stater. To that end, I support efforts to ensure that folks who like their current health plan can keep them for another year.

In New Hampshire, Granite Staters already have the option of renewing their current plans; and I believe that families across the country should be able to do the same, and I will support good-faith efforts to do that.

But the Affordable Care Act is not a perfect law, and I am committed to improving it. Make no mistake; we cannot go back to the days when insurance companies were free to deny insurance coverage for people with preexisting conditions, or simply because they were female and their rates would be higher, or to drop people from their plans because they got sick, or to drop people from their plans because they grew older and were not living in their own home with the family.

I will continue to work with anybody who is serious about making this law work and to ensure that Granite Staters have access to the quality, affordable health care that they deserve.

FREEDOM TO SPEAK YOUR MIND WITHOUT FEAR OF RETRIBUTION

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I got a letter from someone in my district. It says:

> You have probably heard about health care reform and wondered what it means to you. This letter is to let you know that your MyChoice health insurance plan from BlueChoice HealthPlan is non-grandfathered. This means you purchased it or made significant changes to it after March 23, 2010—the day the Affordable Care Act became law. As a result, the law requires that your insurance plan expire.

This is not the saddest part of this letter, the fact that this woman was made a promise that no one is keeping to her. The saddest part of this letter is she asked me not to use her name here today.

Someone does need to be held accountable for making promises to citizens that are not kept. But beyond that, someone needs to be held accountable for allowing an environment to grow up where citizens of this country are afraid to have their name spoken on the floor of this House for fear of retribution from their government.

We will deal with health care. We will do the very best that we can. But beyond that, we need to figure out a way to create an environment where people are free to speak their minds on issues such as this.

WE STAND IN SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, following one of the worst natural disasters to hit landfall, we stand as a world community in support of the people of the Philippines.

Last week, Typhoon Yolanda tore through the Philippines, tragically taking thousands of lives and leaving millions without food, water, or shelter. The road ahead will be difficult, but the resilient spirit of the Filipino community far and near will overcome this challenge.

As the representative of one of the largest Filipino communities in the United States, my heart goes out to the families in my communities whose loved ones suffered through this dreadful storm. My office is working to connect families with the State Department to help them locate and get news about their loved ones.

I am pleased by the significant humanitarian efforts from both my home district and around the world. We are a Nation founded and guided by the principles of humanity.

We must not forget our brothers and sisters in the Philippines, for far too many are still without food, water, and shelter. If the infrastructure is down, come on. Let's start thinking outside of the box and do everything in our power to provide food and water and critical support today.

RHODE ISLAND NURSES INSTITUTE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of the Rhode Island Nurses Institute Middle College Charter High School, the first middle college established in Rhode Island, and the first American charter school that is dedicated to the nursing profession.

My grandmother Lucy Cicilline was a proud nurse at St. Joseph's Hospital for many years.

As a 4-year program, this institution helps to bridge the gap between high school and college, providing students who have graduated ninth grade with an innovative learning experience that allows them to graduate with a high

school diploma and nursing credentials so they can enter the workforce successfully.

The Rhode Island Nurses Institute Middle College Charter High School first opened its doors 2 years ago and today provides a quality education for 272 young people from my home State of Rhode Island.

If we are serious about getting our economy back on the right track, we need to find new, innovative ways to make sure that young people have the opportunity to go to college or begin their careers equipped with the skills they need to compete in a global economy. The Nursing Institute Middle College is showing us one way to achieve this goal.

I want to applaud the work of Chief Executive Officer Pamela McCue, their entire faculty, staff, and all of the students.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the Affordable Care Act in Congress have spent the past few weeks reveling in the problems of the Federal exchange Web site, healthcare.gov.

In my State of Kentucky, where we have created our own exchange, we have had tremendous success. As of last week, nearly 415,000 people had explored the Web site and assessed their options. More than 42,000 are now enrolled in health plans, many of them for the first time; and 843 small businesses have begun applying for coverage for their employees, with 309 of them already able to offer coverage to their workers.

We are 6 weeks into a 6-month open enrollment period, and while the failures of the Federal health care Web site are frustrating, they are far from fatal. The true danger to the more than 42,000 Kentuckians who have gained coverage under the law—and the hundreds of thousands more who will—is what opponents of the law are proposing in its place: a return to the broken system that failed tens of millions of Americans each year.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues and the American people to keep a healthy perspective. We did not enact the Affordable Care Act to launch a Web site. We did it to ensure that every American has access to affordable, quality care, and we should all work together to accomplish that goal.

SUPPORT FOR THE TYPHOON VICTIMS

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from California, Guam, and CNMI in expressing our support for those devastated by superstorm Typhoon Yolanda/Haiyan.

We do know that the United States has already committed $20 million and that PACOM has mobilized. The U.N. has estimated that it may probably cost $300-plus million to send aid to the Philippines. We know that our military has shown that its humanitarian and disaster relief capabilities are bar none, and they showed that on March 11, 2011, when the Tohoku earthquake hit Japan.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress must stand ready to support the efforts to aid the people in the Philippines. Hawaii's Filipino community is the largest minority that we have, and many have relatives from the area. Typhoon Haiyan ripped through the Visayan area, which is where our first immigrants came from.

We need to show the world, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is again the great Nation that it is because it does not turn its back on people in need.

SHIA KILLINGS IN PAKISTAN

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the United States and Pakistan has been a long and mutually beneficial relationship, in general. But I rise today, based on the representations of many of my constituents, to raise concerns about the status of religious minorities.

I support a strong U.S.-Pakistan relationship, and I have experienced kindness and generosity from the Pakistani people myself and their beautiful diversity.

In addition to Pakistan's Sunni Muslim majority, there are Shia Muslims, Ahmadi Muslims, Christians, Hindus, and others. Pakistan is a country with rich religious diversity.

However, the situation for many religious minorities is of grave concern, and this is particularly true for Shia Muslims, although all have expressed concern. Shias face daily discrimination at work, school, and in the political process.

According to the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, more than 500 people were killed last year in sectarian attacks against Muslim sects, mainly Shias. This year, nearly three Shias have been killed every single day; three people have been killed simply because of how they practice their faith.

Mr. Speaker, this is a crisis, and something must be done. I urge the people of Pakistan and their leadership to do something about it now.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of the Special Diabetes Program, which represents 35 percent of the Federal investment in type 1 diabetes research, and to encourage my colleagues to support a multiyear renewal of the program at current funding levels.

Type 1 diabetes among Americans under the age of 20 rose by 23 percent between 2001 and 2009. People with type 1 diabetes, including one of my constituents, 8-year-old Charlie, need daily finger sticks and insulin injections to stay alive.

As part of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation's ''Promise to Remember Me'' campaign, I recently met with Charlie and his father and another constituent, Nancy, whose 17-year-old daughter also has type 1 diabetes, to discuss their daily struggle with the disease and their hopes for better treatment options and, someday, a cure.

The Special Diabetes Program has delivered groundbreaking research for type 1 diabetes, including artificial pancreas systems, a revolutionary technology in the research pipeline that will automatically control blood sugar levels, keep patients healthier, and help avoid many dangerous and costly long-term complications due to diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the program.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2655, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 982, FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY (FACT) ACT OF 2013

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 403 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 403

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2655) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims

for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I think back to a time when I was a teenager and I came into the gallery, and I am convinced that I came in during a rule because the reading clerk was standing there, reading line after line after line of material I didn't understand at all, and I thought, Why in the world is line by line by line the legislation being read? Haven't the Members already looked at that legislation? Haven't they already had time to study it?

What I know now, Mr. Speaker, 3 years with the voting card of the people of the Seventh District of Georgia, is that the rule is the only piece of legislation in this entire body that has to be read word for word here on the floor of the House.

My colleague from Florida and I spend a lot of hours up there in the Rules Committee sorting those things out, but the rules matter. The process matters.

I will be able to confess to you, Mr. Speaker—and I think sometimes we get that process done a little better, sometimes we get that process not done quite so well, but today we have a rule that brings two very important pieces of legislation to the floor. This structured rule provides for H.R. 982, which is the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act, the FACT Act; and it brings a closed rule for H.R. 2655, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2013.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I was just talking with a group about what the Rules Committee does, and I have talked about the importance of an open process and how closed rules don't give folks as much opportunity to express their views on the floor.

It is going to be a closed rule on the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, H.R. 2655, because for 11 days, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee solicited amendments from the entire body. It asked anyone who had any ideas about how to improve this legislation to submit those amendments so that we could consider them in the Rules Committee, and over that period of 11 days, Mr. Speaker, not one Member of this body offered any ideas about how to improve this bill. We would have liked to have made amendments in order for this bill, but none were submitted. So while we say this is a closed rule on H.R. 2655, it is only because no amendments were submitted to improve upon it.

Now on H.R. 982, the FACT Act, Mr. Speaker, we had five amendments submitted, all Democrat amendments. One was withdrawn. So there were only four that were in order for our meeting last night. One was confessed to actually just try to eliminate the effectiveness of the bill altogether. So we excluded that one because if folks don't like the bill, they can just vote ''no.'' They don't have to destroy the bill from within; they can just vote ''no'' on final passage. But all of the other amendments that were submitted we made in order. Now these are not amendments that I intend to support on the floor, Mr. Speaker, but I do think it is important that people's voices be heard.

So, again, three amendments are made in order. That is 75 percent of all the amendments that were submitted, and they are all amendments offered by my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle. The Rules Committee thought it was important to make those amendments in order.

Now we will talk a lot, Mr. Speaker, in the debate that comes after the rule about the content of these bills. One deals with frivolous litigation and whether or not judges will be required to allow folks who had to defend against frivolous lawsuits to recover the costs of those suits.

Today, Mr. Speaker, if someone files a frivolous lawsuit against you, you can have that lawsuit tossed out, but you have to go back to the court a second time to recover all of the costs that it took you to have the frivolous lawsuit tossed out. It is a tremendous burden on small businesses in our Nation. This bill seeks to solve that.

The FACT Act, our asbestos litigation act, aims to provide some transparency to the asbestos trust funds. I don't know if you are familiar, Mr. Speaker, but when it was discovered all of the health damage done by asbestos, the lawsuits began immediately and would have driven every one of those companies that either used asbestos or produced asbestos into bankruptcy, leaving no money at all for victims who had health problems that they then sought compensation for.

So federally we created, within Federal bankruptcy courts, these asbestos trust funds that allowed these companies, these manufacturers of asbestos, these folks who utilized processes that included asbestos, to deposit money into a trust fund and not go out of business but to provide certainty that victims would be able to recover from those funds in the future.

There is some concern, Mr. Speaker, that the process, as it exists today, does not allow for folks to see who is getting those dollars and whether or not the victims who have the most urgent needs are receiving those dollars first. Our great concern, Mr. Speaker, is that when those trust funds are depleted, they are gone forever. As you know, asbestos-related illnesses often don't present themselves for years down the road, so we have a stewardship obligation to these trust funds to keep them protected for future claimants.

This bill requires a degree of transparency, a quarterly report from the trustees of these trust funds to see who is making claims on these funds, who is receiving claims out of these funds, again, just so we can be good stewards of those trust funds and ensure they are available for future years.

I don't sit on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker, but I heard from the ranking member of the Constitution Subcommittee last night. I heard from the chairman of the full committee last night in the Rules Committee as we held a hearing on both of these bills. I am glad that we are able to bring them to the floor today, Mr. Speaker. Two bills, a structured rule. One rule is closed because no amendments were provided. The other bill is receiving 75 percent of all of the amendments that were submitted. Just one amendment was excluded by that rule.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman, and he was very clear about, one, the process and, two, the basic substance of both measures that are on the floor today. To a relative degree, I agree with much of what he has said. I know that my friend from Georgia is an advocate of an open process, and with all due respect to him and the

committee, structured rules—whether Members have offered suggestions for change or not—are not open rules. However, in this particular case, he is correct that of the five amendments that were offered by Members of my party, three of them were made in order, and none were offered on the first of the two measures.

Mr. Speaker, with only 15 days left in this session of the 113th Congress, we are here yet again doing more of the same, which is nothing. It has been reported that some among my friends across the aisle have even joked that the House shouldn't be in session in December at all.

Instead of addressing our Nation's serious immigration needs—and I might add a footnote there. There is a substantial loss to our economic undertakings by virtue of us failing to do the things that we can and should do either comprehensively or step by step to deal with the immigration circumstances of this great Nation. We could be passing ENDA, as the Senate did last week, where we could end discrimination in the workplace.

Or we could do something that all of us know needs to be done: we could work on ending sequestration. I was at two meetings this morning, one dealing with homelessness and the other dealing with the need for food, and in each instance, the parties that were the experts cited how sequestration has impacted their nonprofit organizations in trying to assist the homeless and the needy as it pertains to food. So we could be working on trying to stop this meat-ax approach that is set in motion. Yet we find ourselves passing bills that won't do anything and aren't going to go anywhere.

In fact, H.R. 2655, as my colleague has pointed out, no Member offered any amendment to it. It is so bad that nobody even wanted to fix it. The bill is nothing more than a partisan solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

The American Bar Association, the preeminent bar association among lawyers in every category in the United States of America, wrote the following:

> No serious problem has been brought to the Rules Committee's attention. There is no need to reinstate the 1983 version of rule 11 that proved contentious and diverted so much time and energy of the bar and bench.

The ABA continued that the bill ''is not based on an empirical foundation, and the proposed amendments ignore lessons learned.''

□ 1245

The proposed changes would ''impede the administration of justice by encouraging additional litigation and increasing court costs and delays.''

This bill not only prevents judges from calling balls and strikes; it forces members of the bench to call balks on every pitch before the ball can even reach the plate.

The Judicial Conference, the preeminent conference of the United States courts in this country that is the body responsible for proposing the necessary changes in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, asked Federal judges about these proposed changes. Eighty-seven percent of the judges asked prefer the existing rule 11 to the 1983 version; 85 percent of them support the safe harbor provisions; 91 percent oppose mandatory sanctions for every rule 11 violation; 84 percent think that attorneys' fees should not be awarded for every rule 11 violation. And here is the big one: 85 percent believe the amount of groundless litigation has not grown since promulgation of the 1993 rule.

These are men and women who face these issues on a daily basis. They know better than most—and almost anyone in this House of Representatives—and believe that rule 11 has plenty of teeth as is.

This bill would substitute the judgment of Congress for that of our judges. When the Judicial Conference of the United States opposes the changes in this bill, you would have to wonder who the bill is really benefiting.

It is not just the judges who oppose this bill. There is a long list of groups that include attorneys, consumer protection groups, civil rights organizations, and public interest advocates, all in opposition to this bill.

As late as this morning, I received an additional letter from the National Employment Lawyers Association. In sum and substance, they feel that they represent farms, fields, schools, factories, executive offices, military services, hospitals, and many others; and they feel that they are a unique voice in this category. They stand in opposition because they think it will proliferate the amount of litigation that is unnecessary in our overburdened courts as it is.

The court already has discretion to award sanctions, attorneys' fees, and expenses. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2655 will create more hurdles with which deep-pocketed businesses can drag out litigation that is already too expensive and time consuming.

My friends across the aisle have produced a number of anecdotes in support of this bill; but most of the cases cited are demand letters or State law cases, neither of which are subject to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Furthermore, lawsuits are too complicated to explain with a quip of carefully selected and characterized facts. Just because a particular fact pattern is entertaining or seemingly silly does not mean the case is without merit. Just because a case makes for a good headline doesn't mean that real people weren't really injured.

The most famous example that I can think of is the woman who sued McDonald's for her coffee being too hot. When you say it like that, it sounds like you want coffee to be hot when you get it. But what is skipped over when we say it that way is that the coffee caused third-degree burns, and the lady had to be hospitalized for 8 days, received skin grafts, and then 2 years of medical treatment. Well, that hot coffee doesn't sound so silly when you look at it from that standpoint.

Speaking of bills opposed by the people they supposedly help, the second portion of this rule, H.R. 982, the FACT Act, is ironically titled because it was drafted without regard to any of the facts. There is no evidence of systemic fraud or that systemic failures encourage fraud. The GAO in its study was unable to identify endemic and overt instances of fraud that would justify these kinds of changes.

Most of the information supporters seek is available through the standard discovery process.

This bill seriously compromises the privacy of victims in order to provide offenders with litigation shortcuts. Claims of wanting to increase transparency are really laughable, since the offenders involved in these suits are allowed to maintain their privacy. This bill further victimizes people who have already been through so much.

Human error is not fraud. Isolated incidents are troubling, but fraud prevention procedures are already in place and functioning adequately.

Asbestos victims oppose this bill. My friends across the aisle would have known, if they had provided victims an opportunity; but they did not provide that opportunity. I asked the chair of this committee last evening whether or not the victims had been afforded an opportunity to make a presentation. When I pointed out to him that staff had allowed that they could have a private meeting, but they did not have an opportunity to testify during the proceedings, he agreed with me.

That seems to be a favorite tactic of my Republican friends. They have done this to asbestos victims, and they have done it to judges.

When it came to shutting down the government, they ignored the overwhelming desire of hardworking and working-poor Americans. They continued to ignore economists and the downgrading of our credit rating over the debt ceiling. They disregard the science of climate change, despite erratic, catastrophic weather patterns and rising sea levels.

I am sure that all of us recognize the most recent typhoon that has devastated the Philippines. I am hopeful that we, along with others in the world, will hasten to the rescue. America is always to be commended for our efforts when tragedies strike other nations, and I would call on other nations who have not done so to become adherent to the kind of philosophy that we have. And I hope that we can help those in the Philippines to recover rapidly.

If my friends continue to ignore the world as it is in favor of the red-tinted paradise they believe it to be, they will have no one to blame but themselves when the country decides it is time to ignore them.

I wish to say one additional thing regarding the privacy concern.

Yesterday, I called Comcast Television. The Miami Heat, champions of basketball for the last 2 years, were playing last night. So I thought that I would order the NBA game last evening.

Well, lo and behold, last evening and this morning, before I left to attend meetings, the Comcast system is down and it is not working. I was told that I would get a phone call yesterday; and I didn't get any phone call. So I called this morning and I was told I would get a phone call today, but I missed the game last night. Incidentally, the Heat won. I did see that in the paper this morning.

But I am concerned about the privacy measures because when I called Comcast, after giving them my account number and after telling them who I was and what my address was—and this is through three different automatic systems—then the young man came over the telephone. And when he came over the telephone after doing all of this—the account, my name, where I live again—he then asked me for the last four digits of my Social Security number.

The wife of a former colleague of ours who died of mesothelioma, Bruce Vento, has written actively, along with others, for us to see how this identity problem might persist if we pursue this course.

This bill would make the private information of asbestos poisoning victims readily available on the Internet, and therein lies the difference. Different now is that any information anybody needs is already in the courthouse. And they can go to the courthouse and achieve that information. But this is part of what we mean when we say this bill ''re-victimizes'' asbestos victims all over again.

If an employer or identity thief wants to get the information in a regular lawsuit, they have to physically now go to every courthouse in the country and look through paper records. But with this bill, if ALCEE HASTINGS applies for a job at X Corporation, the manager at X can search for my name on the Internet, learn that I got money from an asbestos trust, and then decide, if he or she wanted, not to hire me out of some misplaced fear that I am someone who just goes around suing their employer. Or they could refuse to hire me because they fear I will be sick a lot or drive up their group health insurance.

An identity thief could learn the last four digits of my Social Security number. That is the same piece of information that I gave to Comcast yesterday and that my bank and credit card companies use to verify my identity during customer service calls.

What part of that do you not understand that, if you put it on the Internet, then anybody can utilize it?

Risking employment discrimination and identity theft for asbestos poisoning victims just because my colleagues on the other side want to stick it to the trial lawyers seems awfully crass to me.

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

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

I say to my friend that I absolutely share his passion for privacy protection. In fact, I had to leave a hearing we were having in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee today, Mr. Speaker, where we were looking at the ObamaCare Web site and talking to the chief information officers and the chief technology officers about how this Web site had gone live without having been fully vetted for security protections; talking about how, even as we sit here today, we have not fully run through those security processes.

I share the gentleman's concern. The gentleman is an attorney as well. I remember when I was in law school and they gave you access to the LexisNexis database when you showed up to law school. You could dial up anybody in the country. It is giving you a credit report and showing you Social Security numbers.

We really do have to have a national conversation, Mr. Speaker, about where we are headed. Those last four digits that were once my private knowledge are out there all over the Internet today. My birthday is broadcast everywhere on the Internet. My mother's maiden name is out there. All of those things that folks used to ask me to protect me have now become part of the public domain. And what the gentleman says about a need to focus on that and protect folks is absolutely right, and we absolutely need to do that.

There was only one amendment last night that was offered to deal with privacy. It was going to give a unique identifier to folks, instead of listing names, so that we could have the transparency to see if folks were trying to game the system and take opportunities away from future victims. That amendment was withdrawn. We didn't have an opportunity to talk about that.

But my great hope is that this bill will pass the House today and that we will be able to have a similar bill come out of the Senate. If regular order has a chance to prevail on Capitol Hill, conference committees will give us another chance to take a bite at that apple.

I think the gentleman brings up very real concerns; and, again, we will have an opportunity to talk about those today.

The gentleman says, Mr. Speaker, there are some bills that are just so bad, nobody wants to fix them. I want to say to the gentleman that I am sympathetic to that sentiment. There are a few that I could rattle off right now that are so bad, I wonder if it is even possible to fix them.

But the bill the gentleman was talking about was the bill to eliminate frivolous lawsuits, Mr. Speaker. When we had these penalties in place back for 10 years between 1983 and 1993, more than 70 percent of judges said that they utilized this procedure and that they awarded damages in frivolous lawsuits. Seventy percent of judges, Mr. Speaker, utilize this provision that we are trying to bring back into being to punish filers of frivolous lawsuits.

This is not a bill for Big Business, Mr. Speaker. This is a bill that has been key voted by the National Federation of Independent Businesses. If you know NFIB—and I know most of my colleagues do—this is the trade association that represents the mom-and-pop shops, Mr. Speaker. These aren't the big, working-out-of-a-glass-building-downtown folks that you think are out to get the consumer. These are our friends and neighbors. These are folks who are employing our sons and daughters. These are folks who create most of the jobs in this country.

And they don't key vote a lot of bills, Mr. Speaker. You can go to their Web site—NFIB—and see the number of bills that they key vote. But they have picked this one out.

□ 1300

My colleague from Florida says that some people believe it is so bad that it can't be fixed. They have heard from lawyer association, after lawyer association, after lawyer association which says it doesn't like it, but we are hearing from the mom-and-pop shops which can't defend against it.

Understand, Mr. Speaker, that today, if a frivolous lawsuit is filed against you—and I don't mean ''frivolous'' because I think it is silly. There are lots of those out there. That is going to be a much higher number. I mean ''frivolous'' because the judge in the case says it has absolutely no merit on either the facts or the law. When the judge says it has no merit whatsoever, but you have had to pay to defend yourself against it, this bill says the fellow who filed it ought to make you whole.

Punitive damages are something we often hear about from the trial lawyer bar. This bill doesn't have punitive damages. This bill doesn't say, if you try to bankrupt the mom-and-pop company that is down the street from me, we are going to punish you. I think probably it should, but they didn't want to go that far. They said, if you are trying to destroy, with a frivolous lawsuit, the mom-and-pop company down the street, you have to make it whole. If a judge decides that your case has no merit—not a possibly of merit, but no merit—on either the facts or the law, the poor small business owner who is being harassed by that lawsuit should at least have the chance to be made whole at the end of that process. The National Federation of Independent Business—small mom-and-pop shops—is who cares about this legislation.

Again, folks are going to vote ''yes,'' and folks are going to vote ''no,'' but I

think it is important that we say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the purview, those things that are important. The gentleman from Florida says, hey, there are more important things we could be working on. I happen to agree with him. There really are important things that we need to have on the floor of this House, but if you are the small business owner who is about to lose your entire lifetime of work because someone has filed a frivolous lawsuit against you, I promise you there is no more important bill in your life than the one that is before us today.

I also have to say, Mr. Speaker, to my friend who talks about sequester that I think that is an important thing. I happen to be the Rules Committee designee to the Budget Committee, and I happen to be the chairman of the Republican Study Committee Budget and Spending Task Force. In fact, we are having a meeting with Maya MacGuineas on the Fix the Debt campaign next Monday afternoon to talk about what those options are for dealing with long-term problems. The Budget Committee right now is in conference with the Senate, trying to find a way to restore funding to discretionary spending programs that we all believe have been ham-handedly reduced. Instead, they are trying to find savings on which we can agree on those long-term mandatory spending programs that rarely, Mr. Speaker, have an opportunity to see aggressive oversight, to see the things that can improve them, to see the things that can preserve their long-term fiscal viability.

I would say, finally, Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Florida that, as the designee to the Budget Committee and as the chairman of the Budget and Spending Task Force, I don't believe it is the failure to raise the debt ceiling that threatens America's credit rating. I think it is out-of-control spending that threatens America's credit rating. It only takes a stroke of a pen here for us to raise the credit limit to infinity, but I promise you that that is not in the best interests of the American economy.

We all know we have spending challenges in this country. We all know that we have made promises to veterans, to seniors, to the infirm, to the poor that we don't have the money to keep. I think that is immoral. If you don't want to help somebody, then say you don't want to help somebody, but do not promise someone that you will be there for him in his time of need and pull the rug out from under him when he needs the promise to be fulfilled the most. We can do better. This body has done better.

In 1983, Republicans and Democrats came together and extended the fiscal lifetime of Social Security by not doing things that hurt seniors in that day but by doing things that raised the retirement age for me—I was 13 at the time—from 65 to 67. That is a pretty modest step that made a big impact in the life of the Social Security trust fund.

There are big issues that we need to discuss here on the floor. I hope we will bring those issues to the floor. Our committees in the House moved things in a responsible way, step by step, throughout the summer. We could use a little partnership from the other side of the Hill, but I hope we will focus on what we have before us here today, Mr. Speaker—an opportunity to make a difference for future victims who are applying to the trust fund and an opportunity to make a difference today for small businesses which are being victimized by frivolous litigation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my classmate, colleague, and good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

I am acutely aware of the devastating impact that asbestos exposure has had on working men and women in this country because I represent an area with several shipyards. In the last few decades, in my district alone, several thousand local shipyard workers have developed asbestosis, lung cancer, and mesothelioma from asbestos exposure that occurred between the 1940s and the 1970s. Hundreds of these workers have already died, and asbestos deaths and disabilities are continuing due to the long latency period associated with the illness.

Now, I believe that we cannot consider legislation affecting victims of asbestos exposure without remembering exactly who caused the problem. Court findings show that companies made willful and malicious decisions to expose their employees to asbestos. There are several examples:

In one case in 1986, after hearing both sides, the New Jersey Supreme Court declared:

> It is, indeed, appalling to us that the company had so much information on the hazards of asbestos workers as early as the mid-1930s and that it not only failed to use that information to protect the workers, but more egregiously, it also attempted to withhold this information from the public;

A few years earlier, the Superior Court, Appellate Division of New Jersey held in the same case:

> The jury here was justified in concluding that both defendants, fully appreciating the nature, extent, and gravity of the risk, nevertheless made a conscious and cold-blooded business decision, in utter and flagrant disregard to the rights of others, to take no protective or remedial action;

In 1999, the Florida Supreme Court found:

> The clear and convincing evidence in this case revealed that, for more than 30 years, the company concealed what it knew about the dangers of asbestos. In fact, the company's conduct was even worse than concealment; it also included intentional and knowing misrepresentations concerning the dangers of its asbestos-containing product.

That is who we are talking about, and those are the types of companies that will benefit from this legislation.

Now, any suggestion that people are getting paid more than once is absolutely absurd. The fact of the matter is, because of the bankruptcies, most of them are not getting anywhere close to what they actually would have been awarded, and the bill before us does not help those victims. It actually hurts them.

The bill is nothing but a scheme to delay the proceedings and to allow the victims to get even less than they get now. Because of the delay, many of the victims will die before they get to court. This helps the guilty corporations that have inflicted this harm on innocent victims because, if the plaintiffs die before they get to court, their pain and suffering damages are extinguished. If you can delay cases enough so that the plaintiffs will die before they get to trial, the corporations will not only get to delay their payments, but when they finally have to pay, they will have to pay much less.

These people are the ones who made those conscious and cold-blooded business decisions. They are the ones who will benefit from the bill at the expense of the innocent, hardworking victims. Regrettably, many of those victims are our veterans because they were working on Navy ships.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3383, which is my good friend Representative ESTY's measure, the Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act of 2013.

To discuss her bill, I now yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Thank you to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, last week, when I was back in my district, I didn't hear about asbestos. I didn't hear about rule 11 sanctions. I heard about how harmful the government shutdown was, about the need to pass comprehensive immigration reform and of the hope that this Congress would focus on job-creating measures, but I also heard from folks in my district about the costs they face in caring for their beloved family members—veterans, who have proudly served our country.

Many of these veterans receive care at home, as they prefer, but some families are simply not able to provide home care for financial or other reasons. Now, these veterans could seek long-term institutional care through the VA, but that is much more expensive. The VA's FY14 budget request estimates that long-term institutional care costs the VA over $116,000 per veteran per year. Caregivers of the post-9/11 victims are eligible for a stipend, which costs much less than the cost of long-term care. More than 10,000 veteran caregivers and their families have been helped so far, and that is a very good thing, but there are more who should qualify. There are more veterans in need, and we shouldn't leave them behind.

I introduced the Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act, which would expand the eligibility for veterans' caregiver benefits to family caregivers of all veterans. According to the CBO, approximately 70,000 caregivers of pre-9/11 veterans could be eligible for this program, and let's stop kidding ourselves into believing we are not already spending more taxpayer dollars to provide care through other VA programs.

Let's work together on a solution for all of our veterans, some of whom, in fact, were exposed to asbestos and suffer from mesothelioma. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can consider the Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act in order to honor our obligation to care for our veterans, an obligation which did not end on Veterans Day.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my colleague that I very much appreciate her concern about the family members of veterans.

So often, we craft a one-size-fits-all solution in this body, and if you want to care for your loved one at home, there is very little help for you. Now, if you want to institutionalize your loved one—if you want to dump your loved one off on the State—then we have a program for you, but if you want to nurture your loved one but you just need a little help, if you want to keep your loved one by your side but you just can't do it alone, there are very few opportunities that you have within our Federal system today. One exception to that is the PACE program, which was championed by Bob Dole back in the day, that allows you to bridge some of the different Federal programs that are available to you and to utilize those within your home, within your family, rather than having to institutionalize your loved one.

I don't think there is a man or a woman in this body, Mr. Speaker, who does not both have a tremendous amount of respect and admiration for our veterans but who also feels a debt of service to our veterans. I will point out that we always talk about the hyperpartisan U.S. House of Representatives. We moved our Veterans Affairs' spending bill in this House back on June 4. On June 4, we passed it in this House with only four Members voting ''no.'' Talk about things that bring you together, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to divide you. That is the kind of commitment that this institution has to our veterans.

I can't tell you why we haven't been able to get that signed into law. I know the Senate has not yet acted on that bill. I think it would be something that would bring them together, too, and I would recommend that to them, but of the 435 Members of this body, only four Members voted ''no'' on our bill to try to fulfill that commitment in order to make sure our veterans—our returning men and women—have the kinds of resources that not just they deserve but that we have committed to them.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my colleague at this time that I have no further speakers and that I am prepared to close if he is prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I am prepared to close.

□ 1315

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

I understand why we are here. I understand that my friends across the aisle evidently don't mind wasting this body's time, their resources, and money passing bills that are going to go nowhere.

In fact, later this week, I know we go to the Rules Committee on Thursday on a provision that is going to take its 46th vote to defund, delay, or repeal the Affordable Care Act and the patient protections and budget savings contained within it.

We have all got our roles to play. It is a shame, in my judgment, that my friends across the aisle would rather reenact some of the same tired political drama rather than actually accomplish something. We can do a great deal more here in the House to address the significant needs that our country has.

Let me tell you how this particular measure is going to play out. The rule is going to pass. It will be debated here on the House floor today, both measures having to do with asbestos and with so-called lawsuit measures. After they pass the House of Representatives, then it is bound over to the United States Senate where nothing is going to take place.

Now, I am not prescient—I don't have any way of predicting the future—but this particular methodology for legislation back and forth is just as much a problem when the House passes something that the Senate doesn't do anything about as when the Senate passes something that the House doesn't do anything about. I can calculate the numbers on both sides. I just personally think it is wrong for us not to let this process work its will on behalf of the American people.

Therefore, passing legislation just to have portions of either of our bases satisfied is not my idea of something to do. What we are doing here today is nothing other than wasting time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment to the resolution, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to this body there are actually more that my friend from Florida and I agree on than what we disagree on. I might not say that at a townhall meeting back home, but I will say that to you here, because at its core we all share a vision of what this Nation can be, what this Nation should be; but we do get mired in the rhetoric.

It is interesting that we have a bill today that those folks who represent mom-and-pop businesses say is so important to them they are going to make sure that every single Member of this House knows that they are keeping score on this and they want a ''yes'' vote on that legislation. Yet we have other bills here that the trial lawyers are saying are so important to them that they are going to write letter after letter after letter saying this is not in the best interest of the country, we should move in a different direction.

I will tell you, those are exactly the kinds of bills that we ought to be working on. Now, are there bigger-picture bills out there? Absolutely there are. I would like to see a bill that solves Social Security forever, where we end this business about Social Security is going to go bankrupt, and once and for all we solve that issue so no senior is ever concerned about that again.

We don't have that bill on the floor today. We have an opportunity to stop frivolous lawsuits.

I would like to see a bill on the floor that balances the Federal budget. I am old fashioned that way, Mr. Speaker. I think if you want to spend it, you ought to raise it. If you don't want to raise it, then don't spend it.

But we don't have that bill on the floor today. We have a bill to make sure that trust funds intended to protect victims of a horrible, horrible perpetration by industry have an opportunity to collect what little money there is left from those businesses that perpetrated those harms. I think we should support that bill today.

Mr. Speaker, one step at a time we really can make a difference. I have been reading with great dismay that some of the colleagues that I was elected with 3 years ago have decided they

are not going to run for reelection. They have been here 3 years, and they have found that while they came here to make America a better place, while they came here to serve the men and women back home, while they came here to make sure their children grew up with the same freedoms and opportunities that they grew up with, they have decided that it might not be happening.

We can and we must do better. In fact, we had a committee hearing last night. My colleague from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) said, I think ''comprehensive'' ought to be a dirty word. Comprehensive ought to be a dirty word, because when I hear ''comprehensive,'' Mr. Speaker, what I hear is we are throwing everything in, and the kitchen sink, and I want you to pass all or nothing on the House floor.

It doesn't have to be that way. I promise you if you put together a 2,000-page bill, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be parts of it that my constituency does not believe are in the best interest of America. But if we pass bills 10 pages at a time, 20 pages at a time, maybe even 30 pages at a time, Mr. Speaker, if we move one idea at a time, we get a ''yes'' or ''no'' vote from both sides of the aisle, we send it to the Senate, we pass it in the Senate, and the President puts a signature on it, we can make a difference.

I believe that that momentum matters. I hope we get a ''yes'' vote on the rule. I hope we get a ''yes'' vote on these underlying bills. I hope we get bills coming out of the farm bill conference. I hope we get bills coming out of the budget conference. I hope we get bills coming out of the Water Resources and Reform Development Act conference. I hope we move these things before we begin to build that momentum.

We are at a stumbling place, Mr. Speaker. There is an impediment in our way. I read some White House sources this week that said they recognize that we have not come through on the promise of ''if you like your insurance, you can keep it.'' They were looking for solutions, but they weren't going to come to Congress to look for solutions. They were going to look for administrative solutions, and they were going to try to fix it on their own.

As we have heard on this floor many times, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land; ObamaCare is the law of the land. An administrative branch shouldn't just be able to unilaterally change the law of the land. The Constitution gives that responsibility to us. We have got to step up and take responsibility for those things that the Constitution invests in us, and article III courts are one of those things. We are taking that responsibility up today.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity not to be Republicans and Democrats, but to be representatives of Americans in the greatest body in this entire land, the closest to the American people—the U.S. House of Representatives. We have a chance to announce our position, the House position, and move that to the Senate and then, lo and bold, we have an opportunity to work with the Senate not to adopt a Republican position or a Democrat position, but a congressional opinion, an article I constitutional opinion that we then march down Pennsylvania Avenue and say to the Executive, be he or she a Republican or a Democrat, this is what the people have to say; we need your signature on that. They can say ''yes'' or ''no.''

We have set up these roadblocks, Mr. Speaker, where it is not House and Senate; it is Republican and Democrat. It does not serve this institution well. It does not serve America well.

I hope we are going to have bipartisan votes on these two bills today, Mr. Speaker. We are exercising a constitutional responsibility to direct the courts. We can vote ''yes,'' we can vote ''no,'' but it is not something that is peripheral to what we are about. It is something that is essential to the responsibilities that the Constitution has placed with us.

I promise my colleagues this institution will be a better institution if we pull out that rule book called the United States Constitution more often and start with those priorities that it has invested in us, not the priorities that some interest group has invested in us, not the priorities that the news media has invested in us, not the priorities that a Republican Party or a Democratic Party have invested in us, but the priorities the United States Constitution invests in us, we will restore the faith of the American people in this institution.

These two bills do that, Mr. Speaker. I encourage a strong ''yes'' vote on the rule that has made in order all of the amendments that were offered, save one. Let this body work its will. Support this rule. Support the underlying bill. Vote your conscience on the amendments to make the bills better if you want to, but let's get our constitutional responsibilities done.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 982, The F.A.C.T. Act.

This intrusive legislation which misuses the word "transparency," would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by requiring the posting of personal exposure and medical information online and create new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases.

We have witnessed decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos, even after its hazards were known, have resulted in a legacy of disease and death. Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have been exposed to, suffered or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease, and the toll continues. It is estimated that each year 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos related diseases. This is an outrage—and to add to their misery—they have to deal with the onerous provisions of H.R. 982.

Asbestos victims have faced huge barriers and obstacles to receiving compensation for their diseases. Major asbestos producers refused to accept responsibility and most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability. In 1994 Congress passed special legislation that allowed the asbestos companies to set up bankruptcy trusts to compensate asbestos victims and reorganize under the bankruptcy law.

But these trusts don't have adequate funding to provide just compensation, and according to a 2010 RAND study, the median payment across the trusts is only 25 percent of the claim's value. With compensation from these trusts so limited, asbestos victims have sought redress from the manufacturers of other asbestos products to which they were exposed.

Although the proponents of this legislation assert that it is intended to protect asbestos victims, not a single asbestos victim has expressed support for H.R. 982. As the widow of our former colleague Representative Bruce Vento (D–MN), who passed away from mesothelioma, stated H.R. 982 "does not do a single thing" to help asbestos victims and their families?

H.R. 982 disturbs a reasonably well-functioning asbestos victim compensation process. Entities facing overwhelming mass tort liability for causing asbestos injuries may, under certain circumstances, shed these liabilities and financially regain their stability in exchange for funding trusts established under Chapter II of the Bankruptcy Code to pay the claims of their victims, under certain circumstances. 3 H.R. 982, however, interferes with this longstanding process in two ways. The FACT Act would require these trusts to: (1) file a publicly available quarterly report with the bankruptcy court that would include personally identifying information about such claimants, including their names, exposure history, and basis for any payment made to them; and (2) provide any information related to payment from and demands for payment from such trust to any party to any action in law or equity concerning liability for asbestos exposure.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this utterly intrusive legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 403 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Strike all and insert the following:

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3383) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as

ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3383.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WOODALL. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 195, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Culberson
Herrera Beutler
Jones
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Rush
Schwartz
Wenstrup
Young (AK)

□ 1406

Mr. HIMES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut and SCOTT of Virginia changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 194, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

AYES—223

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

NOES—194

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

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Culberson
Doggett
Herrera Beutler
Jones
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Rush
Schwartz
Tiberi
Wenstrup
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1416

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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, November 13, 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 November 13, 2013 at 11:24 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1499.
That the Senate passed S. 1512.
That the Senate passed S. 1557.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

Karen L. Haas.

FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY (FACT) ACT OF 2013.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 982, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 403 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 982.

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

□ 1420

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

I rise today in support of a bill that will help those asbestos victims that must look to the bankruptcy process to seek redress for their or their loved ones' injuries. Unfortunately, on too frequent an occasion, by the time asbestos victims assert their claims for compensation, the bankruptcy trusts formed for their benefit have been diluted by fraudulent claims, leaving these victims without their entitled recovery.

The reason that fraud is allowed to exist within the asbestos trust system is the excessive lack of transparency created by plaintiffs' firms. Due to a provision in the Bankruptcy Code, plaintiffs' firms are essentially granted a statutory veto right over a debtor's chapter 11 plan that seeks to restructure asbestos liabilities. Plaintiffs' firms have exploited this leverage to prevent information contained within the asbestos trusts from seeing the light of day.

The predictable result from this reduced transparency has been a growing wave of claims and reports of fraud. The increase in claims has caused many asbestos trusts to reduce the recoveries paid to asbestos victims who emerge following the formation of the trusts. For example, the T.H. Agriculture and Nutrition asbestos trust cut its recovery rate from 100 percent to 70 percent, and the Owens Corning trust sliced its recovery rate from 40 percent to 10 percent.

In addition, instances of fraud within the asbestos trust system have been documented in news reports, State court cases, and testimony before the Judiciary Committee. The Wall Street Journal conducted an investigation into asbestos trusts where it found, among other things, that hundreds of plaintiffs filed claims against asbestos trusts asserting one injury while simultaneously asserting a completely different injury before the State courts.

Reports directly from many State courts are uncovering similar conduct. For example, in Ohio, one judge described a plaintiff's case as ''lies upon lies upon lies'' after discovering that the plaintiff received hundreds of thousands of dollars from various asbestos bankruptcy trusts while alleging in court that a single product caused his illness. In Virginia, a judge stated that a similar case over which he presided was the ''worst deception'' he had seen in his 22-year career.

The FACT Act, introduced by Congressman FARENTHOLD, will combat this fraud by introducing long-needed transparency into the asbestos bankruptcy trust system. The FACT Act increases transparency through two simple measures. First, it requires the asbestos trusts to file quarterly reports on their public bankruptcy dockets. These reports will contain very basic information about demands to the trusts and payments made by the trusts to claimants. Second, the FACT Act requires asbestos trusts to respond to information requests about claims asserted against and payments made by the asbestos trusts.

These measures were carefully designed to increase transparency while providing claimants with sufficient privacy protection. To accomplish this goal, the bill leverages the privacy protections contained in the Bankruptcy Code and includes additional safeguards to preserve claimants' privacy.

A State court judge with 29 years of bench experience described the privacy protections within the FACT Act as far stronger than those afforded in State court, where asbestos plaintiffs often pursue parallel claims. The FACT Act also was deliberately structured to minimize the administrative impact on asbestos trusts. Indeed, according to testimony before the Judiciary Committee from an expert on asbestos litigation and the asbestos trusts, preparing the quarterly disclosure requirements would be ''very simple'' and would ''take minutes.''

The FACT Act strikes the appropriate balance between achieving the transparency necessary to reduce fraud in an efficient manner and providing claimants with sufficient privacy protections. We cannot allow fraud to continue reducing recoveries for future asbestos victims. The FACT Act is a simple, narrow measure that will shed much-needed sunshine on a shadowy system.

I thank Mr. FARENTHOLD for introducing this legislation and urge all of my colleagues to vote for the FACT Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Members of the House, we are confronted with a very simple proposition today. What we have here is a piece of legislation that seeks to address a nonexistent problem and is strongly opposed by asbestos victims, the trusts charged with administering compensation to victims, privacy advocates, consumer groups, labor organizations, and legal representatives of future claimants.

I will point out that I have one of the longest lists of organizational opposition that I have seen in a long time, more than 11 organizations, starting with the Asbestos Cancer Victims' Rights Campaign and then going to the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, the AFL–CIO, the United Steelworkers, AFSCME, Public Citizen, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, the Environmental Working Group, the Alliance for Justice, the American Association for Justice, and many others.

What we are doing here is beginning this debate by asking who actually supports this bill and why are their interests being put ahead of asbestos victims.

To begin with, the bill's reporting and disclosure requirements are an assault against asbestos victims' privacy interests. The bill mandates that the trusts publicly report information on the claimants that could include their name, address, work history, income, medical information, exposure history, as well as the basis of any payment that the trust made to the claimant.

□ 1430

Given the fact that all this information would potentially be available on the Internet, just imagine what insurance companies, potential employers, prospective lenders, and data collectors could do with this private information.

Essentially, what this bill does is allow asbestos victims to be re-victimized by exposing their health information to the public, including those who seek information for illegal purposes.

And so I ask all of the thoughtful Members of this body to join me in strongly and vigorously opposing the measure before us today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee.

Mr. BACHUS. I appreciate the chairman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for Mr. CONYERS. He has been my chairman and is now my ranking member.

I, too, see this as a very simple proposition. However, I have a different point of view. I believe that sunshine is the best disinfectant, and I think that light can expose things that need to be exposed; and that is, really, the essence of this bill. This bill is about transparency. It is about revealing how much people are being paid in a claim.

America is a country that helps deserving people in their time of need, and for that reason, when we had tens of thousands of asbestos exposures which caused serious injury and death, a trust fund was specifically set up to compensate those individuals whose health had been harmed. However, as with almost anything we establish, there are those that would take advantage, there are those who would commit fraud, there are those who would abuse it. And that is the case here.

There have been inconsistent claims. Trust fund money has been diverted from these victims and from future victims to where it should properly go—to those people that truly could demonstrate health needs. Instead it went, in many cases, to the undeserved.

Don't take my word for it. An article published by The Wall Street Journal just this past March revealed that nearly half of all trusts have reduced payments to new victims at least once since 2010, partly in an effort to preserve assets for future victims. The same article cited a number of disturbing examples of money being drained from the system by waste and fraud—it is not something we made up—leaving less to those who truly suffered. We have had judges appear and tell us about those problems. We have had others.

For example, the article disclosed that, after virtually no examination

and no transparency, over $26,000 was awarded to a person who never existed. It also found that 2,700 claimants to the Manville Trust alone—just one of many trusts—couldn't have been older than 12 years of age at the time they said they were exposed to asbestos in an industrial job.

The FACT Act would combat fraud through sunshine by increasing transparency and accountability in the system. In doing so, it strengthens the asbestos trust fund and system for present and future claimants. It would improve information-sharing in the trust fund process while fully respecting privacy—and let me stress that—fully respecting privacy and protecting confidential medical information, which is very important when personal health is involved.

As we have said many times, sunshine is a disinfectant. I said it at the start of the speech, and I will say it now.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that would help asbestos victims get the compensation they need and deserve by protecting the asbestos trust fund from fraud, waste, and abuse.

Let me close by commending Mr. FARENTHOLD from Texas and Mr. MATHESON from Utah for bringing this bipartisan legislation. I urge you to support them and others and bring this bill to the floor and pass it to increase accountability.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to thank my good friend, SPENCER BACHUS, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, for participating here on the floor with me. I want him to know that the privacy part of his remarks are not too relevant at this point because this bill allows the name, the disease, and all related facts to be published. It can be picked up by the Internet; and so assurances of privacy are of little usefulness here.

I am so glad to know that Mrs. Sue Vento, the widow of our former colleague, Bruce Vento, is here with us in the gallery. She has been working along with us in strongly opposing H.R. 982.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend, Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. Chairman, it is deeply troubling to see that today the House of Representatives might vote to pass the so-called FACT Act, or Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill because it is not about transparency. It is not about accountability. It is absolutely not about justice. The FACT Act is nothing more than a thinly veiled attack on the rights of cancer victims and their families. That is the only way I can describe a piece of legislation that undermines the constitutional rights of asbestos victims and even threatens the privacy of victims and their families.

The FACT Act does nothing to protect the rights of victims like Genevieve Bosilevac, who was diagnosed with mesothelioma just a few days before her 48th birthday in 2009, and widows like Judy Van Ness, who lost her husband to asbestos-caused disease.

Victims of mesothelioma do not have the luxury of time. This brutal form of cancer is hard to detect until it has progressed significantly and all too often already compromised vital internal organs.

Despite the dire implications of this diagnosis, the FACT Act would place additional burdens on victims and even delay court proceedings to the point that a victim would die before receiving any financial assistance through the asbestos trust fund.

If anything, this body should be looking at ways to make it easier to identify legitimate asbestos victims and fast-track their cases. Instead, we are doing the opposite.

This legislation might as well have been written by the asbestos industry because it only provides these companies with new tools to evade justice and their responsibility to victims. Even more incomprehensibly, the FACT Act would require the asbestos trust fund to turn over personally identifying information about victims and even their children.

For the families whose lives have already been torn apart by disease from asbestos exposure, this legislation would create an online Web site that lists victims' sensitive information, including financial histories and even partial Social Security numbers.

I implore my colleagues to recognize that these families have been through enough. There is nothing we in this Chamber can do to fill the void that has been left in the hearts of so many Americans who have lost loved ones due to exposure.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEUTCH. What we can do is ensure that we have a justice system that protects the rights of victims and puts the constitutional rights of our citizens ahead of special interests.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the FACT Act.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), the author of the legislation.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Quite frankly, I am personally offended by the claim that this bill is against victims. It is for the victims. It is preserving the asbestos trusts for those yet undiscovered victims from people who would defraud the system.

This is a simple, short two-page bill. We are asking for no more information than you have to supply when you file a lawsuit in any court. We are asking for your name and the basis of your claim. We are asking that the expenditures be listed of the trust in a method that people can check to make sure somebody isn't claiming twice for the same injury so we don't have double dippers.

This is for the victims. We are going to try to stop unscrupulous attorneys and folks they rope in from filing false claims. We don't want to stop anybody who has a legitimate claim.

The asbestos trust has been riddled with fraud. It even comes down to Corpus Christi, Texas, the district I represent, where there were early cases where a Federal judge, Janis Jack, a Clinton-appointee and a friend of mine, ruled there was fraud with doctors. The courts are dealing with that.

We are trying to deal with multiple claims and bring simple transparency. We are not asking for detailed medical information to be released. We are just asking for the basis of the claim, and that is pretty simple information.

We are not asking for Social Security numbers. We are not asking for any financial information, other than the amount that is being claimed. This is public record in any other lawsuit in the country, and it is not an invasion of privacy. It is a protection of the system that was set up to compensate victims of mesothelioma and other asbestos-related exposure diseases that don't manifest for years after the exposure. We have got to protect this for future generations.

The FACT Act is a simple, two-page bill that leverages all the privacy protections already in the Bankruptcy Code and simply asks that we know who is getting what out of these trusts so they can't get them from multiple trusts for the same injury or they can't file a claim in State court. It is to try to stop double dipping and fraud.

Unfortunately, when they were set up, there weren't enough safeguards in place to run by plaintiffs' attorneys, who get percentages of compensation off of that. So we are trying to get this taken care of. The plaintiffs' attorneys have a big impact in creating and managing these trusts, and we are just trying to get some simple oversight.

Mr. BACHUS put it quite well when he said that sunshine is the best disinfectant. We are asking to shine the light of day on these claims so we can protect future victims. We don't want to deny anybody who is a legitimate claimant what they are entitled to. We want to get them compensated and make sure there is enough money there for everyone.

This is a bill for the victims. It is a bill to stop fraud, waste, and abuse.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Houston, Texas, (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, with all of the protests, I think there is nothing more that we can say other than that it is a

very cruel decision to move forward this particular legislation. It really implodes and violates the process of litigation between plaintiffs and defendants, petitioners and those who are in opposition, because we have an infrastructure of a court system that allows those who participate in that court system to guide the evidence that is being presented under the representation of their counsel.

The Sixth Amendment provides for individuals to have a right to counsel, and what this legislation is trying to do is implode that relationship and ask for information that could be given in the regular order of a court process.

This is intrusive legislation under the false guise of transparency and, in actuality, would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by requiring the posting of personal exposure and medical information online and erect new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases.

This cancer-driven disease, this asbestos-driven disease, is a silent killer. For a long time, the victims don't even know that they are being impacted by asbestos that is causing cancer.

We have witnessed decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos; and even after its hazards became widely known, disease and death still persist because people work in it and they do not know. And so they have been forced to hire counsel merely to provide for their families or themselves in the waning hours and days of their life.

Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have been exposed, suffered, or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease; and the toll continues. And yet we have legislation like this that wants to clearly undermine the legal system, the justice system, which means I go into a court, I have a lawyer, there is someone opposed to my position, they have a lawyer, and we submit information under the basis of that litigation or that settlement or that negotiation.

□ 1445

Why do Americans have to be subjected to another abuse while they are suffering and dying?

This is an abuse. H.R. 982 is asking for information that can already be gotten. As I indicated, these individuals have been exposed, suffered, or died from asbestos-related cancer. It is estimated that, each year, 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos-related diseases. How much more of an outrage do we have to place on their families—and burdens—to ask them to give information about their sicknesses and other issues that are squarely within the realm of their counsel? Call up their lawyers and ask for it. This is an outrage that they have to deal with this onerous provision.

Time and again, asbestos victims have faced huge obstacles, inconvenient barriers, and veiled but persistent resistance to receiving compensation for their diseases. That is why they organized in the manner that they did. It is because they were dying, dying, dying, and there was no response.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It is particularly galling that many of the major asbestos producers refuse to accept responsibility and that most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation. How much more can we put on these poor victims? If you want information, go to their counsel. Go into the courthouse. They will provide it. Let's give them relief. I oppose this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 982, the F.A.C.T. Act. This intrusive legislation which misuses the word "transparency," would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by requiring the posting of personal exposure and medical information online and erect new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases.

We have witnessed decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos, and, even after its hazards became widely known, disease and death still persist.

Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have been exposed to, suffered or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease, and the toll continues. It is estimated that each year 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos related diseases. This is an outrage—and to add to their misery—they have to deal with the onerous provisions of H.R. 982.

Time and time again, asbestos victims have faced huge obstacles, inconvenient barriers, and veiled but persistent resistance to receiving compensation for their diseases and it is important to note that asbestos litigation is the longest-running mass tort litigation in the United States.

It is particularly galling that many of the major asbestos producers refused to accept responsibility and most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability. In 1994 Congress passed reasonably balanced special legislation that allowed the asbestos companies to set up bankruptcy trusts to compensate asbestos victims and reorganize under the bankruptcy law.

But these trusts don't have adequate funding to provide just compensation, and according to a 2010 RAND study, the median payment across the trusts is only 25 percent of the claim's value. With compensation from these trusts so limited, asbestos victims have sought redress from the manufacturers of other asbestos products to which they were exposed—the original tortfeasors.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration, better known as OSHA noted two decades ago that

"It was aware of no instance in which exposure to a toxic substance has more clearly demonstrated detrimental health effects on human than has asbestos exposure."

We see the harm that asbestos causes when people become sick—ordinary Americans who did extraordinary things to get this disease—like go to work every day to support their families.

And although the proponents of this legislation assert that it is intended to protect asbestos victims, I have not heard of a single asbestos victim who has expressed support for the H.R. 982, the FACT Act.

As the widow of our former colleague Representative Bruce Vento (D–MN), who passed away from mesothelioma, stated H.R. 982 "does not do a single thing" to help asbestos victims and their families.

H.R. 982 does not help and actually disturbs a reasonably well-functioning asbestos victim compensation process. Entities facing overwhelming mass tort liability for causing asbestos injuries may, under certain circumstances, shed these liabilities and financially regain their stability in exchange for funding trusts established under Chapter II of the Bankruptcy Code to pay the claims of their victims, under certain circumstances.

H.R. 982, however, interferes with this longstanding process in two ways. The FACT Act would require these trusts to: (1) file a publicly available quarterly report with the bankruptcy court that would include personally identifying information about such claimants, including their names, exposure history, and basis for any payment made to them; and (2) provide any information related to payment from and demands for payment from such trust to any party to any action in law or equity concerning liability for asbestos exposure.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this utterly intrusive legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 18½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the mischaracterization of this legislation as it is somehow imposing burdens on the victims of asbestos. In fact, it is quite the opposite.

First of all, the information disclosed under the FACT Act is very basic and is less information than would be disclosed during the normal course of a State court lawsuit, in which many asbestos bankruptcy claimants pursue simultaneous claims, but they don't tell the bankruptcy courts about that, so these trusts need to tell them that.

Secondly, the FACT Act includes strong privacy protections, including prohibiting the disclosure of confidential medical records and full Social Security numbers. To be clear, the FACT Act does not require asbestos trusts to require or to disclose asbestos victims' Social Security numbers.

The FACT Act also leverages existing privacy protections in the Bankruptcy Code to give the presiding bankruptcy judge broad discretion to prevent the disclosure of information that would result in identity theft or in any other unlawful activity. Indeed, a judge with 29 years of bench experience testified before the Judiciary Committee that the FACT Act provides more protection in terms of the confidentiality of asbestos claimants' records than the legal system is able to do.

By requiring the disclosure of basic information regarding claims submitted to the asbestos trusts, the FACT Act will facilitate a reduction in fraud that will allow future asbestos victims to maximize their recovery, but they will not be able to do that if we continue to have money taken from these trusts for duplicative claims, fraudulent claims, and claims without merit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia, HANK JOHNSON, and I would indicate his very deep concern for asbestos cancer victims.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 982, the so-called FACT Act.

The FACT Act would require asbestos trusts to publicly disclose extensive amounts of private information about asbestos victims on a public Web site. These quarterly reports would have to describe each demand the trust received, including the name and exposure history of a claimant and the basis for any payment from the trust made to such claimant. Also required to be publicly disclosed by the trusts are a claimant's home address, work history, income, medical information, and even the last four digits of a claimant's Social Security number.

Any person, including every crook in the world with Internet access, could use this information for any and all illicit purposes. That criminal or mischievous person could be your neighbor. He could be your daughter's exboyfriend—you know, the one you never liked and barred from coming to the house. He could be an employee on the job, somebody who is vying for your job. He could be anybody who wants to do harm to you or your family.

It is a serious threat to asbestos victims' security and privacy, and it is an unfair and unnecessary advantage bestowed upon the asbestos manufacturers. The truth of the matter is that such information is available to the tortfeasors during the course of the litigation. Federal and/or State Rules of Civil Procedure allow a defendant to gain all relevant information during the discovery process about a claimant's exposure. Moreover, a defendant's discovery request should never justify the publication of a plaintiff's entire medical history.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment that would have protected the privacy of asbestos victims and their families, but, unfortunately, the Republicans on the Rules Committee did not allow the House to consider my amendment today. It is disappointing that my Republican colleagues who pretend that they support Americans' rights to privacy are now willing to throw privacy rights under the bus while they stand with Big Asbestos and as they again victimize the victims by trampling on the privacy rights of those same victims and those families. Without adding important privacy safeguards, nothing would stop rampant identity theft or the misuse of a claimant victim's personal information, including that victim's entire medical history.

Why is it necessary for a claimant to have to give up his right to privacy just because he seeks to recover damages arising from exposure to asbestos?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you.

Asbestos victims who seek compensation for their injuries should retain the same privacy protections as other patients, as well as other people who make claims for personal injury.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to address some claims that my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made.

The FACT Act is simple. There are two pages of text to the FACT Act. There is no requirement of any action whatsoever by the victims of asbestos. The trusts are the only ones that are required to do something. Let me just read to you exactly what the requirement is. It doesn't include a broad release of personal information. It is very simple:

> A trust described in paragraph 2 shall, subject to section 107, file with the bankruptcy court not later than 60 days at the end of every quarter a report that shall be made available on the court's public docket with respect to such quarter. It describes each demand the trust has received from a claimant, including the name, exposure history of a claimant and the basis for any payment from the trust made to such claimant, and it does not include any confidential medical record or the claimant's full Social Security number.

All we are asking for in this bill is that the trusts let us know who they are paying the money to and what they are paying it for so we make sure people don't double dip so that there is plenty of money there for future claimants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. How do you determine claimants individually with that level of information that you just described?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It gives you their names and potentially a part of their Social Security numbers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It is not their full Social Security numbers. It is not their confidential medical records. It is the basis of their claims.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Part of your medical record goes into that public file; is that not correct?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It is a limited basis of the claim.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. So the gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It is not part of the medical record. It is just the basis of the claim. It would be simply: claiming mesothelioma from exposure at ''this'' location. It is that basic information that would allow other courts to determine that the person who is making the claim is not double dipping, that he has not already made that claim.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, STEVE COHEN, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, there is one fact that is indisputable, and that is the procedure by which this particular bill came to the floor. It is a procedure whereby the majority had three witnesses and the minority had one, and none of the witnesses were victims.

There are two major asbestos victims' groups. They would be the people most interested in preserving the funds for victims—the Asbestos Cancer Victims' Rights Campaign and the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization. One is headed up by the widow of a former Member of this House, Mrs. Vento. Her husband, Congressman Bruce Vento, died of mesothelioma. They oppose this bill, but the fact is, indisputably, that they were not allowed to testify.

If this bill, indeed, were for the victims, the victims should have had an opportunity to testify. The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BACHUS, of which I am the ranking member, valiantly tried to rectify that error by allowing them to testify, but he was overruled.

The fact is that the procedure that brought this bill to the floor was flawed. Accordingly, I submit that the bill should be flawed because the victims should have had the opportunity to speak. If it is for the victims, if it is for preserving funds, the people who are proponents shouldn't have been afraid of the victims' organizations going on record and giving testimony and testifying.

This whole proceeding today is conceived in an attack on the victims—not allowing the victims to speak and not allowing transparency in the hearing process. This is allegedly about transparency. It is not. It is about covering up and not allowing freedom of speech from the people who are most affected—those who had loved ones die from mesothelioma.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the mischaracterization of the process followed in the Judiciary Committee.

The FACT Act and the problems it addresses have been the subject of three separate hearings: one before the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution on September 9, 2011, on the issue generally, and two legislative hearings before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law—one during the 112th Congress and another this year on March 13.

The minority used these opportunities to call witnesses who were representatives from the asbestos plaintiffs' trial bar to voice their concerns with the bill. In fact, the minority called the same witness for two out of the three hearings. Now they claim that asbestos victims were never provided an opportunity to testify. The Judiciary Committee provided ample opportunities to include asbestos victims' views on the legislation on the record, and there are many letters and statements from asbestos victims in the record as a result. Additionally, the committee offered a special procedure to asbestos victims in order to provide an occasion for the victims to personally inform Members and staff of their views, which they refused.

It has become necessary to act with expediency and move this important legislation forward. Each day that passes is a day on which fraudulent claims can be prosecuted against the asbestos trusts, thereby reducing the recovery to legitimate asbestos victims. This legislation will benefit victims by reducing fraudulent claims and by ensuring that asbestos trusts provide the maximum recovery to future asbestos claimants.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Would you explain to me then why the victims were never allowed to testify on the record in this Congress and were never given an opportunity even though the subcommittee chairman valiantly and heroically tried to rectify that?

Mr. GOODLATTE. In reclaiming my time, that is not accurate. The claimants were offered a process by which they could come and speak to the members of the committee.

Mr. COHEN. In private.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia controls the time.

□ 1500

Mr. GOODLATTE. The minority had the opportunity to have an asbestos victim testify if they wished to do so and chose instead to have a plaintiff's attorney who had already testified in a previous hearing do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, we had one witness; the majority had three witnesses. Ours had to try to explain the legal effects.

The fact is the proponents of the bill who claim it is for the victims should have had the right to have the victims be there. The special procedure they had was an in camera hearing not on the record. That is not right. If you want to propose something for the victims, you give them an opportunity to testify on the record—and they all opposed the bill to a one.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for his leadership.

This bill represents an unjustified corporate giveaway being built on the backs of hardworking individuals from all across this country who in many cases were unwittingly victimized by asbestos exposure. It is an unwarranted, unnecessary, and unconscionable effort to benefit Big Business and the asbestos industrial complex, which in many instances has unleashed mesothelioma, lung cancer, and other diseases of mass destruction on Americans all across this country who are hardworking and, in most instances, simply trying to make a living for themselves and for their families.

It is being done allegedly to create greater transparency and in the name of litigation reform. Yet the record reflects that there is no evidence of systematic fraud, no evidence of systematic waste, no evidence of systematic abuse, no evidence of systematic overpayment to victims of asbestos exposure.

This is wrong, it is shameful, it is a bill that is dead on arrival in the Senate; and that is why I respectfully urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to myself to respond to the allegation that fraud has not been documented.

Fraud has been documented in news reports, State court cases, and testimony before the Judiciary Committee. The Wall Street Journal conducted an investigation that found thousands of disparately filed claims. Court documents in many States, including Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia, attest to widespread fraud.

Additionally, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony over the course of three hearings during which witnesses repeatedly testified that fraud existed within the asbestos trust bankruptcy system. Keep in mind that the fraud reported to date has been in spite of the lack of disclosure that currently pervades this system. The increased transparency the FACT Act introduces will go a long way in uncovering previously undetected fraud and preserving assets for future asbestos victims.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the FACT Act. This bill aims to address a fraud problem and ensure that true asbestos victims obtain maximum recoveries for their injuries.

My district is home to many asbestos lawsuits. Currently, a lack of transparency has led to fraud in the asbestos bankruptcy trust system and diverted millions of dollars away from those who should have the ability to receive these recoveries. This lack of transparency discourages a free flow of information resulting in fraudulent claims that deplete funds that are intended for legitimate victims.

This bill requires these trusts to file quarterly reports, which include the claimant's name, basis for the claim, payments made, and the basis behind those payments. It protects privacy by prohibiting disclosure of sensitive medical records and Social Security numbers.

In order to help ensure future victims will have access to the money they deserve, these problems cannot be allowed to continue. This is why I stand today in support of the FACT Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the leader of the Democratic Caucus, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on so many issues.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the debates that we have on the floor of the House affect millions of Americans: families, senior citizens, veterans, students, and children. We all bring stories of men and women and families from our districts—the challenges facing our neighbors, the urgent need to solve them.

Today, we address an issue that takes the lives of thousands of Americans each year: asbestos exposure. Yet we do not have to look back only to our districts on this scourge; we only need to look into the lives of some who have served in this body.

I am very honored today, as I know some of my colleagues are as well, that Susan Vento, wife of our former colleague Bruce Vento who served with such distinction in the Congress with some of us some years ago, is with us. Bruce Vento was affected by asbestos exposure. It took his life.

I wish to place in the RECORD Susan Vento's letter, Mr. Chairman, and just to say that in the letter Susan says:

> During the consideration of this legislation in the Judiciary Committee, two other women who have been affected by the ravages of asbestos and I requested to have a chance to testify about how the legislation would affect people like us. Our request was denied. To date, not one victim of asbestos exposure or an affected family member has been allowed to be heard on this legislation. The only people who would be directly affected by this bill have been completely shut out of the process.

It goes on to say the so-called FACT Act—and this letter doesn't say ''the

so-called.'' That is my characterization. The letter says:

The FACT Act drastically erodes the decades of work Bruce and so many of you have invested in helping those who could not help themselves. If this bill passes, it will be a serious setback for Americans who expect their elected representatives to work on their behalf. Instead of helping those who suffer from the diseases caused by asbestos, it will reward those who have perpetuated the diseases.

I would also like to talk about another of our colleagues who is affected by this: Congresswoman CAROLYN MCCARTHY. CAROLYN MCCARTHY serves in this Congress with us. She is a distinguished Congresswoman from the State of New York. Congresswoman MCCARTHY's father and brother were career boilermakers. Each night, they brought home asbestos fibers in their clothes. Over time, exposure to this asbestos affected Congresswoman MCCARTHY herself. Today, she is battling asbestos-related lung cancer.

Her story is like the stories of countless Americans across the country. It is up to us to strengthen the health of those suffering from exposure. It is up to us to act in their names, whether they suffer from cancer today or face the prospect of severe illness in the future.

Yet the Republican measure we consider today does not meet this challenge. Like far too many Republican bills in this Congress, this legislation only serves to make matters worse for the American people. The so-called—there it is again—the so-called FACT Act actually harms the American people—that is a fact—and hinders the ability of asbestos victims to obtain compensation.

How does it do this? This bill would deny cancer victims the assistance and simple justice they deserve. It would even delay compensation beyond the life of a person suffering from asbestos-related cancer and illnesses. It would invade the privacy of thousands of Americans, and it would pose a particularly detrimental impact on veterans of the United States Armed Forces who have been disproportionately affected by asbestos.

Contrary to the claims of the bill's proponents, there is no need for this bill. State laws provide for adequate disclosure. There is no evidence of systematic fraud in the asbestos trust system.

In short, this bill is unnecessary, it is mean-spirited and will never become the law of the land.

The Republican majority has little time left on the legislative calendar this year: just 13 days between now and December 31, according to the schedule they have given us. In that short window, the House should focus on the most pressing challenges—priorities like job creation, economic growth, comprehensive immigration reform, or deficit reduction. Instead, our Republican colleagues have chosen to waste time on another message bill to nowhere.

In the name of Bruce Vento and Congresswoman MCCARTHY, in the name of our friends, family members, and constituents facing the daily challenges of asbestos exposure, let's work together on steps to strengthen the health of the American people. Let's preserve the privacy and well-being of asbestos victims and all American families.

We can do this by voting ''no'' on this legislation.

PLEASE OPPOSE H.R. 982, THE FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY ACT (FACT ACT)

NOVEMBER 11, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: My name is Susan Vent, and I'm writing to express my strong opposition to H.R. 982, called the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act (FACT Act). My husband was the late Congressman Bruce F. Vento who served for almost 24 years in the House of Representatives representing Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District. He died from mesothelioma in 2000 within eight months of being diagnosed.

Mesothelioma is an aggressive cancer caused by asbestos exposure. Bruce was exposed through his work as a laborer years before we met or became involved in public life. He told his constituency about his diagnosis in early February 2000 when he announced why he would not run for re-election. On February 14, he had his lung surgically removed and then began an aggressive treatment regimen at the Mayo Clinic.

It was not enough. My husband died three days after his 60th birthday in October 2010, just eight and one-half months after the diagnosis. With his death, our country lost a hard-working and humble public servant years before his time. Bruce's parents, children, grandchildren and I lost so much more.

Bruce dedicated himself as a tireless and effective advocate for the environment, for working people and for the disadvantaged. During his time in Congress, he was well respected by members of both parties. He served as ranking member and chairman of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands and also served on the House Banking Committee.

During the consideration of this legislation in the Judiciary Committee, two other women who have been affected by the ravages of asbestos and I requested to have a chance to testify about how the legislation would affect people like us. Our request was denied. To date, not one victim of asbestos exposure or an affected family member has been allowed to be heard on the legislation. The only people who would be directly affected by this bill have been completely shut out of the process.

This legislation is premised on a myth that fraud is a problem in asbestos-related litigation and that transparency must be required of those suffering from asbestos-caused diseases and their families. Such transparency would require mesothelioma patients and their families and others suffering from asbestos-related diseases to divulge personal information on public websites, including portions of their Social Security numbers, information about their personal finances and information about their children. Extensive and reputable research has disproved the fraud claims.

I find it highly ironic that the asbestos industry is seeking transparency, of all things. If the companies that are pushing this bill really cared about transparency, they wouldn't have concealed what they knew regarding the lethal nature of exposure to asbestos and hundreds of thousands of Americans would not have died from such cruel diseases, including my husband.

If Congress is striving to be transparent about asbestos, please pass legislation to reduce exposure to asbestos in work-settings, schools, hospitals, and other settings, increase awareness of the risks of asbestos exposure including secondary exposure, and significantly increase federal funding for medical research to fund diagnoses and treatments for mesothelioma, asbestosis and other asbestos-related diseases.

The FACT Act drastically erodes the decades of work Bruce and so many of you have invested in helping those who could not help themselves. If this bill passes, it will be a serious step back for Americans who expect their elected representatives to work on their behalf. Instead of helping those who suffer from the diseases caused by asbestos, it will reward those who have perpetuated the diseases.

I thank you for your consideration. I hope you will stand with me in support of Bruce's memory and in opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

SUSAN VENTO.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against H.R. 982.

This legislation requires that asbestos trusts, which were set up to manage a company's asbestos liability exposure, disclose names and personal information of any individual who is seeking compensation from such trusts.

The negative health effects associated with asbestos have been under investigation since the early 1990s. Premature death, lung cancer, and mesothelioma are known effects of asbestos exposure. While asbestos industry officials were aware of these negative health impacts since the 1930s, it wasn't until the 1970s that evidence emerged that the industry concealed these dangers from the public.

Lawsuits resulted; and in 1973 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upheld the first successful asbestos liability suit. Today, hundreds of thousands of claims have been filed, amounting to billions of dollars in damages.

The key principle behind this legislation is to prevent duplicative and fraudulent claims from being filed against companies. However, there is zero evidence to support any allegation of endemic fraud in the filing of asbestos claims. In fact, in 2011, during an examination of asbestos trusts, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, did not find any evidence of such fraud.

Make no mistake, this bill does nothing to enhance transparency and simply increases the burden on the victims who are seeking compensation for asbestos exposure and the related side effects. Instead, the FACT Act simply makes it more difficult for asbestos victims to receive compensation for

their injuries. The individuals who file asbestos disease claims do so in order to receive compensation to pay for medical bills or to make up for lost income when they are too sick to work.

Many others were not as fortunate and ultimately died from the consequences of asbestos exposure, leaving family members and friends behind.

The FACT Act not only fails to enhance transparency, but it may also expose these victims to added fraud and abuse. This bill would require asbestos trusts to publish the claimants' name, address, work history, income, and even personal medical information onto the Internet, where it can be accessed by people all around the world. This gross invasion of privacy could unwittingly expose these victims to identity theft or other forms of fraud, while completely failing to enhance the operation of these trusts to compensate legitimate victims.

Mr. Speaker, the FACT Act is a terrible piece of legislation that undermines the safety and privacy of many Americans, while giving unjustified deference to companies that have wittingly exposed individuals to asbestos. Instead of focusing on legislation that creates jobs or enhances U.S. competitiveness abroad, House Republicans continue to waste our time with poorly crafted bills that have obvious ties to industry. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on this legislation so that we may continue to compensate legitimate victims of asbestos exposure.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. ERIC SWALWELL.

□ 1515

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the ranking member for his leadership on this issue, and I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 982, the FACT Act.

It is a fact that asbestos can be found in thousands of products and locations. It is a fact that asbestos is a deadly carcinogen which kills about 10,000 Americans a year. It is a fact that trusts were set up so victims could still be compensated even when asbestos companies went bankrupt. It is also a fact that there is no evidence of systemic fraud or abuse in these asbestos trusts. It is also a fact that H.R. 982 would put tremendous new administrative burdens on these trusts. It is a fact that the result of this bill would make it more difficult for victims of asbestos exposure and their families to achieve justice.

With all of these facts, the evidence is clear: the FACT Act is a fact in name only, and instead, what it claims to do is really a fiction. It is just another part of the majority's historic and ongoing hostility to victims and their attorneys who are trying to achieve justice through our courts.

Instead of working to make it easier for victims to be compensated, instead of working on a whole host of other problems facing the American people, we are targeting innocent asbestos victims who are merely trying to be compensated for a wrong done to them.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject this misguided legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to close. If the gentleman from Michigan is prepared to close as well, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close. I think the case has been made that the asbestos victims do not benefit from this bill, that there is no widespread fraud or abuse, that all of the victims and their organizations are, in fact, strongly opposed to H.R. 982, and so are we. It is for that reason that I urge Members of the House to soundly reject this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, a lot of assertions have been made by the other side of the aisle with regard to the FACT Act. Let's make clear what we are talking about here.

This is a bill that in its totality doesn't cover two full pages of double-spaced type in legislative language. It simply requires that trusts that have been established to preserve the assets of companies that have gone bankrupt and have paid funds into these trusts, that future claims, future real, legitimate claims, will have resources available to them when it is a known fact and established by testimony before the Judiciary Committee and by investigations in a number of publications, including The Wall Street Journal, and by reports from various State courts in more than a half-dozen States, of fraud, duplicative claims.

These are what we are concerned about, and this is simply good legislative reform for protection of these assets for future availability. Otherwise, these trusts, which are already reducing the amount that they can pay to legitimate asbestos victims, will run out of money altogether before all of the legitimate claims have been addressed.

That's what the purpose of this legislation is. The opponents of the FACT Act have offered creative and far-ranging allegations against a measure that only seeks to introduce a modest amount of transparency into an opaque system. We know these allegations to be unfounded. The allegation that it hurts asbestos victims is unfounded. We know this because by increasing transparency and deterring fraud, the FACT Act helps asbestos victims by protecting trust funds for future claimants.

The allegation there is no widespread fraud is unfounded. We know this because there has been fraud documented in news reports, State court cases, and before the Judiciary Committee.

I urge my colleagues to reject the unfounded allegations offered today by critics of the FACT Act, and vote in support of this simple transparency measure.

I might add, this does not in any way delay the claim of anyone with a legitimate claim, either in State courts or in the bankruptcy courts. What it will do is it will root out those who are making duplicative claims, who are trying to double dip at the same time there are people with legitimate claims that will not have any money available to them because, as we know, and as was mentioned by many of the speakers here today, asbestos is a problem that has affected many, many Americans, and it is something that can be latent for a long period of time. We want to make sure that those victims who come along at the end of this process, who discover late in their lives that they also suffer from mesothelioma and related cancers, and other diseases caused by asbestos, have the opportunity to recover, not just those who want to abuse this system by hiding their claims and not allowing proper discovery of duplicative claims and fraudulent claims.

I urge my colleagues to support this well founded, good legal reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 982.

The average adult takes about 20,000 breaths a day. Most of us don't think much about those breaths. But for those living with asbestosis or mesothelioma, they think about every one of them. They struggle to breathe, they struggle to get medical treatments that are often painful, and they struggle financially. And they have struggled for decades for justice and some have died before receiving it.

Asbestos victims and their families have a right to believe that the House of Representatives—the people's House—would not put further barriers in their way. And that is why H.R. 982 is so disturbing.

This bill would threaten asbestos victims' privacy by putting their personal information on a public website. Exposed to asbestos, they would now be exposed to identity theft and fraud.

The Rand Institute estimates that the median payment to asbestos victims is just 25 cents on the dollars—with some as low as 1.1 percent. Yet, H.R. 982 would divert dollars away from compensation to burdensome paperwork requirements that go far beyond current law and bypass long-established rules of discovery. Asbestos companies face no similar "transparency" requirements.

The proponents of this bill say it is necessary to put victims' privacy at risk; delay and lower the payments they need to live because of fraud in company trusts—but there is no evidence of fraud.

This is an unjustifiable bill—and it is a dangerous bill. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 982

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 ''Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

Section 524(g) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) A trust described in paragraph (2) shall, subject to section 107—

''(A) file with the bankruptcy court, not later than 60 days after the end of every quarter, a report that shall be made available on the court's public docket and with respect to such quarter—

''(i) describes each demand the trust received from, including the name and exposure history of, a claimant and the basis for any payment from the trust made to such claimant; and

''(ii) does not include any confidential medical record or the claimant's full social security number; and

''(B) upon written request, and subject to payment (demanded at the option of the trust) for any reasonable cost incurred by the trust to comply with such request, provide in a timely manner any information related to payment from, and demands for payment from, such trust, subject to appropriate protective orders, to any party to any action in law or equity if the subject of such action concerns liability for asbestos exposure.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to cases commenced under title 11 of the United States Code before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 113–264. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–264.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 9, insert ''that does not have a claims audit program intended to ensure that claims are valid and supported and that is'' after ''trust''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 403, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

My amendment ensures that H.R. 982 will not apply to trusts that have an internal claims audit program to ensure that claims are valid and supported.

Proponents of H.R. 982 argue that its reporting and other information-sharing requirements are necessary in order to ensure that asbestos victims are not committing fraud by recovering money both from trusts and through the tort system, thereby ''double dipping.''

While proponents of the bill have yet to point to any empirical evidence of endemic fraud within the asbestos trust claims process, H.R. 982, if enacted, will impose unnecessary burdens and costs on trusts and will expose claimants' private information to the unnecessary risk of inappropriate exposure, exposure that their loved ones have already suffered from.

H.R. 982's additional requirements on trusts will raise their administrative costs significantly. Money used to pay these costs ultimately means less money to compensate asbestos victims.

This is particularly problematic in light of the fact that defendants can already obtain the information they want using existing discovery tools without undermining compensation for legitimate claims.

The reporting requirements in H.R. 982 also raise privacy concerns. This provision requires that a claimant's name and exposure history be made part of a bankruptcy court's public docket, meaning that anyone can access such information for any purpose, including purposes that have nothing to do with compensation for asbestos exposure.

I recognize that the bill specifically prohibits trusts from making public any medical records or full Social Security numbers, although it does require the last four digits of the Social Security number to be used.

I also recognize that limited additional privacy protection is available under rule 107 of the Bankruptcy Code.

Nonetheless, these measures are insufficient to fully protect the claimant's privacy. As noted by my colleagues, once out in public, such information can be used for any purpose. Potential employers, insurance companies, lenders, and even those who may seek to harm an asbestos victim in some way can have access to this information without the victim's permission or knowledge.

In light of these concerns, and notwithstanding the lack of any evidence of systemic fraud, my amendment ensures that to the extent that a trust already has measures in place to ferret out potential fraudulent claims, it should not have to bear the costs, burdens, and privacy risks presented by H.R. 982's requirements.

If, in fact, proponents of H.R. 982 are primarily concerned about potential fraud in the asbestos trust claims process, then they should have little trouble supporting this amendment that recognizes processes already in place to address fraud while also addressing some of the concerns of those who oppose the bill. Accordingly, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would exclude asbestos trusts that have in place internal audit systems from the requirements of the FACT Act.

There has not been any evidence presented to establish that trusts with internal reporting systems are free from fraud. On the contrary, a GAO report found that trust audit processes are designed to ensure compliance with internal trust procedures, not to remedy the fraud that the bill seeks to address. Simply put, internal audits will not be able to detect whether disparate claims are filed among several asbestos trusts or in the State courts.

Excluding certain asbestos trusts from the FACT Act would eliminate critical sources of information that can facilitate the reduction of fraud. Furthermore, the amendment would not address the problem presented by plaintiffs who assert inconsistent allegations between the State court tort system and the asbestos trusts. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the Cohen amendment to limit the bill to asbestos trusts that do not have an internal fraud detection system is very appropriate. That is because, according to the Government Accountability Office, which has studied this and filed a report, they have found that in every trust that had an existing internal quality control to detect fraud, there was no evidence of systematic fraud found, and so I want to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee for bringing this to our attention. We think that it makes a better attempt at regulating and protecting victims of asbestos, and so I am very pleased to support it, and I hope that it becomes part of the bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment has nothing to do with the problem we are trying to address. Listen, all well-managed trusts, nonprofits, and businesses should have an internal audit procedure to detect fraud within that organization.

What we are trying to combat with the FACT Act is fraud between organizations, where an unscrupulous attorney or claimant will file multiple claims with multiple trusts, or in State court and in Federal court, in bankruptcy court, and with the trust. So an

auditor for one trust is going to have no idea what is going on in State court or in other trusts. This is a red herring to get us away from the purpose of this bill: to protect victims by preserving the funds that have been set aside to compensate victims from waste, fraud, and abuse.

This is a victims' rights bill that the proponent of this amendment, I believe, is trying to undermine with an amendment that would exempt most trusts because, as I said, any well-run organization ought to have internal and external audit procedures in place.

□ 1530

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment that undermines the purpose of the bill and support the FACT Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond.

The gentleman from Houston mentions this is a ''victims' rights bill,'' but all the victims' rights organizations are against it. There is something wrong. Something smells, and it is not Denmark.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. The point I am trying to make is that the existing victims have been compensated, and I am glad they are compensated; but there isn't an organization in place for people who don't know they have the disease.

Mr. COHEN. Sure there isn't, because a group that is unknown, they don't know who they are.

The victims' organizations are concerned about victims in the future. They have suffered. They project into the future. They want to help other people put into their position. They are reaching out in a benevolent manner.

Mr. Vento's widow and her organization and the other organizations are against it. They had no voice. The only voice they have is through Representatives, and they ask the Representatives to vote ''no.''

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I simply would reiterate that the fact of the matter is that when you don't know who future victims are going to be and you make a claim that somehow this is going to enrich businesses when, in fact, the businesses are bankrupt and they paid their money into a fund, that this is in the interest of determining what people who have not yet made claims have and in the interest of justice in making sure that people who have false claims or duplicative claims and are making claims to more than one trust for different claims about the same illness or claims in State court, as well as in the bankruptcy court, need to be uncovered. That is what this seeks to do. If some victims are doing that, that is not a defense to this legislation, to say we shouldn't have transparency in the providing of benefits to people who have truly been harmed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–264.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, beginning on line 5, strike ''if'' and all that follows through ''exposure.'', and insert the following:

if—

(i) the subject of such action concerns liability for asbestos exposure; and

(ii) such party agrees to make available (upon written request) information relevant to such action that pertains to the protection of public health or safety to any other person or to any Federal or State entity that has authority to enforce a law regulating an activity relating to such information.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 403, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

This amendment would ensure that the transparency the bill's supporters demand from the victims of the asbestos industry will also be applied to the corporations that have inflicted so much damage and so much suffering over the years.

The amendment would require that a defendant seeking the information required by the bill must himself provide information about threats to the public safety or health. This information must be provided to any other person or to any Federal or State entity that has the authority to enforce the law regulating activity relating to such information.

This would go a long way to addressing the longstanding efforts by these corporations to conceal the facts surrounding their actions from the public, from their victims, and from government agencies charged with enforcing health and safety laws.

Too often, cases are settled specifically in order to prevent evidence of wrongdoing from becoming public. More importantly, because of the secrecy of these settlements, other people who have been injured have no way of gaining important information about their exposure, their illnesses, or the settled liability of the companies that made them sick.

Information about the concealment of wrongdoing never becomes public, and the people who have suffered have no way of knowing about the wrongdoing that caused their suffering or its extent. Governmental agencies that are charged with protecting the public health, whether in the workplace or the home, are deprived of the information they need to enforce the laws we have enacted.

If the sponsors of this legislation really mean what they say about the need for transparency and accountability, they will support this amendment. There has been too long a record over too many decades of concealment, disassembly, and lawlessness, and too many lives destroyed because of that illegal conduct for us to tolerate the continued coverup. This amendment will go a long way toward remedying that situation and toward correcting the unjust imbalance in the current system.

Without this amendment and the openness and clarity it would provide, this bill would favor only those who inflicted the harm and would give them yet another advantage over the victims. We should stand with the people whose lives have been destroyed, not with the corporations whose illegal and immoral conduct destroyed those lives.

This amendment would prevent a situation where as part of a settlement compensating a victim it is agreed to keep key information relevant to the public health and safety secret so that more people will not be victimized.

When such terms of the settlement are kept secret, other people will not learn that a given product contains asbestos or that a given product leaked asbestos and, therefore, will not know that they potentially were harmed, and government agencies may not learn facts necessary to exercise their responsibility to protect the public.

At the very least, we should be evenhanded and demand of the wrongdoers the same transparency that this bill demands of their victims, a transparency which will enable other victims to understand their remedies and will enable government agencies to better enforce the law. Unless you want to assist tortfeasors and wrongdoers in concealing the effects of their wrongdoing, you should support this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, one of the principal issues discussed over the course of three separate hearings before the Judiciary Committee was the existing impediments to information contained in the asbestos trusts.

In particular, these impediments include obstacles that asbestos trusts institute against the prosecution of valid State court subpoenas for trust information.

The FACT Act addresses these issues by requiring affirmative, minimal disclosures from asbestos trusts and allowing for access to additional information at the cost of the requesting party. The amendment does not address these underlying problems and instead places broad additional burdens on defendants seeking to prosecute discovery requests in State courts. Specifically, it requires defendants potentially to comply with a host of unrelated requests from unknown parties. These defendants include small businesses that played a very minor role, if any, in asbestos manufacturing, but are the last wave of companies in the plaintiffs' firms never-ending search for a solvent defendant.

The burden this amendment imposes on a defendant is highly atypical, unnecessary, and would unduly impair a party's ability to assert a defense. The FACT Act, by contrast, provides transparency where previously it did not and provides defendants with the same access to information as plaintiffs. The legislation merely levels the playing field so all parties, including other asbestos trusts and State court judges, have access to the same information.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

In reply to the gentleman from Virginia, the amendment refers to ''such party agrees to make available information.'' Such party is asbestos trusts, not a small business. So I don't know what he is talking about with small business requirements being imposed by this amendment, and the amendment deals with information that the trust must make available. It does not deal with the underlying burdens that the bill places on victims, which is what the gentleman was referring to. This has nothing to do with small business.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, Mr. NADLER, for your very important amendment.

As has been reported by the Fifth Circuit in the First Appellate opinion upholding the product liability against a manufacturer of asbestos-containing products, the Government Accountability Office reported:

In the course of the first successful personal injury lawsuits against asbestos manufacturers, the plaintiffs' attorney introduced evidence that these manufacturers had known but concealed information about the dangers of asbestos exposure, or that such dangers were reasonably foreseeable. And in the nearly four decades since, litigation over personal injuries resulting from exposure to asbestos has resulted in hundreds of thousands of claims filed and billions of dollars of compensation paid.

I urge support of the Nadler amendment.

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

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

The underlying bill imposes burdens on victims of asbestos poisoning because of an unsubstantiated allegation that the trusts, set up by the tortfeasors, by the giant corporations that caused the problem, may be suffering some fraud, although there is no specific about that.

The amendment simply says that if we are going to request information of the victims, we should request minimally that the representatives of the tortfeasors, the trusts, tell us the information that will prevent further people from being harmed.

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

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

The FACT Act does not impose burdens on the victims of asbestos. It imposes a minimal disclosure requirement upon the trust, a disclosure requirement that will benefit both plaintiffs and defendants in various courts litigating asbestos claims.

Therefore, these new burdens that would be imposed by the defendant, which are substantial and onerous burdens, not the minimal informational disclosure that would help to identify duplicative claims in various courts, is a massive additional burden added to this legislation.

For that reason, I oppose the legislation, oppose the amendment, and urge my colleagues to join me opposing the amendment and supporting the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–264.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 6 on page 4, and insert the following:

''(8)(A) A trust described in paragraph (2) shall, subject to subsection (B) and section 107, provide upon written request and subject to payment (demanded at the option of the trust) for any reasonable cost incurred by the trust to comply with such request, to any party that is a defendant in a pending court action relating to asbestos exposure, information that is directly relates to the plaintiff's claim in such action.

''(B) A defendant requesting information under subparagraph (A) shall first disclose to such plaintiff and such trust, subject to an appropriate protective order—

''(i) the name of each asbestos-containing product mined, manufactured, sold, or purchased by the defendant at any point in time and the name and location of each worksite under such defendant's control at any point in time at which such asbestos was mined or such product was manufactured; and

''(ii) each location at which such product was sold or purchased by such defendant;

except that such information shall not include any information that is a trade secret.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 403, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, we are here today for several reasons, and my friends on the other side of the aisle have their high calling and reasons of great merit that they argue, but I think we have a more devastating and prevailing reason that we are opposed to this legislation.

Frankly, as I indicated earlier in my remarks, there are thousands and thousands of asbestos victims who are suffering from lung disease or cancer. Many of them were diagnosed late. Many of them, unfortunately, have passed. Their families are still victims. They have lost everything that they have had in trying to treat them, and now we add what we are used to saying in the community: insult to injury.

We come with an enormously burdensome and unfair initiative. So today I rise to introduce an amendment that I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider because it is fair.

The amendment would apply the transparency rules that they are seeking from those victims who are barely receiving dollars out of a trust that is the final result of numbers of bankrupt companies. We are asking to equally apply these transparency rules to asbestos industry defendants by requiring asbestos companies to report information about the location of their asbestos-containing products; and the amendment, out of respect for trade secrets, will exempt that.

□ 1545

So today we are asking for transparency on both sides. H.R. 982 is one-sided in that it maintains the rights of asbestos defendants to demand confidentiality of settlements and protects an asbestos defendant's right to continue to hide the dangers of their asbestos products from asbestos victims and the American public. A typical asbestos defendant who settles a case in

the tort system demands the utmost confidentiality along with the right to file for bankruptcy as a condition of the settlement in order to ensure that other victims cannot learn how much they paid or for which asbestos products the defendant is paying compensation.

By no means do we want to help those who are hurting. We certainly don't want to give them a leg up by understanding what the process of compensation is.

These same defendants now, under this particular bill, want the victims to disclose specific settlement amounts with the trusts along with product exposure information and work history. How unfair is that? On my dying bed, I have to offer and find a basis of giving you a settlement, or my family has to give it to you in the midst of our crisis.

The asbestos health crisis is the result of a massive cover-up; therefore, we are asking today for simple fairness. If there is confidentiality on the defendant's part and they ask for information on those who are suffering, then I believe, minimally, defendants can give information about the location of the asbestos-containing products to ensure that our victims are not exposed any longer.

Furthermore, the trust information is already public, and I would ask why this bill is even necessary. And then the further point of controversy is that this bill seeks to override State law regarding discovery disclosure of information.

So I am asking my colleagues to be fair, to recognize the hurt and the pain, and to support the Jackson Lee amendment, which simply asks for those defendants, those companies, to give us the location of the asbestos-containing products.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jackson Lee amendment which would require the Asbestos Industry to Report Information about Dangerous Asbestos Products.

WHAT DOES THE AMENDMENT DO?

The Amendment would apply the transparency rules in the bill equally to asbestos industry defendants by requiring asbestos companies to report information about the location of their asbestos-containing products. And the amendment includes a "trade secrets" exception.

WHY SUPPORT THE AMENDMENT?

H.R. 982 is one-sided in that it maintains the rights of asbestos defendants to demand confidentiality of settlements and protects an asbestos defendant's right to continue to hide the dangers of their asbestos products from asbestos victims and the American public. A typical asbestos defendant who settles a case in the tort system demands confidentiality as a condition of settlement in order to ensure that other victims cannot learn how much they paid or for which asbestos products the defendant is paying compensation. These same defendants now want the victims to disclose specific settlement amounts with the trusts, along with product exposure information and work history, that they do not themselves provide nor would have provided before the trusts were created. If transparency were the true goal of this bill, then why doesn't the bill require settling defendants to reveal information important to public safety and health?

The asbestos health crisis is the result of a massive corporate cover-up. For decades, asbestos companies knew about the dangers of asbestos and failed to warn or adequately protect workers and their families. "The 1966 comments of the Director of Purchasing for Bendix Corporation, now a part of Honeywell, capture the complete disregard of an industry for its workforce that is expressed over and over again in company documents spanning the past 60 years. '. . . if you have enjoyed a good life while working with asbestos products, why not die from it?' "

Now, the same industry responsible for causing this crisis is asking Congress to protect them from liability. If such a bill is going to pass the U.S. House, the bill should at least force asbestos defendants to reveal information about their asbestos products, where they are in use, and how many Americans continue to be exposed to those products.

Trust information is already public. Trusts already disclose far more information than solvent defendants do about their settlement practices and amounts—the settlement criteria used by a trust and the offer the trust will make if the criteria are met are publicly available in the Trust Distribution Procedures ("TDP") for that trust. Trusts also file annual reports with the Bankruptcy courts and publish lists of the products for which they have assumed responsibility. If asbestos victims are going to be forced to reveal private medical and work history information in a public forum, to the very industry that caused their harm, asbestos defendants should at least be required to reveal which of their products contain asbestos and how many people are being exposed.

The bill seeks to override state law regarding discovery/disclosure of information. State discovery rules currently govern disclosure of a trust claimant's work and exposure history. If such information is relevant to a state law claim, a defendant can seek and get that information according to the rules of a state court.

What a defendant cannot do, and what this bill would allow, is for a defendant to engage in fishing expeditions for irrelevant information which has no use other than to delay a claim for as long as possible. Thus, the bill must be amended to only apply to defendants willing to reveal important information about their asbestos-containing products.

Lastly, let me add that the asbestos defendants would not be required to disclose trade secrets under the amendment. The asbestos defendants would only be required to disclose information about which of their products contain asbestos, where they are in use, and how many people are being exposed. The amendment would not force asbestos defendants to reveal industry trade secrets or place them at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace. Instead, this amendment ensures transparency from both the asbestos victims and asbestos defendants since transparency is the stated goal of the bill.

I urge my colleagues to Support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the FACT Act addresses a number of issues, including State court litigants' inability to obtain information from federally-supervised asbestos trusts and the general lack of disclosure that is allowing fraud to be committed against these trusts. The FACT Act addresses these problems by introducing transparency into the asbestos bankruptcy trust system.

The amendment dramatically undercuts the transparency provided under the bill by completely eliminating the quarterly reporting requirements. This removes an important and efficient disclosure component provided by the FACT Act and would eliminate sister asbestos trusts' access to information that is critical for the defense against fraudulent claims. Additionally, the amendment would place disclosure requirements on the State court party requesting information from the asbestos trusts. These disclosure requirements are unnecessary, unusual, and would severely constrain a party's availability to defend itself in State court litigation.

Plaintiffs and plaintiffs' firms already have the ability to gain access to the defendant's information through the traditional discovery process; however, it is the defendant's inability to gain access to information submitted to the asbestos trusts that has created an environment that is conducive to fraud. The FACT Act merely levels the playing field so all parties, including other asbestos trusts, State court litigants, and State court judges have access to this information and the same information.

I would point out that, when one brings a lawsuit seeking damages from another entity that they make a party to that lawsuit, they are not entitled to anonymity in doing so. The purpose of the complaint, the initial pleading filed in the lawsuit, is to disclose who it is that is seeking the damages and what damages they are seeking.

All we are asking for in this legislation is that trusts that have been entrusted with funds that are to be made available for the exclusive purpose of helping the victims of asbestos problems have the opportunity to have information that they would have if it were a normal plaintiff's filing in a lawsuit. That is what we seek to have disclosed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to support the underlying bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And the gentleman from Virginia?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from

the great State of Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to commend the creative inquiry of the gentlelady from Texas in examining this measure to make it clear to us, through her amendment, that this places disclosure burdens on trusts and asbestos victims but not on the corporations, and that is what she seeks to deal with. So this bill helps this be accomplished. And what is so critical about it is that we now have a more balanced approach than is currently in the bill. So please support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his important remarks.

Mr. Chairman, let me quickly say, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. Ranking Member, you were superbly right. The plaintiffs in litigation have had their right of exchange of information. What our friends are trying to do on the other side of the aisle is to make the trusts, now, a courtroom where information is dragged out of the victim, but it is not asked for from the defendants, the ones who have filed for bankruptcy, the ones who have left the victims to suffer and to fend for themselves.

I ask my colleagues to make this fair and require the asbestos company to give us where the asbestos-remaining products are so that we can save lives. If there is transparency, if the FACT bill would be fair, they would then have information coming from both parties, not only the victims, the plaintiffs, but they would have it coming from the asbestos companies that have driven up the numbers of those suffering from lung disease and cancer.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

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

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, DC, November 12, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to express the strong opposition of the AFL–CIO to H.R. 982, the ''Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act'' (FACT Act). This legislation would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by posting personal exposure and medical information online and create new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases. The AFL–CIO urges you to oppose this harmful bill.

Decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos, even after its hazards were known, have resulted in a legacy of disease and death. Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have suffered or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease, and the toll continues. Each year an estimated 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos related diseases.

Asbestos victims have faced huge barriers and obstacles to receiving compensation for their diseases. Major asbestos producers refused to accept responsibility and most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability. In 1994 Congress passed special legislation that allowed the asbestos companies to set up bankruptcy trusts to compensate asbestos victims and reorganize under the bankruptcy law. But these trusts don't have adequate funding to provide just compensation, and according to a 2010 RAND study, the median payment across the trusts is only 25 percent of the claim's value. With compensation from these trusts so limited, asbestos victims have sought redress from the manufacturers of other asbestos products to which they were exposed.

The AFL–CIO is well aware that the system for compensating asbestos disease victims has had its share of problems, with victims facing delays and inadequate compensation and too much money being spent on defendant and plaintiff lawyers. We have spent years of effort trying to seek solutions to make the asbestos compensation system fairer and more effective. But H.R. 982 does nothing to improve compensation for asbestos victims and would in fact make the situation even worse. In our view, the bill is simply an effort by asbestos manufacturers who still are subject to asbestos lawsuits to avoid liability for diseases caused by exposure to their products.

H.R. 982 would require personally identifiable exposure histories and disease information for each asbestos victim filing a claim with an asbestos trust, and related payment information, to be posted on a public docket. This public posting is an extreme invasion of privacy. It would give unfettered access to employers, insurance companies, workers compensation carriers and others who could use this information for any purpose including blacklisting workers from employment and fighting compensation claims.

The bill would also require asbestos trusts to provide on demand to asbestos defendants and litigants any information related to payments made by and claims filed with the trusts. This would place unnecessary and added burdens on the trusts, delaying much-needed compensation for asbestos victims. Such a provision allows asbestos defendants to bypass the established rules of discovery in the civil justice system, and provides broad, unrestricted access to personal information with no limitations on its use.

Congress should be helping the hundreds of thousands of individuals who are suffering from disabling and deadly asbestos diseases, not further victimizing them by invading their privacy and subjecting them to potential blacklisting and discrimination. The AFL–CIO strongly urges you to oppose H.R. 982.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director,
Government Affairs Department.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time in opposition to the amendment.

I just have to say that this amendment goes well beyond the scope of this legislation in terms of what it would do in terms of discovery in State courts and gathering various types of information that is already readily and easily discoverable in those proceedings, including, if necessary, in the bankruptcy court.

What it doesn't get at, and the FACT Act does, is information that is not otherwise available to all of the parties to all of those proceedings to determine whether there are duplicative claims, whether there are fraudulent claims, whether there are claims where one party is claiming to have the same disease caused by two different places of employment or having claimed the same disease caused by two different instrumentalities in two different places. That is what we need to know. That is why the FACT Act is necessary.

I oppose the amendment, urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1617

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI) at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY (FACT) ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 403 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 982.

Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1618

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information

regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–264 by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–264 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 223, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

AYES—198

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

NOES—223

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

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Culberson
Herrera Beutler
Jones
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Wenstrup
Young (AK)

□ 1646

Messrs. BENISHEK, BENTIVOLIO, REED, LUCAS, DeSANTIS, PETRI, HASTINGS of Washington, and SMITH of Nebraska changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PETERSON, PETERS of California, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Messrs. GARAMENDI, GRIJALVA, and McDERMOTT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 226, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

AYES—194

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei

Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—226

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

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Culberson
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Jones
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Wenstrup
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1653

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 226, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—195

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

NOES—226

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

Wolf	Woodall	Yoho
Womack	Yoder	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell	Jones	Rush
Culberson	Matsui	Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Young (AK)

□ 1658

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 403, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OWENS. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Owens moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 982) to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Redesignate section 3 as section 4.

Insert after section 2 the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING THE PRIVACY OF U.S. SERVICE MEMBERS AND VETERANS AND ENSURING CLAIMS ARE PAID BEFORE DEATH.

Paragraph (8) of section 524(g) of title 11 of the United States Code, as added by section 2, shall not apply with respect to a claimant who is or has been a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This motion to recommit very simply exempts veterans and Active Duty servicemembers from the reporting requirements of the underlying bill.

We celebrated Veterans Day 2 days ago with much thanks and praise. Now we propose to punish those very same folks whom we praised. Under the guise of transparency, H.R. 982 requires quarterly reports of claims and payouts made against asbestos trust funds, which provide remedies to victims of asbestos exposure while allowing companies to continue to operate. A strict set of fraud prevention steps already exists when seeking an asbestos claim. In fact, a 2011 GAO report did not find any evidence of overt fraud during its examination of asbestos trusts.

Mr. Speaker, 30 percent of asbestos victims are veterans. Let me repeat that: 30 percent of asbestos victims are veterans. The reporting requirement created by this bill will delay claims payments to these men and women who have served their country and are now suffering from deadly diseases, including lung cancer and mesothelioma, because of asbestos exposure. Victims of mesothelioma typically only live 4 to 18 months after diagnosis. This final amendment will ensure we do not unnecessarily delay a claim to a veteran with just months to live.

In addition to the delayed payment of claims, the personal information required to be submitted in these quarterly reports poses a serious threat to privacy by forcing asbestos trust funds to reveal, on a public database, personally identifiable information about asbestos victims and their families. Why would we subject a gravely ill veteran battling a disease like cancer to the additional risk of identity theft?

This motion to recommit very simply exempts veterans and Active Duty servicemembers from the onerous and invasive reporting requirements of the underlying bill. These heroes have sacrificed for our Nation. Join me in protecting their privacy and ensuring their asbestos claims are paid before death.

We will punish those whom we praise, and that is simply unacceptable. I urge support for this final amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the FACT Act is a simple measure to address an obvious problem. The lack of transparency that exists in the asbestos bankruptcy trust system cannot be allowed to continue. Fraudulent claims are diluting the ability of too many trusts to provide for the recoveries of future asbestos victims, including our Nation's veterans, who must often rely solely on the bankruptcy process to obtain a recovery for their asbestos injury.

The FACT Act will help preserve the finite amount of trust resources available for all future victims by increasing transparency in the asbestos bankruptcy trust system, thereby facilitating a reduction in fraud. The FACT Act achieves transparency through a measured approach, carefully crafted to provide strong privacy protections and respect states' rights, and strong privacy protections for veterans and all other victims.

This will not delay compensation to asbestos victims but will ensure that the true victims, including victims who will be identified in the future as suffering from asbestos injuries, are not kept from having compensation. These trusts are being used up as a result of fraudulent claims. The asbestos bankruptcy trusts need additional transparency so they can root out fraud and protect recoveries for future asbestos victims. The FACT Act provides this vital sunshine in a simple, efficient manner. It is a 2-page bill.

I commend my colleagues, Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas and Mr. MATHESON of Utah, for bringing forward this bipartisan legal reform. I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to recommit and to support the FACT Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 224, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

YEAS—197

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

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

NAYS—224

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

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Culberson
Franks (AZ)
Herrera Beutler
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Rush
Wenstrup
Young (AK)

□ 1716

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—221

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

NOES—199

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

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Jones	Wenstrup
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	Peterson	
Herrera Beutler	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1726

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

SUPPORTING THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 196) supporting the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the right to counsel, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

PASS THE KEEP YOUR HEALTH PLAN ACT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Midge, one of the women I represent from Alexander County, wrote me to say:

> I am one of the many . . . policy holders whose policy was canceled due to ObamaCare mandates.
>
> My policy was great, affordable, and I liked it. The most similar policy Blue Cross can put me on has higher deductibles, higher co-insurance, and coverage that I don't need.

For this new coverage, Midge and her husband are going to have to pay 81 percent more. Midge closed off her letter to me with this simple request:

> Please do all you can to help us be able to keep the plan we like as we were promised by our President.

Letters like Midge's are pouring in from across the country to Democrats and Republicans alike. That is because promises aren't partisan issues, and promises matter to the American people.

Let's require the President to keep this central ObamaCare promise by passing the Keep Your Health Plan Act.

RECOGNIZING THE SPIRIT OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the spirit of the American farmer.

A 31-year-old farmer from Hammond, Illinois, tragically succumbed to cancer in September of this year. Kyle Hendrix was an avid golfer, farmer, and family man who left behind a wife and two young children.

His untimely passing brought out the best in his rural Piatt County community. In the middle of the harvest season, his friends and family organized a tribute of over 60 tractors and other pieces of farming equipment that lined up along Bement Road to honor Kyle's life. And all of the equipment, worth millions of dollars, had the keys left in the ignition overnight without a single worry.

Thanks to the photographer, Matt Rubel, who captured the moment, the story has now gone viral. Matt said:

> It seems to me that farming communities all over the country may still hold the key to what makes this country a shining beacon in a world of trouble.

Matt, I agree. This rural community story is a tribute to rural American values.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Kyle's family and friends, and may God grant him favor.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all of our difficult debates that are occurring in this body and throughout Washington, whether it is about the right type of health care reform or how to stop the ever-expanding Federal debt which threatens both our economic as well as national security, and as important as these debates are, it should not be lost on us, though, that there is a grave struggle for the protection of a fundamental proposition of human dignity and a basis for civilization itself. This is the protection of the rights of conscience and religious freedom.

Even in the midst of all of our other debates, many Americans are concerned about the heart-wrenching stories of individuals who have been detained, condemned, incarcerated, often tortured, sometimes for years, throughout the world, even under the sentence of death for some, simply for the peaceful exercise of their religious rights.

Mr. Speaker, given the scale of human suffering endured and extensively documented in this past century alone, it is often difficult to grasp that humanity, in the 21st century, with all of its technological advances at our disposal, has not yet learned some very basic lessons.

These lessons of the 20th century, after two horrific world wars and other unspeakable human tragedies, including the Holocaust and the slaughter of tens of millions of persons under the repressive and cruel Communist regimes, should not be lost. They are indispensable in pressing forward toward a more hopeful future, one based upon the unchanging principles that underlie a free and noble society.

One of these basic lessons is that religious freedom is a foundation for social stability, security, civility, as well as economic prosperity, because it is built upon a foundation of respect for human dignity. Mr. Speaker, this is why we should, this body and the administration, we should all redouble our efforts to ensure that that first principle of religious liberty is integrated as a critical element of American foreign policy generally, and is prioritized in the day-to-day work of the diplomacy of this country.

With our position of Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom now being vacant, we should act quickly to quell any potential sense of ambiguity about where the United States stands on this important issue.

Let me first make an important distinction, Mr. Speaker: Religious freedom is not the same as freedom to worship, which is a much more restrictive concept and should not be confused. We are not merely concerned about allowing people to worship, think freely in their own minds or in their own home or in their own church, but about championing the free exercise of religion, grounded in human dignity, in its fullness, robustly, in the public square, as is guaranteed by our own Constitution in the First Amendment.

Religious freedom, the cornerstone of our civil society, is something that we can actually still take for granted, though, in the United States; although, this freedom has been eroding here in recent years. It is a painful irony that our own Department of Health and Human Services is mired in litigation over challenges to fundamental laws and basic standards of religious freedom in health care policy. Even here, this right is fragile.

So think of the many people throughout the world, in countries where the precepts of religious liberty are routinely and often egregiously violated

by the state, persons who must witness or endure cruel abuses for exercising this right of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, the prominent case of Pastor Saeed Abedini in Iran is a good example. He is an American citizen who is currently under house arrest in Iran for his Christian faith, and it is one of the more urgent cases worldwide. He and his family need our thoughts and prayers now. And we have been given the recent news that he has been moved to a notorious prison, reportedly confined in a small cell with hardened and ruthless criminals, with no access to sanitation or desperately needed medication.

In the United States, thankfully, we are starting to see a groundswell of concern over such barbaric treatment of Pastor Saeed. And, ironically, this again is so close to the anniversary of the storming of the United States Embassy in Tehran in 1979.

We are not alone in our appeal to something higher. Together with many good people of faith throughout world, or people who have no faith throughout the world, many are calling for his immediate release and safe return to his family. But, unfortunately, this is not an isolated case.

Beyond our intuitive understanding of right and wrong, we must also say that religious freedom is not simply a matter of exercise of a principle of justice. We know that it is inextricably linked to security and stability.

According to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, those nations that work to respect human dignity tend to perform more strongly on a broad scale of metrics than command and control societies, where freedoms are restricted and economic prosperity can seem unattainable, especially for those individuals who are marginalized and subjected to wrongful religious discrimination. The metrics in countries where religious freedom abounds are so much stronger in multiple areas of well-being versus in controlled societies where religious freedom is oppressed. Religious liberty is a principle tied to both security and stability in civil society itself.

Areas of the Middle East, for example, where religious minorities have traditionally served as a leavening influence for all peoples, they are now under severe distress. Can civil society really have a chance under such conditions as minority faith groups flee from persecution in their ancient homelands?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the United States has been one of the world's greatest champions of religious freedom, and we cannot afford to backslide or be seen as ambivalent in this regard, especially at this fragile time of our history, when social upheavals and economic dislocations demand principled leadership from this Congress and the President.

Pursuant to the International Religious Freedom Act passed by Congress in 1998 and signed into law by President Clinton, the State Department is required to provide a detailed annual report on the status of religious freedom throughout the world. The current report, which covers last year, provides a robust overview of recent trends and concerns. It also leaves us with the enormous challenge of confronting serious and escalating levels of abuse, particularly in environments where impunity reigns and powerful forces align to intimidate and brutalize vulnerable faith communities. Not only have affronts to religious freedom over the past year been widespread, but sadly, Mr. Speaker, they are escalating.

Before I review some of the key concerns highlighted during this past year, let me take a moment to recall a courageous official in the country of Pakistan who made a profound impression upon me a number of years ago when I went to Islamabad, along with the House Democracy Partnership, which is an effort of this United States Congress to partner with emerging democracies to help in any way, share technical expertise as to how to properly run a legislature or a parliament.

While in Pakistan, I had some time with the Interior Minister, whose name was Mr. Shahbaz Bhatti. Mr. Bhatti was a man of great humility, great decency, great courage. I worried for a time, Mr. Speaker, because where we met was out in the open in a public setting, and him being seen as proximate to a United States official, I just wondered if this might be problematic for him, given the stress between our two countries.

Our conversation turned to some basic requests. He wanted to create student exchange opportunities for individuals representing Pakistan's minority faith communities. He proposed establishing a three-judge panel for blasphemy trials, which, as is commonly reported, are sometimes used for persecuting minorities or the settling of personal grievances. These were neither grandiose nor unreasonable propositions.

Mr. Speaker, as we continued our conversation, again, although brief, this man of deep faith—he was a Catholic—impressed me significantly. He not only showed great humility, he showed a great desire, in his public commitment and witness, to protecting the rights of all religious minorities, even beyond his own faith tradition.

About a year later, I was getting ready to give a speech to a group of Nebraskans who had gathered for the Nebraska Breakfast, which we hold many times throughout the year here. Any Nebraskan who is in town is welcome to meet with the entire delegation. It is an important 70-year tradition that we have enjoyed in our State.

So, as I was gathering my thoughts, a message came to me that Mr. Shahbaz Bhatti had been murdered, had been executed, had been martyred in Pakistan simply for exercising the legitimate authority of standing up for the minority faith communities in that country.

□ 1745

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, my face must have been ashen as I was preparing to speak to the community where I come from. I told them about Shahbaz Bhatti. I changed what I was going to say and added a few lines as best I could about, again, his courage, his decency, and how in our few moments together, he had deeply impacted me.

Mr. Speaker, over the past year, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has identified several countries that ''have engaged in or tolerated particularly severe violations of religious freedom.'' This is their report, Mr. Speaker. If you look closely, you can see a photo, a picture, a placard held by people who were probably in attendance at Shahbaz Bhatti's funeral. It has his picture on it.

These violations, documented by the Commission, include ''systematic, ongoing, and egregious'' examples of torture, prolonged arbitrary detention, or ''other flagrant denials of the right to life, liberty, or the security of persons.'' These tier one countries, as they are called, which the Commission has urged the Secretary of State to designate as countries of particular concern, include Burma, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Uzbekistan, and China. Try going a week without buying something that wasn't made in China. Moreover, the Commission also identified other countries who are ''on the threshold'' of such status. These included Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, there is a large minority community where I live in Lincoln, Nebraska, made up of persons who come from the country of Iraq, who fled that country due to persecution. They have made their home where I have made my home, and they contribute greatly to the well-being of our society.

There is one minority faith group there in Lincoln, an ancient religious tradition called the Yazidis. One of the elders of that community came to see me one day because the Yazidis have traditionally lived very quietly in Iraq. They have not created the conditions on which they should in any way be targeted by anyone else, but the community had come under great distress and was also under persecution and attack. One of the elders of the Yazidi community said this to me: ''Congressman, we protected the Christians. Now we ask the Christians to protect us.''

To emphasize the deep and abiding concerns over religious violence, the Commission has also launched the Religious Violence Project, which has recently focused its efforts on both Nigeria as well as Pakistan, where targeted religious violence has torn at social foundations and created an atmosphere of widespread fear and intimidation. Over the past year in Nigeria, for example, where the Islamic militant

movement called Boko Haram is considered the ''primary perpetrator of religiously related violence and gross religious freedom violations,'' there have been 50 churches attacked, killing some 366 people. Thirty-one attacks have been documented on Christians, killing 166 people. Among the other violence, 23 attacks on Islamic clerics or senior figures critical of that group have killed some 60 people.

Over 18 months going back from July of 2013, the Religious Violence Project tracked some 203 incidents of sectarian violence that resulted in more than 700 deaths and attacks by militants and terrorist organizations in Pakistan, primarily against their Shia community. Attacks on other minority populations in Pakistan included the Christians, Ahmadis, Hindus, Sikhs, and other groups that were subjected to targeted bombings, shootings, and rapes.

Mr. Speaker, the trend toward the type of violence that has been documented by the Commission in recent years is profoundly disturbing and should be addressed in a thoroughgoing manner by member countries at the United Nations and at all appropriate venues of international engagement, in a credible and reliable manner. Interestingly, Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times just reported that yesterday, several of the 14 new States elected by secret ballot to the United Nations Human Rights Council are widely considered by human rights advocates as violators of personal freedoms. The new countries elected to the Human Rights Council are Russia, China, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, and Vietnam. Again, they are considered by human rights advocates to be violators of personal freedoms.

In view of this development, it concerns me that our own administration has downgraded the status of the State Department's Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom. This is an important position, Mr. Speaker. It is a reflection of who we are as a Nation. Also, the position of the special envoy to monitor and combat anti-Semitism remains unfulfilled in our government as well. I would like to see us elevate the principle of religious freedom as a core measure of civil society and diplomatic intent, institutionalizing this as a priority with the Department of State and building upon the very commendable work of our last Ambassador, who is now gone, Ambassador Suzan Johnson Cook.

The time to do this is now. Otherwise, we risk sending a very dangerous signal that, again, really doesn't fit who we are as a Nation. We must care about this fundamental principle of the rights of conscience and religious liberty. We cannot afford to convey a message that religious freedom really doesn't matter all that much to us while so many lives throughout the world hang in the balance, while so many people still look to us for the ideals which bring about civil society in its fullness, where we respect one another's differences, work them out through comity, work them out through legislative debate and not at the point of a sword or at the end of a gun.

Mr. Speaker, the world is screaming for meaning. Religious liberty is a cornerstone of human dignity and a foundation for civil society itself. We don't think about it very often, but it is true here. We don't think about the fact that we could enter our church or synagogue or mosque each Sunday, Friday, Wednesday freely, for the most part, without threat of fear of intimidation, without the government listening to us, without persons seeking to do us harm.

People can preach and teach as they see fit within the civil society to try to reflect their deeply held faith traditions out of respect to not only those who follow them but those whom they wish to convince or tell their story to. This is a great tradition in America. We have our differences, but we respect those. We actually honor that right, the right of conscience to speak freely and the right of religious liberty in the public square.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be interesting to point out that it is the image of Moses who looks down upon me right now as I am speaking, who looks upon this body as we deliberate, one of the great lawgivers of all time who actually also happened to be a great religious leader of all time.

Our country is replete with the strong condition for the exercise of religious liberty both at home, within our churches, and in the public square. This is one of the reasons that people are so attracted to America, because it is a principle consistent with human dignity. It appeals to the hearts of all persons to be able to exercise freely who they are and what they would like to believe with respect to others.

This is a great tradition that we have institutionalized in law and have tried to project through our diplomacy. That is why it is so important that we actually fill this open Ambassador's position and we do so now, and we elevate the ideals of religious liberty and the rights of conscience as a core part of our diplomatic outreach in order to give people hope, a hope that they are yearning for, a hope that they need, and a hope to give balance and equality in the 21st century to a world that is very unsure as to where it is going next.

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

SANCTIONING IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity and the privilege to be able to be here in the well of the greatest deliberative body on Earth, the United States House of Representatives, to talk about what I believe is one of the most crucial issues facing the national security not only of the United States but for freedom-seeking people all across the world.

You know, I had a tremendous privilege. This last week, seven Members of Congress—Democrat, Republican, and myself—were privileged to be on a trip that was life-changing in many ways. We had the privilege of going to Israel. We met with leaders of Israel. We met with the people of Israel, and we talked about issues of national security.

Israel is a Nation that has been literally under attack since the time of its founding of the modern Jewish State in May of 1948. Very wisely, the United States President at the time—a Democrat, Harry Truman—gave Israel what she needed more than anything else: to be able to show the world that she could be an independent, sovereign power. It was this: President Harry Truman recognized Israel as a sovereign, independent nation. That told the world that the United States of America would have Israel's back because we recognized her right to exist, unlike Israel's current neighbors—many of whom, particularly in Hamas and the Palestinian Authority—to this day continue to deny Israel's right to exist and Israel's right to defend herself. As is often said, Israel lives in a very tough neighborhood. We had the privilege to find out more about the concerns and the issues that face our greatest ally in the world that we have, and that is the Jewish State of Israel.

While we were there, Mr. Speaker, our delegation was able to quite literally witness world history as it happened. Secretary of State John Kerry decided to add Jerusalem to his itinerary in addition to Cairo. He went to Jerusalem because he was in the process of speaking about the Palestinian-Israeli talks for a so-called two-State solution, but something even more important that week was at stake, and it was this: a meeting in Geneva, Switzerland. It was a meeting of the nations that talked about whether or not the economic sanctions that have worked so well to prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons—the question was, Will those sanctions now be lifted?

As we went through the course of our time in Israel last Thursday, we were about to have our scheduled meeting with Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. The meeting had been rearranged, and rightly so; because Secretary of State Kerry was in town, the prime minister adjusted his schedule. We, Members of Congress, adjusted our schedule so that the Prime Minister could meet with Secretary Kerry according to his timetable. That was the right thing to do.

When we filed into the office that we usually meet the Prime Minister in late Thursday afternoon, it was very

evident when we sat down that something was clearly amiss. The first remark from the Prime Minister was, had we heard the news? We looked at each other, we looked at the Prime Minister, and we said, What news would that be? We had been in meetings all day long. We had no idea what he was talking about. Just prior to our meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu, he had been briefed on the events in Geneva, Switzerland. Israel was not there. They were not present at the P5+1 meetings.

The news wasn't good. It wasn't good at all. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister said to us, Iran is getting the deal of the century. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had the attention of the seven Members of Congress—Democrat and Republican—sitting around that table.

He went on to say some very firm words. This is a poster that was created by Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois. He said this to us: This is a very, very—and he said it a third time—very bad deal. It is not only a bad deal for Israel because, as he told us, you know, we are only the little Satan, according to Iran. You, the United States, are the big Satan in Iran's eyes. In other words, if you think this is bad for us in Israel, imagine what this will be for the United States.

□ 1800

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus just a little bit on the chart that Senator KIRK put together because I think it talks and speaks very eloquently of why the P5+1 deal was very, very bad and why the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, was rightly concerned about not only the national security of the Jewish State of Israel, but the national security interests of the people of the United States and of freedom-loving people around the world.

Let's look at this very important document that was put together by Senator KIRK. Iran's deal of the century: what is it that Iran would get?

What is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, is what Iran would get in this deal. They would get, in cash, $3 billion. As a matter of fact, some of the literature that I have read since Thursday when we were with the Prime Minister has said that upwards of $50 billion would be freed and available to Iran; but, at minimum, they would have access to $3 billion in cash.

Remember, this is an actor, the state of Iran, which was found illegally creating nuclear material for their stated purpose of creating a nuclear weapon to use to wipe out not only Israel, but the United States of America off the face of the map.

If there is anything that history has taught us, Mr. Speaker, it is this: it is that when a madman speaks, freedom-loving nations should listen.

The leader in Iran is called the supreme leader. He is not called that for no reason. It isn't the president of the country who is truly the throne in Iran. It is the religious leader named Khomeini. The presidents come and go, but Khomeini, the supreme leader, remains the same.

His announced intentions are completely clear. Iran seeks to be the hegemon. In other words, Iran seeks to be the dominant power in not only the Middle East region, but they also have evidence of dabbling in the far East in China, in the Philippines, and in South America. They intend to have their fingers in places all over the world because they intend to dominate. They intend to dominate with the shia religion. They intend to dominate through the use of nuclear weaponry through the most vile form of violence that there is in the world in order to achieve their objectives.

So, again, let's look at what Iran would have gotten had the nation of France not intervened and put a stop to this disastrous effort and agreement that would have had the potential of changing the course of human history.

Again, here is what Iran would get. They would get $3 billion in cash, at minimum. Some report upwards of $50 billion in cash. They would get $9.6 billion in gold reserves for the Iran regime; over $5 billion in petrochemicals for the nation; $1.3 billion in automobiles. Iran is heavily engaged in the production of automobiles and this would have given them that revenue. Also, enriched uranium for one bomb.

Why in world would P5+1, the nations that met in Geneva, Switzerland, allow Iran to have enriched uranium for one bomb, when they have already stated their intention if they have that bomb?

We also know that Iran has plans to be involved in having intercontinental ballistic missiles. In other words, they not only want a bomb, Mr. Speaker, but they want a delivery system. And they need a delivery system that goes just so far to be able to get to Israel, but they seek a delivery system, Mr. Speaker, that could take their bombs to United States targets as well. United States targets here in the homeland, but United States targets as well overseas.

And it just doesn't end with Iran, Mr. Speaker. If Iran gains a nuclear weapon, what the world must know is that the weapon will not simply remain within the boundaries and in the hands of a nuclear Iran. Oh, that it would be, that would be bad enough.

What we do know is that Saudi Arabia has already had to make plans to defend herself. She already has a preorder into a nuclear Pakistan, foreign order for a nuclear weapon, because Saudi Arabia knows they will be a target from a nuclear Iran if Iran obtains that weapon. So, therefore, we will see another nation—Saudi Arabia—that will have to have a nuclear weapon.

But it won't stop with Saudi Arabia, Mr. Speaker. We know that each will be seeking a nuclear weapon.

Let's not forget that prior to July 4, 2013, the violent terrorist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood was the legitimate government of the state of Egypt. Imagine the violent terrorist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood with a nuclear weapon. Also, imagine Turkey with a nuclear weapon.

Imagine then that we are no longer talking nation-states. What we could be talking about very well with Iran having a nuclear weapon would be some of its umbrella protectorates, i.e., Hezbollah. The terrorist organization primarily located in Lebanon, just north of Israel's border, also would, in all likelihood, have access to a nuclear weapon or have one located on Israel's northern border.

Syria could also have a nuclear weapon; and from there we could be talking about, Mr. Speaker, al Qaeda having a nuclear weapon, with miniaturization. Perhaps the al-Nusra Front, perhaps Boko Haram or any of the other myriad terrorist organizations that there are around the world.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the entire paradigm of the world's structure could change quite literally. And for what? What is it that we would have gotten out of this very bad deal that the United States was about to enter into? It makes no sense.

We would have gotten zero centrifuges dismantled.

What is a centrifuge? That is what is used by Iran to enrich uranium; the fissile material that is required to create a nuclear bomb. We would have gotten zero dismantled. Iran would have continued to maintain control and ownership of their centrifuges. Let's face it and let's not kid ourselves: if those centrifuges would have continued to run and spun enriched uranium, we would have gotten zero ounces of uranium shipped out of Iran.

That is the whole ball game, Mr. Speaker.

The estimate today, as we stand here, is that Iran already has enriched uranium to the tune of 9 to 10 tons—well over the amount needed to have a nuclear bomb.

You see, that must be the first condition, not the last and not one that is off the table. That is the first condition to lift any sanction. We must first make sure that all of the enriched uranium leaves the nation of Iran because, again, we know their stated intention. That must go.

We also get out of this deal zero facilities closed. We know there are multiple facilities against and in violation of U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution. Iran has continued to be one of the biggest violators of U.N. resolutions that there is in the world today. One nuclear facility after another, including a plutonium facility, a heavy-water reactor in Iraq—that doesn't have to close.

Why would we do this? Why would we allow them to continue the means of production for nuclear weapons when we get nothing in return? They get $3 billion. Some say $50 billion. We get nothing in return. Are we mad?

Thank God for the French. Thank God for the French foreign minister, who said this was a sucker's deal. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said this is a very, very bad deal and said it is the deal of the century. Why would we continue to reward bad behavior and a bad actor? Why would we allow no delay on the plutonium reactor? Why would there be no stop in missile testing?

Let's face it, what do they want the missiles for? Who is attacking Iran right now? And yet we would allow them to continue to test missiles and the delivery system for a nuclear weapon?

No stop in terrorism. Who is the exporter of terrorism? It is Iran. Who exports terrorism to Lebanon? It is Iran, through Hezbollah. Who exports terrorism in Syria, where Bashar al-Assad has killed over 100,000 of his people? It is Iran. Imagine Iran with a nuclear weapon and the terror that would be exported once they have that nuclear weapon and no stop in the human rights abuses.

All of this they get. They get a plutonium reactor, 3,000 new centrifuges, the enriched uranium for a bomb.

While we were over in Israel this last week, we had heard from the Prime Minister that there are well over 18,000 centrifuges running today. The first level of purity that is reached in uranium is 3.5 percent. The second level that is reached is 20 percent. From there it is a hop and a skip literally only weeks to get to 90 percent purity, which is what is required for a nuclear bomb. We are virtually sitting on the edge of a nuclear Iran, with no wiggle room left.

Finally, we are beginning to see the beginning of the economic sanctions coming to work, just when they are coming to bear, just when Iran is about to buckle at the knee, come to the table, and actually agree to something over here on this side of the scorecard. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is a big goose egg on this side of the scorecard—what the freedom-loving people of the world seek, what the American people seek, what the Jewish people of the State of Israel seek. We get zero on this scorecard while the Iranian nuclear program is allowed to continue at pace, moving forward toward the ultimate goal of the nuclear weapon and the means of delivery. And all the while working on miniaturization so that the nuclear warhead can deliver its deadly, lethal target to the most vulnerable people in the world.

And wouldn't it be horrible and wouldn't it be sick if a city here in the United States would be a recipient of one of those nuclear warheads? Why? Because in the midst of foolishness, the P5+1 thought it would be a good idea to let the Iranians continue their nuclear program.

May it never be.

There was an article that was just published. It was published by someone that I have great admiration for in The Wall Street Journal—a very smart guy by the name of Bret Stephens. Bret had a column that came out. He talked about, again, this last weekend and the fact that the world dodged a bullet, just barely—not because of the Obama administration's efforts, I am sorry to say, and not because of the efforts of the United Kingdom, I am sorry to say, but because of the French. And we have them to thank.

> The talks unexpectedly fell apart at the last minute when the French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius publicly objected to what he called a sucker's deal, meaning the United States was prepared to begin lifting sanctions on Iran in exchange for tentative Iranian promises that they would slow their multiple nuclear programs.

Now, this is very important that I read this, Mr. Speaker, because Bret Stephens goes on to say in his article:

> Not stop their nuclear program, not suspend their nuclear program, mind you, much less dismantle them, but merely reduce their pace from run to jog when they're on mile 23 of their nuclear marathon.

He said:

> It says a lot about the administration that they so wanted a deal that they would have been prepared to take this one.

And what this deal would have meant, quite simply, Mr. Speaker, is that we would have seen an Iran with a nuclear bomb very soon, and the means to deliver it and put the world on edge.

May it never be. Thank God for the French.

That is what happens when the line between politics is a game of perception and policy as the pursuit of national objectives dissolves.

I think this was a very important weekend. And it is important to know that this isn't over. You see, what happened is that there was a delay. A delay, I suppose, for what? To buy the vote of the French, to take their arm and twist it behind their back?

□ 1815

Because now the pressure is on France and the P5+1. The pressure is on France. Seven days from today, Mr. Speaker, there will be another meeting. Our Secretary of State, John Kerry, who insists that this deal and that he and the United States aren't blind and aren't stupid with this deal—he insisted this on ''Meet the Press'' last Sunday. He is stating that he believes that there will be a deal with Iran and that there will be one quickly.

My question would be, Mr. Speaker, to the Secretary of State or to anyone in the Obama administration who is in the process of working on this deal with a nuclear Iran: Is this what the deal is that you are intending to strike? We get zero, and Iran gets the ability to develop a nuclear bomb. What is the deal? What is in that?

I think we need to ask the lead negotiator, whose name is Wendy Sherman. She is President Obama's lead negotiator, chief nuclear negotiator, in this very crucial negotiation which has the potential to change the course of history.

In 1988, Wendy Sherman was a social worker. She worked on the Dukakis campaign. She worked at the Democratic National Committee. This is the person who is striking this deal right now on a nuclear Iran. She also was the CEO of the Fannie Mae Foundation. It was a charity that was shut down 10 years later for what The Washington Post called ''using a tax-exempt contribution to advance corporate interests.''

From there, Wendy Sherman went to the State Department. There she served as the point person in nuclear negotiations with North Korea. She met with Kim Jong Il, himself. She found him witty and humorous, a conceptual thinker, a quick problem-solver, smart, engaged, knowledgeable, self-confident. She called him a ''regular guy.'' She was found working for her former boss at the Albright Stonebridge Group before she went to the No. 3 spot at the State Department. From there, the arc of her career has gone to her now being in charge of this effort of giving away the ability to Iran to be able to continue on a pace to develop a nuclear bomb.

Again, may it never be.

When we were in Israel on Friday evening, we found out, Mr. Speaker, that the Obama administration had gone much further in this effort than even we had thought, because the story came out in the Daily Beast in an article by Eli Lake. He said that in this very bad deal with a nuclear Iran that once the current President was elected in June, Rouhani, that the Obama administration began then to already ease the sanctions on Iran. It is something that I think none of us could even begin to imagine. Even without consulting Congress, the Treasury Department issued notices in June that they would no longer be checking on those who are violating the sanctions' deals.

In other words, there wouldn't be the type of sanctions going out and the type of punishments, if you will, for bad actors who were doing trades with Iran. In other words, beginning past June, according to the article that came out on Friday, the Obama administration was already evening out the scorecard. In other words, they were already giving bonuses to Iran.

Why?

Because Rouhani was seen as a ''moderate,'' someone the Obama administration could work with. Even in September, President Obama, himself, wanted to be able to meet and talk and discuss without any precondition at all with the leader of Iran.

You see, there is a read that happened among the leadership in Iran. They looked at the United States. They tested our pulse. They tested the pulse of the Obama administration, and they saw that they could get what Benjamin Netanyahu called a very, very, very bad deal for freedom-loving people across the world. As a matter of fact, the leadership in Iran saw something

else. They saw that they could get a sucker's deal—in the words of the French diplomat and negotiator—but that is not what the American people want, Mr. Speaker.

They want to know that when they tuck their children in bed at night that the world will be secure for them and that they won't have to worry about a nuclear weapon coming within the borders of the United States of America or of any nation. No one wants to see a nuclear nightmare, but the Obama administration needs to recognize that, in order to alleviate the burden of a nuclear nightmare, we must never, ever, ever allow Iran to have a nuclear bomb and the means to deliver that bomb.

You see, when we were in Israel, Mr. Speaker, we were told by some of the leadership in Israel that there are 25 nations that have the civilian capability of having nuclear power but that only five nations enrich uranium in order to have the fissile material. When you have a responsibility, you have to act responsibly, and those nations have acted responsibly with the fissile material. The argument from Iran is quite different. Iran says they have an indigenous right to enrich uranium, that all nations do.

All nations don't have the right when they have spoken irresponsibly, when they have acted in violation of U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution, when they have said ''no'' to International Atomic Energy Commission inspectors coming to Iran to check on what Iran is doing in regards to uranium enrichment, in regards to nuclear reactors or to the plutonium heavy-water reactor. The door is slammed in the faces of the inspectors. When they ask to come in, they are told ''maybe some other time.'' Think of that with your teenager. You want to go in and check on your teenager's room, and your teenager says, ''Maybe not this time, Mom. How about you try me tomorrow?'' Does that raise a few suspicions in your mind? Usually, it does. In the case of the security of the people of the world, that should definitely raise our concerns.

So why would we give the benefit of the doubt to a nation that has thumbed its nose at the United Nations Security Council? that has thumbed its nose at the International Atomic Energy Commission inspectors? Why would we give them the benefit of the doubt? Why would the Obama administration give them the benefit of the doubt?

When Wendy Sherman has negotiated what is arguably one of the biggest failures in North Korea, with North Korea's obtaining nuclear weaponry and missile capability, that is absolute failure—failure for the world and failure for this negotiator. Now the same negotiator is trying to strike this deal where it looks, to me, like Iran is getting it all—it is a clean sweep—and the freedom-loving people of the world are getting a goose egg. This is a very bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to pull Wendy Sherman back and off of this project. This isn't working. I think the United States should pull back and not be a part of the P5+1. I think we need to take a big step backwards and take a deep breath and do a thorough review of the history of Iran and of Iran's violations.

This is bipartisan, Mr. Speaker. This is not Republicans beating up on the Obama administration. There are numerous Democrats, including Senator MENENDEZ on the Senate side, including many of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle. They are pro-Israel. They are pro-American national security. They don't want to see a nuclear Iran any more than Republicans do. This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. This is completely bipartisan. In fact, I believe, if we were to put a resolution on the floor of this House that were to call on the Obama administration to say ''no'' to this very, very, very bad deal—to a sucker's deal in the words of the French diplomat—I believe that we would see a very strong bipartisan agreement.

Why?

Because, as a body—Democrat, Republican—we are truly, not just in word but in deed, pro-Israel. We are first pro-United States, first pro our national security interests. That is totally bipartisan.

I am privileged to sit on the House Intelligence Committee. We deal with the classified secrets of the Nation. I compliment my colleague DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER as much as I compliment my colleague MIKE ROGERS, the chair of the committee, because they have made a decision that, when it comes to America's national security, the partisanship gets checked outside the door. We are completely bipartisan when we go on that committee, as it should be.

So, when it comes to making sure that a rogue—perhaps even an evil—regime does not have access to a nuclear weapon, that is probably the most bipartisan move that could ever come out of this body, and I believe that it will because I trust my Democrat colleagues to also believe and understand that a nuclear Iran is a very, very bad idea. I believe the Senate will see it the same way. I think we will see, again, agreement on both sides of the aisle because this is about America. This is about our national security. It is about the security interests and the future of the world. It is about the national security interests of our friend, the Jewish State of Israel. It is about her survival. It is about making sure that violent terrorist organizations never, ever, ever, ever, ever have access to nuclear fissile material and the means and capability of creating a nuclear bomb and delivering it on innocent people anywhere across the world.

We want a peaceful world, and we will not have a peaceful world if madmen have a nuclear weapon. It is a bipartisan issue—it is a peace issue—and it is an issue, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that should capture our attention.

Might I ask how many minutes I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again refer to one of my colleagues who has also eloquently written on this subject, and I would like to give her credit as well. She is a former Member of this body but a wonderful Member with whom I had the privilege of traveling to the Middle East. She was defeated in her last election, but she served this body very well. She is a Democrat colleague. I have great respect for her. She and I traveled to Israel. We traveled to Pakistan. We traveled to Kuwait. Her name is Shelley Berkley, and she is from Nevada. I would like to read a few of the words from former Representative Shelley Berkley.

She said that the deal that is in the works with Iran is far worse than anyone could have possibly imagined. She said that the details are still emerging on this deal that was nearly put together over the weekend in Geneva, and she said:

> By all accounts and despite all denials, the United States is actively pursuing a catastrophic agreement with Iran. It is one that would facilitate the nuclearization of one of the most extreme, violent, and anti-American tyrannies on Earth, with consequences that will be regretted for generations.

You see, Shelley Berkley of Nevada gets it. She understands that this isn't a short-term action. She understood that if Iran obtains a nuclear weapon that this will change the course of history for generations, and it is one that would be near impossible to roll back because, again, of the idea of proliferation. It wouldn't be just Iran who has it, as if that isn't bad enough; it would be rogue terrorist organizations across the globe.

Former Representative Shelley Berkley writes:

> The centerpiece of the deal from the West's perspective is Iran's agreement to convert its stockpiles of 20 percent enriched uranium to fuel for civilian use and to halt further enrichment to 20 percent for 6 months.

Now, it is interesting. We just met this last week with the leader of intelligence in Israel. He told us that part of this very, very, very bad deal would include Iran's not firing up their heavy-water plutonium reactor in Iraq—''Araq,'' some people say. He said the joke on all of that is that this reactor won't even go on line for use until next August, so Iran gives up absolutely nothing in this deal. You see, it is a scam. They don't even have an ability over the next 6 months to fire up this reactor. So Iran's agreeing not to develop any plutonium from that reactor is a zero. It is a goose egg. It is a nonstarter.

These are the negotiators? I know one thing. I wouldn't want them negotiating my salary at my next job. They don't get it. They don't understand what is at stake—or do they? That is how important this is.

□ 1830

''The entire question of 20 percent enriched uranium,'' says former Representative Shelley Berkley, ''is a smoke screen.''

For many years, making a bomb went like this: first you spent a lot of time enriching uranium to 3.5 percent purity. That is difficult, but that is exactly what Iran would be allowed to continue to do. Then you enriched what you had created to 20 percent purity. When you had enough of that—and the centrifuges Iran has now are better and faster and quicker than what they had before, five times faster, as a matter of fact—you would be in a position to easily and quickly convert that material to 90 percent purity that is good enough for a nuclear warhead.

In recent months, Iran has advanced dramatically in both the number of centrifuges—again, nearly 19,000 centrifuges today at its disposal and their efficiency. Today, experts say that in just a few weeks' time Iran could go from 3.5 percent all the way to 90 percent, which is ''bingo,'' bomb-making material for Iran. The whole issue of 20 percent enrichment has become absolutely irrelevant. Instead, the most important questions are how much 3.5 percent enriched uranium they have and whether they are allowed to keep their centrifuges spinning. If the answer to both is yes, they are moving forward on a bomb.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, if we have a deal with Iran, the number one parameter that must be included—and I spoke with both the current intelligence director and the former intelligence director of Israel, and they both said: A nonnegotiable is that Iran has to give up the 9 to 10 tons of enriched uranium that they have on hand. Why wouldn't you? Why wouldn't they be forced to give up the fissile material to make a bomb? It only makes sense.

Number two, they need to give up the ability to make further enriched uranium. Those are the centrifuges. That has to go as well.

The world is saying if you want to have the material, the nuclear material, that you need for a peaceful civilian use of power, if you want, for instance, nuclear reactors, that is fine. The world has no problem with nuclear power for true electricity, or if they want radio isotopes for cancer research, no problem. But that means that the material comes into Iran, and it is used for a civilian purpose, and we have inspectors. That is reasonable.

We have countries like Spain that have civilian-use nuclear reactors. They bring their uranium in, and they don't enrich it themselves, and there are inspectors. The same with Sweden. The same with other countries.

This is fine to have nuclear reactors for electricity. We would back that, but what we will not back, what we must not ever back is the ability for Iran to create a nuclear bomb. That does not change in the current Obama administration effort of the deal that came out and was thankfully put on hold by the French at Geneva at this P5+1.

The new agreement would allow Iran to continue to freely enrich to 3.5 percent at its Natanz and Fordow facilities. That is beyond all comprehension. How can you have a deal if Iran is continuing to enrich their uranium at two facilities and to continue building centrifuges that can easily and quickly be installed?

''At the end of the 6-month period,'' Representative Shelley Berkley writes, ''Iran would be even closer to breakout capacity.'' Meaning the ability to build a nuclear warhead so quickly that no one could mobilize forces in time to stop it.

In other words, what we would have given Iran last weekend is the luxury of time, time to develop a deadly nuclear weapon. It takes time for a nation, the United States, Israel, the United Kingdom, Canada, any nation, it takes time for a nation to mobilize, to come against a bad actor nation, like Iran, in its development of a nuclear weapon.

Again, that is why this is so important—this chart that was created by Senator MARK KIRK. He accurately reported what the score will be for the world. We will get nothing, and Iran will get everything; and that must not be.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for activities associated with the ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get to my remarks, I briefly want to address the nuclear proliferation issue in Iran. The gentlelady from Minnesota, as well as myself, and the vast majority of Members of this body, have been supportive of crippling sanctions against Iran. Many of us believe that that has helped drive Iran to the negotiating table.

We hope for, of course, a peaceful outcome that takes nuclear weapons off the table and prevents Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons; and, of course, we continue to keep the use of force on the table if our diplomatic solution fails to be enacted that reaches President Obama's objective of preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

The issue has had strong bipartisan support, nearly unanimous, here in this Chamber, with regard to continuing the pressure on Iran to rejoin the responsible nations and renounce the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

But I am here today to talk about something closer to home, Mr. Speaker, in fact, at home, Mr. Speaker, namely, the need to act on immigration reform. It has been 138 days since the Senate passed a commonsense bipartisan immigration reform bill. I was proud to be part of a bipartisan group of Members here in the House that introduced H.R. 15, a companion bill to the Senate's immigration reform bill that makes additional improvements on outcome-based border enforcement and would address our broken immigration system and replace it with one that reflects our values as Americans, helps create jobs here at home, reduces our deficit by over $100 billion, and restores the rule of law here in our country, which is currently being undermined by the presence of 10 million, 15 million, 8 million—nobody knows how many people are here illegally.

The issue will not resolve itself, Mr. Speaker. I call upon this body to act immediately and bring to the floor H.R. 15 and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Later on in my remarks, given that this is the week of Veterans Day, I will be talking about the contributions that many members of our military have made who are from immigrant backgrounds, including the talent that our military is missing out on today, including DACA, or deferred action recipients, who are able to work legally in our country, but are not allowed to serve in our military.

H.R. 15 would solve that issue, and we will be talking about the many contributions that immigrants have made and continue to make with regards to our military.

My colleague, Mr. TONKO from New York, is here; and I would be happy to yield to him for a moment.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Representative POLIS, for bringing us together for what I believe is very thoughtful discussion about immigration reform, for we are by definition a Nation of immigrants.

I believe that the passion that is the luring card to America is that American Dream. People for decades and centuries throughout the history of this Nation have pursued that American Dream with the opportunity to climb those economic ladders, those opportunities that present themselves in this country, where we are emboldened by immigrants; and certainly the military is no exception.

Tonight, we will be talking about the empowerment that comes with H.R. 15,

which is a very thoughtful piece of legislation. I am a cosponsor on that legislation. I believe it is important for us to follow suit that the bipartisan spirit in the Senate has already initiated.

The opportunities for us to allow for, some suggest, 11 million, if not more, immigrants to pursue that path to citizenship is an empowerment tool. It is great for our economic recovery. As was mentioned by Representative POLIS, it provides for a great dent in our deficit. It allows for us over the 20 years to come to experience tens of billions of reduction in the deficit, which is no short feat to be ignored. It is important for us to understand the economic vitality that sound immigration reform produces for this Nation.

We are in need of many of the skill sets that our immigrants bring. You talk to the agriculture industry and those skill sets are there. You talk to the medical industry, you talk to the engineers that are required in this Nation, and many immigrants are assuming those roles. So it is important.

We look at the tremendous history in this Nation of the military, the empowerment that came to this Nation, that comes to this Nation as we speak. There are our daughters and sons on the battlefield protecting our liberties, promoting our freedoms in this Nation to freedom-loving nations around the world.

There has been an awesome sector within that military force that either is immigrants or those who are residing in this country and are not yet United States citizens. They have made a statement in the military history of this Nation. They have made a very strong statement of support of this Nation and all for which she stands. They have defended the banner that unites us as the United States flag. They have certainly made their mark.

As of 2009, I am informed that there are some 114,000-plus foreign-born individuals serving in the military. Twelve percent of them were not even United States citizens. So it makes a very powerful statement.

I am a grandson of immigrants. My grandfather, William Tonko, served in World War I. I am proud of that history that he helped to write. He did that as an immigrant coming to this Nation, understanding that as he left Poland that there would be this American Dream that he could pursue.

My colleague made mention of the DREAMers—a tremendous bit of nomenclature that we put on to people who were born here, perhaps, or came as youngsters and are denied opportunities.

We have within the context of H.R. 15 the opportunity to empower DREAMers. They are allowed with certain programming now that we have with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, with that program they are enabled to, perhaps, get a reprieve from deportation or be able to secure a work permit; but they cannot serve in this Nation's military.

H.R. 15 would empower the DREAMers, people who know no other country, who have been raised here and want to serve but cannot.

There are great improvements made in H.R. 15. I am proud to stand here with my colleagues who will speak in support of H.R. 15. It, I believe, provides a shot in the arm for our economic recovery. It provides military strength, as has been proven throughout our history. Twenty percent of all Medal of Honor recipients have been immigrant servicemembers.

The track record is there. The data are speaking to the empowerment that comes to the military with those who have that passion. That passion of immigrants, that passion of naturalized citizens, that whole effort of those who are looking to be naturalized, believing in this Nation and all for which she stands is a tremendous statement of who we are as a Nation and our definition as a clustering of immigrants with this quilt work of Americana that allows for the economic climb for the opportunities, the ladders of opportunity, called the American Dream.''

That is the passion that fills our hearts and souls. They have given to this military, they have given to the fight for freedom, they have given to the fight to protect our liberties. H.R. 15 goes a long way to recognize that and further strengthen this Nation.

I am happy to join my colleagues tonight in support of H.R. 15.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership on the immigration reform issue and his impassioned words.

We also have with us this evening one of the original cosponsors of H.R. 15, a leader on immigration reform, the gentlelady from Washington, Ms. DELBENE.

□ 1845

Ms. DELBENE. This is an important moment for immigration reform. My district in Washington State is very representative of why we need reform. We have a northern border and a diverse economy with a rich agricultural industry, including dairy and berry farmers. In the southern part of my district, there are some of the world's most innovative companies, including technology, advanced manufacturing, biotech, and countless startups. These businesses have been making the case that fixing our immigration system must be a top priority for our economy.

Whether it is an ultrasound manufacturer who needs an acoustic engineer or a video game developer looking for a 3–D modeler, companies in my district are in need of specialized high-skilled workers. We have to ensure that foreign graduate students can stay here to start new companies or support ongoing research that will lead to future breakthroughs in many areas.

Also, farmers need immigration reform in order to find a stable, skilled, and reliable workforce to help us grow our food and our economy.

That's why I helped lead the introduction of H.R. 15. This is a bipartisan bill with 190 cosponsors. In light of Veterans Day earlier this week, I can think of no better way to honor our Active Duty military servicemembers who are immigrants—currently, there are more than 65,000 immigrants, or 5 percent of the force—than by taking action on immigration reform.

Unless Congress takes action, there are many DREAMers who were brought here as children and are undocumented who want to serve their country but cannot do so as the military can currently only enlist people who have legal status.

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program that we talked about earlier that the administration announced last year allows many DREAMers to apply for a reprieve from deportation and a work permit, but it does not confer legal status, which means that recipients of this deferred action remain ineligible to serve.

The American people want our broken immigration system fixed, and they are tired of congressional inaction. The time to act is now, and I join my colleagues in asking us to act as quickly as possible.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady from Washington for her leadership on this issue. This body's continual refusal to act on immigration reform sadly comes at a tremendous cost to our country and to our security as a Nation.

The financial costs, according to the CBO—it is estimated that the Senate bill would reduce our deficit by over $135 billion, grow millions of new jobs, and boost our economy.

In fact, in the 4 months since the Senate bill was passed, we have already missed over $5 billion in revenue and tens of thousands of jobs, jobs that Americans could use that have not been created, that don't exist today, because of this body's failure to act.

In the spirit of Veterans Day, it is important to highlight the tradition of military service that the gentleman from New York and the gentlelady from Washington talked about. At a time when the military is facing recruitment issues, making sure we have the very best men and women to wear our uniform and defend our Nation, many individuals who fall under the deferred action program are not allowed to serve in our military. We are talking about DREAMers, young people who grew up here, might have been here since 2 or 5, and know no other country, are as American as you or I, many of whom want to give back, want to risk their life to protect their country, the only country they know, the country that they love, and yet, the military is not allowed to recruit them, and they are not allowed to serve.

It has been estimated that more than 30,000 young immigrants would join the military and qualify for legal status if we passed comprehensive immigration

reform. Key provisions of H.R. 15, our immigration reform bill, would have important and lasting benefits for our Armed Forces, and it has broad support from the military.

For example, the bill would allow deferred action childhood arrivals to enlist in all branches of the U.S. military, including the National Guard, and be provided with an expedited path to citizenship in recognition of their service to our great Nation.

Many immigrant servicemembers have become exemplary soldiers. Until 2009, only citizens and permanent residents were allowed to serve. In 2009, the Department of Defense introduced the Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest program, which allowed visa holders with high-level skills to enlist in the military and earn U.S. citizenship through their service.

We are fortunate as a Nation to have talented and hardworking immigrants who want to serve in the military, but this opportunity today is largely restricted to special visas for medical professionals and language experts. While that improves the security of our country, it would be improved even more by passing H.R. 15 to benefit from the great potential and the tens of thousands of would-be servicemembers who are asking to give back to our country, who are asking to put their lives on the line to defend the country they love, the country they know, the country that they want to serve. Millions of aspiring Americans who want nothing more than to pay their fair share, who want nothing more than to give back to our country, to make our country stronger.

It is time for us to find a way for DREAMers, for hundreds of thousands of other talented people, to pursue their dreams in the only country they know. Whether their dreams take them to the front lines of combat defending our Nation or to the front lines of competitive jobs in the private sector, or to other forms of public service, failure to take action only perpetuates an underground economy in which our Nation fails to benefit from the great depth of human capital and talent that resides in immigrants that are already here, are already in many cases working, and already in many cases are contributing members of the communities that they live in. It is simply a matter of formalizing that process and restoring the rule of law so that we have a legal way of facilitating the flow of immigrants to our country.

I can reconcile that we are both a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws. Those two values that we have as Americans, a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws, far from being mutually exclusive, are complementary. H.R. 15 and the comprehensive Senate bill honor that tradition. That is why more than 70 percent of the American people support comprehensive immigration reform. It is why I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that placed before the floor of this House, H.R. 15 would pass today, would pass tomorrow, would pass next week.

I had the opportunity to ask Mr. GOODLATTE, as well as the chair of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, yesterday in the Rules Committee what the plan was for immigration reform, why we were bringing forth bills with regard to asbestos, a legitimate problem to be sure, a bill that has passed this Chamber before, and a bill that will not likely be taken up by the Senate, but a bill that comes under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, why are we spending days and days debating this bill rather than actually solving a problem of immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are victims of asbestos poisoning, I know there are companies that want to resolve this issue, but I can tell you honestly, I haven't heard from any constituents who called my office begging Congress to take up asbestos reform. It is an issue; we should deal with it. I hope there is a bipartisan approach. But not one, not one of my constituents, last week, last month, last year, not one, called my office and said: We demand action. We demand action on asbestos reform.

Not one. Thousands—thousands—not only have called my office, have attended rallies in my office. I have never had thousands of people with the archbishop, with my good friend from Chicago, LUIS GUTIÉRREZ, who joined us in my district, thousands packed a church for immigration reform. Thousands packed a church for immigration reform. Not one call, not one phone call, not one email, asking Congress to pass asbestos reform. A thousand people in an afternoon. We had to close off promotion because it filled up so much, not to mention the thousands if not tens of thousands of emails and phone calls and letters saying, solve this issue. Solve this issue, Congressman. Solve this issue, Congress; we don't like the fact that there are 10 million people here illegally. We don't like that we dishonor the rule of law. I don't like the fact that my cousin is in detention and might be deported even though he has American kids to support. I don't like that.

You know what, Mr. Speaker? When we consider how unpopular this Congress is, it is no wonder that instead of acting on issues that Americans care about, we are discussing issues that, yes, we can discuss, of course, spend a day, spend 2 days. Are they going anywhere? I don't know, but issues that I haven't heard about. I certainly haven't had a church with thousands of people in my district calling for that issue. That's why we need to act.

Mr. TONKO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TONKO. The gentleman from Colorado speaks of the tremendous support of the American public to do immigration reform. I think it is very easy to understand. It is explained by the deep-routed sense of heritage in this Nation for everyone. Many of us can identify with immigrant roots. I believe that is what drives the desire to have this reform put into play. We talk about the overwhelming polls for support for this effort, and we are halfway through this battle because the Senate has made a major statement with the measure that they have brought forth, and so we can meet that opportunity here in the House of Representatives.

Earlier, the gentleman from Colorado talked about the military strength that comes with immigrants, and cited many of the facts that really speak favorably to the shot in the arm that they give the military. We think of some of those unique skills that they bring to the military as the immigrant servicemembers. We talk about the opportunity to draw upon their second language proficiency. That is very important in service to the military. Certainly their greater cultural understanding, which is again a benefit that is borne by the military because of immigrants or those looking in some way at some time to be naturalized. They could join the military and provide that strength. We have a long history of decorated service, with 20 percent of all Medal of Honor recipients having been immigrant servicemembers. The list goes on and on. There is a lower attrition rate. There is proven data that are available.

So this is a powerful statement, and when we think about the heritage of this Nation, when we think about that American quilt, there are so many patches brought together under one common banner of different cultures, of races, of nationalities, that really make a statement of who we are. So this is just a natural move forward to have an immigration reform policy developed here this year in Congress.

Mr. POLIS. I would ask the gentleman from New York, just to make sure my district isn't atypical, have you gotten more letters or calls about the need to take up asbestos reform or immigration reform?

Mr. TONKO. We have had many, many requests to move with immigration reform. It is one of the greatest bits of requests that we get.

Mr. POLIS. Not to put you on the spot, but would you say it is more or less than people who have demanded that Congress act on asbestos reform?

Mr. TONKO. It is much more.

Mr. POLIS. So your district is similar to mine in that respect.

Mr. TONKO. You are absolutely right. These are very legitimate, justified issues to talk about, but when it comes to immigration reform, people are saying: Look, let's get this done. We have many people who are developing great intellectual skills, they are getting great higher ed opportunities, and we are not taking advantage of that. We are not incorporating them into the American peoplescape. We

have people who are assisting the agricultural industry, the engineering industry, the technical industry, the innovation economy, the medical health care industry, people need to fill these efforts with this immigrant power that is available.

It is great to join you on the floor. I know there are many who want to speak their voice here, and rightfully so, because this is a very pertinent issue right now. Reform is very much required, and let's get it done.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter to submit to the RECORD from the Evangelical Immigration Table, and to quote in part, the Evangelical Immigration Table and the faith-based community, with strong support from the Catholic Church as well as from evangelical churches across the spectrum, have been strong supporters of immigration reform, from the pews and here in the Halls of Congress. The Evangelical Immigration Table endorsed value-driven immigration reform that respects the God-given dignity of every person, protects the unity of the immediate family, respects the rule of law, guarantees secure national borders, ensures fairness to taxpayers, and establishes a path toward legal status and/or citizenship for those who qualify and those who wish to become permanent residents. I am proud to say that H.R. 15 honors the values of evangelical leaders, of Catholic leaders, of Jewish leaders, of Muslim leaders, of Americans across the faith spectrum, ensuring that our values as Americans and as people of faith are reflected in our immigration system.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, The time has come to fix our broken immigration system. We are pleased that the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees have worked on several bills each addressing a part of the immigration reform puzzle. As leaders of evangelical churches and organizations we write to offer our support and encourage further bipartisan cooperation towards enacting common sense immigration reform.

Evangelical leaders from across the country came together in June 2012 to form the *Evangelical Immigration Table*. The Table has issued broad principles for reform, which have been endorsed by prominent evangelical pastors, denominational heads, leaders of national parachurch ministries, and university and seminary presidents. We are working across the country to educate and mobilize our fellow evangelical Christians in support of a just and fair bipartisan policy solution to immigration that:

Respects the God-given dignity of every person,

Protects the unity of the immediate family,

Respects the rule of law,

Guarantees secure national borders,

Ensures fairness to taxpayers, and

Establishes a path toward legal status and/or citizenship for those who qualify and who wish to become permanent residents.

We applaud the significant progress toward legislation that would secure our borders, marshal additional resources for border enforcement and internal enforcement, and require the Department of Homeland Security to submit, implement and report on a detailed border security plan. The bills take steps to elevate respect for the rule of law—strengthening E-Verify, establishing a legal guest worker program for agricultural workers, a more workable program for science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) visas, and increasing passport and visa security. We are encouraged by reports of other bills being drafted that would address the need for more low skill visas and the legal status of children, adults, and asylees; addressing these needs is vital to fixing all the components of the current system.

The work the House has done on immigration reform thus far is commendable. However, we remain concerned about several provisions of H.R. 2278, The Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act (SAFE Act), that could have unintended consequences adversely affecting religious communities, law enforcement agencies, and the people they are called to serve. The SAFE Act, in its current form, criminalizes unlawful presence and includes broad prohibitions on ''harboring'' undocumented immigrants that could make criminals of the family members of undocumented immigrants and others, including fellow church members, who assist them with everyday activities. This is a significant problem for our pastors, faith leaders and others in our community, who as an extension of their faith, care in tangible ways for the immigrants (regardless of status) within their community. Pastors, faith leaders and others in our communities should not have to decide between following the law and giving water to a thirsty traveler in the desert, providing food to those who are hungry or giving rides to church for those without transportation. While collaboration and communication between federal, state, and local law enforcement is an essential part of effective policing, it must be structured in a way that fosters buy-in from those agencies and does not compromise their rapport and cooperation with immigrant communities.

As you continue to work towards a complete legislative solution for immigration reform, you and your staff are in our prayers. We appreciate the complexity of designing a system that meets our country's needs and that can meet with broad public acceptance. Through Bible reading, prayer, and public education campaigns we have mobilized a broad base of evangelical support for immigration reform. But while Congress debates reform proposals, immigrant families and workers continue to suffer under our broken system. Now it is time to finish the job. Please prioritize work to finalize immigration reform legislation this year.

May God bless you and your staff in the days ahead.

Sincerely,

THE EVANGELICAL IMMIGRATION TABLE

□ 1900

I now yield to the original sponsor of H.R. 15, a leader in this House on the fight for immigration reform, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, every day thousands of Americans risk their lives for our Nation, despite the fact that our broken immigration system rips them apart, rips their families apart by deporting their mothers, fathers, siblings, and spouses.

In my home State of Florida, Rita Cote, the wife of a gulf war veteran, was detained by local law enforcement when she was translating between police and her sister, her sister who had been a victim of domestic violence. Instead of arresting her sister's assailant, Rita was held without a warrant, without being charged, and without seeing a judge for 7 days before being transferred to ICE custody.

This is the spouse of a veteran, of someone who is serving in our Armed Forces. No one deserve this treatment, but certainly not someone who has faced the challenges of being a military spouse. Our Nation's veterans were willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to protect us. The least we could do is protect their families.

At the same time, there are thousands of young people who would give anything to defend our country, the only country they have ever known. While these individuals with green cards cannot serve in the military because DACA doesn't allow for it, they are willing to do it; yet we do not allow it. These kids are an asset to our Nation, and it is simply bad policy to turn them away.

Since 2002, almost 90,000 military servicemembers have become citizens. We should be welcoming them with open arms. All of those willing to fight and risk their lives for our great Nation deserve that respect.

This is an issue that underscores the urgency with which we must pass immigration reform. Fixing our immigration system isn't about justice and fairness. It is about enhancing our national security and military readiness.

There are enough Members in the House that understand the benefits of immigration reform. There are enough people who know that it benefits our Nation's prosperity and understand that we will do this inevitably. But with every day that passes, this problem gets bigger. The consequences of inaction become more costly. This body needs to stop hiding behind empty promises and start doing the job we were sent here to do.

We recognize the sacrifices of America's veterans. Let's remember their loved ones who are left in the shadows.

I want to remind my colleagues across the aisle that there is enough blame to go around, but here is what is clear: a Democratic Senate took up comprehensive immigration reform and passed a bipartisan bill. This would not be the bill that I would love. This would not be the bill that the gentleman from Colorado or the gentleman from California would love. Many of us could probably write a better bill; yet we took up this bill, and it got passed. The President has said he would sign that bill. And before this House, we have a bipartisan bill that has 190 signatures. If the Speaker would allow it to come to the floor, it would pass.

Mr. Speaker, we need you to yield here. You did it on Hurricane Sandy relief, you did it on the budget and fiscal crisis, you did it on VAWA; and it is time to do it now. Let the will of this body happen. Let us vote, and we will vote it through. The consequences are grave not only for our country, not

only for the millions who suffer, not only for the veterans, not only for their spouses and family; but they are going to have a great consequence for your party. The time has come to let this be voted on.

We have been given an unprecedented opportunity to fix our broken immigration system and make our Nation stronger. Now is the time to pass immigration reform.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Miami for his impassioned words.

It is rare, in my experience here, that more than two-thirds of the Senate can agree to solve an issue. They always talk about reaching the 60-vote threshold. There are only 54 or 55 of one party. How do we get to 60? This was 68 votes, more than two-thirds of the United States Senate. This House could act tomorrow.

As you know, Madam Speaker, what many Americans wonder is if it could pass, why aren't we debating it? Why aren't we discussing it? What we spend our time on and the bills that we debate in this Chamber are determined by the majority leader and the Speaker. That is why we need their ability to bring these bills to the floor. If people want to stand in opposition, let them be public with that and say they don't want to solve immigration. But I am confident that the votes exist today with support of more than a third of the Republicans in the Senate. I think the numbers would be similar here. I think it could be a quarter, it could be a third, it could be 20 percent of the Republicans in this body that would agree it is time to fix our broken immigration system.

I yield to the gentleman from Miami.

Mr. GARCIA. I just wanted to agree with the gentleman from Colorado.

What is clear is that there are enough votes here to pass this. What is clear is if this comes to the floor, this will pass. What is clear is that Mr. CANTOR wants a bill to pass. What is clear is that there has probably been no bill with broader support—probably since I have been in Congress, probably since the gentleman from Colorado got here. We not only have the Chamber of Commerce on our side, but we have the AFL–CIO, who is on the other side of the spectrum. We have the farm workers, and then we have the growers. We have almost every sector, including the religious sector. All of them are looking for a solution here, and there is only one man standing in the way. That is the Speaker.

We ask, Mr. Speaker, for you to yield to the will of this body, yield to the majority, and yield to what is right for our Nation. We demand a vote. The Nation deserves a vote. Our country deserves a vote.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

It is not the desire, I don't think of any of us, of the Democrats, of our leader, of our Members, for this to be a political issue that one side is demonized on, that is used to generate political support. Rather, we would like to solve it. We would like this issue to go away. We would like to fix our broken immigration system; but if that doesn't happen, of course candidates are going to run on fixing it and the American people, with overwhelming support, will elect candidates who want to fix it.

If Members of this body won't lead, frankly, Madam Speaker, they will need to get out of the way, whether by their choice or whether by the people's choice. The Americans are demanding action.

I yield to the gentleman from California, a leader on immigration reform.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding time.

The issue of immigration reform is a top priority for our Nation and rightly so. It will not only help our economy grow, but it will also help families stay together.

I was taken aback earlier today when Speaker BOEHNER said that the Republican-controlled House has ''no intention of ever going to conference on the Senate immigration bill.''

That is clearly at odds with what the American people want and what the American people need.

I just want to recount a bit of my own history.

Mr. POLIS. One way to honor the Speaker's word and not go to conference would simply be to take up the Senate immigration bill and advance it directly to the President. Perhaps we can also call upon the Speaker to honor his word in not having to go to conference by actually bringing the Senate bill before this body.

The conference would not be necessary; is that correct? It would go right to the President.

Mr. TAKANO. I believe so. Just bring it directly to the floor. We can bring that Senate bill directly to the floor and let the House work its will.

The topic of our Special Order had to do with immigration reform in the military and veterans.

I recount a very poignant part of my own family's history. All of my grandparents, both my parents were interned during World War II without trial in Japanese American internment camps.

Despite this great injustice, many children of these immigrants, young men, volunteered for military service. They fought in the 100th Infantry, in the 442nd, suffered some of the greatest casualties, and were most recently awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their service. These were young men who wanted to demonstrate their loyalty to this country and were given an opportunity to fight for our country. I think it is tragic that young DREAMers under deferred action are not allowed to serve the country that they love, where the language of English is mainly the language they speak, and the culture they know is that of our country, America.

Just like the men of the World War II generation, Japanese Americans who fought for this country and all Japanese American fighting units, I believe that the children of immigrants today want that opportunity.

Over the past few months, I have received hundreds of letters from residents in my district, letters from business owners, husbands, wives, and perhaps even most distressing, children. One letter I received is from a local teenager who wrote to me about her mother who will likely be deported back to Mexico in 2015. She said:

> It is going to be very hard to bring her back to California. Her four kids need her back. She is a single mother. She is the only person we have close to us.

Another letter I received said:

> My stepfather's mother died of heart problems, so he had to go back to Mexico to her funeral. He was there for a couple of days, and when he tried to come home, it was hard for him to come back over to California. It has been a while since we have seen him. My mom misses him terribly. She cries every time she talks to him on the phone. It has been 2 months since he left to Mexico, which probably means he lost his job. He is the main provider for our family. This is very stressful and hard on my mom because she is not able to pay the bills. It is hard for her to support us and be strong at the same time. I hate to see her suffer and be sad all the time. Families should not be ripped apart like this. Other families should not have to go through what my family is going through.

Madam Speaker, these are letters from children whose families are being ripped apart.

I also received a letter from a wife and a mother saying:

> I myself am one of those many families that unfortunately have to go through this injustice. My husband was deported on his way to work about 3 years ago, and during these few years, it has been really hard for my new 5-year-old daughter and me. The stress I go through every day is unhealthy, and, unfortunately, my daughter has to go through it, as well. My daughter really wants to be with her father, and it really hurts to see her go through this situation.

These are American families that we can help by passing immigration reform.

The last letter I would like to read is from one of the largest employers in my district, the Blue Banner Company, a grower and shipper of California citrus. They wrote to me and detailed the difficulties of a recent crop of theirs when they faced a 30 percent to 35 percent labor shortage. Because of the labor shortage, less fruit was harvested from the trees in a timely manner. Because the fruit was harvested not at peak time, it was sent to be juiced instead of sold fresh for eating by consumers. This resulted in a total loss for their growers of $3.4 million to $3.8 million.

The letter goes on to say:

> We, California agriculture, desperately need a legal workforce from which to hire.

Reforming our immigration system will help businesses such as Blue Banner by providing a workforce that is ready and willing to work. Let's pass immigration reform and help families stay together and help businesses obtain the workers they need.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, we have here another leader from the great State of California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), my friend.

□ 1915

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much for bringing together this important discussion on this floor of our Nation's Capitol.

I think it is really important, Madam Speaker, for us to remind ourselves that the only thing that is stopping comprehensive immigration reform is the fact that, Madam Speaker, the leadership of this House is unwilling to allow the vote to take place.

Today I am proud to join my colleagues to talk about the need for immigration reform but, more importantly, the cost America bears as Congress does nothing.

We were sent to Washington to solve our Nation's problems, but Republican leadership has announced we are done and will not take up immigration reform this year. Madam Speaker, it is November 13. We are not done. We have 6 more weeks to work, just like all Americans. Why don't we just continue doing our job?

Members of our Armed Forces don't get the liberty to say when they are done. There are no vacations or timeouts for them. They proudly wear the U.S. flag on their shoulder and continue to protect our freedoms, even when the leadership in our Congress decides that they no longer want to work.

As of June 2009, for example, there were over 114,000 foreign-born individuals in our United States armed services serving our country. Over 95,000 of those individuals were naturalized U.S. citizens. They were not born in this country, but they went through the process of becoming citizens and serve our country proudly. More than 10,000 of those servicemembers are not U.S.-born citizens. They stand on the front lines because they believe in what America stands for. Let's get to work, pass comprehensive immigration reform, and earn the honor of their service and their sacrifice.

Every day we await action on a comprehensive immigration reform bill, millions of dollars in potential revenue is lost to Americans in our country. Our farms do not have a stable workforce. Far too many high-tech companies are short the workers they need to continue to innovate and grow American jobs.

Our schools attract the best and the brightest from around the world, but when they get their degrees and want to stay in this great country, they are sent away, not allowed to start businesses and hire American citizens.

In all, the full economic potential of undocumented immigrants as workers, taxpayers, consumers, and entrepreneurs is being lost because they are unable to earn legal status. And when we grow the American economy, we create more jobs for Americans.

As many in Congress continue to deny the pressing need for comprehensive immigration reform, the broken U.S. immigration system continues to tear families apart, while simultaneously draining the Federal budget and robbing our American economy. Talking about comprehensive immigration reform is not enough. It is time for Democrats and Republicans to vote together on this floor and pass a solution that will serve all of America. The time for reform is now.

The system is broken, and fixing it in an intelligent, bipartisan way is something that a majority of Americans want. Americans understand that deportation, or even self-deportation, is not an option. They support a pathway to citizenship. Even more support a pathway to legal residency. The American people want this solution.

With the introduction of H.R. 15 in our House, a bipartisan bill for comprehensive immigration reform, we have reached a significant milestone for commonsense immigration reform. The bill is practical and fair and holds everyone accountable. The bill strengthens the border, strengthens the economy, and provides a pathway to citizenship for people who have lived, worked, and raised their families right here in the United States of America.

We cannot wait any longer. It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill to the floor of this House and let the will of the American people have its way. America deserves a solution. We are ready for a vote. It is time that our House do the will of the people, that we have a comprehensive immigration reform bill come to this floor and allow Republicans and Democrats to vote their conscience and pass that bill.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California.

And just to highlight how we can improve our security as a Nation and honor the tradition of contributions that veterans have made to the security of our Nation, by simply allowing young people loyal to our country, who have lived here and it is the only country they know, who are able to work legally under DACA, simply allowing them, if they choose to, to put their lives on the line for the country that they love, that will make us all safer, Madam Speaker, and is part of H.R. 15 and comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield to another leader in the effort to fix our broken immigration system, a gentleman from a large district in Texas that covers a lot of the border, my good friend, Mr. GALLEGO.

Mr. GALLEGO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Madam Speaker, thank you so much for the opportunity to speak.

This past Veterans Day, I had the opportunity to recognize and to thank those who served in the military with a duty to defend our country. I and all of us, I think, who serve in this Chamber have a duty to these veterans to defend their needs here in the U.S. Congress, and that would include the need for comprehensive immigration reform.

I am very privileged to represent a portion of San Antonio, Texas, known as Military City, USA. This past weekend, at a Veterans Day ceremony at Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery, there was a different aspect of that celebration for veterans, because this past weekend, as we honored veterans on Veterans Day at Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery, there was also, at that same site, that same location, that same time, a naturalization ceremony, where 18 people, servicemembers, were naturalized:

Eddie Rivers, Theophilus Botchway, Lily Alexandra Caceres, Tashique Williams, Kwaku Bosoah, Kenneth Francis, Jr., Nabieula Samura, Maria Cervantes Ramos, Carena Garabet Akridge, Larry Ndungu, Elkanah Yator, Mario Alexis Mares, Omar Ruiz Perez, Guillermo Chavez Cardenas, Marlon Chris Gabriel, Petra Maria Thompson, Gabriel Adjetey, all of those were involved in the Veterans Day naturalization ceremony.

They came from Dominica, Ecuador, Germany, Ghana, Honduras, the Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Mexico, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago and Syria.

You see, each year about 8,000 noncitizens join the U.S. military. Their sacrifices throughout history have been many. Immigrants who served in the U.S. military are enlistees like Lance Corporal Jose Gutierrez, who was the first U.S. serviceman killed in combat in Iraq some 10 years ago. Mr. Gutierrez, who was a native of Guatemala, arrived in the U.S. without documents at the age of 14. He received his U.S. citizenship posthumously, after his supreme sacrifice.

Others, like Alfred Rascon, emerged from the war as high achievers. Mr. Rascon, who was an undocumented immigrant from Mexico, was assigned to Fort Sam Houston for basic and for specialist medical training. He was awarded the Medal of Honor during the Vietnam war. He became a U.S. citizen, and he later served as Director of the United States Selective Service System.

The list of stories of noncitizens who have served in the U.S. military is a very long list. Enlistments by immigrants are highest during times of war. At the end of the last decade, Madam Speaker, there were over 100,000 foreign-born individuals serving in various aspects in various capacities in our Armed Forces. That is why it is so important to recognize the contributions of immigration to our national security.

On social media, through Twitter and Facebook, I made it known that I was at this ceremony on Veterans Day in San Antonio, where not only were we honoring veterans, but there was a citizenship and naturalization ceremony at the same time. And there were many comments about, How is this possible?

Well, it is and it has been. In the years since 9/11 and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have, in fact, relied on immigrants in our military.

Since 2002, over 89,000 military servicemembers have become U.S. citizens. Immigrants in the military and other agencies critical to our national security have served as translators, for example; and through their understanding of local communities and through their understanding of local customs, they have helped collect intelligence which better protects Americans, not only at home, but also abroad.

Unfortunately, today the House leadership said that they would not consider immigration reform this year, and, frankly, that is a real tragedy. They said they wouldn't even consider looking at the Senate bill as a starting point to negotiate.

H.R. 15, of which I am a cosponsor, has 190 other cosponsors and 25 or so Republicans who have vowed to support it, and thus, the votes are there to pass immigration reform.

In this time of excessive partisanship and excessive bickering, we have to find a way forward to do the right thing for our country, for our kids, and for our future. We have to figure out a way to succeed, even if we succeed sometimes in spite of ourselves.

Especially in today's political climate, so many of us here in the House, we repeatedly talk about our commitment to principles, our commitment to fighting for what we, as individual Members, believe in. But the reality is that, in a House with 435 people and with 100 Members of the Senate and an all-or-nothing attitude, many times it produces nothing, and that all-or-nothing attitude kills immigration reform. That all-or-nothing attitude produces nothing for children who have known no other home than the United States and are here through no fault of their own. It produces nothing of the estimated $775 billion in revenue and $125 billion in payroll from immigrant-owned businesses, and it produces nothing of the $175 billion in deficit reduction in the first 10 years after immigration reform is enacted or another $700 billion in deficit reduction in the 10 years after that.

Immigrants are so important to our country in so many ways. We say it all the time. We say it all the time. Ours is a Nation of immigrants. Immigration reform is critical to our economy, to our families, and, yes, even to our national security.

□ 1930

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative POLIS.

Earlier tonight when we started this hour, I made mention of how proud I am of my grandfather, who was an immigrant from Poland. He added, along with his military colleagues, to the muscle of the military might of this Nation, and together, they were able to help serve this Nation so as to proclaim victory in the war that was to end all wars. But we know that that wasn't the case.

Nonetheless, with that contribution to this country behind him, he returned home. He returned to build a life. He returned to build a family. He returned to build a community. He returned, like all of our veterans, to build a Nation. Why would we want to stop this pathway to progress? Why would we want to stop this pathway to economic vitality? Why would we want to stop this pathway to citizenship?

You know, it is no wonder that so many from various perspectives have come forth, imploring us in this House, imploring the Republican leadership, to set an agenda that includes immigration reform. For everyone from the Chamber of Commerce to the Farm Bureau, from labor to the farm community to the working families of this Nation to so many of the businesses that have asked for sound immigration reform, let's not stand in the way of progress. We only ask the Republican majority in this House to set the tone, open to the discussion, because if it is brought to the floor, I am convinced that we will recognize, as Representatives, as leaders of this Nation, the true definition of this Nation, a land of immigrants.

With that, I yield back to Representative POLIS and thank him for leading us in this very important discussion here this evening.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for his impassioned words.

Here in the spirit of Veterans Day week—of course we all honor our veterans every day of the year. This past Monday was Veterans Day. This week, in particular, we are honoring those who serve our Nation. I would like to share the stories of several immigrants who serve in our Armed Forces.

This is Augustus Maiyo, who serves in Colorado with the U.S. Army World Class Athlete Program at Fort Carson. I am proud to say that he won the Marine Corps Marathon last year and led the team to victory. He is a runner and has done remarkable times and ended up winning it. He was fortunate to get the run done right before Hurricane Sandy impacted our Nation. We are proud, of course. I want to thank Augustus Maiyo for his service and for being a role model for so many others.

One of the hats I wear in Congress is I cochair the U.S.-Nepal Caucus, and I am particularly proud to be able to share the story of Saral Shrestha, a Fort Bragg soldier from Katmandu, Nepal, who was selected as the 2012 Soldier of the Year. He came to the United States in 2007 from Nepal. He went to college in Nebraska, joined the Army in 2009, and was deployed in Afghanistan.

We should be proud of the contributions that our 2012 Soldier of the Year has made, himself an immigrant, an inspiration to all the men and women who serve, including those who were born in other nations.

As many of you know, the contest for Soldier of the Year is a very rigorous competition. Shrestha has been promoted to sergeant since he began the competition. We are particularly proud that the announcement was made during the Association of the United States Army annual meeting in Washington, D.C.

There were many others, Madam Speaker, that we would like to be able to share the stories of, who want to lay down their lives to defend our country and to serve with distinction but, under current law, are prevented from serving in the Armed Forces, even though under the deferred action program they are able to work, they are able to attend school in our country, and all that many of them ask is to be able to risk their lives to defend the country they love, the country they know, the United States of America. H.R. 15 and the Senate bill address this situation and would allow these brave young men and women to serve.

It is time, Madam Speaker. It is time to bring this bill forward. It is time to have a simple ''yes'' or ''no'' vote. It is what the American people are demanding. The American people are not demanding that we spend our precious hours and days debating asbestos reform. The American people are not demanding that we only work a dozen days before the end of the year here in Congress. The American people are demanding that we solve problems.

More than 70 percent of the American people support comprehensive immigration reform. It would improve the security of the Nation. It would honor the service of our veterans. It would secure our borders. It would reflect our values. It would improve our economy. It would reduce the deficit—and it would create jobs for Americans. What is not to like? Let's pass comprehensive immigration reform now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DEFENDING ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, one thing becomes very clear from our study of history, and that is that things that nations do have consequences. Things we do individually have consequences, and things we do as a Nation have consequences. That is why some people remember that on May 30, 2010, there were six flotilla ships—and this is from the U.N. release, a report into last year's raid, how events unfolded, dated 2 September 2011.

It points out that on May 30, 2010, six flotilla ships leave Cyprus for Gaza in an attempt to break Israel's naval blockade. The Turkish cruise liner Mavi Marmara is chartered by Islamic charity IHH and carries 581 of the 700

flotilla activists. We know that didn't turn out so well. Israel did have a legitimate right to blockade the Gaza Strip to prevent more rockets, more munitions from being brought into the Gaza Strip that were being used to fire on, kill, and terrorize Israelis. Again, actions have consequences, and many remember the flotilla coming down and challenging the blockade, and there were people who were killed.

If you go back, here is an article. It is dated also May 30, 2010, which was a Sunday. But it points out—and this is an article from The Washington Times entitled, ''Israel assails resolution on nuke weapons as 'flawed,' '' and it is talking about an agreement that President Obama was trying to get done, a nonproliferation agreement, and the article points out that on Friday, which was May 28, 2010:

> A U.S. delegation in New York voted to endorse a consensus document ending the 2010 review conference for the Non-Proliferation Treaty that calls for a conference in 2012 to discuss a weapons of mass destruction-free zone in the Middle East.
>
> The final document of the monthlong review conference calls on Israel to join the treaty, a move that would require Israel to disclose and then give up its undeclared nuclear arsenal.

This was viewed and discussed as being the first time in people's memory when the United States, by and through its administration—the Obama administration—had taken action that was very adverse to Israel and the international community, and particularly in the U.N. Normally we did not side with Israel's enemies.

One of the lessons that I was taught by history professors at Texas A&M is that when a nation's enemies see that nation's strongest ally pulling away, it is provocative. It often provokes action by that nation's enemies against it because they think their strongest ally is pulling away. Some saw that before the war in Korea. They thought that the United States might have North Korea beyond its ''sphere of influence.'' Those kinds of things, those words, these actions, these votes can be provocative.

So 2 days after the United States sides with Israel's enemies in demanding that Israel disclose its nuclear weapons, the flotilla launches to challenge the blockade. Isn't that amazing? It just happens to be right after this administration sides with Israel's enemies. Here comes a challenge to Israel's blockade that was just trying to save Israeli lives.

Well, the reason that it is important to point these things out now is, what is happening between the United States and Iran, as we leave Israel out of the equation—even though it is Israel that is considered to be the little Satan and we are considered the great Satan, and Israel is probably to be the first attacked, if there is an attack—they are certainly the most vulnerable. Yet we leave our former friend Israel out of the equation.

It brings to mind a number of things that have been happening during this administration that have caused the vast majority of people in Israel, of Israeli citizens, to believe that this Obama administration is not concerned about Israel's best interests.

There are many who have been aware of Scripture, and it has often been a guide in our relations with Israel. It is really such an historically appropriate thing in this House of Representatives, especially if we were down the hall in the former House Chamber, now called Statuary Hall, where they used to hold church most Sundays during the 1800s. Up until the late 1800s, the largest church congregation was in the House of Representatives, and it was not considered to be violative of the Constitution because it didn't endorse a particular religion. It was considered nondenominational.

Scripture was read regularly, every week, down the hall. Thomas Jefferson had coined the phrase ''separation of church and State'' as being appropriate. He didn't find it offensive, that notion, and, in fact, at times would bring the Marine band to play hymns.

So it seems appropriate, when we talk about Israel, to talk about Israel's roots because in Genesis 12—and this is the King James version:

> Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee;
>
> And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing;
>
> And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all families of the Earth be blessed.

So Abram went to the land of Canaan, which later became Israel, just as God had promised in these verses. So it was no accident that just minutes after Israel became a Nation, the United States, through its President, Harry Truman, became the first nation in the world to recognize what was prophesied throughout the Old Testament about Israel returning after its absence.

□ 1945

Israel returned and Harry Truman made sure we were the first Nation that recognized them as an independent nation. The U.N. had voted unanimously. Because of the Holocaust and over 6 million Jews being killed, they wanted to ensure that another Holocaust would never happen again. And that brought about Israel being reestablished in part of the land they had possessed 3,000 years before.

This is an article from The Washington Post, David Ignatius:

> Is Israel preparing to attack Iran? Because it is considered a betrayal of an ally to warn an ally's enemies that that ally may take self-defensive action to prevent being attacked. And the United States and Iran, including President Obama, has said repeatedly and has promised an American-Israeli gathering here at the Convention Center that he would never allow Iran to have nuclear weapons, that it is an existential threat to Israel. It certainly is.

So we have been hearing behind the scenes for a number of years that this administration was telling Israeli leaders, Don't you dare attack Iran without our permission. We will take care of this. We won't let them have nuclear weapons; and yet it is not the United States that is first threatened. The great Satan, the United States, in the eyes of leaders in Iran—not the Iranian people, but Iranian leaders—would get around to attacking us. But first Israel is threatened.

So there was concern, obviously, here in Washington in the Obama administration that the reported threats to Israel not to defend themselves without our permission—even though no nation should ever need permission from another to defend itself—and even President Obama said this out here at the Convention Center to an American-Israeli group. Prime Minister Netanyahu reminded me of our President's words, and I went back and looked them up. Sure enough, he said:

> Israel must defend itself by itself.

Our President said that. And yet if we are not going to help Israel defend itself, which is actually defending us as well, then shouldn't we avoid jeopardizing Israel's own self-defense?

Yet here is this article dated February 2, 2012. It says:

> Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has a lot on his mind these days, from cutting the defense budget to managing the drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan. But his biggest worry is the growing possibility that Israel will attack Iran over the next few months.
>
> Panetta believes there is a strong likelihood that Israel will strike Iran in April, May, or June—before Iran enters what Israeli's described as a ''zone of immunity'' to commence building a nuclear bomb. Very soon, the Israelis fear, the Iranians will have stored enough enriched uranium in deep underground facilities to make a weapon—and only the United States could then stop them militarily.

That is a betrayal of our ally, Israel. That is a gross betrayal of our ally, Israel. We are supposed to be on the same side; and if Israel defends itself, it is defending us as well, whether we recognize it or not.

That was a betrayal of Israel to leak what this administration believed were their plans to defend itself. If we are not going to defend ourselves, for heaven's sake, at least allow Israel to do it without putting them more in jeopardy.

By leaking that, obviously, it was this administration saying to Israel, Well, you better not go when you were thinking you were going to go because they are going to be ready because we warned your enemy for you.

So we get to May and, obviously, the window that Israel may have been considering attacking had to pass because of the leak by our own administration to Israel's enemies, through The Washington Post. An intentional leak.

This is from March 29, 2012, ''Israelis Suspect Obama Media Leaks to Prevent Strike on Iran,'' by Alexander Marquardt from ABC News:

> Two reports today about Iran's nuclear program and the possibility of an Israeli

military strike have analysts in Israel accusing the Obama administration of leaking information to pressure Israel not to bomb Iran and for Iran to reach a compromise in upcoming nuclear talks.

That is simply outrageous.

This article says, continuing that same article:

The first report in Foreign Policy quotes anonymous American officials saying that Israel has been given access to air bases by Iran's northern neighbor Azerbaijan from which Israel could launch air strikes or at least drones and search and rescue aircraft.

The article goes on:

It seems like a big campaign to prevent Israel from attacking, analyst Yoel Guzansky at the Institute for National Security Studies told ABC News. I think the Obama administration is really worried Jerusalem will attack—and attack soon. They're trying hard to prevent it in so many ways.

The Foreign Policy report by Mark Perry quotes an intelligence officer saying, We're watching what Iran does closely. But we're now watching what Israel is doing in Azerbaijan. And we're not happy about it.

Further down:

In recent weeks the Obama administration shifted from persuasion efforts vis-a-vis decisionmakers and Israel's public opinion to a practical, targeted assassination of potential Israeli operations in Iran, Ben-Yishai writes. The campaign's aims are fully operational: to make it more difficult for Israeli decisionmakers to order the Israeli defense forces to carry out a strike, and what's even graver, to erode the IDF's capacity to launch a strike with minimal casualties.

We are putting Israel's own forces at far greater risk for casualties. Is that something an ally does to a friend?

Some of us believe that the Bible is accurate. Certainly, so many prophesies have been fulfilled. And if that is true, this administration, unless they can find a verse that accurately says that those who betray Israel will be blessed, then this country is being dug in a deeper hole by this administration and its betrayals of Israel's trust and Israel's friendship.

This is from November 3, 2013, from TheBlaze, ''Fury, Scandalous: Israel Conveys Bitter Protests to Obama Admin Over Reported White House Security Leak.

This says:

The Israeli government conveyed ''bitter protests'' to the White House this weekend over the Obama administration's reported leak of who was behind last week's air raid on a Syrian base near the port city of Latakia. Words being used by the media and officials speaking anonymously in Israel to describe what they perceive as a breach in trust on the part of the United States include fury, scandalous, baffled, unthinkable.

This administration continues to betray our friend, our ally, Israel.

Other things that have happened in the past were the comments made by President Obama to President Sarkozy in 2012 at a G–20 summit which were belittling Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, comments in 2011 that Israel should return to its 1967 borders that would have subjected it to relentless attacks and vulnerability. They were not helpful to our friend and ally.

The Obama administration's failure to condemn Palestinians building of illegal settlements, yet constantly criticizing Israeli housing plans for East Jerusalem; the Obama administration's decision to eradicate the missile defense programs that would have helped Israel as well as the United States; leaving Prime Minister Netanyahu in 2010 on for over an hour in the White House meeting room while President Obama dined with his family and refused to take a picture with him was not a friendly gesture.

Also, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced the Obama administration planned to send $147 million to the West Bank and Hamas-run Gaza; President Obama stated that all his friends in Chicago were Jewish and says he was sometimes being accused of being a Jewish ''puppet''; the Obama administration leak to The Washington Post of the time window in which Israel would take out Iran's nuclear program; the Obama administration leaked to the media that Israel was going to use the Azerbaijan airspace to take out Iran's nuclear program.

We placed immense pressure on Israel not to defend itself without the United States' permission. The Obama administration has never rejected or condemned the racist, hateful teachings about Jewish people going on in Palestinian schools in the Middle East and in some Muslim schools in the United States.

President Obama traveled to Turkey, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt and apologized to them on behalf of the United States. The Obama administration's support for the Muslim Brotherhood's rise to power in Egypt as well as throughout the Middle East, though the Muslim Brotherhood had never backed away from their demand for the nonexistence of Israel, the Obama administration continues to support the Muslim Brotherhood's return to power in Egypt, when Egypt is where the Muslim Brotherhood turned violent on Morsi's arrest because of his violation of the constitution that did not provide for impeachment, after the Egyptian people turned out in the millions to demand his removal.

It was not a coup, as the Christian Pope in Egypt told me. It was not a coup. This was a people rising up and demanding removal, and yet this administration now has cut off support because Egypt does not want the group, the Muslim Brotherhood, that was killing Christians, burning churches, terrorizing the nation, we want them back in charge—this administration does.

It is an outrage.

Though the Syrian leader Assad has been ruthless in killing and abusing his people, has not been helpful to Israel to the extent the Egyptian leader Mubarak was, this administration has not done anything but put Israel in more jeopardy by its actions in Syria.

So we have not been terribly helpful to our friend Israel. And it doesn't sound like we are actually blessing Israel. It sounds like we are cursing Israel, belittling its leaders, marginalizing its efforts to defend itself, which also enures to our benefit.

My oath of office is to this country. When I was in the Army for 4 years, my oath was to this country. My allegiance continues to this country, and I believe that being Israel's friend is helpful to this country; and that is why I so strongly support being a friend to Israel.

And even if you took the Bible completely out, you took out most anything except just looking at the Middle East and who believes in the value of life like we do here in the United States, who believes more in democratic actions like we do in the United States, then Israel should certainly be our friend.

But what this administration is doing with Iran is foolhardy. It is foolhardy. And thank God for France. They didn't wave a white flag of surrender. They said, This is a terrible deal. And thank goodness they slowed it down, because this administration thinks they just knew and everything they try will work perfectly. Hello, ObamaCare.

□ 2000

It doesn't work any better when they try to mess with our friendships and reward our enemies and hurt our friends.

So, in the few minutes that are remaining, Madam Speaker, I would like to reference back to the New York Times article by Barry James, October 21, 1994, during the Clinton administration.

The director of the International Atomic Energy Agency expressed skepticism Thursday about the U.S.-North Korean nuclear agreement, saying it could delay inspections by the agency.

Officials at the agency, some U.S. Republican Senators and politicians in South Korea criticized the accord, saying they feared Pyongyang had bought itself a further 5 years of secrecy, thus concealing whether it has reprocessed enough plutonium to build one or more nuclear weapons.

The energy agency says it needs to inspect two nuclear waste dumps to be able to answer the question. North Korea has never conceded the existence of the dumps. ''It would be in the interests of all concerned that a prolonged delay be avoided,'' said the agency director, Hans Blix; but, he added, ''We are better off'' with the agreement than with none at all. ''We have to worry about how much they have squirreled away,'' an agency official said. ''Blix thinks 5 years is a long time to have to wait for our inspectors to gain access to the facilities we need to see, including the two facilities the North Koreans have never declared.''

Yet, under the agreement that the Clinton administration reached, North Korea agreed to place in storage the fuel removed last spring from a 5-megawatt graphite reactor containing enough plutonium for four or five nuclear bombs. U.S. Republican Senators protested in a letter to President Bill Clinton that this reversed longstanding U.S. policy because it allowed the North Koreans to hang onto their spent fuel rods and would delay for several years the inspection of suspect sites.

The accord ''shows it is always possible to get an agreement when you give enough away,'' said Senator Bob Dole of Kansas . . . The deal also has been heavily criticized in South Korea. Many people there see it as a diplomatic triumph for Pyongyang, which failed to dispel doubts about its nuclear intentions.

As part of the pact, which will be signed in Geneva on Friday, the United States will head an international consortium to provide North Korea with an interim supply of fuel to overcome its chronic energy shortage and, eventually, two 1,000-megawatt light-water reactors. In exchange, North Korea will abandon its existing nuclear facilities and renounce any plans to build nuclear weapons.

Gee, doesn't that sound familiar? This administration is repeating the same mistakes of Madeleine Albright and Bill Clinton as President. They are running to Iran, which can not be trusted, which has lied repeatedly just like North Korea did.

And how did the Clinton deal work out? Yes, they took the nuclear facilities we provided them, but they didn't stand good behind their promise not to develop nuclear weapons. They developed them and we helped them.

Now this administration wants to do the same thing with Iran? We are still paying for the mistakes of the Clinton administration with North Korea's helping them get more nuclear power—and now this administration wants to do that with Iran? That is a huge mistake.

We need to help our friend Israel, to stop betraying them, to help our friends, to stop rewarding our enemies, because the consequences to this Nation will be dire if we don't turn this around.

Madam Speaker, it is my prayer—it is my hope—that this administration will turn from its stupid ways. The arrogance that existed before ObamaCare kicked in surely should have come down a notch so that they can realize maybe we are making a mistake in dealing with bloodthirsty people in Iran as well.

This country's future is at stake. That ought to be enough to make this administration slow down and realize they are about to make another huge mistake that we will pay for for generations if they don't stop. Iran will certainly not stop just as North Korea did not. They had gotten help from North Korea. They learned the lesson from North Korea. It is time this administration learned a lesson from our mistake and from the mistake of the Clinton administration and Madeleine Albright.

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

THE PRICE IS WRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 30 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, everyone has heard about ''The Price is Right,'' but on C–SPAN tonight, we are going to play ''The Price is Wrong.'' Before doing so, I want to put this in perspective.

A number of years ago, we were all aghast as taxpayers—even here as Members of Congress—when we found out that in the Department of Defense we were spending $436 on a hammer, that we spent $7,600 on a coffee urn, and that—oh, yes—we spent $640 on a toilet seat. Talk about flushing money down a toilet—we were doing it—but that fleecing that we thought had ended has actually continued.

Since 2010, the inspector general of the Department of Defense has found that we are spending more than $430 million over what we should be paying for spare parts—thousands of spare parts. So we are paying much more than the fair or reasonable price for these parts. What the military should do when it needs parts is go to what is called the Defense Logistics Agency, DLA—it is sort of like the defense hardware store—but sometimes they think it is cheaper and, maybe, faster if they go to a defense contractor and ask for those parts.

These audits also showed that the certain parts we have in such volume will last us 100 years. That is like having spare parts like, let's say, horseshoes dating back to World War I, and they are sitting around the defense hardware store today—more than 100 years' worth of certain spare parts. You might think maybe this is a little complicated, but it is really not complicated. The auditors go to the Department of Defense databases, and they can tell immediately, with just a click, whether or not these spare parts are in stock and how much they will be charged for those spare parts.

So let's play our very first game of ''The Price is Wrong.''

This is a ramp gate roller assembly. It is about the size of a quarter. This particular assembly sells for $7.71 in the defense hardware store. The auditors suggested—maybe because this is, in fact, for a Chinook helicopter—that it could be even a little bit more. What did the personnel within the Department of Defense pay for this little assembly? It wasn't $7.71. Was it perhaps $77.10? No, it wasn't $77.10. Was it $771? No, it wasn't $771. We paid for this $7.71 part $1,678.61.

The price is wrong, and the Department of Defense has got to clean up its act.

Let's move on to yet another game that we can play. It is called ''That's Too Much.''

I am going to show you another part. This is a bearing sleeve, and you are going to tell me whether or not you think the price is too much. At the local hardware store, this would sell for $6. Again, this is for a Chinook helicopter. The inspector general says maybe, for this sophisticated helicopter, it would cost $10 for this part. So, what did we pay for this part? Did we pay $86? No, we didn't pay $86. Did we pay $286? No, we didn't pay $286. We paid $2,286 for this little part. Now, we didn't just buy one part. We bought 573 of these parts, of this little bearing sleeve, and it cost us $1.3 million.

All right. If you haven't enjoyed playing this game so far, we have one more game to play tonight. This game is the finale. It is called the ''Showcase Showdown.'' This is when we compare two packages and see which one costs more.

Our first items here are two simple ramp gate roller assemblies. Now, which is more expensive—these two ramp gate roller assemblies or a trip to Paris, France, for two, including airfare and hotel for four nights? Which is more expensive? If you guessed the trip to Paris, France, you would be wrong because a trip to Paris, France, if you go on one of the local Web sites, would cost $2,681, and we paid—or, I should say, the Army paid—$3,357 for these two ramp gate roller assemblies.

The Pentagon is playing games with taxpayer dollars, and let me tell you that this is just the tip of the iceberg. The worst part of this game is that it is rigged. The contractors always win, and the taxpayers always lose.

The inspector general found that the Army overpaid one defense contractor $13 million but that the Pentagon only recovered $2.6 million. Now get this: it is discovered that one defense contractor overcharged us $13 million for a number of parts, and then after it was exposed, they didn't even refund us what they should have. They only paid us back $2.6 million. It included paying twice the fair and reasonable price for kits and overpaying by $16,000 for a structural support that should have cost only $1,300.

Now, this bearing sleeve that I just showed you that was over $2,200, let's put it in kind of simple terms.

If we went into a local cafe and ordered the blue light special and the menu said it was $2,200, we would walk right out, and they would be laughed out of our community—but no, that doesn't happen in the military. As for that defense contractor who overcharged us and then didn't even pay us back what they had overcharged us—get this—the Air Force has just signed on the dotted line a contract with this defense contractor to do the following: to manage the supply chain. It is almost laughable that the defense contractor who ripped us off now has another contract to manage the supply chain.

Those are all of the games we have for tonight. Thank you for playing. We will see you next time on ''The Price is Wrong.''

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1499. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 278 Main Street in Chadron, Nebraska, as the ''Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1512. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the ''Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1557. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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:

H.R. 2747. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 31, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3190. To provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 14, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3636. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2013 Annual Report on the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3637. A letter from the Secretary, 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 Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3638. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2012 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3639. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers employed at the Baker Brothers site in Toledo, Ohio, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3640. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers employed at the Feed Materials Production Center (FMPC) in Fernand, Ohio, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3641. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting (RIN: 3245-AG43) received October 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

3642. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Support Activities for Mining (RIN: 3245-AG44) received October 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

3643. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Ballard Canyon Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2013-0001; T.D. TTB-116; Ref: Notice No. 132] (RIN: 1513-AB98) received October 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3644. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Big Valley District-Lake County and Kelsey Bench-Lake County Viticultural Areas and Modification of the Red Hills Lake County Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2013-0003; T.D. TTB-118; Ref: Notice No. 134] (RIN: 1515-AB99) received October 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3645. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Moon Mountain District Sonoma County Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2013-0002; T.D. TTB-117; Ref: Notice No. 133] (RIN: 1513-AC00) received October 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 3461. A bill to support early learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3462. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group health plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and 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. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BARBER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 3463. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure proper manpower on the United States border and to provide for reforms to rates of pay for Border Patrol agents; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 3464. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to discharges incidental to the normal operation of certain vessels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 3465. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3466. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the prohibition against the conversion of contributions to personal use to contributions accepted by political committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. JONES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 3467. A bill to enhance reciprocal market access for United States domestic producers in the negotiating process of bilateral, regional, and multilateral trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 3468. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend insurance coverage to amounts held in a member account on behalf of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENYART, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr.

GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. COOK, Mr. COLE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 3469. A bill to amend titles 5 and 38, United States Code, to clarify the veteran status of an individual based on the attendance of the individual at a preparatory school of a service academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 3470. A bill to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MENG, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 3471. A bill to protect a woman's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 3472. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the ''Sergeant Brett E. Gornewicz Memorial Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the qualifying therapeutic discovery project credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3474. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3475. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide protections for cruise vessel passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the American Opportunity Tax Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3477. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide support to university law school programs that are designed to provide legal assistance to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 3478. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO):

H.R. 3479. A bill to provide a taxpayer bill of rights for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 3480. A bill to prohibit entities from using Federal funds to contribute to political campaigns or participate in lobbying activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COLE):

H.J. Res. 102. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Risa Lavizzo-Mourey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COLE):

H.J. Res. 103. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of John Fahey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MENG, Ms. CHU, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 408. A resolution expressing sincere condolences and support for assistance to the people of the Philippines and all those affected by the tragic Super Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda) of November 8, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARINO, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H. Res. 409. A resolution expressing support for the goals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H. Res. 410. A resolution expressing support for the designation of a ''Small Business Saturday'' and supporting efforts to increase awareness of the value of locally owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

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. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 3461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, paragraph 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 3463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 3464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, which states that ''Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations'' regarding the ''Times, Places and Manner of holding elections.''

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 3467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this bill affects spending by the United States, in that it alters the definition of a constitutionally-permissible class (military Veterans) that receives funds from the federal government, Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution which empowers Congress ''To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence [sic] and general Welfare of the United States'' and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 3471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America and Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, the authority to enact this legislation rests with the Congress.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 3472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish post offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

16th Amendment

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 3475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

As it is the purpose of the government of the United States to protect and defend the natural and inalienable rights of the American citizen, it is necessary and proper for the Congress to legislate, when necessary, to ensure the ability of the citizenry to keep and bear arms and to travel with such arms while taking reasonable precautions to ensure the safety of his/her fellows and to respect state and local laws.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;''

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 3480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas

H.J. Res. 102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithson donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithson donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 129: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 274: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 292: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 351: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 411: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 455: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr.TONKO.

H.R. 494: Ms. DELBENE, Ms.SLAUGHTER, and Mr.CAPUANO.

H.R. 564: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 631: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 647: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 664: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 685: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 713: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 719: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 732: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 831: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 858: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 861: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 920: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 940: Mr. STUTZMAN and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 961: Mr. CARNEY and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1000: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1015: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1020: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1027: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1091: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1098: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1105: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1125: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1176: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1199: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1209: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1226: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1240: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1250: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1295: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1318: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1331: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1337: Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1339: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1354: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1453: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1528: Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1557: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1563: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1661: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1692: Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1726: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1767: Mr. ENYART, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1775: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1812: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1814: Mr. FARR and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1823: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1837: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1845: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1851: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1861: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1869: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1914: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. BASS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1950: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1984: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 2019: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2027: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2028: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2041: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2073: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2086: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2093: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2118: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2120: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2123: Mr. MARINO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2203: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2233: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2247: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2263: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2315: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2328: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2429: Mr. MARINO and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 2509: Ms. EDWARDS and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 2536: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 2575: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2697: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2723: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2725: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 2780: Mr. KEATING, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2783: Mr. NOLAN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2785: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2791: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 2805: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2807: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 2822: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2866: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2902: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2911: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2932: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2941: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2955: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2957: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2967: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 2983: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3017: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 3022: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 3038: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 3111: Mr. SALMON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3113: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3116: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 3121: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3122: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3137: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3154: Mr. YODER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 3179: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3206: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3240: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3292: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 3299: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 3311: Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3333: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3335: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3344: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 3350: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3360: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3361: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 3367: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 3369: Mr. WOLF, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3374: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 3382: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3388: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3391: Mr. POCAN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 3397: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3406: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3408: Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 3416: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3429: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3435: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3446: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3448: Mr. FINCHER.
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. DOYLE.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 11: Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 109: Mr. LEWIS.
H. Res. 135: Mr. LEVIN.
H. Res. 153: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 250: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. LAMALFA.
H. Res. 296: Ms. FOXX.
H. Res. 301: Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 302: Mr. HARRIS.
H. Res. 356: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mrs. CAPITO.
H. Res. 360: Mr. BURGESS.
H. Res. 365: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BARBER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 398: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 404: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 405: Mr. LONG, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H. Res. 406: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

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. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3350 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2013 No. 161

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Spirit of God, descend on our hearts, for apart from You life is a tale full of sound and fury signifying nothing.

May our Senators walk in Your ways, keeping Your precepts with such integrity that they will never be ashamed. Lord, incline their hearts to Your wisdom, providing them with the understanding they need to accomplish Your purposes in our world. Let Your mercy protect them from the dangers of this life, as they learn to find delight in Your commandments. Keep them ever mindful of the fewness of their days and the greatness of their work.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

THANKING THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the esteemed senior Senator from Vermont leaves the floor, I want to say a few words.

I appreciate the guidance and leadership my friend has given over these many years in leading the Judiciary Committee. It is a committee where most all of the legislation is funneled, and what we have focused on in recent months is the problem we have with judges.

Yesterday my friend did a remarkably good job in leading a precedent indicating the issues we have with the DC Circuit, and I so appreciate his leadership on this issue and all the other issues on which the Judiciary Committee works. It is too bad we cannot have the Judiciary Committee as it was in our earlier years in the Senate where the productivity of that committee is not thwarted by not being able to bring items to the floor.

The Judiciary Committee has a wide range of jurisdiction over matters that are so important to our country, such as our national security agencies and cyber security. There is a multitude of issues the Judiciary Committee deals with, and I wish we could be doing more legislation on the floor which comes from that committee.

I wanted to extend my appreciation to the Senator for the good work he has done, and I also want to send accolades to the people of Vermont for having this good man leading the Senate in many different ways, not the least of which is being the Senate President pro tempore.

DRUG SAFETY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the symptoms of fungal meningitis can be very subtle at first: headaches, fever, even light can start bothering people, as well as neckaches and backaches. The disease can also cause strokes, seizures, and even coma.

Fungal meningitis led to the death of at least 64 unfortunate Americans when they were injected with a contaminated medicine. The medicine—a steroid injection used to heal back pain—was tainted by unsanitary conditions from a facility that was masquerading as a compounding pharmacy in Massachusetts. The true compounding pharmacies provide custom-made medications for patients with unique health needs that cannot be treated by off-the-shelf prescription medicines. This practice is essential and can be critical for children, cancer patients, and people with severe allergies.

The contaminated medicine mixed at the New England Compounding Center was sent to scores of medical facilities in 23 different States and given to 14,000 patients. As I have indicated, 64 of them died and hundreds of those patients were seriously ill.

Recently a heart medication mixed at the same pharmacy was linked to the death of two young Nevada boys, ages 4 and 6, according to a lawsuit filed by their parents.

The New England Compounding Center was skirting Federal regulations and manufacturing large batches of drugs for mass distribution in very unsanitary conditions. By avoiding the safety inspections required of large-scale drug manufacturers, companies such as this one can boost profits, but in the process they risk lives.

The legislation on the floor will end that dangerous practice and ensure that patients have access to high-quality custom medications. This is not a contentious issue. On the contrary, this legislation has wide bipartisan support—led by HARKIN and ALEXANDER—and would pass by a wide margin in mere moments if not for the stall tactics by a few Republican Senators. This bill has already been delayed for more than a month because of these tactics, and Republicans continue to insist on running out the clock on this matter.

As everyone knows, if all time is required on the procedural issues, we will not be able to finish the bill until this Sunday—that includes working Saturday—and the final 30 hours won't run out until sometime on Sunday. It is time to dispense with this noncontroversial measure—a measure that will safeguard the lives of vulnerable

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Americans, people with back pain and other maladies—and move on to other important legislative priorities.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Republican leader is recognized.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, one of the favorite pastimes of politicians in Washington is to talk about how frustrated the American people are with politicians in Washington. After the past few weeks, it is easy to see why. I am talking about the President's promise, repeated dozens of times, that if you like your health care plan, you can keep it, and the sobering realization by literally millions of Americans is that it was not true.

Some of the top fact checkers in the country have used terms such as ''pants on fire'' and ''false'' and ''four Pinocchios'' to describe the claim that under ObamaCare folks would be able to keep their plans.

In a matter of weeks, it has gone from being one of the law's top selling points to a national punchline. If millions of people were not so frustrated and upset by it, it might actually be funny, but it is not the least bit funny.

At this stage about 50,000 folks are believed to have signed up for insurance on the Federal exchange—way below administration estimates. That is 50,000 folks who have signed up for insurance on the exchange, while 3.5 million Americans have lost their health care coverage. In other words, about twice as many folks have lost their insurance in the State of Idaho alone since October 1 as have obtained health insurance across the entire Federal exchange all across America. So this is a real crisis.

In my home State of Kentucky, over a quarter of a million people have lost their private health care plan so far and only about 7,000 Kentuckians have been able to obtain new private insurance under ObamaCare. If you consider that Kentucky received $250 million in taxpayer funds to get ObamaCare up and running, that works out to about $35,000 per private insurance enrollee, and that is before the taxpayer subsidies kick in.

We have literally thrown untold millions at this disastrous rollout, and what do we have to show for it? Millions of people losing their coverage despite assurances from the President they would be able to keep it. He said they would be able to keep it, period. That is what the President said.

Let's be very clear about something. These insurance cancellations are not any kind of an accident. This is no accident. It is the way the law was designed. Remember, in order for ObamaCare to work, millions of Americans had to lose the coverage they purchased on their own so the government could dump them into the ObamaCare exchanges. That way the government could then get them to pay more to subsidize coverage for everybody else. That is the way this was designed to work.

The 31-year-old dentist from Louisville whom I mentioned last week—the one who is not married, has no kids—now has to carry pediatric dental care on his plan. He is one of the unfortunate ones subsidizing care for everybody else.

Despite the fact that the President and other supporters of the bill vowed up and down that folks would be able to keep the health care plan they had and liked, the fact is that was never true. It was never true and they knew it. They knew folks would lose their coverage. They knew it all along. Just as the President once famously predicted that utility rates would necessarily skyrocket as a result of his cap-and-trade policy, so too would health care rates skyrocket under ObamaCare. The only difference is that on health care, Democrats apparently knew they could not tell people how it would all shake out in the end, but they knew. That is why in 2010 every Democrat who was in the Senate voted against a Republican proposal designed to hold the President to his word.

The fact is the President's health care law was designed to capture millions of middle-class Americans, jack up their premiums, and use the extra cash to keep ObamaCare afloat. This is not some unforeseen consequence of the law, it is the law. It is working just as they designed it—just like what they voted for.

It is hard to take seriously this faux outrage we have seen of late from some of our Democratic friends. As for the President, this should be no great revelation to him either. Just the other day the media pointed out that the administration knew for years that Americans would lose coverage.

But there is something else.

At a bipartisan health care summit in 2010, the President was asked directly about this kind of thing by House Majority Leader CANTOR. In reply, the President admitted that 8 million to 9 million would have to change coverage and justified it on grounds they would be getting better coverage from the government once they lost it. So the President actually admitted during that event that millions would lose their health care and still went out on the campaign trail claiming Americans could keep the health care plans they had.

This is why Americans feel so hurt by this particular broken promise. And what many of them want to know is why would Washington Democrats persist with it even after it became clear it was false?

I think the reasons are simple enough. One, they needed to pass the ObamaCare bill; and, two, they needed to sell it to a skeptical public. And neither would have been possible without it.

If the President had gone out and told people that if he likes your plan, you can keep it—if the President had said if he likes your plan, you can keep it—it would have never passed. That is why the President's so-called apology the other night rang so hollow for so many.

ObamaCare's problems run so deep and the broken promises are so pervasive that it is impossible to identify an ''easy fix.'' It truly ought to be repealed or delayed. But if the President is sorry for breaking his promise to the American people, there is a natural place to start. He could support legislation that would help restore the plans for the folks who want them back, and he can act on it as early as this Friday. That is because the House is expected to send over a bill that would allow Americans to keep the plans they have and want to keep. There is no reason the President and Senate Democrats should not join Republicans and the American people in supporting it.

This does not have to be a partisan battle. These cancellations have not discriminated based on party. The people out there who are frustrated and upset at losing their health care plans are Democrats and Republicans. The President can help all of them by backing the bill the House is expected to pass on Friday.

I think that is basically what President Clinton was suggesting yesterday when he said the President should honor the commitment the government made to these folks, even—even, said Bill Clinton—if it means changing the law.

I have had a lot of disagreements with President Clinton over the years. But at key moments he was willing to cross party lines, and I think here is a moment where the American people are expecting President Obama to do the same. Allowing Americans to keep their health plans is a promise Democrats made over and over.

Whether or not they meant it, Democrats promised this to the American people, and it is their duty to make good on what they said. Once the House acts, my conference will be watching closely to see whether the Senate Democratic majority allows a vote and will help us send a bill to the President's desk. The American people will be watching closely as well.

So my message to the President is simple: Mr. President, our constituents are frustrated and they are upset. You could help. Do the right thing.

CONGRATULATING FORD MOTOR COMPANY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Ford Motor Company has a proud 100-year history of manufacturing in Kentucky. Today the company announces a new model to be constructed in its Louisville assembly plant, further employing yet another generation of Kentuckians.

I congratulate Ford on this development and applaud its continued excellence in manufacturing in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from Indiana.

CONGRATULATING SENATOR McCONNELL

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate my friend from Kentucky on Ford's expansion there. We have a proud auto building history in Indiana as well. We are extraordinarily proud of all the different folks who help make our country run, who help make our cars go, and in Indiana it is part of who we are. It is great to see expansion in Kentucky as well.

MANUFACTURING JOBS FOR AMERICA

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I am here today to discuss the most important issue facing Hoosiers—and all Americans—and that is getting a good job.

Good jobs allow us to provide for our loved ones, educate our children, and ultimately retire with dignity. Good jobs are also critical for strong communities and a vibrant economy. That is why I am proud to be part of the group of Senators working on Manufacturing Jobs for America. It is an effort to refocus the Senate on helping businesses create jobs and helping communities pursue economic development in the area of manufacturing.

This effort is aimed at building bipartisan support for modernizing the manufacturing sector, increasing access to capital, strengthening our workforce, and creating the conditions necessary for American manufacturers to grow and create jobs.

I have two bills as a part of this effort, the Skills Gap Strategy Act and the AMERICA Works Act. Both of them are focused on closing the skills gap. There are an estimated 600,000 manufacturing jobs that are unfilled across our country in part because employers cannot find workers with the skills they need to fill these open jobs.

We need to match up unemployed or underemployed Americans with the training and education programs employers need so we can get more Americans into these good-paying, skilled jobs.

Last month my friend, Senator DEAN HELLER, and I introduced the Skills Gap Strategy Act. This directs the Department of Labor to develop a goal-oriented strategy to address our skills gap challenges. In order for every Hoosier who wants a job to have a job, and for Indiana's economy to continue to grow, we must train Hoosiers for the jobs that are available right now.

Our bill examines how we can better use existing resources to prioritize training and education programs and prepare our workforce to hit the ground running on day one.

The Skills Gap Strategy Act requires the Department of Labor to provide recommendations on: increasing on-the-job training and apprenticeship opportunities, helping employers participate more in education and workforce training, and identifying and prioritizing in-demand credentials in existing and emerging industries.

When completing this report, we call on the Department to consider: specific labor barriers contributing to the skills gap; policies that have proven successful in key industries, regions, and countries where employers play a larger role in education and workforce training; and ways to better utilize Registered Apprenticeship and other workforce development programs.

We are also asking the Department of Labor to develop plans with the Departments of Commerce and Education to align education with industry and enhance employer participation in K through 12 and career and technical education programs, to increase preapprenticeship and college credit courses in secondary schools, and to improve school-to-work transitions and connections.

I am a strong believer in being fiscally responsible with Hoosier taxpayer dollars. That is why our bill asks the Department of Labor to focus on these solutions that use existing resources, existing programs, and existing personnel—not new programs or new spending.

Closing the skills gap requires participation from individual workers, the education community, and employers. But we have the ability to help, and a specific plan should be in place to do just that.

Also a part of the Manufacturing Jobs for America effort is another bill I am proud to support that focuses on closing the skills gap. Introduced by Senators HAGAN, HELLER, and myself, the AMERICA Works Act modifies existing Federal training programs so that they place a priority on programs and certifications that are recognized and demanded by industry.

I have heard time after time from Hoosier business owners and educators and workers about the pressing need to close the skills gap and to get more people to work.

To address this issue while not increasing Federal spending, the AMERICA Works Act modifies the Workforce Investment Act, Perkins Career and Technical Education, and Trade Adjustment Assistance to prioritize the credentials that employers need now.

The improvements made in this bill benefit both workers and employers, as workers would know that the time they spend training is more likely to lead to employment in a good-paying job, and employers would know that it is more likely that the people they hire would have the training they need to get the job done on day one.

The Department of Labor estimates there are nearly 4 million job openings in the United States, despite an unemployment rate that is still over 7 percent and despite millions of Americans looking for work. Now is the time to get to work on these jobs and match these people up with the job opportunities that are available out there. That is the most important thing we can be doing.

When Americans are working, we are a stronger nation. The Manufacturing Jobs for America effort to pass bipartisan legislation that everyone can buy into that helps manufacturers and workers is one important way we can move the ball ahead.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I wish to begin by thanking Chairman HARKIN, Ranking Member ALEXANDER, Senators FRANKEN and ROBERTS, and all of their staffs for their tremendous leadership on this bill. This bill was also developed in concert with our counterparts in the House of Representatives. I extend my thanks to ranking member HENRY WAXMAN and chairman FRED UPTON and their staffs of the Energy and Commerce Committee. What we have now is a bipartisan, bicameral bill that addresses two very serious issues: the safety of compounded drugs and the security of our entire drug supply.

Last fall an outbreak of fungal meningitis stunned the Nation and thus far has claimed the lives of 64 people and has sickened 751 in 20 States. This issue hits home for me because it started in

Massachusetts. At the center of this tragedy was the New England Compounding Center, also known as NECC. It is located in Framingham, MA. I met some of the victims of this terrible outbreak and heard about their struggles, people like Jerry Cohen, a resident of Pikesville, MD, who went to the doctor for routine steroid injections to treat recurring back pain and received two doses that came from the contaminated lots. Jerry suffered a stroke and had to adjust to a new life, dealing with dizziness, nausea, weakness, and exhaustion. Melanie Norwood's mother Marjorie went into a Tennessee hospital to treat an acute back injury she suffered while mowing the lawn. Instead of walking out of the hospital, Marjorie became severely sick, spent months in the hospital and a nursing home, and now has permanent nerve damage and medical bills that are close to putting her into bankruptcy.

For the last decade complaints about sterility, safety, lack of valid prescriptions, and mass production of drugs have been lodged against NECC. Yet the company was allowed to continue operating largely unchecked, falling between the regulatory checks that exist between Federal oversight of drug manufacturers and State oversight of pharmacies.

Sadly, NECC was not an isolated instance. Almost a year ago I issued a report detailing more than a decade of violations and problems at compounding pharmacies all across our Nation. Contaminated IV solutions, tainted steroid injections, and fouled eyedrops permanently impacted thousands of patients' lives across this country and killed or injured dozens across 34 States. The New England Compounding Center, like many large compounding facilities, fell into a regulatory black hole. That is because there are two kinds of compounding pharmacies: the neighborhood pharmacist you have known and trusted for years and the large drug manufacturers operating in the shadows that have slipped through the regulatory cracks.

Traditional compounding pharmacies make custom medication that fits the needs of an individual patient, such as creating a liquid medication instead of a pill for an elderly patient or a child because it is easier to swallow. We are familiar with that corner-store pharmacist who does that for a patient. These pharmacies are an important tool in our medical arsenal and have historically fallen under the jurisdiction of the States. They are the corner pharmacies that people grew up with. They are the corner pharmacies that people trust.

But there has been a recent disturbing trend of larger compounding pharmacies entering the market, making high-risk drugs sold to hospitals and clinics throughout the country. These compounding facilities are operating more as modern-day drug manufacturers rather than the mortar-and-pestle compounders of yesteryear on the corner near your home. They are not on Main Street, and they do most of their business out of site and under the FDA's radar.

In 1997 Congress passed a law to define FDA's role in the oversight of compounding pharmacies, but just 2 days before the new law was to take effect seven compounding pharmacies sued to block its enactment. Since then, the law and the FDA's authority to regulate compounding pharmacies have been mired in litigation and uncertainty. The result is that oversight of even large-scale drug manufacturers, such as NECC, has been largely relegated to the States.

How are the States doing their job? Well, last April I issued an investigative report that took a deep look at how States actually oversee and govern the activities of compounding pharmacies. What I found was a regulatory state of disarray. My investigation found that nationwide most State regulators did not look at the safety of compounding pharmacies. They do not make all their activities and investigations public. Some of them did not even know how many compounding pharmacies exist in their State, and States typically are not equipped to regulate the safety of large companies shipping massive quantities of drugs outside their own borders into States all across our country.

Since the NECC outbreak, some States have made efforts to improve their regulations and guidelines over compounding pharmacies, but the results are not consistent. Within the last month my home State of Massachusetts passed through its house and senate a bill that I am proud to say will put in place the strongest State regulations in the country overseeing the compounding pharmacy industry. However, while Massachusetts has become a national leader in the oversight of compounding pharmacies in the aftermath of what happened at NECC, this does little to protect the residents of other States. It cannot protect residents of Massachusetts from drugs that are shipped in from other States that do not have strong safety standards in place.

The Drug Safety and Security Act in front of us today helps to solve that problem by creating for the first time a national and uniform set of rules for compounding pharmacies that wish to register with the FDA and be subject to FDA oversight and enforcement. The bill also provides transparency by requiring the FDA to publish a list of the name and location of registered facilities that are compounding drugs in large quantities without a prescription. The Drug Safety and Security Act also mirrors several concepts from the VALID Compounding Act of 2013, legislation which I introduced in the House of Representatives. The bill distinguishes between compounders engaging in traditional pharmacy work and those making large volumes of compounded drugs without individual prescriptions. It places limits on the types and quality of ingredients that can be used to compound drugs. It ensures that drugs removed for the market for safety and effectiveness reasons are not compounded. The bill requires reporting of adverse events, such as patient sickness or hospitalizations that could be caused by compounding pharmacies that are registered with the FDA. It provides more information on the label of compounded drugs, including identification of the drug as being compounded—the first time ever that this information will be required.

Because of this bill, for the first time ever, the FDA will know who these large sterile compounding entities are and what they are making. The FDA will be given the resources it needs to conduct inspections of those facilities. For the first time ever, hospitals and health care facilities will have the option of purchasing compounded drugs that are subject to rigorous FDA quality standards and oversight. Because this bill removes the legal ambiguities of existing law, compounding pharmacies will no longer fly under the radar. This bill will go a long way in ensuring that public health is protected and compounded drugs are safe.

I specifically thank Chairman HARKIN and his staff for including in this bill a provision that I authored requiring the GAO to examine whether States and Federal authorities are doing their jobs to properly ensure the safety of compounded drugs.

Congress needs to continue to keep a close eye on the FDA and this industry, holding them accountable for their new responsibilities. This study will assist us in carrying out effective oversight of this new law. We need to ensure that a tragedy like the NECC meningitis outbreak is never repeated.

With the passage of the Drug Safety and Security Act, today we have a clear example of what Congress can accomplish when both sides come together in a bipartisan fashion. We can protect the public, we can hold industry to high but achievable standards, and we can support small businesses that have been doing the right thing for years.

This is a very important, historic piece of legislation. It goes right to the heart of what Congress can do to make sure that when drugs are in interstate commerce, we are protecting people so that the health of their families is, in fact, being protected. That is the essence of what Congress should be doing.

It is a very good day when Congress is working to protect the people of our country. Today is one of those days. Throughout the course of this week we are going to have a discussion about the role the Federal Government has to play in ensuring that the drugs which families in our country use are, in fact, safe for their consumption, that the representations that are made to those families are accurate. We cannot accept a rollback of the protections,

which did happen in this area. That exposed families to the kinds of risks that generations ago were common within our country. It is a big day. It is a historic piece of legislation. I urge its unanimous passage through this body.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. BLUNT. It has been less than 6 weeks since the President's health care initiative, the Affordable Care Act, was launched. The Web site is still not working, but the Web site will work. Actually, the Web site will be the easiest thing, in my view, that the administration will deal with as they try to solve the problems created by the act itself and, frankly, then the problems that were created by the Web site not working when we started.

What we see happening already in these 6 weeks is that families are losing their current health care coverage, and certainly the cost, in example after example from my State of Missouri and across the country, appears to be going up at substantial levels for many families. A few families are lucky enough that they don't have much additional cost but not very many. A lot of families are simply losing the coverage they have had even though the President said, as we all have been reminded over and over in recent days: If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan.

Apparently, there are a whole lot of caveats on that that weren't said at the time, because people aren't able to keep their health care plan. The Associated Press reported that at least 3.5 million people have received cancellation notices. I heard somebody at the White House the other day say: These individual policies, that is only about 5 percent of all the people in the country. Five percent of all of the people in the country are millions and millions of people. Even if there weren't millions of people, if someone is one of the 3.5 million families who were recently told their health care policy was cancelled—100 percent of their health care policies were cancelled because they don't have one right now—or at least they were told they won't have one sometime between now and the end of the year.

As millions of people are losing their plans, we find out that only a few thousand people are signed up. Reports apparently show that fewer than 50,000 people have been able to successfully get through this system in 6 weeks, a period where the estimate was 500,000 people. So far we have 50,000 people signing up, not 500,000 people. We have millions of people losing their plans, even though everybody was told that if they like their plan, they will be able to keep their plan.

It is estimated now that 7 million people were expected to get coverage by the end of March. Nobody, any longer, thinks that is a number that will come anywhere close to being achieved.

The American people, obviously, would like the President to figure out how to live up to the promise that people can keep the health care they have if they like it. A lot of people are weighing in.

President Clinton, in the last day or so, says we ought to figure out a way to keep the promise. This is not a real reach. This was not a promise made only one time and accidentally stated, this was a promise stated over and over again: If you like your health care plan, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

We are finding that is not true. Whether it is President Clinton who said we should figure out how to keep that promise, or there are all kinds of bills being filed in both the House and the Senate that would keep the promise, what I think we are going to find out is there are many promises in the Affordable Care Act that aren't going to be kept.

We already know this has a workplace impact that is not good. People are going from full time to part time. People are trying to keep their employee numbers under 50 so they don't have to comply with the law. I have heard from many Missourians who have seen their hours reduced, seen their health care premiums rise, seen their options of insurance limited and their policies being cancelled. They deserve to have the people who made this pledge now keep this pledge.

Congressional Democrats voted for the law. And there are very few laws one could say congressional Democrats voted for the law. This is a law that not a single Republican in the House or the Senate supported.

There were many alternatives available. High-risk pools would work better, medical liability reform, expanding the marketplace where one could buy across State lines, more reporting by healthcare providers of what they charge and what their results are.

The idea that there were no other options, which is widely repeated—that the people who don't want to follow the Affordable Care Act don't want to do anything—is simply not true. When I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I filed a handful of bills, none of which were more than 75 pages long, that would deal with these rifleshot things that would have made the best health care system in the world better. It wasn't perfect, but it was the best health care system in the world, and I think we are in danger of losing that.

The President promised: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Over and over again, that is not the case. The largest insurer on the Missouri exchange, on the exchange that Missouri voters have access to, doesn't include the largest hospital system. That means thousands of patients won't be able to see the doctors or to go to the 13 hospitals of the largest health care system from the company that was their likely provider. This was the largest insurer—and as of this moment, the largest insurer in our State, the largest health care system—not part of their plan. Your insurance company, hospital, long-time doctor, all should be your choice, not the choice of some government-dictated health care plan. With only one other insurer selling policies in the region where this big hospital system is, people aren't going to be able to go there.

Many States have this same problem. Many States have options that don't include many of their hospitals or many of their health care providers.

People are beginning to look at this and not only be concerned about a violated pledge, but being concerned about somebody besides them interfering with a long-term relationship with the hospital people go to and the doctor they see. Patients across the country are seeing and are likely to continue to see narrower and narrower networks available to them as insurers will try to keep costs down.

With all of the new mandates in the law, one of the things they can control is they can negotiate with the people who would be available to see patients under their plan. That is obviously what has happened.

Smaller networks can require patients to travel farther. People are driving by the doctor's office that they went to for years to get to the doctor they now have to go to. People are passing by the hospital that their family may have gone to for generations to get to the hospital that now is the only hospital available in their area, available under the exchange. This is going to become the routine for Americans who aren't going to be able to keep the insurance they like. They are not going to be able to keep the doctor they like, and in many cases they won't be able to go to the hospital they like.

Last week I told stories of several Missourians who had preexisting conditions and are going to lose those policies when the Missouri high-risk pool goes out of existence.

Another thing we suggested in 2009 was to look for ways to expand the high-risk pools and make them work even better. They were working pretty well. The problem was there was always a waiting list to get into the high-risk pool. This was a way to deal with preexisting conditions. In a State such as ours where 4,300 people are in the high-risk pool, they pay about 135 percent of the normal premium. That is a little more than the normal premium, but they are getting insurance after they got sick. This is a high-risk

pool where that has to work, 135 percent. For somebody who didn't have insurance until they got sick or lost their insurance after they got sick, that was probably a whole lot better than they are going to do right now. They are finding out it is a whole lot better than they are going to do right now.

One of the stories we received this week was from Pam in Oronogo, MO, just outside of Joplin. Pam says her oldest son Aaron was born with a medical condition where there was a build-up of fluid inside his skull. He had his first shunt surgery at age 18 months. Her family has a family business and held onto their insurance through the business as long as they could, because they knew that no one would insure Aaron if they lost their insurance. That is obviously not a reason we would want to see perpetuated.

Aaron, however, was ready to go to the high-risk pool. After 10 years, their premiums had increased to $2,000 a month with a $10,000 deductible. They were able to get Aaron in the high-risk pool and they were reasonably comfortable with that.

With the elimination of the high-risk pool—all of which close December 31 in every State in the country—Pam and her family have to go to the exchange for Aaron. The exchange has to take Aaron, because he can get into the exchange.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BLUNT. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. He can get into the exchange even if he had a preexisting condition. What they found in the exchange is Aaron can no longer use his neurosurgeon from Kansas City, the surgeon he has used for years now. They can't buy a catastrophic policy that would allow them to have some choice and pay some upfront costs on their own so they could have the doctor they are comfortable with. This is where they are. The insurance they had has gone away. The insurance they have doesn't allow them to see the doctor this young man has seen for years with a condition he has had his whole life.

The President also promised that premiums would decrease, and that is clearly not the case.

I look forward to Missourians continuing to let us know the challenges they are having. I look forward to being able to share those on the floor of the Senate in the next few weeks.

One of my constituents from Independence discovered when his wife came home, their policy which has been costing $500 a month now is going to cost $1,100 a month. She is the office manager of an office with about 20 employees. Their insurance more than doubled.

Unfortunately, these aren't the only cases I could talk about today. They are not nearly as limited as we would hope they would be. People are finding out that the Affordable Care Act that wasn't good for the workplace is now turning out to be not very good for health care.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT

Mr. BURR. We have heard about horror stories. I want to talk about another one, the bill that is in front of the Senate today, the Drug Quality and Security Act.

The Senate has an important opportunity to advance balanced bipartisan legislation on behalf of our Nation's patients. The Drug Quality and Security Act will respond to the tragic events surrounding last year's meningitis outbreak and will strengthen and improve our national pharmaceutical supply chain. Last year's unfortunate compounding meningitis outbreak has reminded us that had the early warning signs been heeded, we might have been able to prevent or mitigate the crisis in the first place.

In light of what Congress has learned since the outbreak first occurred last fall, this bipartisan legislation includes provisions that respond to and take a big step toward addressing the issues which led to the unfortunate pharmaceutical compounding tragedy over 1 year ago.

America's patients expect and deserve the peace of mind that medicines they take are safe and effective. FDA's repeated warnings of counterfeited drugs making their way into our prescription drug supply chain and the increased number of pharmaceutical thefts are the early warning signs of a potential and growing threat that could significantly compromise or endanger the health and well-being of patients across our Nation.

In recent years, States have responded by putting new requirements in place. At a time when we should be working to lower the cost of health care, this increasing patchwork of State and regulatory requirements is, instead, driving up the cost of health care in America.

For more than 1 year I have worked with Senator MICHAEL BENNET and my colleagues on the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee on bipartisan legislation to address these problems and to strengthen the safety, security, and accountability of our Nation's pharmaceutical drug supply chain.

The Drug Quality and Security Act, which we have before us today, includes provisions that will establish strong, uniform prescription drug-tracing standards that reflect today's realities and ensure a safer and more secure pharmaceutical drug supply chain.

The Drug Quality and Security Act establishes a uniform electronic unit-level system over the next decade that will increase the security and ensure a safer pharmaceutical drug supply chain from manufacturers all the way to dispensers. This legislation will require trading partners to be authorized to pass and receive information as part of their transactions. It raises the wholesale distribution licensing standard. It establishes licensure standards for third-party logistics providers and requires suspect and illegitimate products to be appropriately handled.

I would like to thank Chairman HARKIN and Ranking Member ALEXANDER for their leadership on this very important bipartisan bill. I especially would like to recognize Senator BENNET, who has been a strong partner throughout the crafting of this legislation. For more than 1 year we have worked together on this bipartisan legislation with our colleagues and have finally achieved an important balance with this bill.

I might add we were told this couldn't be done. We were told this was too difficult. But for 1½ years we have tackled this objective. Congress has the opportunity to proactively put in place uniform, workable standards that will allow stakeholders greater regulatory certainty and give patients the confidence they deserve in the safety and security of our Nation's pharmaceutical drug supply chain.

Congress's opportunities are twofold because this legislation is also our chance to respond to a crisis that impacted the lives of hundreds of patients nationwide, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting the Drug Quality and Security Act.

HEALTH CARE

To follow up the conversations on today's bill, I listened to my good friend Senator BLUNT talk about Aaron, one of those Americans caught in the crosshairs of the Affordable Care Act and its unintended consequences. I was home this weekend and I was stopped by five individuals—five individuals—with practically the identical story. They came up and said: RICHARD, I was covered. I had insurance. I have no preexisting conditions, nor does anybody in my family. I had a $10,000 deductible insurance policy that cost me about $450 a month, and I had the security of knowing it was there. I just got my new notice and my insurance went to a $15,000 deductible and my monthly premium is $1,440. These are five individuals—five different families—but with a similar story.

I think of the yearlong debate we had on the Affordable Care Act and the claims that were made: reduced premiums, bring down health care costs, provide coverage for those who don't have it. Today what do we see? Today's snapshot, and this may change: dysfunctional Web site, 5 million people who have been notified they have lost their insurance, a very tepid enrollment of individuals, and what has gotten lost in reality is that there are hundreds of thousands of Americans

just like the five who came up to me this weekend. They are still getting insurance, but their deductible went up to $15,000 and their premium went up to $1,440 a month.

Tell me, where in that scenario is this affordable? Tell me, where in this process did they get a better plan than they had before? Their deductible went up $5,000. That means the first $15,000 of their health care is coming right out of their pocket and they are paying $1,440 a month to have the security of knowing there is insurance after that.

Clearly, these are five Americans who would tell me this falls woefully short of the promises made to them. I would be willing to bet in every State, in every House district around the country, we are going to continue to hear stories about this.

We will, I am sure, debate heavily where we move to from here. But don't forget that under this bill, now that we have extended the enrollment period to March 31, under the law every insurer who bids to be in the exchange, starting April 1 of next year through April 27, has to submit their bids for 2015. Let me repeat that. For every insurer that wants to be in the exchange, starting April 1 of next year through April 27, they will have to submit their premium bids for 2015. They are going to do that having no experience with the pool of insured lives because we have extended until March 31 the enrollment. That assumes the Web site gets fixed and that people are going to enroll. With little actuarial history, these insurance companies are going to have to bid for 2015. Imagine what the premium cost is going to be in 2015 when it is not 5 percent of the American people now in the exchange but it is 100 percent—it is all the employers that are impacted by 2015 prices.

I have always been taught there are signs you should pay attention to. When five people come to you and say: Listen, my deductible went from $10,000 to $15,000 and my premium went from $450 to $1,440, that is a warning sign. We ought to listen to it.

We still have a chance to fix this. Most important, as Senator BLUNT talked about, it means when you have a high-risk pool in Missouri and North Carolina, you let them keep the high-risk pool. We can manage it much better on a State level than we can in nationalizing and doing top-down health care in this country.

This will not be the end of the conversation on the Affordable Care Act. The American people deserve better and this Congress must produce it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, there is an old expression used by many Hoosiers and others across America that is time tested: Your word is your bond. In Indiana, as in so many other places across our country, we value honesty and good old-fashioned truth-telling, even if it hurts a little bit to hear the truth.

Having spent the previous 4 days in Indiana listening to Hoosiers, it is clear to me many people in my State—and as I am reading, nationwide—are pretty fed up with Washington right now, and they have good reason to be. They are frustrated because the promises that were made to them are being broken and outright guarantees have been disregarded.

President Obama, both before and after his signature legislation—now called ObamaCare—passed, promised all Americans they could keep their health insurance plans if they liked those plans. It was a promise repeated over and over again. For many Americans it was the sole reason they supported the Affordable Care Act. But the President's guarantee, announced publicly by him several times, simply was not true.

In recent months, millions of Americans have received notifications their plans are being canceled because of the ObamaCare law, and reports indicate now the White House has known this for over 3 years—that these cancellations were coming. So when the American people found out the White House knew the bad news was coming all along, they were, to put it mildly, not happy.

It is clear that some of those who voted for ObamaCare and continued to support it are now agreeing with the majority of Americans that the President's health care law simply is not working. One such Member has floated the idea of having the Government Accountability Office and the inspector general for the Department of Health and Human Services conduct ''a complete, thorough investigation to determine the causes of the design and implementation failures of HealthCare .gov.''

We need to talk about the fundamental policies and provisions that undermine this law going forward.

Fixing the Web site, if that happens—it can happen and eventually it would have to happen—is not the real problem. The real problem is a flawed design. Two Democrats have introduced a bill entitled ''Keeping the Affordable Care Act Promise Act.''

A House Democrat recently stated, ''I think the President was grossly misleading to the American public'' when he promised Americans they could keep their health care coverage if they liked it. Even former President Bill Clinton has said he thinks the President's pledge to allow Americans to keep their coverage should be honored.

In an interview this week, former President Clinton said:

> So I personally believe, even if it takes a change in the law, the President should honor the commitment that the Federal Government made to those people and let them keep what they got.

There is a growing admission from the supporters of ObamaCare that we are dealing with more than just a Web site glitch; that we are dealing with fundamental policy design flaws. So I agree with President Clinton. Regardless of whether you support ObamaCare, there should be 100 percent bipartisan support for letting Americans keep what they have been promised—that they can keep their existing health care insurance plans if they like them.

It is time to acknowledge, however, as Senate minority leader MITCH MCCONNELL said yesterday, that it goes beyond this; that the Affordable Care Act is beyond repair. This disastrous law needs to be repealed and replaced with real reforms that drive down the cost of health care, increase the quality of care, and put patients, not Washington bureaucrats, in charge of their health care decisions.

Unfortunately, this President and Senate Democrats have made it clear they will never allow a full repeal to pass, despite all the broken promises to the American people and despite the fact the law simply isn't working.

Given this reality, the appropriate step, I believe, and one with growing, bipartisan support is for a 1-year delay of the implementation of ObamaCare.

I have offered a bill to delay the individual mandate—to join with the decision already made by the President to have a 1-year delay of the employer mandate—so all Americans can have the same relief, not just business. By delaying the mandates—all the mandates in this health care law—we can give the American people a fundamental choice when they go to the polls in 2014: continue ObamaCare or replace it with sensible, affordable reforms that drive down the cost of care, increase the quality, and, most important, put patients, not Washington bureaucrats, in control of their health care decisions and their health future.

In closing, I would say this to the President: Your word needs to be your bond. As Albert Einstein once said: Whoever is careless with the truth in small matters cannot be trusted with important matters.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, it hasn't been even a month since the end of the Republican shutdown of the government, and they are already back at trying to paralyze the government again.

Yesterday, the Republicans blocked an up-or-down vote on the nomination

of Nina Pillard to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. This filibuster comes just 1 week after Republicans filibustered the nomination of Patricia Millett to the DC Circuit, and less than 1 year after Republicans filibustered Caitlin Halligan, who eventually just gave up and withdrew her nomination.

Republicans now hold the dubious distinction of having filibustered all three women that President Obama nominated to the DC Circuit. Collectively, these women have diverse experiences in private practice, in government, and in public interest law. Between them, they have argued an amazing 45 cases before the Supreme Court and have participated in many more. All three have the support of a majority of Senators. So why have they been filibustered? The reason is simple. They are caught in a fight over the future of our courts—a fight over whether the courts will be a neutral forum that decides every dispute fairly or whether the courts will be stacked in favor of the wealthy and the powerful.

Every day in Congress we deal with the influence of powerful groups and their armies of lobbyists. But in our democracy, when we write laws, sometimes we can push back on that power. In our democracy we have tools that can be used in the legislative process—tools such as open debate, public opinion, and political accountability, tools that can help the people win these fights. I saw it happen up close in the 2008 financial crisis when we were able to get a strong consumer financial protection bureau despite the efforts of the large financial institutions to kill it.

But the story doesn't end when Congress passes a law. Powerful interests don't just give up. They shift their fight to the courts because they know that if they can weaken or overturn a law in court, they turn defeat into victory. If they can break the courts by putting enough sympathetic judges in lifetime positions, a friendly judicial system will give them the chance to undermine any laws they don't like. That is already happening in the Supreme Court. Three well-respected legal scholars, including Judge Richard Posner of the Seventh Circuit, a distinguished judge and conservative Reagan appointee, recently examined almost 20,000 Supreme Court cases from the last 65 years. The researchers concluded that the five conservative justices currently sitting on the Supreme Court are in the top 10 most procorporate justices in more than half a century. Justices Alito and Roberts are number one and number two.

Take a look at the win rate of the national Chamber of Commerce in cases before the Supreme Court. According to the Constitutional Accountability Center, the national Chamber moved from a 43-percent win rate during the last 5 terms of the Burger court, to a 56-percent win rate under the Rehnquist court, to a 70-percent rate under the Roberts court. Follow this procorporate trend to its logical conclusion, and pretty soon you will have a Supreme Court that is a wholly owned subsidiary of big business.

The powerful interests that work to rig the Supreme Court also want to rig the lower courts. The DC Circuit is a particular target because that court has the power to overturn agency regulations. If a business doesn't like it when the agencies implement the will of Congress, they try to undermine those agencies through the DC Circuit.

In the next 5 years, the DC Circuit will decide some of the most important cases of our time—including cases which will decide whether Wall Street reform will have real bite or whether it will just be toothless. Swaps dealers, the securities industry, the Business Roundtable, and the Chamber of Commerce are all lining up to challenge the new rules that agencies have written to try to put some teeth into Wall Street reform and other laws. These big-industry players want business-friendly judges to help bail them out.

So let's be clear. Nine of the 14 judges on the DC Circuit who currently hear cases were appointed by Republican Presidents. The President with the most appointees on that court right now is Ronald Reagan.

This lopsided court has been busy striking down environmental regulations that stop companies from spewing mercury into the air we breathe, striking down investor protections that hold corporate boards accountable, striking down a requirement for employers to provide access to birth control under ObamaCare. Each of these regulations exists because Congress has passed laws telling the agencies to write them.

It is true that sometimes an agency may get it wrong, but these days the DC Circuit seems to be finding more and more ways to help bail out the businesses that never wanted to be regulated in the first place.

Republicans have noticed what is going on with this lopsided court. They would like to keep things the way they are, and they have not been subtle about it. Many Republicans have talked openly of their opposition to any new judges to fill the three vacancies on this court precisely because the new nominees will give the court more balance and fairness. Republicans may prefer a rigged court that gives their corporate friends and their armies of lobbyists and lawyers a second chance to undercut the will of Congress, but that is not the job of judges. Judges aren't supposed to make law. Judges aren't supposed to tilt politically one way or the other.

Republicans may not like Wall Street reform. They may not like ObamaCare. But Congress passed those laws. President Obama signed those laws. President Obama ran for reelection on those laws, while his opponent pledged to repeal them—and his opponent lost by nearly 5 million votes. It is not up to judges to overturn those laws or their associated regulations just because they don't fit the judges' policy preferences.

There are three vacancies on the DC Circuit, and the President has nominated three impressive people to fill those vacancies—including Patricia Millett and Nina Pillard. These nominees are not ideological. They have extraordinary legal resumes and have received bipartisan support from top litigators around the country. They are among the top legal minds of this generation.

This is how the President plans to push back against efforts to tilt our judicial system: by nominating judges who will be judges—judges who will be fair, judges who will be evenhanded, judges who will have the diversity of professional experience to understand and consider all sides of an issue.

I understand that Republicans may prefer to keep the DC Circuit exactly as it is. But article II, section 2 of the Constitution says the President of the United States nominates judges, with the advice and consent of the Senate. There is no clause that says, except when that President is a Democrat. Democrats allowed President George W. Bush to put four very conservative judges on the DC Circuit. All four are still serving, and one is Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

There are three vacancies in the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. The President of the United States has nominated judges to fill those vacancies. That is his job, and it is the job of the Senate to confirm highly qualified, independent judges. That is how our system works. That is what the Constitution demands.

Republicans these days do not seem to like that. They keep looking for ways to keep this President from doing his job. So far they have shut down the government, they have filibustered people he has nominated to fill his administration, and they are now filibustering judges to block him from filling any of the vacancies with highly qualified people. We need to call out these filibusters for what they are—naked attempts to nullify the results of the last Presidential election, to force us to govern as though President Obama had not won the 2012 election.

President Obama did win the 2012 election—by 5 million votes. He has done what the Constitution requires him to do—nominated highly qualified people to fill open vacancies on the Federal bench. If Republicans continue to filibuster these highly qualified nominees for no reason other than to nullify the President's constitutional authority, then Senators not only have the right to change the filibuster rules, Senators have a duty to change the filibuster rules. We cannot turn our back on the Constitution. We cannot abdicate our oath of office. We have a responsibility to protect and defend our democracy, and that includes protecting the neutrality of our courts

and preserving the constitutional power of the President to nominate highly qualified people to court vacancies.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 3204, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the bill (H.R. 3204) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the question of the week is, more important than apologizing, will President Obama live up to his promise that Americans can keep the care they have and like? Democrats are clearly running away from embracing this law and are suggesting the President live up to his promise as well. Yesterday former President Clinton said:

I personally believe, even if it takes a change to the law, the President should honor the commitment the Federal Government made to those people and let them keep what they got.

That is from former President Clinton yesterday in a interview he did.

More and more we see people on the Democratic side of the aisle coming forward, acknowledging what many of us have been acknowledging for a long time; that is, this is not living up to expectations. We need a timeout. It is clearly not working, it is not ready for prime time, and it is obvious that we need to acknowledge that and come up with plan B.

Senator DURBIN, here in the Senate, said in an interview Tuesday that the cancellations of their coverage that people might face under ObamaCare and the statement that people could keep their plans ''should have been clarified.''

Democratic Representative KURT SCHRADER from Oregon thinks the President was grossly misleading to the American public and said:

I think the President was grossly misleading the American public.

Senator FEINSTEIN, who is not up for reelection, is supporting legislation to allow individuals to maintain enrollment in the plans they like.

These mistruths are clearly affecting the President's credibility. President Obama's approval ratings have dipped to a record low. A poll from Quinnipiac University that was released shows respondents disapprove of the President's job performance by a 54-to-39 margin. His approval rating of 39 percent is worse than his previous alltime low of 41 percent in the Quinnipiac survey done previously. Further, more people—52 percent—say the President is not honest and trustworthy.

We are on the verge of another misstatement from this administration where they make promises to the American people that they do not meet. Last month the administration promised they would have healthcare.gov fixed by the end of November. It appears unlikely, according to today's Washington Post, where a headline reads: ''Troubled HealthCare.gov unlikely to work fully by end of November.''

For proof that this Web site design has been a failure of leadership, compare it to Cyber Monday volume at amazon.com in 2012. According to amazon.com's press release, it sold 27 million items on Cyber Monday, or 306 items per second. That is how the private sector has been able to process huge volumes of data and requests. If we compare and contrast that with the rollout of ObamaCare and healthcare.com, it is a stunning failure—even epic in terms of the inability of that whole program to function with any level of competence.

It is clear that technology exists to fix the Web site to handle high volumes, but, as the President has said, the health care law is more than just a Web site, and that is where most of us come down on this issue. This is a flawed policy that is causing millions of Americans to lose the health care they like. Most of us know someone who has had his or her health care canceled by ObamaCare, and it is going to get worse. The Associated Press reports that at least 3.5 million have received cancellation notices, and that number is expected to increase to tens of millions of people. As Americans—millions more—are losing their plans, only thousands are signing up through ObamaCare.

Constituents are encouraged to visit our Web site at republican.senate.gov/yourstory to submit their stories about how this is impacting them personally. The American people deserve to have their stories heard, and Americans deserve to have the President and congressional Democrats keep their promise.

We believe what former President Clinton said yesterday is correct; that is, President Obama should honor the commitment the Federal Government made to those people and let them keep what they have. That is essentially where we are today. I would simply ask rhetorically, what is the President going to do to address and honor the promise he made to the American people that they can keep what they have?

Increasingly, more and more Democrats—and, of course, there are many of us on this side of the aisle who predicted this would happen a long time ago—realize this was an ill-conceived policy. I have maintained for a long time that it was built upon a faulty foundation; therefore, you cannot just fix a Web site or have an IT specialist come in and expect this to get better. This is a flawed policy, and it is already having profound and harmful impacts on the American people. We believe many more people will be harmed in the future as the insurance is fully implemented.

The best we can do for the American people in order to minimize the impact and harm is to put off, suspend, delay—whatever you want to call it—the implementation of ObamaCare. Frankly, the best we could do in the long run is pivot away from this failed policy and move in a direction that actually does address some of the fundamental problems we have with health care in this country today.

There is a whole list of solutions Republicans have advanced and put forward in the past—for example, allow people to buy insurance across State lines and create interstate competition so we have insurance companies competing with each other. Obviously, if we have competition and the forces of the market at work, it helps to bring down costs and prices.

Another example is to allow small businesses to join larger groups to get the benefit of group purchasing power—to pool, if you will. That is something we have been proposing for some time, and it has been consistently defeated by Democrats in Congress. Other examples are reducing the cost of defensive medicine by ending the junk lawsuits that clog up our legal system and drive up the cost of health care, allowing an expanded use of health savings accounts and those types of vehicles that are out there for people today to put money aside for their health care needs; allowing people to have a refundable tax credit so they can buy their own insurance, which would give them more choices, create more competition, and, again, put downward pressure on the cost and price of health care in this country.

Those are commonsense step-by-step solutions that we think would work so much better than having one-sixth of our entire economy, which is what health care represents, taken over by the Federal Government. Political command and control in Washington, DC, is driving the decisionmaking for Americans across the country. As we have already seen, the Federal Government does not do complicated tasks very well, and the Federal Government doesn't do comprehensive tasks very well.

Everybody talked about a comprehensive solution to this problem. Clearly, we have problems in America today that need to be addressed. We have a lot of people who don't have health care, and that needs to be fixed. We have people with preexisting conditions, and that needs to be addressed. There are solutions to those problems that don't include and don't entail having the Federal Government take over one-sixth of the American economy, which is what happened with ObamaCare. We are seeing the impacts and the results of that today.

I suggest we take a timeout and make a conscious decision to move in a different direction—a direction that will lead to lower costs, higher quality of care, allow people to keep the plan they like if they like it, allow people to keep the doctor they like, and keep the cost of health care at an affordable level.

One thing we have seen since ObamaCare passed and is now in the process of being implemented is that the promise that people would see their health care costs go down, not up—that promise is another broken promise because what we are seeing in America today is canceled policies. As people try to get new policies, there are increased costs. We are seeing that in the individual marketplace. When the President was campaigning for his health care law, he said he would drive the costs down for families by $2,500 per family. Yet we have seen the cost per family increase since he took office by $2,500.

We have a cloud hanging over our economy right now because of this massive new regulation with a massive amount of government mandates. Due to government-approved insurance, the workweek has been redefined from a 40-hour workweek to a 30-hour workweek. We have a lot of employers who are creating part-time jobs instead of full-time jobs. In order to avoid the mandates and requirements and costs associated with ObamaCare, employers are hiring people to get under that 30-hour workweek. There are a lot of people who are hired to work 29 hours a week. Well, Americans can't take care of their families and meet the needs they have in their personal and family budgets on 29 hours a week, so more and more people are having to get more than one job. In fact, some estimates show that the majority of jobs that have been created over the last year have been part-time jobs, not full-time jobs. That is the impact this is having on the overall economy.

If we are serious about getting the economy growing and expanding again and creating good-paying jobs for middle-class Americans, there are a number of things we can do to create that kind of economic growth. What we have seen of late is a growth rate that hovers between 1 and 2 percent. The economy is lethargic and sluggish compared to any historic average. We continue to have chronic high unemployment. If we factor in that the labor participation force is literally at the lowest level in the last 35 years, we would have to go back to the administration of President Carter. At that time there were fewer people working as a percentage of the entire workforce. If we factor that in, we have an economy that is in a very bad way.

As I said, there are a whole series of things that need to be done to get the economy growing and expanding at a faster rate, create more jobs, and increase the take-home pay for middle-class Americans. We really need to start over with Obamacare.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. I suggest it starts with shutting this down and starting over. We need to create more options, more choices, and more competition in the health care economy so people can get away from the sticker shock we have seen with ObamaCare and get costs down. We need to get away from these cancellation notices that are going out and allow people to keep the care and doctor they have and like. Because of the broken promises under ObamaCare, that is not happening.

Until we decide this was the wrong direction and pivot and go in a different direction, we are going to continue to see the results we have today—higher costs, more cancellations, people not being able to keep the care they like or the doctor they like. We can do better and should do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I would like to talk for a few minutes about a subject that will affect all of us at some point in our lives; that is, the safety of our medicine.

If my child or wife urgently needed medicine, I would have a number of questions: Will my loved one get well? What is going to happen? But I should never have to ask a question about whether the medicine my family takes is safe and whether it is what the doctor says it should be.

More than 1,000 patients and their families across Minnesota found it necessary to ask that question last year during the meningitis outbreak. They had to ask that question because the contaminated medicine they received could have caused them enormous harm. More than 700 patients across the country got sick and more than 60 died after receiving these contaminated injections produced by a large-scale compounding pharmacy in Massachusetts that was essentially an unregulated drug manufacturer.

In Minnesota we specialize in medical innovation. We have some of the best doctors and health care systems and biomedical pioneers anywhere in the world. Our Nation has an incredible capacity for innovation and development in this field. There is no possible explanation that can justify the fact that more than 17,000 vials of contaminated medicine were shipped to providers throughout the country. That should simply not be happening. That is why the legislation we are set to pass, which I helped to write, is so important. It will go a long way toward making compounded medication safer and preventing another outbreak like the one we had a little over a year ago.

Many people don't know what pharmacy compounding is—including many patients who have received compounded medicine. Compounding is a traditional practice of a pharmacy where a pharmacist makes a new drug or takes an existing one and changes it based on a particular patient's needs. If a patient needs a drug and is allergic to one ingredient in it, the pharmacy can remake the drug, or compound it, without that ingredient based on a doctor's prescription. Pharmacists and pharmacies are regulated by the States.

This practice of tailoring medications for individual people is incredibly important, and it has always been a part of practicing pharmacy. It will continue under the bill we have written. But that is not what happened in Massachusetts last year; instead, a facility exploited a legal loophole to make thousands of doses of a product that was not FDA approved and sold it to hospitals and clinics across the country without receiving a prescription. As I said, more than 700 patients got sick after receiving that medicine and 64 people died. That is why my colleagues and I have worked so hard over the past year to develop the bill before us today, the Drug Quality and Security Act, which takes important steps for preventing this kind of outbreak in the future.

I would like to take a moment to thank my friends on both sides of the aisle and in both the Senate and the House who have worked so hard on this legislation.

I thank chairman TOM HARKIN for his leadership and for the bipartisan HELP Committee staff process that was crucial to producing this legislation.

I thank ranking member LAMAR ALEXANDER and Senator PAT ROBERTS for their commitment to getting this bill right.

I thank the staff who worked so hard on this bill. Specifically, I thank members of Senator HARKIN's staff: Jenelle Krishnamoorthy, Elizabeth Jungman, and Nathan Brown. I also thank Senator ALEXANDER's staff: Mary Sumpter-Lapinski and Grace Stuntz, as well as Jennifer Boyer, who works for Senator ROBERTS. Their hard work and dedication helped to develop this important legislation.

I also thank Hannah Katch, a member of my staff, who has worked tirelessly on this bill.

I thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN and their colleagues in the House for their work, as

well as the many stakeholders who have worked productively with us to develop and improve this proposal. In particular, I counted on input from the Minnesota Board of Pharmacy, the Minnesota Pharmacist Association, Thrifty White Pharmacy, and many other experts and pharmacists in Minnesota who helped us get this bill right.

Is our legislation perfect? No. There were a number of provisions in the bill that we passed out of the HELP Committee that would have provided additional safety and quality assurances for patients, but in order to come to a compromise with the House of Representatives, our legislation changed. Although the final bill does not include everything I would have liked, the bill before us today will take an enormous step forward for patient safety.

The bill will reinstate the law that allows the Food and Drug Administration to regulate large-scale compounders that have exploited a loophole in the law in order to act effectively as unregulated drug manufacturers. It will also give hospitals and health systems the option of buying compounded products from facilities that are inspected by the FDA and are complying with the FDA's quality standards. And it will do all of that without changing the rules for traditional pharmacies, which will continue to be regulated by their State boards of pharmacy.

Specifically, our bill creates a new option for facilities that want to provide compounded drugs to hospitals and health centers. These entities, called ''outsourcing facilities,'' will be inspected by the FDA and will have high quality standards. The hospitals that buy from these facilities will be able to trust that the compounded medicine they buy from outsourcing facilities is safe.

If a compounder chooses not to be either a traditional pharmacy or an outsourcing facility, the FDA will be responsible for making sure that compounder complies with the normal requirements for pharmaceutical manufacturers. Those are the options. Unlike what we saw in Massachusetts, these facilities will no longer be able to occupy an unregulated no man's land. So under the new law, there will be traditional pharmacies, which will continue to be regulated at the State level; outsourcing facilities, which the FDA will oversee; and pharmaceutical manufacturers, which will be regulated by the FDA, as they have been.

I am also pleased that the bill we wrote on compounding is paired today with another bill on the drug supply chain, which is aimed at making sure that the FDA-approved medicine that patients receive is safe and has not been tampered with. By creating a national system to track drugs from the time they leave the manufacturer until they are dispensed to patients, this legislation will provide certainty that our medicines are what they say they are.

My colleagues, Senators BENNET and BURR, have been working on this proposal for more than 2 years, and I thank them for their work and congratulate them on this important achievement.

My home State of Minnesota is a model for pharmacy practice nationwide. Not only does our State have important protections for compounding pharmacies that have kept the medicine made in Minnesota safe, but Minnesota pharmacists have also led the Nation in developing innovative new ways of helping their patients get the right medicine at the right time.

For example, pharmacists at Hennepin County Medical Center in Minneapolis found that when a pharmacist reviewed the prescriptions for patients with complex conditions before they were discharged from the hospital, those patients had fewer problems related to their medicine and were 50 percent less likely to be readmitted to the hospital. So it saved a lot of money. It cost HCMC about $112,000 for pharmacists to provide this service, and it saved the hospital nearly $600,000. This is exactly—exactly—the kind of innovation that we are known for in Minnesota, and our pharmacists are on the front lines of this kind of reform and discovery.

The pharmacists at HCMC, and those around Minnesota, do incredibly important work. They provide access to needed medicine for thousands of patients every day. Those pharmacists and their patients must be able to trust that the medicine is safe and it will work. The Drug Quality and Security Act will take an important step toward preventing another outbreak like the one we saw last year, and I urge my colleagues to join me in passing the Drug Quality and Security Act into law.

Thank you, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

OBAMACARE

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, in a front page story yesterday, the Wall Street Journal reported that fewer than 50,000 people had successfully used the Federal ObamaCare Web site to enroll in a private health plan—less than 50,000. Meanwhile, we know that millions of Americans are already getting a cancellation notice from their insurance company telling them that their current policy—even if they like it—will no longer be available. In other words, if you like what you have, it turns out you cannot keep it—as millions of people are finding.

No less a luminary in the Democratic Party than President Clinton has said that ObamaCare should be reformed to let people maintain their current health insurance. And we will see some votes in the House of Representatives as soon as Friday on that proposition, helping the President keep his promise to the American people that if you like what you have, you can keep it, which currently has proven not to be the case.

Just a month ago, Democrats of all stripes were declaring that Obama was the settled law of the land and condemning attempts on our side of the aisle to actually reform it. Now we are seeing more and more of our friends across the aisle contemplating serious changes aimed at fixing some of the law's myriad problems. Some, but not all, of the problems with ObamaCare have become painfully obvious—some, because I think most people probably think ObamaCare has already been implemented, when, in fact, it has only begun to be implemented.

But we know ObamaCare is forcing people to lose their health insurance and/or their doctor. It may be that even in the exchanges, the hospital which they prefer to be treated at or the doctor from whom they would prefer to have their care, they will not be available on the exchanges.

We also know that ObamaCare is raising health care premiums. Again, the President promised that if we passed ObamaCare, we would see a reduction in the premiums for a family of four of about $2,500. Instead of seeing premiums go down, we are seeing premiums go up.

We know that Medicare and Medicaid remain on an unsustainable path, and we are actually seeing, in many States, the States opting to expand the Medicaid program, when they cannot even care for or pay for the people who are currently in the Medicaid program.

We have found that organized labor has gone to the White House. They said that because of the incentives in ObamaCare, many full-time employees were now being put on part-time work in order to avoid some of the penalties associated with ObamaCare.

We know that in the medical device sector—one of the most innovative parts of health care today—those jobs are moving offshore. They are moving outside of the United States, and it is stifling innovation, this medical device tax which is part of the pay-for of ObamaCare.

But here is another issue that has not gotten much attention lately. I was a little surprised when I came across this article in the Atlantic magazine, but the truth is the ObamaCare structure penalizes people for getting married. Certain couples who do qualify for the ObamaCare subsidies right now would lose those subsidies if they got married. In some cases, the ObamaCare marriage penalty could amount to thousands of dollars. So just when you think things could not quite get any worse, you find out they do.

As if all these problems were not bad enough, ObamaCare has also created a magnet for fraud and corruption in the so-called navigators program. You will remember, the navigators were created in order to help people sign up on the exchanges. But we know the navigators will be collecting sensitive tax and personal information—medical, both physical and mental health information—from folks all across the country as

they try to navigate ObamaCare. But we also know, because the Secretary of Health and Human Services admitted this last week, that they are not subject to any kind of background check, including a criminal background check. As a matter of fact, I think Secretary Sebelius surprised an awful lot of people when she admitted that people participating in the navigator program could possibly be convicted felons because there is simply no screening mechanism to bar them from participating in the process and no background check whatsoever.

Then we have learned, as a result of some creative journalists, that navigators, including those in my home State of Texas, were actively encouraging people to break the law as a process of signing up for the ObamaCare exchanges.

It is simply astounding that the administration is urging the American people to give their Social Security numbers and sensitive personal information to people who have not been properly vetted. Yesterday I called on the President to suspend the navigators program, and I want to reiterate that call today. He needs to end it, at least until basic precautions are taken to prevent identity theft and corruption and fraud.

Given the lack of Federal background checks and other safeguards, this program is an invitation to fraud and identity theft.

As with so many other aspects of ObamaCare, the problems with the navigators program are the result of politically motivated decisions. Do not just take my word for it. Consider the scathing indictment that was recently issued by Michael Astrue, who served as HHS general counsel from 1989 to 1992. More recently, he served as a commissioner for Social Security, from 2007 to 2013.

Writing in the Weekly Standard, Mr. Astrue points out:

> Instead of hiring well-screened, well-trained, and well-supervised workers, HHS decided to build political support for the Affordable Care Act by pouring money into supportive organizations so they could launch poorly trained workers into their communities without obtaining criminal background checks or creating systems for monitoring their activities.

Over the long term, we need to dismantle ObamaCare entirely and replace it with patient-centered alternatives that will actually bring costs down; improve the quality of care, by making more care accessible; and leaving the choices with consumers and their families, patients and their doctors making the decisions, not Washington, DC. In the short term, we need to also dismantle the navigators program before it unleashes a wave of fraud and corruption.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, before I make my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that Senator REED from Rhode Island be recognized immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I rise today, also, to speak about a subject on the minds of all Americans and that is the rollout of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare.

Many of us have predicted the implementation of ObamaCare would result in difficulties for American families, businesses, and our still fragile economy.

We spoke about the tax hikes that would come, the rising premiums, the canceled policies, the benefit cuts to Medicare programs for seniors, and other problems in the flawed law. Still, the President insisted that he was right and that he knew best what Americans wanted.

Since then, countless opportunities have been provided for our colleagues to join us in defunding or at least delaying the implementation of this damaging law.

To further sow confusion, the administration has selectively changed the law to suit its political advantage.

And now that October 1 has come and gone, millions of Americans are becoming painfully aware of the reality of how ObamaCare will affect them.

The American people are seeing the effects of ObamaCare, not based on the rhetoric of politicians or the debate here in Congress, but by their own personal experiences in dealing with it.

The initial feedback is clear, and it is not pretty. The trillion dollars in new taxes that I led the fight against on the floor during the initial ObamaCare debate are now largely in effect.

And as I said, and many others warned, and the Joint Tax Committee has actually confirmed, a significant portion of those tax increases are hitting squarely on the middle-income families the President solemnly pledged to protect. He said that people in America who make less than $250,000 per couple or $200,000 per individual would not see one dime of tax increases as a result of the act.

Yet now we are seeing that the burden of this huge tax increase is falling squarely on those in what the President has defined as the middle class. The American people are also now experiencing for themselves the reality we have long warned against—that the President has also broken his promise that his health care plan would lower premiums by $2,500 on average for Americans.

In fact, the Washington Post fact checker gave that President's pledge a three Pinocchios score for not being true. Yet another promise proven to be false is the President's pledge to the American people that if you like your doctor and you like your current health care plan, you can keep it.

Again, the Washington Post reviewed this pledge. But this time it gave the President four Pinocchios saying, ''The President's promise apparently came with a very large caveat: If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan—if we deem it to be adequate.''

I recently received a letter from Nancy from Eagle, ID, about the loss of her husband's employer-provided coverage. The cancellation notification reads that ''due to the Affordable Health Care Act and unprecedented increases in healthcare costs, effective January 1, 2014 traditional comprehensive medical insurance will no longer be available.'' Instead, his employer will offer two preventive health care plans and refer them to the exchange to purchase his insurance.

After browsing the exchange Web site, Nancy and her husband have realized they will either be forced to pay $500 more a month on health insurance premiums or pay a lower premium rate which would result in limited access to providers and hospitals.

Simply put, this is wrong. But I fear that there will be many more like Nancy with similar experiences. This week I was contacted by Matt from Meridian, ID, about his wife who receives coverage through her employer. They will see their premiums rise and a considerably higher deductible due to the increased cost to her employer because of ObamaCare.

Just 1 month after the ObamaCare exchange rollout, at least 3.5 million Americans have received insurance cancellation notices. This number is expected to dramatically increase in coming months. Over 100,000 of those people live in Idaho, according to the Associated Press. According to media reports, the administration knew Americans would not be able to keep their current coverage, even though the President continued to push the message that people could.

After breaking this promise, the President is now telling millions of Americans who have had their insurance cancelled that they should shop around for policies that frankly could be more costly and require them to change their doctors.

Many of my colleagues in the Senate, as a response to this, are cosponsoring a measure known as the If You Like Your Health Plan, You Can Keep It Act. This act is one the Senate should immediately take up and pass.

Idahoans are now learning that the flawed health care law will force them to change their plans and in many cases pay higher premiums. While this law was sold on the promise of providing health care coverage for the uninsured, it is creating new uninsured Americans who will be forced to enter the troubled Federal health care exchanges.

At the same time, the administration refuses calls for transparency and hides information about enrollment numbers. It is hard for me to believe that in the year 2013, when we have iPhones, tablets, Twitter and Google, the administration has no idea or ability to release enrollment numbers.

According to documents released recently from the House oversight committee, six people signed up for ObamaCare on day one. We understand that more are signing up now, but it could be that the administration has such low numbers of enrollments for their signature achievement that they do not want to present the accurate facts.

Many of us in this body are concerned also about the security risks posed by ObamaCare. Several weeks ago, Republican members of the Senate Finance Committee wrote to Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, asking whether all Federal privacy and security standards were met prior to the launch of healthcare.gov, the Web site to sign up for ObamaCare.

We have asked Secretary Sebelius to provide answers and information to a series of questions detailing what levels of security and privacy measures were undertaken prior to the launch of the Web site to safeguard the privacy of those Americans signing up for coverage through healthcare.gov. This is a serious concern that must be addressed.

Additionally, because of the law, some businesses are cutting back on employees and on hours, making it harder for Americans to find full-time jobs. Those who do hold on to their full-time jobs could lose their employer-sponsored private insurance and are instead being dumped into the exchange or into the failing Medicaid system.

These are just some of the unfortunate realities we are facing with the implementation of ObamaCare. As these stories continue to pour in, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, along with the President, to carefully listen to the American people, to American businesses and this feedback and work together to defund and repeal every element that proves not to work.

We must replace those failed policies with true reforms that are in the best interests of the American people and in the best interests of the American economy. From day one, the administration has continued to make excuses for why healthCare.gov is not functioning properly, even though they have had years to prepare and perform testing.

The American people see now that this law is more than just a Web site problem; it is a train wreck. This system was not ready and the law looks impossible to fix. Simply put, the promises of this law are nothing like its realities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

THE BUDGET

Mr. REED. Madam President, it is clear we have honest disagreements about how we should address our budget. I believe the path forward should be fair and balanced. That is not what we have seen to date. We have enacted $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction, with $1.8 trillion coming from spending cuts. These cuts put tremendous pressure on important domestic investments in areas such as education, health care, and national security.

I do not believe cutting domestic programs that invest in our future and help low- and middle-income American families is the right thing to do, especially when we can close egregious tax loopholes that benefit multinational corporations and some of the wealthiest Americans.

Again, we have made significant progress in deficit reduction. The bulk of that has been cutting programs that invest in the country and help families. To go forward, we need a balanced approach, selective cuts, but we also need to close some of these egregious loopholes that are benefiting—not the small business man or woman living in Rhode Island—but multinational corporations—not working wage earners in Rhode Island—but some of the wealthiest Americans.

I know some of my colleagues disagree with me. But in order to address our long-term fiscal challenges, the brinkmanship has to stop. Drawing lines in the sand and daring people to cross them has to stop. What we need is not to surrender our principles but to reach principled compromise.

That is why we should provide immediate certainty that the shutdowns and the threats to wreck the economy are totally off the table. We can do this by agreeing to adequate top-line numbers for the appropriations process for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 and eliminating the job-killing sequester.

Then we can move forward to a long-term debate about our fiscal challenges. We can then build consensus and reach this principled compromise. In reaching that compromise, I would urge my colleagues to include policies that focus on jobs and economic growth, that restore fairness to our Tax Code and preserve hard-earned Social Security and Medicare benefits.

Looking over the last few years, the uncertainty and the brinkmanship according to most economists has robbed us of growth. That growth, in and of itself, not only would have put more Americans to work, but it would have contributed to deficit reduction, even more than we have already been able to do to date.

If we are serious about deficit reduction, if we are serious about narrowing the gap in terms of equality in our society, then we have to emphasize not only wise fiscal policies that reduce the deficit directly but wise fiscal policies that encourage growth and also reduce the deficit.

Let's agree to those top-line numbers. Let's also eliminate the sequester and let's move forward. That is why we were sent here. Americans want us to keep the economy moving forward and to get the economy working for them. They do not want to see us engage in procedural maneuvers that simply leave us without adequate progress on these issues that are extraordinarily important to them.

We are recovering from the most recent self-inflicted wound—the government shutdown and near default. That manufactured crisis was absolutely unnecessary and it was particularly unnecessary to threaten the credit of the United States. A vast majority of Americans are clear that at a minimum we should keep the government open and we should pay our bills. We have always done that. Only in the last few years and harking back to when Mr. Gingrich was Speaker did the other side engage in this sort of brinksmanship.

This does not work for Americans. They do understand we have differences in policy. They do understand we have to debate these various differences. But at a threshold level, government has to be working for them, not sporadically but constantly. And we cannot threaten the credit of the United States.

Jumping from these manufactured crises to crises is no way to do the job. As I said before, there are immediate tasks before us. We have to have a reasonable expenditure level for our budgets for fiscal years 2014 and 2015. Sequester must stop. Then we have to start to look at longer term problems that are being driven by demographics.

We know the sequestration is harming our job growth. CBO has estimated that the 2013 and 2014 sequester will cost the economy 900,000 jobs. Simply suspending or limiting the sequester, if we can generate 900,000 jobs, most Americans would say that is the right policy. If you can just do that and create jobs, then do it.

It is obvious the sequester is not workable. The House of Representatives, our colleagues, have had very difficult times passing bills that adhere to sequestration, bills that traditionally passed overwhelmingly, like transportation and infrastructure bills. If we cannot even do that under the pressure of the sequester, then, again, we are back to a dysfunctional government. It might be formally open, but it is not helping people and it's not doing the things we have to do: getting economies to grow, letting States build bridges, sewers, and highways.

Senator MIKULSKI has done an extraordinary job as the chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee. She has been working hard to make sure we bring bills to this floor that not only have the support of our Members, our colleagues, but also meet the needs of the American people.

I have the privilege of chairing the interior subcommittee. We have been able, working with my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska, to propose—we have not brought it to the subcommittee or full committee—but to propose a mark that would respond to the real needs of this country in terms of clean water and drinking

water infrastructure—which is vital to the economy of every American community.

On the other side, the House is proposing a cut of $1.756 billion, more than 75 percent. That cut would devastate these programs and result in 97,000 fewer jobs. These are the good kinds of construction jobs, high-paying jobs, that allow families to stay above the water and allow communities to prosper. The workers who are putting in those infrastructure projects are also going to local supermarkets, local restaurants, paying the fees and dues to the Little League teams, and doing the things we expect every family should be able to do and we hope every family can do.

In the Transportation bill, for example, we were able to maintain our promise to fund transit, airport, and highway systems. We have been able to set aside more than $1 billion for the popular TIGER grant program and a new initiative to replace bridges in critical transportation corridors. This is an effort that can benefit every State in this country in terms of infrastructure projects.

Looking across the Capitol at the House Republican Transportation bill, they are cutting by $7.7 billion—even more than last year's sequestration level. It not only eliminates the TIGER grants for 2014, it reaches back to 2013 TIGER grants and cuts them by $237 million. These kinds of cuts are untenable.

They also signal a very different attitude here. It was at one time clear that transportation was one of those issues that united us, Republicans and Democrats, the North, the South, the East, and the West, because it was something that every community needed and every community understood. Now we see this dichotomy, and that is unhealthy for our government and for our economy.

House Appropriations Chairman HAL ROGERS said last July when these draconian cuts forced House leaders to pull the bill from consideration:

> With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just three months ago. Thus, I believe that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

Even the chairperson of the House Appropriations Committee is signaling that sequestration is untenable and unworkable.

On this side of the Capitol, Chairman MIKULSKI has been a strong voice echoing—not only echoing, but asserting—that position constantly.

We can't get rid of sequestration with spending cuts alone. We can't cut our way to prosperity. Revenue has to be part of the solution.

In fact, as we have done over the last several years, we have cut discretionary spending dramatically. We are down to not fat but bone, and so we need additional revenues.

There is some good news. There are loopholes, egregious loopholes, that in and of themselves should be closed, regardless if we were dealing with the issues of deficit and sequestration. They are not appropriate, not efficient, and they do not add to the overall economic benefit of the country. They do benefit very narrow interests. It comes down to whether my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to see these special preferences prevail or whether the national economy and the families across this country will benefit.

We have to move forward. We have to emphasize things that will help us, for example, create more manufacturing jobs in this time and for the future. I think at one point we thought manufacturing was passé. We discovered it is not only not passé but it is absolutely vital, because we can't take new innovation, new discoveries, at which we are so good, commercialize them, and then create new products in that commercialization process, unless we have manufacturing.

We learn a lot on the manufacturing floor. We have seen products we have developed intellectually become not only manufactured but improved by other countries who have the ability to manufacture, we have to get back to doing that.

We have to be able to align our workforce and our education system so that we have the skills for the next century. Job training has to be competent, efficient, and adequate. All of this requires investments in resources, not simply cutting away and cutting away.

Ultimately, as we understand, and as our predecessors, particularly my predecessor, Senator Claiborne Pell, understood, education is the engine that pulls this country forward. We used to assume we were the most educated. We were the country with the best record of college graduates. We were the country that advanced public education for everyone. We look around the world and we have slipped in terms of college graduates. We have slipped in terms of skills. Our public education system needs to be reinvigorated. Not only with suggestions from the sidelines, not only with new approaches, but also with real resources. These investments have to be made.

It is a multifaceted approach, but I think we have to begin with only the simple understanding, as we go forward, we need to provide the economy, our constituents, and ourselves the certainty of an adequate funding level for the government for the next 2 years. We need to suspend, dispense with, postpone—whatever the appropriate term—sequestration, because it is not going to help us grow the economy. In fact, it will take away about 900,000 jobs.

Then we have to certainly make it clear we will not threaten the creditworthiness of the United States by defaulting on our debt.

If we can do these things, and I believe we can, we can provide the certainty that our private entrepreneurs need to make real investments in the economy and to grow. In all of this, we have to bring a balanced approach. It is not only cutting, it is expenditure cuts wisely chosen, together with revenue wisely chosen, through closing loopholes that will give us a growing economy, hopefully increase opportunity, and put us back on the path to profound sustained economic recovery.

(The further remarks of Mr. REED are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. REED. I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

There upon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HEINRICH).

DRUG QUALITY AND SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the Senate as in morning business and that the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, be allowed to join me in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

IRAN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the administration's negotiations with Iran failed to achieve an interim agreement this past weekend, and if published reports are accurate, we owe our French allies a great deal of credit for preventing the major powers in the negotiations—the so-called P5-plus-1—from making a bad, bad, bad interim deal with Iran—a deal that could have allowed Iran to continue making progress on key aspects of its nuclear program and in return receiving an easing of billions of dollars in sanctions.

The Senator from South Carolina and I are not opposed to seeking an interim agreement with Iran as a way to create better conditions for negotiations on a final agreement. We joined with some of our colleagues in a letter to the President in support of such an approach before the Geneva agreement. But our support was conditioned on the need for any interim agreement to be based on the principle of suspension for suspension; that is to say, the Iranians would have to fully suspend their enrichment of uranium and the development of their nuclear weaponization programs and infrastructure, including construction of the heavy water reactor at Arak. The idea would be to freeze Iran's nuclear program in place so that negotiations could proceed on how to roll it back without the threat the Iranians could use negotiations as a delaying tactic.

I remind my colleagues they have done that time after time. In fact, the new President of Iran, Mr. Rouhani, bragged when he was negotiator that they were able to fool the negotiators and increase the centrifuges from 150 to 1,000. We have seen the movie before.

If Iran agreed, though, to this freeze, Senator GRAHAM and I have said we would support suspension of our efforts to pass and implement new sanctions. Unfortunately, public reports suggest the administration was willing to agree in Geneva to less than a full suspension of Iran's program and to pay for that inadequate step with billions of dollars in sanctions relief. This is not ''suspension for suspension,'' regardless of administration claims to the contrary. And that is a problem. It puts too much trust in President Rouhani—the one whom I talked about before who bragged—he bragged—about deceiving the international community when he was Iran's nuclear negotiator. In fact, the current diplomatic efforts are consistent with a pattern of past dealings undertaken by the Iranian government to buy breathing space and shift international expectations in order to continue development of its nuclear program.

We have to avoid an interim agreement that diminishes Iran's incentive to make the hard decisions we ultimately need them to make as part of a final agreement, and that final agreement must require Iran to do the following: Comply with all outstanding U.N. Security Council resolutions; sign, ratify, and implement the additional protocol of the nuclear proliferation treaty; address outstanding concerns of the IAEA, especially through expanding inspection measures; halt construction on and ultimately dismantle the Arak heavy water reactor; stop development of advanced centrifuges; and turn its supply of enriched material over to the IAEA.

A final agreement should also not recognize that Iran has any inherent right to enrich. A country that has continuously been on the path for nuclear weapons, that has violated protocol after protocol, should not have the ''right to enrich.'' Without these measures, Iran's nuclear program will continue to grow. And as the program grows, it will be harder to track and harder to set back.

Only when Iran seriously undertakes measures to dismantle its nuclear program should sanctions be unwound. The administration should not weaken the strong negotiating position that Congress has helped create. Instead, it should use its position to its advantage.

Before I ask my friend from South Carolina to comment, I would add that we should not forget the context of Iran and negotiations with Iran. This is an arms control issue—the nuclear weapons. Meanwhile, we seem to ignore the fact that Iran is spreading terror throughout the Middle East and would like to throughout the world.

It is the Iranians who have armed and trained and equipped 5,000 Hezbollah, who are slaughtering people in Syria. It is Iran that sends the Iranian Revolutionary Guard into Syria and slaughters people. It is Iran that is supporting the Islamic extremist groups that are now moving seriously on the side of Bashar Assad into Syria. It is Iran that is spreading terror throughout the Middle East and would attempt to throughout the world. They still view the United States of America as the great Satan. They are still committed to ''wiping Israel off the map.''

Iran is a threat to peace in the world. And it is not only the issue of nuclear weaponry, it is their entire behavior of spreading terrorism throughout the region, propping Bashar Asad while he continues to slaughter, maim, rape, torture, and kill. And for this administration and this Secretary of State to ignore those facts about Iran, in my view, is disgraceful conduct.

Finally, before I turn to my friend from South Carolina, I would add that the influence and power of the United States throughout the world, especially in the Middle East, is no longer there. Every Middle East leader I talk to, everyone I know in the region, says they believe the United States is leaving, the United States is not in any way involved, and they are making accommodation for the absence of the United States leadership.

This President does not believe in American exceptionalism. America must lead or Iran, Russia, and other countries will lead, and sooner or later the United States will pay a very heavy price. We must not ignore the lessons of history. Several times in our history we have tried to withdraw the fortress America, and every time we have paid a very heavy price.

So I say to my friend from South Carolina, it is important, this Iranian issue, it is of transcendent importance, but I do not believe it can be viewed in a vacuum, considering Iran's continued effort to try to undermine and destroy everything—the freedom and democracy—for which American stands.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I could respond, I guess the essence of what we are trying to say is we believe Iran is the problem, not the solution, to the Mid East and the world at large. There has been bipartisan support for curtailing and controlling and eventually eliminating the Iranian nuclear program. There has been bipartisan support for our friends in Israel, and we want to keep it that way. We want to make sure Congress speaks with one voice, that we are helpful when we can be, and that we offer criticism at an appropriate time.

I guess the concerns we have about this agreement are that it is getting to be more like North Korea in a fashion that makes us all uncomfortable. If you interject billions of dollars into the Iranian economy now, without dismantling the centrifuges, I think you have made a huge mistake.

What are we trying to accomplish? We are trying to make sure the Iranians do not have the capability to develop a nuclear weapon. The first question you have to ask: Are they trying to build a nuclear powerplant—a nuclear infrastructure for commercial purposes—or are they trying to create capability to produce a weapon? Trust me on this: Nobody goes about building a commercial nuclear program this way. They are trying to build a nuclear weapon. Why? Because that would give them influence in the region they have never had. It would give Iran a strong standing in the historical Sunni-Shia conflict between the Persians and the Arabs. And as a consequence, it would lead to a nuclear arms race in the Mid East, because the Sunni Arabs are not going to allow the Shia Persians to have a nuclear capability.

They also believe, fairly rationally so, if they get a nuclear weapon, the regime is probably home free; that the West is going to back off, much as we did in North Korea. So the decision of how to handle this program is probably the most important decision President Obama will make in his second term and will be one of the most important decisions the world makes for the future of our planet here going into the 21st century.

Mr. MCCAIN. If my friend would yield for a question, the Senator from South Carolina and I have known the Prime Minister of Israel rather well over the years. Obviously, the first target of Iran, in the case of a nuclear weapon, would be Israel. Iran has never stepped back from saying that Israel should be wiped from the face of the Earth. Has the Senator from South Carolina ever known a time since the creation of the State of Israel that the United States and Israel have been further apart; that there has been more open disagreement and, indeed, tension at a level the likes of which we have never seen? And does it not appear by not including Israel in any of the negotiations, to start with, but also there seems to be a complete disregard of the knowledge, information, and frontline status of Israel in this whole issue?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I think it is pretty obvious the tensions are growing, and not just with Israel. I believe the Obama administration's eagerness to reach a deal is unnerving to the people in the region, and not just Israel. The Israelis and the Sunni Arabs are being pushed together in an unprecedented fashion. We are hearing out of the Arab community the same concerns as out of the Israeli community. So that is an odd alignment.

Mr. MCCAIN. And haven't the Saudis already basically let it be known if Iran acquires a nuclear weapon they will be right behind them?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, absolutely, it will create an arms race.

There is a positive note here: The Congress itself. The Congress has not been confused. We are more together on this issue than we have ever been. The Congress passed 90 to 1 a resolution rejecting the idea of allowing the

Iranians to have a nuclear weapon and trying to contain them. The idea of containing a nuclear-armed Iran is not a good idea. We fear they would share the technology with a terrorist group that would wind its way here to the United States. And Israel believes they could never have a moment of peace with a nuclear-armed Iran. Containment won't work.

Secondly, the Congress, 99 to 0, said: If Israel has to defend itself against a nuclear-capable Iran, has to intervene to stop this existential threat to the Jewish state, that we would provide political, economic, and military support. So the Congress has been very much together.

The next thing we hope to do is have a resolution, bipartisan in nature, that defines the end game. What are we trying to accomplish? We don't want a war. Nobody wants a war. The idea of the Iranians having a commercial nuclear powerplant is OK with me. Mexico and Canada have commercial nuclear power facilities. They just don't enrich uranium. They buy the product from the world community. They don't have enrichment and reprocessing. I don't mind the Iranians having a nuclear powerplant for commercial purposes as long as the international community controls the fuel cycle.

Here is the problem: They are insisting on the right to enrich. And the problem is you can take uranium and enrich it to a certain level for commercial purposes, and with today's technology you can break out and have a nuclear weapon very quickly.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask, aren't the parameters of this proposed agreement to allow them to continue to enrich materials?

Mr. GRAHAM. The concern the Israelis have, and that my colleague and I have, is the number of centrifuges available to the Iranians is into the tens of thousands now, pushing from 18 to 24,000. Who really knows. But the advanced centrifuges we are talking about can take 3.5-percent enriched uranium and go to 90 percent to get a weapon in just a matter of weeks, if not months.

So here is the rub: I think Congress will speak with one voice. We don't mind a commercial capability for the Iranians as long as you control the fuel cycle. As to the previously enriched uranium, particularly the 20 percent stockpile, turn it over to the international community. That is the U.N. position. Stop enriching. There is no right to enrich. At the end of the day, this plutonium heavy water reactor that you are building is a threat to Israel beyond belief. Dismantle that reactor. You don't need a heavy water plutonium-producing reactor to engage in commercial power production. These are what we would like to let the administration know would be a successful outcome regarding the Congress. They actually mirror the U.N. resolutions.

I am hopeful we can find a way to end the nuclear program in Iran which would be a win-win situation for the Iranians and the world at large. But what we can't afford to do is get it wrong with Iran. These negotiations, the interim agreement, as Senator MCCAIN stated so well, sent chills up the spine of almost everybody in the region. So if the Iranians insist upon enriching, to have the ability to take the uranium and enrich it in the future, I think is a nonstarter. That would be incredibly dangerous, and we will wake up one day with a North Korea in the Middle East. If the Iranians get a nuclear weapon, it will be far more destabilizing than North Korea having a nuclear weapon on the Korean Peninsula. It will open Pandora's box.

I am hopeful the administration will go into the next round of negotiations eyes wide open, understanding where the American people and the international community are and the people in the region and if we get a deal, it is a good deal. But what is a good deal? To make sure the Iranians can have a peaceful nuclear power program but can't get a bomb. The only way they can get a bomb is to have enrichment capability as part of an agreement. Mexico, Canada, and 15 other nations have nuclear powerplants for commercial purposes, but they don't insist on enriching uranium to provide the fuel. If they insist on enriching, that tells us all we need to know about what their true intent is.

I thank Senator MCCAIN for bringing his voice.

Mr. MCCAIN. It is also true that the right to enrich is undercut by their many years' record of deception and efforts at acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Finally, again, I want to emphasize our Israeli friends are on the frontline. It is not the United States of America that the ayatollahs have committed to ''wipe off the face of the earth,'' that have been dedicated ever since the Iranian revolution to the extinction of the State of Israel.

So shouldn't we pay close attention? We aren't dictated by Israeli behavior, but shouldn't we profit from their experiences? Twice the Israelis have had to act militarily against nuclear facilities. Twice they have had to do that in order to prevent in one case Syria and another case Iraq from acquiring nuclear weapons which would threaten them with extinction. Now this agreement, clearly, in the words of the Israeli Prime Minister, is something that is very dangerous to the very existence of the State of Israel.

Again, Israel does not dictate American policy, but to ignore the warnings of literally every expert in the Middle East—especially that of Israel, including Arab countries—I think is ignoring evidence and opinions that are very well informed. To get an agreement for the sake of an agreement, in my view, would be a disaster.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would the Senator yield? To conclude, why are the Iranians at the table? Because the sanctions are working. The Congress has passed tough sanctions. To the Obama administration's credit, they put together an international coalition—unprecedented in nature—which has gotten the Iranians' attention and we are at the table. The last thing we want to do is relieve the pressure because that is what got them there. There are two things they must understand: Until you abandon your nuclear quest for a bomb and replace it with a reasonable solution for commercial nuclear power aspirations, we will continue sanctions. The threat of military force is also one of the factors that got them to the table.

Jay Carney said yesterday: If you push for new sanctions, you are inviting war. I would like to respond. I think the reason we are having a peaceful opportunity moment here is because of the sanctions. If we back off now and infuse billions of dollars into the Iranian economy and leave the centrifuges in place, we are inviting an attack by Israel. If you don't shut down the plutonium heavy water reactor, Israel is not going to sit on the sidelines forever. So to not have a continuation of sanctions until we get the right answer is going to invite more destabilizing in the region.

We have to realize that Israel is in a different position than almost anybody else. They are close. The Iranians have talked about wiping them off the map. When it comes to the Jewish people, they don't take that stuff lightly anymore. When they say ''never again,'' they literally mean it. Can you tell the Prime Minister of Israel—given the behavior of the Iranians in the last 30 years—that they are just joking? Can you tell the people of the United States, if the Iranians got a nuclear weapon, they wouldn't share it with a terrorist group to come our way? Name one thing they have produced they haven't shared.

So this is a moment of history. This is the biggest decision President Obama will make, and I would like to help him make the right decision. I would like to help the world resolve this problem without a war. But here is the situation we find ourselves in: If we attack Iran to stop their nuclear program if we couldn't get a peaceful ending, we would open Pandora's box. It would be difficult. But if they got a nuclear weapon, it would empty Pandora's box. That is the world in which we live. We have a little time to get this right. I hope we can.

Mr. MCCAIN. I appreciate the patience of my friend from Iowa, and I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to cover the bill we are on, the Drug Quality and Security Act. Before I do, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE, be recognized to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. One year ago, we were at the beginning of our effort to understand one of the worst public health crises this country has experienced in recent years. We were just learning about the New England Compounding Center's astonishing disregard for basic procedures to ensure that the products they were manufacturing were sterile. We were shocked and saddened by the news that hundreds were sick and dozens had died from infections caused by NECC's blatant disregard for patient safety, and we were fearful for the fate of the thousands of additional patients who had received injections of NECC products.

Despite the urgency of that crisis, the bill we are considering was not slapped together overnight—far from it. It is the product of a full year of careful bipartisan policy collaboration, and it rests upon the factual foundation developed through the bipartisan oversight investigation that Senator ALEXANDER and I launched over 1 year ago. When we learned of the NECC tragedy, we did not rush to pick up a pen and dash off a quick legislative answer. Instead, we sought to understand what that story was, what its causes were, so we could develop legislation which would make a difference in the future and not just make headlines.

In early October of 2012, shortly after the outbreak became known, this is what the outbreak looked like. We had these States with 64 deaths and 750 people got sick. I don't mean they just got sick overnight and then got better. Some of the people who lived will have lingering illnesses for the remainder of their lives. In many cases they will never be able to work again because of meningitis. My partner's home State of Tennessee was very hard hit with 153 cases. Michigan was the highest with 264 cases.

But this is what it looked like when this outbreak occurred. As we can see, there were a couple out West, and it was starting to spread in that direction. Thankfully, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention was able to intervene and find the source of it and stop it; again, another example of how CDC protects the American people.

When this happened, we began to talk directly with various stakeholders to understand it. We continued to talk to the FDA and the CDC on their investigations. We held briefing calls with the Massachusetts Board of Pharmacy, where the NECC was located. We talked to an array of compounding pharmacies and purchasers of the compounded products.

On October 25 of last year, to explore the need for and potential contours of legislation, the committee launched a bipartisan process to examine the respective State and Federal roles in regulating compounding pharmacies. My oversight team worked with Senator ALEXANDER's to gather documents from FDA and from the State of Massachusetts that shed light upon how NECC had been allowed to grow so large with so little oversight. Last November, we released an initial report and held a hearing exploring the statutory and regulatory gaps that contributed to this tragedy. Our bipartisan investigation continued and culminated in a final report released on May 22 of this year.

Over the course of this investigation, we explored how drug compounding has evolved as an industry over the past couple of decades. Drug compounding is a traditional and longstanding activity of pharmacies. It serves an important role in our health care system. Compounding is when just a few people—maybe only one person—needs a certain compound of a drug. So a pharmacist, maybe not with the classic mortar and pestle but with other devices, mixes, compounds the specific drug that is needed. Maybe it is needed for a few people in a hospital, a specific chronic illness that someone might have. This is sort of the traditional compounding, where you can't just get a prescription for it and go down to the pharmacy and have it filled, simply because there is not that big of a demand for it. But over the last couple of decades a number of large-scale drug compounding companies have started to produce large batches of high-risk drugs for national sale.

For example, at the time of the meningitis outbreak, NECC's sister company called Ameridose was providing prepared IV mixtures to 25,000 hospitals and facilities across the country. Despite a scope of operations that makes these companies much more similar to drug manufacturers than to pharmacies, they primarily faced oversight similar to State-licensed community pharmacies rather than the more rigorous quality standards governing traditional drug manufacturers.

Our investigation found that both NECC and Ameridose had lengthy track records of producing drugs of questionable sterility and potency, and both had been the subject of repeated adverse event reports and consumer complaints. The committee review of FDA documents indicates that between 2002 and 2012, NECC was the subject of at least 52 adverse event reports, exposing the dangers created by its hazardous compounding practices with documented issues including the failure to ensure the sterility of equipment and products, the distribution of drugs containing particulate matter, the manufacture of superpotent and subpotent drugs, mislabeling of drugs, inaccurate ''beyond use'' dating, and the illegal distribution of drugs in the absence of patient-specific prescriptions.

Similarly, between 2007 and 2012, internal documents indicate that Ameridose was the subject of at least 18 adverse event reports. Ameridose was cited in 2008 for producing a compounded version of the pain reliever fentanyl that was more than 100 percent stronger than the standard level.

What was happening at NECC during this time period was unfortunately an example of a larger problem across the industry. In an effort to understand better the risks posed by increasingly large drug compounding companies, the FDA undertook surveys of compounded drugs in 2001 and 2006. In each of those surveys, about one-third of the drugs sampled failed one or more standard quality tests. In the 2006 survey of sterile injectable drugs, 33 percent of the samples contained either not enough or too much of the active drug ingredient.

Between 2001 and 2011, FDA documents indicate at least 25 deaths and 36 serious injuries, including hospitalizations, were linked to large-scale drug compounding companies, including 13 deaths in 2011 alone. Between 1998 and 2005, FDA documented at least 38 deaths and 210 injuries from drugs that were contaminated, mislabeled, or caused overdoses because they contained more of the active pharmaceutical ingredient than indicated. These include the deaths of 6 infants and children, and at least 18 other children paralyzed, burned, hospitalized, or suffering from other severe reactions, and these numbers likely understate the actual number of adverse events because current law, unlike what we have in this bill, does not require reporting of adverse events.

Our bipartisan investigation concluded that large-scale drug compounders continue to pose a serious risk to public health. At the time of our final report in May, we had identified at least 48 compounding companies that had been found to be producing and selling drugs that were contaminated or created in unsafe conditions in just the preceding 8 months since this outbreak.

I guess what I am saying is, if you follow this, this had been going on for some time but it kept getting worse and worse as more and more of these large-scale drug compounders found they could get away with it.

In that same time 10 drug compounders had issued national recalls because of concerns about contamination, and 11 drug compounders had been ordered by State licensing agencies to stop producing some or all drugs.

Our investigation concluded that in order to reduce the serious and ongoing risk to the public health from compounded drug products, it is essential that a clear statutory framework be enacted that requires entities compounding drugs outside of traditional pharmacy practice to engage in good manufacturing practices and to better ensure the sterility and quality of their drugs. So we developed this bill, the DQSA, as we called it, to address the regulatory gaps that we identified in this investigation.

Under the legislation before us, large compounders such as NECC or any other compounder that chooses to operate outside of traditional pharmacy

practice have only one legal option: They must register with the FDA. They must follow good manufacturing practices. They must tell FDA when their products hurt people; otherwise, they must follow the manufacturer-like requirements that apply to outsourcing facilities under this bill. If they are not traditional compounders and they do not meet the requirements for outsourcing facilities, our bill says FDA can shut them down immediately.

The Drug Quality and Security Act is a carefully crafted bill that not only responds to the NECC outbreak but to the root causes that I have gone over that go back almost 2 decades, that really led up to this tragedy. It is good bipartisan policy.

I pointed out the other day in my remarks, and I point out again today, it has wide industry and consumer support: the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the American Pharmacists Association, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, large drug manufacturers, and also consumer groups—the Center for Science and Democracy, the Center for Medical Consumers, and others. So it has both consumer and industry support.

I wanted to take this time to lay out the background as to why this bill is so vitally important. I will also point out the House of Representatives passed this bill on a voice vote. Now we have it here at the desk. It is the same basic bill we passed out of our committee on a bipartisan unanimous vote.

Last night we had a 97-to-1 vote on cloture to proceed to this bill. That ought to be an indication that this is an important bill, but one that has broad bipartisan support. Now, under the rules of the Senate we have 30 hours, of which I am now taking my part of 1 hour. I don't intend to take the whole hour. Then we go 30 hours, and then we get on the bill. If one person then—this one person—continues to object, I guess we will have to file cloture on the bill. That will take 2 days to ripen, 2 days for cloture to ripen. Then we will have yet another vote on cloture on the bill. I assume we will get 97 to 1. Then we have 30 hours after that, and then we vote. I think that takes us to Sunday, if I am not mistaken, if we stay here.

This is not really part of what I want to talk about, but I think this is an important reason why I have supported a change in the rules of the Senate since 1995. We cannot continue to be a 21st century country, to be a major world power, and operate under 19th century rules and regulations. It is just not right that one person, one Senator, any Senator—I am not pointing fingers at anyone. I am saying anybody, any one Senator in the face of a bill that is not only vital for the health and safety of the American people but which has broad bipartisan support—that one person could tie up the Senate for literally a week or more through procedural roadblocks. That is why I say we need to do something about the rules around this place.

If this were a contentious issue, I could see the need to slow things down. This has to do with the health and safety of the American people. A lot of time and effort went into this bill, by Republicans and Democrats, FDA, CDC, pharmaceutical companies, consumer groups. That is why I think it has such broad support. I hope we do not have to go through all this. But if we do, we do. There is no doubt in anybody's mind that this bill will pass and it will probably pass on a 97–1 vote. But why tie up the Senate for all this time? Why put off the signing of a bill that would get action to protect the health and safety of the American people?

I hope we can bring this to a resolution and have a vote up or down on it. Frankly, I think we could probably voice-vote the bill. I think we could ask for unanimous consent—but for one person—and then we could voice vote it. Then, if there is an objection, maybe we do have to have a rollcall. If someone wants a rollcall, that is their right, but at least let's vote on the bill and get it out of here. That is the least we can do to protect the health and safety of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

OBAMACARE

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, last week I came to the floor to discuss the negative impact that ObamaCare is having on the people of New Hampshire. I shared dozens of compelling stories from my constituents, who are telling me that they are seeing their coverage canceled and they are seeing their premiums rise. These sad stories continue to arrive in my in-box every day, and these are real people. They are having great difficulty with not only the Web site but structural problems that exist with the law itself. They deserve to have their voices heard on the floor of the Senate. I will say, as one of my constituents said to me: Lives in New Hampshire are depending on it.

Last week President Obama said he was sorry to those who are now receiving cancellation notices. But a simple apology falls short because the structural problems we are now seeing with this law, including the cancellation notices that too many of my constituents are receiving, were problems that many in this Chamber, even before I got elected to the Senate, warned about before the law was passed.

Here are some of the stories I want to share from people in New Hampshire and how they are being impacted by this law.

Jeanne in Meredith wrote me she was diagnosed with breast cancer 2½ years ago. She was laid off from her job of 20 years and then went on COBRA. Jeanne traveled to Mass General in Boston to receive care and when her coverage ran out she worked with her insurance agent to receive coverage that she could afford and that would allow her to continue with her subsequent treatments without any interruptions. She has now told me that what she has worked out in the plan she had has been canceled. She wrote me:

> I liked my plan. And I not only liked my doctors, I consider them my lifeline. If I purchase a plan under the Exchange, I lose access to all my doctors in Boston, and I am finding that I will also lose my oncologist in Nashua as well. This can't be happening.

Lori in Littleton wrote me. She told me she and her husband recently were notified that their coverage will be canceled. When she learned about the new plan that was being offered to comply with ObamaCare, she said:

> We were shocked that the cost would be $400 a month more than we are currently paying. This is way beyond our budget. So we began to explore the so-called Exchange to shop for all of our choices. Once again, we were very frustrated to learn that New Hampshire has a monopoly with only one carrier [on the exchange].

What I have also heard from my constituents is concerns that they are receiving notices that their premiums are rising as a result of ObamaCare. Sara in New Castle wrote me that her premiums for a high-deductible plan that complies with ObamaCare will be double her current premium. Moreover, Sara said that she ''will no longer be able to go to Portsmouth Hospital. My primary physician, gynecologist, eye doctor, and children's pediatrician are all excluded from the ACA plan that I will be forced to purchase by the end of 2014.''

She finished the letter she wrote to me by saying: ''No, my family is not better off with the ACA.''

John in Pembroke wrote:

> The new law is called the Affordable Care Act. What a hurtful joke that is to hard-working Americans. My existing policy is being canceled. After I called Anthem to inform them they must have misheard the President and the other supporters of the ACA, they told me that my existing policy did not meet the standards for the new law. I was shocked. The new higher plans from Anthem in the best case scenario are more than double my existing plan.

David in Nashua wrote me that recently he saw his coverage canceled like too many others. He wrote:

> When working with Anthem to get a plan that will have the closest coverages and plan services with similar deductibles and copays, I was disheartened to learn it will cost me an additional $110 per month—about 40 percent more than I was paying.

He continued:

> To get comparable services to what I had it will cost an additional $45 per month. All said, I am looking at an increase of $155 per month.

David said he is looking at a 57-percent increase in costs and an additional $1,800 per year.

He said to me:

> This is grossly unacceptable, has been misleading from the words conveyed by the President and downright frustrating to have to deal with such a problem.

A couple from Amherst, NH, wrote me and said:

> . . . because of the Affordable Care Act our health insurance plan is being canceled and

the least expensive plan, either within the exchange or outside of it, will more than double our cost. The least expensive plan we can obtain will increase our monthly premium from $582 to $1,183 per month. Our annual premium under the new health care law will increase from $6,984 to $14,196—an increase of [over $7,000] per year.

They further wrote to me:

President Obama promised us that if we liked our plan, we could keep it. But ours has been canceled. President Obama promised us that if we liked our doctor we could keep our doctor.

President Obama promised us that under the new health care law we would save $2,500. But our premiums will be increasing by over $7,000 a year.

A couple from Center Sandwich also contacted me. They said their rates will double and cost them an additional $7,000 per year.

They wrote:

We are both in our second careers and in our 50s, working hard and doing two jobs. Blue collar couple who are very healthy. Under this so-called Affordable Care law, our rates are going to double!

Scott from Concord wrote:

I currently have a great family plan through my work. This plan costs me $240 per month. On January 1st this plan will cost me $600 per month. I can't afford to pay such a high premium. Now I am forced to get a plan that has a 50% greater deductible, and much higher co-pays.

I also heard from a mother from Manchester. She has a little girl who is scheduled to have surgery at the beginning of January. As any mother would be, she is worried, and now she has been told her plan has been canceled. She wrote:

I looked, and my current plan is not available through the Exchange. I will have to purchase a plan with a high deductible. The new plan will cost over $1,200 per month, increasing my premium which is currently just over $1,000 per month. The new plans, through the Exchange, have a smaller network of doctors, so I could be losing my doctors too.

Finally, I am hearing frustration and concerns from my constituents about the Web site.

David in Bedford wrote:

My wife and I are semi-retired and have been trying since October 1 to obtain health insurance through HealthCare.gov. We have also used the telephone option but we were unable so far to obtain coverage.

He finished this message to me by saying:

We are very concerned with being without coverage on January 1, 2014.

I heard a similar concern from a resident in Greenfield who also expressed deep concern about private information put on the Web site. I heard the same from a registered nurse from Milford. She expressed frustrations about how the exchange is working.

There are many more pieces of correspondence I have received from my constituents. I will not share them all on the floor today, but their voices deserve to be heard. Because of this law, people in New Hampshire are losing the coverage they thought they could keep. They are getting premium increase notices, which they cannot afford to pay, that are attributed to ObamaCare. Finally, as I have previously said on the floor, some people are having their hours cut because it defines the workweek as a 30-hour workweek. Unfortunately, the people who do want to continue to work more hours are being harmed.

As I have done before, I come to the floor today to call for a timeout on ObamaCare. We need a timeout because we are seeing that the problems with this law are much deeper than a Web site. We hope those problems will be fixed. Of course, they have not yet been fixed. The Washington Post reported today that they may not even be fixed with what the administration has represented—at the end of this month.

That said, what about the canceled policies, the premium increases, and the lost hours? It is time to have a timeout where we do what should have been done in the beginning. Instead of passing a law of this magnitude on a partisan basis, people need to come together to address health care, rising costs, access, and the issues the American people want us to take on. This law is not the answer, and the American people—and the people of New Hampshire—deserve better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the issue that got me into politics many years ago in the first place—early childhood education.

I thank my friend and colleague Chairman HARKIN, whose leadership on this critical issue is unparalleled. I am delighted he is on the floor today as well. I also thank Senators CASEY and HIRONO for their strong support of early childhood education. They are great partners in this work as well.

Of the 535 Members of Congress, I have to say each one of us comes to Washington, DC, with our own unique background. We are a collection of military veterans, farmers, business owners, and a lot more.

As for me, I come to Congress as a mother and preschool teacher. When my kids were much younger, I found that their wonderful preschool program was being closed down by my State because of budget cuts. When my children were very young, I put them in my car and traveled to Olympia, our State capital, which is 100 miles away, to explain to these legislators, whom I did not know, why they could not cut this important program. When I got there, legislators told me there was nothing someone like me could do to save that preschool program. One legislator in particular told me I was just a mom in tennis shoes and had no chance of changing anything. He said I could not make a difference.

Well, that made me slightly mad. I drove home, picked up my phone, started calling other moms and dads, and they called moms and dads from around our State. Over time—about 3 months—we organized thousands of families in our State. We wrote letters, held rallies, and when all was said and done the legislature listened to us and reinstated that preschool program. I went on to teach in that program as a preschool teacher and then to serve on my local school board.

When I eventually did come to Washington, DC, as a U.S. Senator, I knew firsthand that if we want to strengthen our economy and give our kids a brighter future, we could not wait until they were teenagers or adults to invest in them. I had seen in my own classrooms that when young children get the attention they need, they are miles ahead of their peers on the path to success. I saw that my own students who knew how to raise their hands or ask questions or stand in line to go to recess were the ones who were then able to go on and tackle a full curriculum in school.

That is why this week I joined a bipartisan group of colleagues to introduce legislation that will give every American child access to high-quality early education. The bill, the Strong Start for America's Children Act, aims to significantly increase access to and quality of early learning programs that start when a child is born and last until their first day of kindergarten. This legislation authorizes a Federal program that supports our individual States' efforts to educate their youngest citizens. It ensures that early learning programs everywhere have quality teachers and meet high standards, but it also provides States, school districts, and preschool programs the flexibility they need to meet their local children's needs.

Although I approach this issue today as a grandmother and mother and a former preschool teacher, many of my colleagues have their own reasons to support early education. Former law enforcement officers and lawyers and sheriffs whom I work with know that when we invest in our children at a young age, they are more likely to stay out of trouble and out of jail. Business leaders and economists know that when we spend $1 on a child's education in the first few years of their life, we save as much as $17 throughout their life. Our military leaders tell me that 75 percent of our Nation's 17- to 24-year-olds are ineligible to serve their country often because they are not able to pass the necessary math and reading.

It is not only teachers who are fighting for pre-K, it is generals, sheriffs, and CEOs. Fifty years of research backs this up. We know that 80 percent of a person's brain development occurs before the age of 5. While China is aiming to provide 70 percent of their children with 3 years of preschool by 2020 and India is doing the same, we do not

have a national strategy to get the youngest Americans ready to learn. Nobel Prize-winning economist James Heckman, an advocate for early learning, says ''skill begets skill.''

This summer I traveled throughout my home State of Washington visiting early learning programs. I heard from a kindergarten teacher who told me that while some of her students in kindergarten are practicing writing their names on their work, others are learning how to hold a pencil. Those children, even at an early age, are already playing catchup. So when a child who has benefited from early education knows how to open a book and turn a page, someone can teach them to read. But in classrooms across our country, some children are falling behind. The gap between children who start school ready to succeed and those who don't has serious implications for our country's future.

Although historically we have invested in education to build a path to the middle class, we are now falling behind. We now rank 28th globally in the proportion of 4-year-olds enrolled in pre-K and 25th globally in public funding for early learning. That cannot continue.

In the coming weeks and months, I will be working with my chairman Senator HARKIN, who is here today, and with many others to work toward making some smart investments in our educational system so we can move this legislation forward. Our country in very large part is the product of decisions that were made decades ago. The decision to make public education a priority now will have an extraordinary impact on the next generation. Every day we are choosing between being a country that is struggling to catch up or being a country that has the knowledge and power to continue to lead.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3204 AND S. 1197

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise today to again advocate for no Washington exemption from ObamaCare. This is an issue I have talked about with several of our colleagues in this body, and I have been joined by many supporters in the House of Representatives. I believe it is very important.

As we hear story after story from Americans in each of our States about what they are facing—being dropped from policies they liked and wanted to keep, having premium increases of 1,000 percent in some cases, getting their work hours cut back to under 30 hours a week—the fact remains that Washington has essentially an exemption from all of that pain. Washington has a big taxpayer-funded subsidy that nobody else in America at the same income level can get, and that really needs to end.

One critical component of this issue is the fact that even though the ObamaCare statute clearly said that every Member of Congress and all of their official staff had to go to the exchanges for their health care—and of course mentioned nothing about any huge taxpayer-funded subsidy—in fact, that language was considered and not included. Even though that is crystal clear under the statute, the Obama administration issued a special rule to get around that clear language. Part of that rule, which I think is outrageous on its face, says: Well, we don't know who official staff are. We cannot determine that, so we are going to leave it up to each individual Member of Congress to determine who their official staff are. As long as they deem certain staff nonofficial, then they don't have to go to the exchanges at all. They don't have to follow that clear mandate in the statute itself.

Well, again, when we are talking about folks who work on our staff, committee staff, and leadership staff, that is ridiculous. They are clearly official staff. They are not campaign staff. They are not off Capitol Hill and outside of government. They are not working for other entities. They are clearly official staff. This is just one of the major ways this illegal rule does an end run around the clear language of the statute.

In reaction to that part of the illegal rule, I introduced a bill that simply says these decisions by each individual Member of the Senate and the House need to be made public. There needs to be full disclosure when anybody is using this end-run around and saying: Yes, this person works for me but somehow they are not ''official,'' so they do not have to follow the mandate of ObamaCare to go to the exchanges. That information should absolutely be public, and I put that in the form of a bill which I have filed both as a free-standing bill and as an amendment to the measure before the Senate today.

Whatever we think about the underlying issues—and I know there is disagreement—to me it should be a no-brainer that there is full disclosure about how each individual office handles the situation. That is not fully disclosed now. Some Members may choose to say it to the press, to answer press questions, but it is not public information. It seems clear to me that how each office elects to handle that situation, how each elected Member elects to handle that situation, should be, by definition, public information, fully disclosed.

The measure I am talking about right now, that is all it does. It does not prohibit anything else from going on. I object to that. I have other measures I will push to prohibit it. But all the measure I am talking about right now does is make sure that information, that election by each individual Member, is public, that there is full disclosure about something I think clearly the public has a right to know about. So I am simply on the floor lobbying for that measure to pass and lobbying for a vote opportunity up or down on that important provision.

My first choice would be a simple vote on the measure in front of the Senate right now, the drug compounding bill. I have no interest in delaying progress of that bill. I simply want an amendment vote on the measure I am describing. We can vote it up or down. Either way, I think it is crystal clear this bill will proceed to become law. If my amendment is adopted, it would be voted on in the House. I think it would clearly be passed, become law. That is my first choice request here.

If that is not possible, I do have a second choice request, which is to simply make this vote in order in the context of the next major bill coming to the floor, the National Defense Authorization Act—again, a simple amendment, a simple vote. I have no interest in delaying the time running on the consideration of this bill, on delaying votes on this bill, or of delaying debate and voting on other amendments on the Defense authorization bill. It seems to me that is a very basic, straightforward request: a vote on a pure disclosure provision.

By the way, this provision has been hotlined on the Republican side, and there is no Republican objection to the substance of this provision. It is pure disclosure. We all think it should be public information. There is no objection.

So I would simply ask unanimous consent to proceed in this way and expedite, in the process, consideration of all of this, including the compounding bill on the floor right now. The distinguished floor manager for the bill said a few minutes ago he does not want delay on this bill. I do not want it either. There does not have to be any delay, and, in fact, this unanimous consent will expedite all of that consideration.

In that spirit, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining time on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3204, the compounding bill, be yielded back; that the motion to proceed be agreed to; that my amendment No. 2024 be the only amendment in order; that no second-degree amendments be in order; and that the amendment be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption; I further ask that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided, and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to a vote on my amendment; following the disposition of my amendment, that the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Well, Mr. President, reclaiming my time, that is unfortunate.

That could dispose of this bill and pass this bill today—a very straightforward, expeditious way of passing this bill with no delay.

I said I had a second choice, a path forward which I think is very reasonable as well, related to the National Defense Authorization Act.

So let me propose this unanimous consent request: I ask unanimous consent that all remaining time on the motion to proceed to H.R. 3204, the compounding bill, be yielded back; that the Senate proceed to H.R. 3204; that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; I further ask that the Senate then proceed to the consideration of S. 1197, the national defense authorization bill; that my amendment, which is at the desk, be called up, and that notwithstanding rule XXII, my amendment remain in order; that no second-degree amendments to my amendment be in order; and that the amendment be subject to a 60-vote affirmative threshold for passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of leadership, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Well, Mr. President, reclaiming my time again, I think that is unfortunate. That would be an even quicker route forward on the compounding bill because had that unanimous consent request been agreed to, the compounding bill would have just passed the Senate. It would have happened right now, and we would move on to something that clearly needs time for debate and discussion and amendments, the National Defense Authorization Act.

In closing, let me underscore all I am seeking, urging, and, yes, demanding is a clear up-or-down vote on a pure disclosure provision: let the public know, as I think they clearly have a right to, how each individual Member is handling the situation. If a Member actually has the gall, in my opinion, to say: No, all these people who work for me are not ''official staff'' and therefore they can right out ignore the clear language and mandate of ObamaCare that says Congress and all staff must go to the exchanges for their health care—people have a right to know that.

By the way, a lot of Members, including myself, say: No, we are all going to the exchanges. That is what the law says. It is perfectly clear, and that is what we are going to live by. A lot of Members are doing that.

Either way, the public should know what is going on. There should be full disclosure, and that is all the provision I am discussing today does.

It has been completely cleared by hotline on the Republican side. There is no objection. I would urge us to move forward with a simple, straightforward vote on it, so we can expedite consideration of this bill on the floor, so we can move more quickly to the national defense authorization bill, which does merit a lot of significant floor time, so we can have amendment votes on that bill immediately and not have any controversy about that.

I urge that reasonable and expedited and clear path forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to say a couple things about my objections. I know a lot of Senators, when they object, always use that phrase: reserving the right to object. But I think if you look at the Senate rules, there is no such provision for reserving a right to object. I have always made it my habit that if you object, you object, and then, when you get time on the floor, you explain why you objected. Thus, I am taking my time now to explain why I objected.

The Senator from Louisiana propounded two unanimous consent requests. The first was basically that we go ahead and get to the bill, the compounding bill that we are on right now; that his amendment, which has nothing to do with the bill, by the way—and I think he would agree with that. It has nothing to do with it. It is not even relevant, not even germane to this bill. It has something to do with ObamaCare and whether we tell people whether our staffs are going on the exchange. So it has nothing to do with this bill.

It seems odd that the Senator from Louisiana says he wants an inalienable right to be able to offer an amendment to this bill, but no one can offer an amendment to his amendment. It is kind of a double standard, to my way of thinking. He says that we vote on his amendment and that no second-degree amendments be in order. Why not? If amendments were allowed to be in order on the bill that were nongermane and nonrelevant, why shouldn't there be a second-degree amendment allowed on his amendment? Kind of a double standard. He wants it all his way, without thinking about the rest of the Senate. Well, again, that is why I keep saying we need the rules changed so that not one person can demand such outrageous accommodations.

Again, this bill is so important to get passed and to get to the President so we can begin this process of protecting the health and safety of the American people. We know how to treat compounders, and they have to register and stop doing what they have been doing in the past. This is vitally important.

The Senator says: Well, we can expedite it if only you will do it my way. Why should we have to do it his way? When 97 people already voted on this bill, when it passed the House by unanimous consent, why should it be: Well, this one Senator has the right to stop this bill, slow it down, unless we meet the demands of that Senator? Yes, it is outrageous in terms of how we conduct our business in the Senate.

Again, I have argued for a long time that rules need to be changed. I have also argued for a long time that the minority ought to have the right, the inalienable right, to offer amendments, but amendments that are relevant and germane to the bill before you; otherwise, you get amendments on everything from Timbuktu to wherever on any bill, and that you can keep offering them and offering them and offering them.

It was my understanding that the majority leader offered to the Senator from Louisiana an up-or-down vote on his amendment—not on this bill, but at some point an up-or-down vote, as long as that was the definitive vote on the amendment and it would not keep coming up. It is further my understanding that the Senator disagreed with that, that he wanted the right to bring it up again and again and again and again. I think this is, again, an outrageous imposition of one Senator's views and considerations on the entire Senate.

I would say to the Senator that there ought to be some way for the Senator to get an up-or-down vote on his amendment—not on this bill. It is not relevant. It is not germane. I do not think it is relevant or germane on the Defense bill. I will say more about that in a second. But we have a lot of things coming down the pike before we leave here this year—or even in the next session of this Congress—to accommodate the Senator from Louisiana on his amendment. But why should we have to keep voting on it time after time after time if we have one dispositive vote on it up or down, which is, as I understand, what the majority leader offered?

Secondly, in regard to the second unanimous consent request proffered by the Senator from Louisiana, to which I objected on behalf of the majority leader—I am not the chairman of the Defense Authorization Committee, nor do I have the right to bring legislation to the floor—again, the Senator wants everything accommodated to his wishes because if you read the unanimous consent request, the Senator asks the Senate then proceed—well, there is a word missing there—it means: to the consideration of S. 1197, the Defense authorization bill.

That is the right of the majority leader. It is the majority leader's right to bring legislation on the floor—not my right, not the right of the Senator from Louisiana, not the right of a Senator from anyplace else. I do not know if the majority leader wants to go to the Defense authorization bill next. I do not know, but that is not my decision to make. But the Senator from Louisiana says he wants to make that decision, and to make sure the Senate does just that. I would say to the Senator from Louisiana, well, when he becomes the majority leader, he would have that right.

So he wants, again, to be able to bring up his amendment—again, which has nothing basically to do with the

Defense authorization bill—and, again, that no second-degree amendment be in order on his amendment—again, a little bit of a double standard.

He wants the right to offer a nongermane, nonrelevant amendment to a bill, but nobody can offer any amendments to his amendment in the second degree. Well, I think we see this for what it is. The Senator obviously wants to vote on his amendment, maybe today, maybe tomorrow, maybe next week, maybe next month; I do not know how many times he wants to vote on his amendment. He was offered the right for an up-or-down dispositive vote on that amendment.

My understanding is—it is only my understanding; I do not know whether this is correct—that was turned down by the Senator from Louisiana. So I say that is why I objected to both of these requests, because on the compounding bill, of the necessity to get it through. I do not know whether the Senator's amendment would fail or lose. I do not. But I do know that the House has said they will not take the compounding bill back. You might say the House is unreasonable. I do not run the House. I do not run the House. All I know is the House passed it by unanimous consent, sent it over here, and said if it is amended, they will not then revisit it. That is what the House said.

So if the Senator's amendment, as worthy as it might be to some, is put on the compounding bill, that is the end of the compounding bill. That is the end of protecting the people of America, their health and their safety, that we have worked so hard to come together. That is why it has no place on this bill.

It may have a place, and I say that the Senator should have a right for a vote on his amendment at some point on either a relevant bill or a freestanding bill, that the Senator gets the right for an up-or-down vote on his amendment, either as a freestanding bill itself or as a relevant or germane amendment to some other bill on the floor. He should have that right but not to stymie, to stop a bill that is so vital to the health and safety of the American people. That is why I objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished floor manager. I want to respond very briefly. My goal is a clear up-or-down vote on this pure disclosure proposal. I am open for suggestions for that to happen in any reasonable timeframe, meaning this calendar year.

I have focused on these two bills simply because it seems to me, from what I know of the Senate schedule and floor activity, these are going to be the only opportunities in terms of amendments proposed. If there are other opportunities we can identify for this year, if we can identify an opportunity for a vote on a freestanding bill, I am all ears. I am completely open to that. I want more amendment votes in the Senate, not fewer. If there is a side-by-side idea, that is fine by me. I am completely open to that. I simply made these concrete suggestions because, based on what I know of the majority leader's plans for the rest of the calendar year, these are going to be the amendment opportunities.

By the way, the only reason I put in my second consent to turn to the Defense bill is because that is exactly what the majority leader articulated as his desire, his plan, to turn to that as soon as possible, to take up amendments.

So I am open for any reasonable opportunity this year for this vote. Again, this is a pure disclosure provision. I do not see why it should be partisan or controversial. It has been cleared through the hotline on my side. So if there are any other suggestions of how this can happen, I am completely open to that.

Unfortunately, I had a phone call with the distinguished majority leader last week and proposed various options. His response was simply: No. No. No. No. No other ideas, no other options. No. But I am completely open to those other ideas. It is obviously part of the tradition of the Senate that nongermane amendments are considered all the time. In fact, with regard to the Defense bill, that is the norm, not exception. There are usually significant nongermane amendments, often by the majority side, sometimes by the majority leadership, which are critical votes on the Defense authorization bill. That is not unusual at all.

I am for more amendment votes, if there are alternative ideas on this topic, more amendment votes there, not fewer. So I look forward to moving forward in a productive, effective way toward getting this simple vote on disclosure and toward moving in an expedited way through this bill and to the Defense bill and whatever else is on the Senate calendar as determined by the majority leader. But, again, so far the response is no, across the board, not any sort of alternative suggestion.

Finally, with regard to the idea of having one vote and one vote only, there is a clear practical problem with agreeing to that. That is the following: For instance, what if there were one vote on my disclosure provision on the Defense authorization bill? That bill is going to a conference committee, so it would obviously be possible for my amendment to be adopted 100 to 0 and then be dumped in the conference committee and stripped from the bill. Then I would have forgone the opportunity to ever bring up the subject again this entire Congress. I mean that is a fool's agreement. I am not going to agree to a fool's agreement. I need to be able to protect my right to revisit the issue, particularly when it would pass through a vote under that scenario and then be stripped in conference.

So I hope we find a productive way forward. Again, this is a pure disclosure provision. I am going for a simple up-or-down vote in whatever context presents itself this calendar year, on this bill or any bill. I am open to other suggestions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONDOLENCES TO SENATOR INHOFE

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, before I begin, I would like to offer my condolences to my friend and colleague from Oklahoma Senator INHOFE and his family on the tragic loss of their son Perry. Both my wife and I will continue to keep their entire family in our thoughts and prayers during this very difficult time.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

I rise today to talk about the President's broken promises on ObamaCare and its effects on the people of Nevada. For more than a month now, the American people have witnessed how poorly this burdensome law has been implemented. People all over the country are frustrated with the problems plaguing healthcare.gov, as they should be.

The government spent hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars to overpromise and underdeliver on the signature legislation of this administration. But there are serious problems in addition to the Web site, and one glaring issue in particular I would like to focus on today. We have all heard from the law's supporters that ObamaCare would give uninsured Americans access to health insurance. Time and time again they promised that people who already had their health plan could keep it. In fact, President Obama made the exact promise on numerous occasions.

In a speech to the American Medical Association in June of 2009, President Obama said:

> . . . no matter how we reform health care, we will keep this promise to the American people: If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor, period. If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period.

But one of my constituents sent me a letter last week telling me that that was not the case. Sunny from the Las Vegas area wrote, ''I wanted to tell you that we have lost our wonderful health insurance plan.'' Sunny's family received a letter from their insurance company telling them that their existing plan did not qualify under the Affordable Care Act. They were automatically reassigned to a new plan that cost about $400 more per month.

Let's remember what the President said, this time in August of 2009, during his weekly Presidential address about what he called ''phony claims'' regarding health reform:

> If you like your private health insurance plan, you can keep your plan. Period.

But yet another one of my constituents, Kirk from northern Nevada, was

just notified that his current health insurance has been cancelled. He went to the exchange to find a new policy and shared his story with me. He wrote:

. . . despite higher deductibles and higher co-pays, my new insurance under this devastating law will be more than 250% of what I am paying now.

Again, March 15, 2010, just a few days before the law was passed—albeit unread—by a party-line vote and signed into law, President Obama said:

If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

I wonder how President Obama and the law's supporters would explain that statement to Marc in Reno. Marc received a letter telling him that his current plan was no longer offered. The plan, the letter detailed, was cancelled in order to ''meet the requirements of the new laws.'' Marc was given the option to keep his plan for 1 additional year if he accepted a rate increase, even though he just saw a rate increase in September.

Mark goes on to tell me:

As an individual health care plan holder and a self-employed individual, the ACA appears to punish me for doing the right thing by having a health care plan for the past 10 years and rewards those who did not.

But yet as recently as this past July, President Obama promised:

If you already have health care, the only thing this bill does is make sure that it's even more secure and insurance companies can't jerk you around.

President Obama made this statement more than 2 years after his administration admitted in comments in the Federal Register that 40 to 67 percent of existing individual policies would lose their grandfathered status. The President knew millions of Americans stood to lose their existing policies but he repeatedly told the American public in no uncertain terms that they could keep their plan.

I think Steven from Washoe County would likely take issue with that promise. He told me that he now has health care that costs $293 per month. However, he just received a letter from his health care provider informing him that the cost of his health care would increase to $546 per month on January 1. That means his health insurance costs will nearly double next year.

There is nothing affordable about that. There is nothing secure about that.

On September 26, just days before the exchanges opened to a disastrous rollout, the President repeated yet again what the administration knew was not true:

. . . the first thing you need to know is this: If you already have health care, you don't have to do anything.

Well, I have another letter here from a father from Reno. He writes:

I am writing to tell you that I'm now eating crow. A few weeks back I wrote to you and expressed my support for health reform and my dissatisfaction with the government shutdown. Since then, I've received notification from my insurance company informing me that my current policy is being discontinued. I then began shopping for new policies for myself and my family and have found that rates are two to three times what I am currently paying and that my max out of pocket will double, all for basically the same plan as what I have now. In essence, I've been put into a situation where I can either save for my kid's college education or buy healthcare.

But this particular letter closes with something that really highlights the tough financial decisions facing the American people in these difficult economic times. This father says:

I'm unfortunately one of those people who makes too much money to qualify for Federal subsidy, but not enough to sell my house which is still underwater from the housing crisis of 2008.

This is the reality of the health care law. Now, in addition to trying to save for his children's education and attempting to recover from the housing crisis, a father has been forced off the plan he likes.

The options available are two or three times more expensive. These stories don't fit with the narrative we have heard for nearly 5 years. President Obama is now trying to backtrack on the dozens of times he made his promise to the American people. Only last week he said:

Now, if you have or had one of these plans before the Affordable Care Act came into law and you really liked that plan, what we said was you can keep it if it hasn't changed since the law passed.

That is just not true. That is not what he promised. Now my constituents are receiving cancellation notices for their existing plans.

The administration argues that even though many people are losing their existing plans, those plans were subpar policies and their new policies will be better, but that ignores the promise. My constituents liked their plans. They decided what was best for them, what plans fit their individual and family needs.

The President and the administration knew before the legislation passed that millions of Americans would lose their current plans. They admitted it in the Federal Register after the bill was signed into law, but the whole time they continued to promote this promise and dismiss any concerns as fearmongering or phony claims. That is unacceptable.

These personal stories are why I am proud to cosponsor the If You Like Your Health Plan You Can Keep It Act, introduced by my colleague Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin. This is a simple but necessary bill to give Americans the ability to keep their health plans if they like them. The people of Nevada deserve better, and they deserve to have a government that keeps its promises.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reports are emerging of another school shooting today. Early reports out of Pittsburgh are that three people have been shot at a high school. The police right now are searching for the shooter in the woods surrounding the high school. We hope and we pray that the three reported victims will survive.

This is becoming part of our regular work week in Washington; that we can expect at some point during the week that we are going to turn on the TV to one of the cable news networks and find a live report from a school or a mall or a church somewhere in this country where a shooting is in progress. It is happening at a rate I don't think any of us could have expected. This number is growing at a rate I don't think any of us could have expected.

I brought this chart to the floor of the Senate for about 6 months since the failure of our commonsense antigun violence bill this spring. This number represents the number of Americans who have died of gun violence since December 14.

December 14 means something to everybody in this Chamber but certainly to those of us from Connecticut. That is the day in which 26 6- and 7-year-olds and the teachers who protected them died in Sandy Hook—10,465 additional people have died.

I have tried to come down to the Senate floor since the failure of that bill to try to tell the stories of these victims. If statistics don't do the job, if the sheer numbers alone don't convince people that something should change, then maybe hearing about who these people are might change things. We hope we will not add to this number with some new young victims from the reported shooting in Pittsburgh today.

These shootings happen in unlikely places. Schools, now, unfortunately, are a likely place for a shooting to happen because they seem to happen with some regularity in schools, in part because we do very little, if anything, to stop them with legislation from this Chamber.

They are happening in other unlikely places as well. Clubs—for instance, in New Haven, CT—have been the site four times just this year of major shootings. Only a few weeks ago, on October 26, police in New Haven responded to an early Saturday morning shooting at a place called the Key Club Cabaret. They arrived and found that 26-year-old Erika Robinson had been killed in a shooting spree that also injured 19-year-old Amanda John, 29-year-old Jahad Brumsey, 24-year-old Nijia Ward, 34-year-old Albert Dickerson, as well as 25-year-old Ivette Sterling.

Officers rushed to the scene as hundreds of patrons were running out.

They walked in and found six victims of gun violence—a dispute in a club resulting in the death of Erika Robinson and several more being injured.

Only a few days ago, in Cypress, TX, there was another shooting at a house party in which two high school students were killed and 19 others were injured shortly before 11 p.m. on November 9, 2013. There was a house party celebrating a young woman's 18th birthday. And because of a local dispute between two rival groups, Qu'eric Danarius Bernard Richardson, 17 years old, was killed, and Arielle Shepherd as well. According to authorities, Richardson was shot in the head while he was running away from the house party. When students returned to school on Monday, there was a lot of crying as they mourned the death of two of their classmates.

School parties celebrating 18th birthdays, clubs in places like New Haven and Bridgeport, CT—not places you think of going where you might end up being shot at when you walk into them—are now the scenes of pretty vicious shootings, as are our schools.

And shootings are increasingly happening in another way as well—by accident. Unfortunately, in preparation for a lot of these speeches, I riffle through a lot of pretty grizzly reports and increasingly I am seeing more and more accidental shootings ending up in tragedy. In Waterbury, CT, again, just a few weeks ago, Dow Kling and Shawn French, both 22 years old, were playing around with their .22 caliber Ruger inside an apartment in Waterbury when the gun went off and Dow was shot to death. His best friend Shawn French, who shot him, said:

> I'm sorry. I wish it was me and not him. I wish I could trade places with him, I really do.

A week earlier, in Henderson, NV, another example where Cherish Pincombe was playing around with a gun with her friend Colin Lowrey. The Remington .45 was loaded. They didn't know it was loaded, and Colin shot Cherish dead, 23 years old. She was described as follows:

> An amazing coworker. She was so caring. She was kind. She was always helpful. She always wanted to do something to help you out. She was very generous.

And just because they didn't understand the gun was loaded, and they were being reckless and playing around with a firearm, Cherish is dead.

So that is why people out there don't understand why we can't have an honest conversation about change. Even when those conversations are attempting to take place, they get shut down and cut off. A pretty innocent op-ed piece in the Guns & Ammo magazine suggested that maybe people should get a few hours of training before they get a concealed carry permit. As a consequence of running that editorial, the editor of Guns & Ammo had to resign and step down, simply because he ran an op-ed by an author that suggested maybe people should get some training before they have a concealed weapon.

So even when we try to engage in these discussions, we can't have them because the folks who get their money from the gun industry, whether it be the NRA or these magazines, aren't even allowed to have these conversations, despite the fact that 84 percent of gun owners support universal background checks, despite the fact that 50 percent of gun owners support a restriction on high-capacity ammunition clips, despite the fact that 46 percent of gun owners think it is a good idea to ban high-powered assault weapons.

Organizations such as Guns & Ammo and the NRA are out of step with gun owners who don't want to see this number continue increasing, who don't want to turn on the TV and see another school shooting.

The reason I come here to talk about who these victims are is because the conscience of this Nation should be enough to move this place to action, and it is about time gun owners and nongun owners alike get together to do something about this. There is much more agreement than there is disagreement among both people who own guns and people who choose not to own guns. Whether it is background checks or a ban on illegal gun trafficking or just a simple requirement that you get a little bit of training on how to use a gun so you don't fire it accidentally and end up shooting your best friend, there are simple commonsense bipartisan things we can do to make sure this number doesn't continue to accelerate at the pace that it has since December 14.

I thank the Chair, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here today for now the 50th time to urge my colleagues to wake up to what carbon pollution is doing to our atmosphere and our oceans. Once a week—50 weeks—every week. Why? Why do I do this?

First, because it is real. It is very real. It is happening. Here is the change in average global surface temperature since 1970. It is pretty hard to deny. Of course, if you are a denier, you will look at it and you will see from the same data that it stopped. The denier who tells you it stopped won't tell you that it stopped five times earlier on the way up. In fact, you could say that climate change has stopped six times since the 1970s, and even went down, but it didn't stay stopped long.

Look at the linear trend for the whole data set from 1970 to 2013. No one can deny over this period the Earth is warming. This decade was warmer than the last, which was warmer than the one before that, which was warmer than the one before that.

Let's look at NASA's entire historic surface temperature record going back to the 19th century. Listen to what University of California Berkeley physics professor Richard Muller has to say about the temperature record.

> The frequent rises and falls, virtually a stairstep pattern, are part of the historic record, and there is no expectation that they will stop, whatever their cause. . . . [T]he land temperature record . . . is full of fits and starts that make the upward trend vanish for short periods. Regardless of whether we understand them, there is no reason to expect them to stop.

Here you can see again these short steps in the upward march.

One reason we can't expect these upward steps to stop is that we know what is driving them. What is driving climate change is something even contrarian scientists accept; that is, more carbon dioxide leads to more warming. Simple as that; a 150-year-old established basic principle of physics.

This is the October 1861 edition of the London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science. It includes a manuscript by physicist John Tyndall entitled ''Radiation of Heat by Gases and Vapours.'' He says:

> [T]o account for different amounts of heat being preserved to the Earth at different times, a slight change in [the atmosphere's] variable constituents would suffice for this. Such changes in fact may have produced all the mutations of climate which the researches of geologists reveal.

The ''variable constituents'' to which Tyndall refers include carbon dioxide, methane, and water vapor. That is from 1861. President Lincoln took office that year. Yet here we are today having to explain on the floor of the Senate the physics of what carbon dioxide does in the atmosphere.

It is not just the principle that is established. There are lots of measurements. The carbon dioxide in our atmosphere now exceeds 400 parts per million. For the last 800,000 years—at least 800,000 years, and perhaps actually millions of years—we have been in a range of 170 to 300 parts per million. That has been the whole of human existence. Homo sapiens have been around for about 200,000 of those 800,000 years, and it is only now—it is only since the industrial revolution—that we have broken out of that safe window that has protected us through that entire history of our species and now we have broken to 400. And that is a measurement.

Look at the oceans. Oceans have absorbed more than 90 percent of the excess heat caused by greenhouse gases over the last 50 years. Absorbing all that heat makes the oceans rise.

Oceans have absorbed about 30 percent of our carbon emissions, which would otherwise be in the atmosphere causing more warming. Absorbing that carbon makes the oceans more acidic, and that is all stuff we measure.

At the Newport tide gauge, sea level is up almost 10 inches since the 1930s when we had our catastrophic 1938 hurricane in Rhode Island. You measure that. It basically takes a ruler.

We are about 3 to 4 degrees warmer in the winter in Narragansett Bay than we were 50 years ago when my wife's URI mentor was doing his doctoral thesis—3 to 4 degrees. You measure that. It takes a thermometer.

And the ocean is acidifying at the fastest rate recorded in 50 million years. You measure that with a litmus test, which anybody with an aquarium does.

It is one thing to be against science, it is another to be the party against measurement. So the polluters and front groups don't talk much about the oceans, but that doesn't change the fact this is real and it is past denying.

That takes me to the second reason I do this, and that is that it is plain old-fashioned wrong when people lie and trick other people, particularly when people are going to be hurt by the lies. And it is worse when there is money behind the trickery—when it is purposeful. Lies cannot go unanswered, and that is another reason that I speak.

There isn't just lying going on. There is a whole carefully built apparatus: phony-baloney organizations designed to look and sound like they are real, messages honed by public relations experts to sound like they are true, payroll scientists whom polluters can trot out when they need them, and the whole thing big and complicated enough to be fooled into thinking it is not all the same beast. But it is. It is akin to the mythical Hydra—many heads, same beast.

One day folks are going to look back at this and those behind it are going to be disgraced for what they did and it is going to be a scandal. That is the third reason I speak. We are all going to be judged very harshly, with all the dread power that history has to inflict on wrong. The polluters and their collaborators will be judged harshly. The Republican Party will be judged harshly for letting itself be led astray by them. But—and here is where it truly hurts—the failure of American democracy this is causing will also be judged harshly and will stain the reputation of our great American experiment. We in this generation have been passed this precious experiment by generations before us that fought, bled, and died to put it safely in our hands—and we do this. We foul it, by lying and denying for a bunch of polluters. Some generation we are going to be.

If we believe this world needs America, this matters. Because a world fouled and changed by carbon pollution, in ways we could foresee but denied, will not believe it as much of a need for what a lying and denying America has to offer. This episode will darken the lamp America holds up to the world. We are a great country but not when we are lying and denying it is real. The atmosphere is warming; ice is melting; seas are warming, rising, and acidifying. It is time for the misleading fantasies to end.

Here is how we go forward. First, price carbon right. Make the big carbon polluters pay a fee to the American people, as I have proposed with Representatives WAXMAN and BLUMENAUER and Senator SCHATZ; a pollution fee to cover the cost of dumping their waste into our atmosphere and oceans, a cost which they now happily push off onto the rest of us. I know at present political conditions do not allow us to price carbon, so we must change those political conditions, and we can.

Recently, President Obama changed the calculus for polluters: carbon pollution standards for new and existing powerplants, no more unchecked carbon dumping. Fifty powerplants emit one out of every eight tons of America's carbon dioxide emissions. These 50 dirtiest U.S. powerplants emit more than Canada or Korea. When the big polluters see the costs of complying with those new standards coming down at them, they may take a second look at an economywide carbon fee. Here is a news flash. When the polluters' calculus begins to change, the political calculus in Congress will change too.

Nothing says we have to wait for the polluters to figure this out on their schedule. There are armies on our side. It is not just the environmental groups such as the Natural Resources Defense Council, League of Conservation Voters, Environmental Defense Fund, Sierra Club or National Wildlife Federation. It is not just virtually every major scientific organization, such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Geophysical Union or the American Meteorological Society.

We have faith-based groups such as the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, the National Council of the Churches of Christ, Interfaith Power & Light, the Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life, and the Jewish Council for Public Affairs. We have fishing, wildlife, and outdoor groups such as Trout Unlimited, Pheasants Forever, and Ducks Unlimited. They are joined by major sports leagues such as the National Football League, Major League Baseball, National Basketball Association, and National Hockey League, as well as the American Lung Association—which prefer to see kids playing outside in clean, healthy air.

We have the Joint Chiefs of Staff on our side, joined by NASA, the National Academies, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, even the Government Accountability Office, the congressional watchdog. By the way, about NASA—let's not forget that NASA scientists sent an SUV-sized rover to Mars, they landed it safely on Mars, and they are driving it around on Mars right now. I will put NASA scientists up against the polluters' payroll scientists all day long.

We have insurers and reinsurers whose business depends on understanding the mounting risk of natural disasters, folks such as Munich Re, Swiss Re, Allianz, and the Reassurance Association of America. We have State and local governments that are already active. Nine Northeastern States, for instance, including my own Rhode Island, engage in cap and trade through the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. Four Florida counties share resources and strategies for adapting to climate change through the bipartisan Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact, and those are just two examples of many from around the country.

A coalition of investors worth nearly $3 trillion just wrote to 45 fossil fuel companies seeking explanation about risks facing their fossil fuel investments. Divestment campaigns are popping up at college campuses across the Nation. Major utilities accept the science and are investing in renewables and improving efficiency. Energy companies PG&E, the Public Service Company of New Mexico, and Exelon all quit the U.S. Chamber of Commerce after a Chamber official called for putting climate science on trial such as the Scopes ''monkey trial'' of 1925.

America's flagship companies such as General Motors, Ford, Coca-Cola, Pepsi, Nike, Apple, Walmart, and Alcoa all recognize the serious implications of climate change. This support is latent, though, and it is unorganized. It is time to wake up and to gather our armies. We have to create allied command, assemble our divisions, agree on a strategy, and go into action. That will affect the calculus in Congress.

Most important, we have the American people. Sixty-five percent of voters support the President taking significant steps to address climate change now. Another poll found that 82 percent of Americans believe we should start preparing now for rising sea levels and severe storms from climate change. Those in Congress who would deny science to protect the polluting interests increasingly look ridiculous, even to their own side. Misleading statements in the media, such as the stuff purveyed by the opinion page of the Wall Street Journal, are losing their battle and losing their audience. It is not just time to wake up. People are waking up. Inevitably, the truth will be fully known.

The polls show clearly that climate denial is a losing tactic. Four out of five voters under 35 support the President taking action to address climate change. Fifty-two percent of young Republican voters would be less likely to vote for someone who opposed the President's climate action plan. Even a majority of Texans say more should be done about global warming by all levels of government, with 62 percent of

Texans saying more should be done in Congress. For those last holdout deniers comes this: Fifty-three percent of young Republican voters under age 35 said they would describe a climate denier as ignorant, out of touch, or crazy.

Republicans outside of Congress are trying to lead their party back to reality and away from what even young Republicans are calling ignorant, out of touch, and crazy extremist views. They support a revenue-neutral carbon fee: Republicans such as our former colleagues in Congress, Sherwood Boehlert, Wayne Gilchrest, and Robert Inglis; Republicans such as former Environmental Protection Agency Administrators William Ruckelshaus, Lee Thomas, William Reilly, and Christine Todd Whitman, who served under Presidents Nixon, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush respectively; advisers such as President Reagan's Secretary of State George Schultz, Reagan's economic policy adviser, Art Laffer—known as Reagan's economist—and David Fromm, speech writer for George W. Bush.

Here is what the Republican Presidential nominee had to say 5 years ago:

> [I]n the end, we're all left with the same set of facts. The facts of global warming demand our urgent attention, especially in Washington. Good stewardship, prudence, and simple common sense demand that we [act to] meet the challenge, and act quickly. . . . We have many advantages in the fight against global warming, but time is not one of them.
>
> [T]he fundamental incentives on the market are still on the side of carbon-based energy. This has to change before we can make the decisive shift away from fossil fuels. . . . [T]here were costs we weren't counting . . . [a]nd these terrible costs have added up now, in the atmosphere, in the oceans, and all across the natural world. . . . We Americans like to say that there is no problem we can't solve, however complicated, and no obstacle we cannot overcome if we meet it together. I believe this about our country. I know this about our country. And now it is time for us to show those qualities once again.

It is indeed time for us to show those qualities once again. It is time to wake up. It is time to turn back from the misleading propaganda of the polluters, the misguided extremism of the tea party, and the mistaken belief that we can ignore without consequence the harm our carbon pollution is causing. It is time to face facts, be adults, and meet our responsibilities.

I give these speeches because climate change is real, because the campaign of denial is as poisonous to our democracy as carbon pollution is to our atmosphere and oceans, and because I am confident, I am confident we can do this. We can strengthen our economy, we can redirect our future, we can protect our democracy, and we can do our duty to the generations that will follow us and will look back in shame unless we change our program. But we have to pay attention. We have to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to talk about jobs and economic growth.

We are continuing to see signs of a steadily improving economy, with more than 200,000 jobs created last month in the jobs report just released last Friday. Of those, 19,000 were new manufacturing jobs. We have had 43 straight months of private sector job growth, but the unemployment rate remains stubbornly high and sadly particularly for those who are long-term unemployed.

Earlier today the Budget Conference Committee met, and we heard from Congressional Budget Office Director Dr. Elmendorf. He let us know that in his view, the uncertainty—the lack of clarity about the path forward for all of us here, for the solutions we need for the budget and for the deficit—is one of the greatest drags on job creation and on competitiveness for our country and our economy.

In our Budget Conference Committee, we need to come together and reach a balanced budget deal that repeals sequester and allows the Appropriations Committee—ably led by Chairman MIKULSKI—to move forward with an Omnibus appropriations bill for this fiscal year. We cannot afford, in my view, another long-term continuing resolution at the current sequester levels.

As we heard today from Dr. Elmendorf, and as we have heard from other sources, the sequester will have killed 750,000 jobs by the end of the year, and next year these ongoing, steady, grinding cuts could kill another 800,000. These are jobs. These are investments by the Federal Government that could be helping the private sector create jobs in repairing our crumbling infrastructure. In Delaware alone, we have 175 deficient bridges being neglected. These are jobs that help families to put food on the table. In Kent County, DE, where Dover Air Force base is, sequester has hurt those who serve our Nation who operate the base and serve our country valiantly. These are jobs that could be going to help research a cure for cancer. NIH supported more than 500 jobs in Delaware in 2011. Now cuts are costing those jobs and setting us back in the fight to find a cure for cancer and many other diseases.

Sequester has been devastating to Delaware and the whole Nation. We need to replace it with a smarter, more balanced set of spending reforms that maintains investments that will allow our country to be competitive. In particular, if I might, we need to refocus on jobs by investing in infrastructure and focusing on manufacturing.

In my view, the 19,000 jobs in the manufacturing sector that we just learned were created in the last month were a promising development but far from as many as we should be filling. Why? Because manufacturing jobs are high-quality jobs. They pay more in wages and benefits. They help create secondary local service jobs. They contribute more to the local economy. And manufacturers invest more in private R&D than any other sector in our economy.

Mr. President, as you know, before I came here to the Senate and before my service in county government, I spent 8 years with a manufacturing company in Delaware. At one point I was part of a large site location team that went around the country to try to decide where to build a new state-of-the-art semiconductor chip packaging manufacturing plant. To make a long story short, in the end we decided on a location where there was a skilled and reliable workforce, a responsive government that invested in the local infrastructure, and certainly we considered other factors—tax rates and incentives offered by the State and local government—but really the skill of the workforce and the quality of the infrastructure were absolutely essential to the decision we made—a surprising decision in terms of where we ultimately located. We invested and were able to get up and running a state-of-the-art plant in record time and were able to contribute significantly to local employment and the tax base. This taught me a lot about the significance of infrastructure and workforce skills.

If I could mention this, the World Economic Forum ranked the United States 25th overall in infrastructure, a key drag on our competitiveness. The American Society of Civil Engineers says we are falling behind by $250 billion a year in deferred maintenance, in investments not made by Federal, State, and local government. In my view, the case for infrastructure investment is a no-brainer. This is exactly the sort of thing we should be doing and that the sequester is preventing us from doing, making wise, timely, and needed investments in improving our infrastructure.

Another critical foundation for growth, as we saw, is a skilled and adaptable workforce. We can be the world's manufacturing leader again but not without investing in workforce skills and in workforce training. There are many programs that can help make this possible. One I like to point to is the Federal, State, and local partnership called the Manufacturing Extension Partnership that helps make it possible for university-based researchers to partner with local manufacturers to deliver skills training that keeps them at the cutting edge, that makes them more productive.

In today's modern manufacturing workplace, there are fewer people, but they are more productive because of their skills. Back in August I visited a new facility, the ILC Grayling plastics manufacturing plant in Seaford, DE, which is a great example of what it will take for America's manufacturing resurgence to continue and grow. This plant has already brought more than 100 jobs to Sussex, DE. These are not the manufacturing jobs of the past. The men and women working on this

line need to be able to collaborate and communicate, to do advanced math and adequate quality control work and oversee high-tech machinery and have an intimate understanding of the products they are working with. In the end, this company looks forward to growing, to probably doubling the number of jobs in this facility in Sussex County. To me, in an even more exciting development, these are jobs that had left the United States to go south to a lower wage country and that have been brought back, brought back from Juarez, Mexico, to Seaford, DE, where there are now Delawareans employed in this newly expanded manufacturing facility.

Let me conclude by simply saying that here in Congress we have the opportunity, if we work together across the aisle, to find a pathway toward making these investments in the skills of our workforce, in the infrastructure of our country, that will help grow our economy and help create good manufacturing jobs today and tomorrow.

One of the core challenges we face in the budget conference committee is to find a path forward that will respond to the call that I hear up and down the State of Delaware, and I presume my colleagues hear from their home States, that we should make principled compromises that allow us to invest again, to replace the sequester with a more responsible and balanced package of revenue and cuts that allow us to return to investing in the skills and infrastructure necessary to grow our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it has now been more than 6 weeks since the Obama administration launched its health insurance marketplace. This afternoon, the Obama administration finally confirmed how few people have been able to select insurance through the exchange. According to the White House, only 106,185 people have selected coverage since October 1. This doesn't mean people actually bought their coverage, it just means they selected a plan.

For most of these, it was through the State-based exchanges. People may be wondering how the Washington-run exchange did. Only 26,794 people selected a plan through healthcare.gov. It is safe to say, if this were a commercial Web site, the plug would have been pulled by now. They came, they saw, they did not buy it.

Low expectations met with even lower reality. The numbers paint a bleak picture of the confidence the American people have in the health care law and the faulty Web site created to sell it. The administration's goal was for a half million people, 500,000 Americans, to sign up in the month of October, the month of October alone. Instead, we now know that only a little over 100,000 people have actually signed up.

The reason the numbers are so low and so disappointing is that the Web site is totally broken and the American people are discovering that the coverage offered on the exchange often costs them more than they can afford, and more than they were previously paying. So far, the ObamaCare exchanges have only succeeded at crashing people's computers or lightening their wallets.

To make matters worse, for every one person who has selected an ObamaCare plan—either from the State or Federal exchanges—40 people have received cancellation notices. This is not what the President repeatedly promised and it is not what the American people deserve.

Enough is enough. It is time to give Americans what they wanted all along: access to quality, affordable health care. It is time to stop this train wreck and ease the damage being done by this terrible law.

To help make that happen, Senator GRAHAM and I will soon introduce a bill that lets States opt out of some of the health care law's most burdensome provisions. Under the State Health Care Choice Act, States could opt out of the individual mandate that requires people to buy government-approved health insurance or face a tax penalty. They could opt out of the employer mandate that will force businesses to provide government-approved health insurance or pay penalties.

Under our bill States could also opt out from the health care law's benefits mandates. These are the requirements that health insurance plans provide numerous expensive services that many people may not want, may not need, will never use, cannot afford, and do not want to pay for. The Obama administration has already issued hundreds of waivers to businesses and it has delayed the employer mandate by a year. States should have the same opportunity to give relief to their citizens.

We know the numbers coming out of Wyoming. In Wyoming we see over 3,000 people have received cancellation notices. Yet only 85 people have been able to select a plan. I was at the Target store in Casper this Saturday. A former patient came up to me, somebody I had operated on. He told me he had received a cancellation notice. He is a small businessman, works hard for himself and for his family, and the insurance he had worked for him. It was something he could afford. What he told me is he will now have to pay a higher premium and also more out-of-pocket costs in terms of a higher copay and higher deductibles. Frankly, he is not sure what he is going to do.

The people I talk to tell me about all of the mandates, the higher costs, the bad side effects of the President's health care law, and they tell me this is not what they wanted in health care reform.

I got a letter from one woman from Newcastle, WY. She told me she is losing her health insurance plan also. The reason she is losing it is it does not meet the President's requirements that she have maternity coverage. As she points out, she doesn't need maternity care, she said, because she has had a hysterectomy and she doesn't like Washington telling her that she has to pay twice as much to get a plan that covers it—something she doesn't want, will never use, doesn't need, cannot afford.

When it comes to health care and health care coverage, one size does not fit all. States should be free to help the citizens of those States get the care they need from the doctor they choose at lower costs. A lot of people in this country do not want all these new mandates, all the burdens and the higher costs. All they actually wanted was President Obama to keep the promises, to allow them to have what the President promised them: that they could keep the insurance and the doctor they already had. After all, that is what the President said.

We have millions of people getting letters from their insurance company canceling their insurance plans. As of today I know that number is over 4.2 million—42 people canceled for every 1 that actually got insurance through the exchange. One of the reasons for all of the insurance plans being canceled, in spite of what the President told the American people repeatedly, is something called the grandfather regulation that the Obama administration actually wrote. The President's own people wrote the regulation so that people cannot keep the insurance they want, in spite of the President's repeated promises. This was a rule the Obama administration wrote to force more people off the insurance plans they had before the law was passed, and force them into new Washington-approved plans.

Three years ago Republicans saw that this regulation was going to lead directly to the millions of cancellation letters that have now gone out across the country. My colleague from Wyoming, Senator ENZI, took the lead and he took to the Senate floor to try to stop this destructive rule from the Obama administration. He introduced a bill that would immediately overturn the administration's restrictive regulations about people keeping their plans. Senator ENZI pointed out back then, 3 years ago, that the administration's rule would have caused millions of people to lose the insurance they had and that they liked. He was right, and the Washington Democrats, here on the floor of the Senate, did not seem to care. Every Democratic Member of this body, every Democrat in the Senate, voted to make sure that the restrictive regulations stayed on the books. Because of that vote, now we have over 4 million Americans looking for new insurance plans that satisfy Obama administration mandates, but they have lost their insurance in spite of the President's repeated promises that if

they like what they have, they could keep it.

Many of them—such as my friend and former patient whom I ran into this past weekend in Casper—are learning that their copays and their deductibles will be much higher than the plans they have lost. Once they get those plans, many of them are going to find out that their costs have increased—but not just that; their choice of doctors has shrunk as well. They may not be able to go to their family doctor because he or she will not be covered by their new plan anymore.

Last week President Obama finally admitted he and his administration were not, as he said, ''as clear as we needed to be.''

Not as clear as he needed to be? That is what the President regrets, that he was not as clear as he needed to be? For the millions of people who are losing their doctors, they don't want an apology; they don't want a new government handout. What they want is what they had before this law came into effect. They want President Obama to live up to his promise and to allow them to keep the coverage they had and they liked and that worked for them. Even former President Bill Clinton has called for a change. Remember, the Obama administration has called President Clinton the so-called ''Secretary of Explaining Stuff.'' They had him traveling the country, trying to convince people that their health care law was going to work out well for everybody. Now it looks as though he is trying to explain to President Obama how badly the President's own health care law has hurt Americans who are losing access to their insurance plans and to their doctors.

Bill Clinton said it just the other day. He said:

> . . . even if it takes a change to the law, the president should honor the commitment the federal government made to those people and let them keep what they got.

Well, that is exactly right. Not only should President Obama take steps to keep his promise to the American people, he should support Republicans who want to help all Americans who are being harmed by the President and the Democrats' terrible health care law. Today's enrollment numbers show what a disaster that law has been, and the President should support the Health Care Choice Act so that States can serve their citizens and opt-out of this terrible law.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, I appeared with Senator BLUNT, my Republican friend from Missouri, in front of Senator ROCKEFELLER's Commerce Committee to talk about our bipartisan legislation with manufacturing hubs. It would promote new technologies to make our country a leader in advanced manufacturing.

Let me illustrate by saying this: Along the Ohio Turnpike—from Toledo, to Lorain, to Cleveland, to Akron, to Youngstown—much of the auto industry grew, from glass that would go for windshields in Toledo, to steel in Lorain and Cleveland for the fenders and the hoods and much of the car, to rubber in Akron for tires—the world's leading tire manufacturer—to assembly in Youngstown, where today the Chevy Cruze is made. If you are on the Ohio Turnpike, you will see this huge plant with the big letters ''CHEVY CRUZE.'' If you have not been at an auto plant or you are not from Ohio and you may not have seen one, the expansiveness of this plant is pretty remarkable. Autos were assembled all along this turnpike.

But the reason this matters—in addition to why it matters in the Presiding Officer's State of Connecticut and other places—is not just that the auto industry, the supply chain, creates jobs, but what happens when an industry sort of locates with a critical mass in a community.

Because Toledo, OH, with the auto industry, had huge glass manufacturing, the University of Toledo had scientists who worked in material science and in glass manufacturing. Today, as a result, while we do not make quite as much glass in Toledo as we did for autos, Toledo is one of the top two or three largest centers for solar energy manufacturing.

Go to Akron, which used to be the center of the world for tire manufacturing. There is not so much of that now, although Goodyear's corporate headquarters is still there and there is a lot of research. But now, again, in partnership with the University of Akron, the scientists who were processing and researching and innovating in rubber and tires—now, for polymer development and manufacturing, Akron is one of the leaders in the country and in the world.

The lesson we learned is what Senator BLUNT and I were talking about. We know in Ohio and Missouri manufacturing is a ticket to the middle class. We also know that for too long Washington made choices which biased finance over manufacturing, that left manufacturing behind—bad trade deals, failure to enforce trade laws, taxes that did not work for manufacturing, and a kind of backing off of a focus on innovation and technology.

So we have seen communities such as Lordstown and Cleveland and Dayton live with the consequences. Between 2000 and 2010, 60,000 plants closed in this country and 5 million manufacturing jobs were lost.

Since the auto rescue and the more aggressive trade enforcement from President Obama—while I do not agree with some of his trade policies, he has been more aggressive on trade enforcement, through the Commerce Department and through the International Trade Commission, than any of his predecessors in either party.

So since 2010, we have seen a beginning of growth coming back in manufacturing—not nearly making up anything close to the 5 million jobs lost or the 60,000 plants closed. But the importance of manufacturing—not just because it is in my State, where my State is No. 3 in the country in production, in manufacturing; and only Texas, with twice our population, and California, with three times our population, make more than we do—but the importance of manufacturing is the multiplier effect. More than any other industry in our country, in manufacturing, for every $1 spent in manufacturing, another $1.48 is added to the economy. We know what that means in the auto supply chain or in the wind turbine supply chain or in the chemical supply chain or anything we manufacture in this country. But what is holding us back is this—we never consciously follow this—but this sort of ''innovate here, make it there'' syndrome. Yes, we still have the best scientists, the best engineers, the best researchers, the best universities. Whether it is storrs at the University of Connecticut or in Cleveland at Case Western or in Dayton or in Cincinnati, we have the best universities, the best researchers, but too often we do the innovation, we do the discovery, we do the experimentation that leads to products, and then we offshore and make the products there.

Let me give you an example about why that does not work and what does work. There is a small community in Ohio: Minster, OH. It is not far from Wapakoneta, Neil Armstrong's hometown—the first man who walked on the moon—and just north of Dayton. It is in Auglaize County, where I visited some time ago. It has the largest yogurt manufacturer in North America. When I went in that plant, they had just made it more efficient. In the past, their supplier had delivered little plastic cups to this yogurt manufacturer. In the plant they had these big silver vats of fermented milk with yogurt, and they would squirt this yogurt into these plastic cups and seal it and package it.

A young industrial engineer and a couple of people who had worked on the line for a decade or so said: We can do this better. Instead of bringing the plastic cups in from a supplier, they did something simple for an engineer—not so simple for me. They took plastic rolls, and they fed a plastic sheet into a machine—the whole assembly line was maybe 80 feet long—and the plastic

would be heated and then extruded and then cooled slowly, and the yogurt would be squirted into the plastic cup and sealed and sent.

Now, the innovation took place on the shop floor. That is what happens. When you develop a product, wherever you manufacture it, the innovation, the product innovation and the process innovation—the process innovation meaning how you make it, the process of making it, as they did Dannon yogurt in the packaging and the actual improvement of the product—it takes place on the shop floor. That is why this is so important.

This legislation, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2013, creates a Network for Manufacturing Innovation and would position the U.S. as the world's leader in advanced manufacturing.

We have already done something like this in Youngstown, OH, mentioned by the President in his State of the Union message, the first ever National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute. It is called America Makes. It is in conjunction with the University of Missouri and in conjunction with businesses and universities—Eastern Gateway and Youngstown State in the Mahoning Valley and the University of Pittsburgh. It is sort of this tech belt along there. They do something called 3–D printing, which is kind of hard to conceptualize, until you see it. But it really is something to look for in the future.

We know how to produce in this country. We have seen, with some Federal funding matched by $40 million in private funds, it is making Youngstown a world leader in 3–D printing manufacturing technology already.

We need to build on this momentum. That is why our legislation is so important. It is supported by manufacturing associations, semiconductor groups. We have seen other countries begin to sort of mimic it and parrot it and imitate it. We know we have something here that will help America lead the world.

In concluding, before yielding to the Senator from Oregon, think of this in terms of a teaching hospital, where you have a great teaching hospital at the University of Cincinnati or Ohio State or Case Western in Cleveland or the University of Toledo. At these teaching hospitals—where research and development and innovation are happening with great scientists and great doctors and great researchers—often what they produce, what they come up with is commercialized locally, and you build a critical mass in that field. In some kind of scientific medical field you build that expertise in that region. That is what we want to do with these manufacturing hubs, like NMI in Youngstown, where in Youngstown we will see all kinds of job creation that will make Youngstown the vital city that it has been in much of its history and we want to see it become in the future.

It is good for our country. It is good for manufacturing. It is good for families who earn their living from manufacturing. And it will be particularly good for our communities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue that should be of concern to all Americans; that is, the advice and consent function of the Senate regarding nominations. This is the critical check envisioned by our Founders in which the President has the power to nominate for the executive branch positions and for judicial nominees, and the Senate is held responsible to provide a check to make sure there are not outrageous nominees that are placed in positions.

That is the advice and consent function which throughout our history has basically been a simple majority function with very rare exceptions. This issue comes up at this moment because 2 weeks ago the minority of this body in the Senate would not allow there to be a vote on whether to confirm Mel Watt. They did that by preventing there being enough votes to close debate.

So that blockade was basically put in place without respecting, if you will, the fact that Mel Watt is highly qualified for his position at the Federal Housing Finance Agency, a position he would hold, and giving the entire Senate the ability to weigh in about whether they agreed with that judgment, the judgment of the President that Mel Watt was well qualified.

In the same week, this body also blocked an up-or-down vote on Patricia Millett, who was a nominee for the DC Circuit Court. On this occasion, it was not because folks said she was not qualified. They said, instead: We do not want to put any more of President Obama's nominees onto the DC Circuit Court because we want it to be dominated by the judges who were confirmed when President Bush was President.

Then, just yesterday, this pattern of blockading up-and-down votes on nominees continued with the minority filibustering, blocking the closing of debate on Cornelia Pillard—again, a highly qualified individual. An argument was not made that there was some exceptional circumstance in her background that left her unprepared for this position. The argument was simply made: We do not want to let the President put any judges on this DC Circuit Court.

That is of extreme concern. I must say that it has caused folks who have been scholars in this area to look at it. Norm Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute basically said: It is ridiculous for the minority to block up-and-down votes, not on the basis that there is something wrong with her qualifications, but just they want to take away the President's ability and constitutional responsibility to nominate individuals to fill vacancies.

So this obstruction, exercised over the last almost 5 years now, has done significant damage to the court. It has done significant damage to the executive branch. It prevents qualified nominees to get a vote on this floor so that they can—if they receive a simple majority vote of support—work on behalf of the American people either in their executive branch capacity or addressing the huge backlog in our judicial system.

The Senate has the advice and consent role which is a treasured responsibility. It is a weighty responsibility. I think everyone in this body—I think all 100 Senators—could agree that under advice and consent the Senate must exercise a significant check on the quality of Presidential nominees, whether for the courts or for the executive branch.

The Senate should vet nominees. The committees that are related to a particular position should explore their background, they should hold a hearing, they should ask tough questions, they should debate the nominees, and then once recommended on the floor of the Senate, we should continue that vetting and debating process. Then, having shared our insights on their background, we need to vote to confirm or reject.

It should be on very rare exceptions, when there are extraordinary circumstances that make someone unworthy that they should be blocked from having a final vote. Advice and consent must not become ''block and destroy.'' But advice and consent has become block and destroy. The Senate nomination process is broken.

A minority of one branch of government, the Senate, should not be able to systematically undermine the other two branches of government. Yet that is what we see today. President Obama's district court nominees have waited, on average, more than twice as long as President George Bush's nominees to be confirmed by the Senate after being reported out of committee.

So we have the challenge of getting up-or-down votes. We also have basically a process of dragging feet in order to make it more difficult to actually get to the votes on these individuals in the first place. For the circuit courts, that comparison is even worse. President Obama's nominees have waited 3½ times longer than the nominees of his predecessor—3½ times longer.

The Congressional Research Service notes that of the last five Presidents, President Obama is the only one to have his district and circuit court nominees wait, on average, more than 6 months for confirmation. So those delays, in combination with ultimately denying the possibility to hold an up-or-down vote—to hold a final vote on whether to confirm or not confirm—

they constitute a systematic undermining of the function of the other two branches of government.

Now, this was not envisioned in any possible way by the creators of our Constitution. They argued there should be three coequal branches. But this outcome, in which the Senate minority seeks to undermine an executive branch nominee, is inconsistent with the constitutional design of coequal branches. They are not coequal if one branch can systematically undermine another.

In regard to the courts, in an outcome in which the Senate minority is seeking to ideologically pack the courts by having insisted on up-or-down votes for President Bush's nominees and then blocking up-and-down votes on President Obama's nominees, it politicizes our judicial system. It undermines the integrity of our court system.

The Senate has confronted this abuse of advice and consent three times in recent history. In 2005, the Democratic minority was blocking up-and-down votes on a series of President Bush's nominees. They were doing the same thing that we see today. A gang of 14 gathered to debate this, because essentially the Republican majority said: If you do not quit blocking up-or-down votes on the President's nominees, we are going to change the rules and make it a simple majority. Out of the gang of 14 came a deal. The deal was that Democrats would, except under exceptional circumstances, not block the nominee. The counterpoint being that the Republicans would not change the rules. So they got what they wanted, which was up-and-down votes without a rule change.

That pledge the Democrats made was honored when subsequent nominees got their up-or-down votes. Now, in January of this year the Democrats, in the reversal of positions, insisted that the Republican minority quit blocking up-or-down votes of President Obama's nominees—kind of a deja vu moment, only the two parties were reversed.

Out of that conversation, out of that dialogue in January, came a promise from the Republican minority leader of this body. He promised a return to the norms and traditions of the Senate regarding nominations. What are those norms and traditions? Those norms and traditions are simple up-or-down votes with rare exception.

But that promise was barely made and within weeks it was broken, when we saw the first ever filibuster of a Defense Secretary nominee. It just so happened, ironically, that the Republican filibuster—the first time in history of a Defense nominee—was against one of their former colleagues, our Republican colleague Chuck Hagel. So the January promise was broken. This led to increasing tensions until July of this year when Democratic and Republican Members met in the Old Senate Chamber to privately share their concerns. A new deal was hammered out, which is, essentially that executive nominees would get up-or-down votes. That happened for a significant list of nominees.

There was an up-or-down vote on Richard Cordray to be the head of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; Gina McCarthy to lead the EPA; nominees to fill the National Labor Relations Board; nominees to head Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; a nominee to lead the Ex-Im Bank; and, following shortly thereafter, a nominee to be the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Powers.

So that July deal held through a list of nominees until 2 weeks ago. Two weeks ago this body blocked an up-or-down vote on MEL WATT. So we are right back where we were before, right back where we were, the promise made in January shattered, the promise made in July shattered, and the ability of this body to do its advice and consent responsibility shattered.

This should be deeply troubling to all. We must restore the ability of the Senate to perform its responsibilities under the Constitution to advise and consent. The Senate with simple up-or-down votes will be a check on bad nominations from the President. I have voted against at least one of the President's nominees. I was prepared to vote against another here just a few weeks ago. The President withdrew that nominee so that vote was not necessary. But that was related to a judgment of the qualifications of the individuals and whether they were a good fit for a particular position. It was not about trying to systematically undermine the executive branch and keep them from operating.

That is essentially why we have up-or-down votes; it is a check on unqualified individuals or a poor fit for a particular position. So in this area, both in the Senate's failure to do its job vis-a-vis judicial nominees and to do its job vis-a-vis executive nominees, we have created unequal branches of government. It is time to fix the broken Senate in regard to nominations. It is time to restore the traditional role of the Senate in evaluating nominations so that with nominees who are confirmed, they can go to work in the courts, can go to work in the executive branch to do the work that the citizens of the United States of America expect them to do on behalf of our Nation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TYPHOON YOLANDA

Mr. SCHATZ. Five days ago Typhoon Yolanda devastated the central Philippines. As a category 5 supertyphoon, this was reportedly the strongest storm ever to make landfall anywhere in recorded history, sweeping away almost everything in its path.

Nearly 10 million people were impacted by this supertyphoon and tens of thousands of homes were destroyed. Eighty to ninety percent of the homes in city of Ormoc, the second largest city in the Leyte Province, are gone. The stories of loss are shocking and heartbreaking.

We do not yet know the full extent of the devastation this typhoon has brought to the Philippines. Local authorities estimate as many as 10,000 people may be dead in the Leyte Province alone, one of the hardest hit regions.

The State Department has said roughly 3,000 Americans were impacted when the storm hit. Our Embassy in Manila is coordinating with U.S. agencies to locate these Americans and bring them home.

The United States and the Philippines share a special bond, rooted in strong cultural and historical ties between our two countries. In Hawaii, where more than 197,000 Filipinos have made their home, we know this bond well.

Our Filipino community has been a part of the islands for more than 100 years, and many at home maintain close relationships with family and friends in the Philippines. My deepest condolences go to those who have lost family and friends in this tragedy.

Although the storm is over, our work has just begun. Millions of survivors are without clean drinking water, food, shelter or power. Rescue workers are attempting to reach isolated coastal communities, but debris and downed power lines are blocking road access.

The U.S. Government is helping the Philippines to recover. We have provided $20 million in humanitarian aid and deployed a Disaster Assistance Response Team to support the Philippine Government. These experts will help to assess the extent of the damage and determine what resources remain to be added.

The USAID Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance has shipped relief supplies, including shelter materials and hygienic supplies, to help around 10,000 families. We are partnering with the U.N. World Food Program to provide $10 million for emergency food assistance because close to 2.5 million people will need food assistance over the next 6 months.

This aid will help airlift 55 metric tons in emergency food to feed more than 20,000 children and 15,000 adults, providing immediate relief for the next 4 to 5 days. It will bring more than 1,000 metric tons of rice to feed 60,000 people for 1 month.

U.S. marines are on the ground. Our military is helping to airlift relief supplies, conduct aerial damage assessments, and coordinate search and rescue operations.

U.S. Pacific Command has forces in Manila to help deliver food and water to the impacted areas. The *George Washington* Carrier Strike Group and its 5,000 sailors are expected in the area soon to provide humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

For those still searching for displaced or missing loved ones, I urge you to contact the Philippine Red Cross or the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council operations center.

Google has also launched the Person Finder: Typhoon Yolanda. Americans can also visit CNN's iReport Web site to upload photos and information about people you may be looking for.

The challenge for the Filipino people is great, but the Philippines is a resilient nation and a true American ally. They need our help. Please donate.

I am proud of our local organizations in Hawaii collecting donations to help survivors and the families of victims. The Philippine consulate in Honolulu, Filipino Chamber of Commerce, Filipino Community Center, Congress of Visayan Organizations, and Kokua Philippines have all stepped up in this time of tremendous need. A full list of organizations is available on my Web site schatz.senate.gov. One may also text AID to 80108 to give a $10 donation to the mGive Philippines Typhoon Disaster Relief Fund. Text AID to 80108 if you would like to give $10 to the relief efforts.

I wish to especially recognize and thank all of the women and men of the U.S. Embassy in Manila, USAID mission in Manila, the State Department, USAID in the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Pacific Command for their great efforts in coordinating our ongoing response.

Today I introduced a resolution expressing the support of the Senate for the victims of the typhoon, along with several of my colleagues. I thank Senators MENENDEZ, DURBIN, CARDIN, RUBIO, HIRONO, TOM UDALL, BOXER, and BEGICH for cosponsoring this resolution.

As the Philippines begins the recovery from this tragedy, I ask that we all pledge together to work with them. When they rebuild their communities, rest assured they will emerge stronger than ever.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Before I make my comments regarding manufacturing and job creation in America and in Alaska, I would like to say I know my friend from Hawaii was here earlier, Senator SCHATZ, talking about the important resolution that has been submitted that I was honored to be able to cosponsor regarding the typhoon in the Philippines.

Alaska has over 20,000 Filipinos living in our State—an incredible group of individuals, people I have known in the business world, as individuals, and family members. The devastation is unbelievable as you look at the photos and see the devastation of the typhoon and the impact it has had on families there. Even though it is thousands of miles away, I can tell you, in Alaska, we feel it, we see it. Our Filipino friends there have many relatives on the islands, and the impact is just unbelievable.

I was in Alaska this weekend and met with members of the leadership of the Filipino community, as well as members from the Red Cross and others to see what we can do from an Alaskan perspective, because Alaska knows what disasters are like. From earthquakes to floods, we seem to have them quite often. We know what type of impact these events have on families, so I was very happy to support the resolution my friend from Hawaii submitted, but also want to recognize the 20,000 Filipino community members in Alaska who are suffering and thinking about their families and friends overseas.

We want to do everything we can. I know our country is there and ready and moving a lot of resources to assist. So I wanted to put that on the record and give my condolences to families who have lost loved ones, but also to Alaskans who are grieving for family and friends who may have been lost in the typhoon. I know personally I have done my own contributions, whatever I can to assist in moving operations forward and bringing resources to the islands.

JOB CREATION

I also came today to talk on the floor about the need for additional job creation. Already in the first 10 months of this year we have created 1.9 million new jobs—higher than last year at this same time—which is a good start, but more needs to be done. Senators COONS and DURBIN and others have been discussing our Manufacturing Jobs in America initiative. In particular, we are talking about the skills necessary to succeed in today's economy—the skills Americans need to land and to keep good manufacturing jobs.

There used to be a time when a bright kid in this country could work hard in school, graduate with a high school diploma, and go work in a factory. He or she could make a decent living, a living wage, enough to raise a family and own a home and think about the future of their kids. Those days are long gone. Unfortunately, today's factories and plants don't look like they used to. The level of technical expertise needed to operate some new machinery is pretty high. That is why I have made career and technical education a priority. We need to have options for the bright kids after high school or that mid-career worker looking to shift gears.

My own State of Alaska is already a leader in career technical education—CTE. As these programs continue to innovate and change across the country, Alaska is in the forefront. I see it when I travel around the State. From career pathways in high schools to creative programs through the University of Alaska system, my State is a leader in career technical education.

To address these issues, I have introduced a bill entitled Investing in Innovation, otherwise called i3, which takes a look at what is happening in our local schools and puts resources into what is working. It supports and expands programs that are helping to improve student achievement. This bill requires 25 percent of the money to go to local rural communities. There are so many programs that sometimes forget our small and rural communities, not only in Alaska but throughout this country.

I have also introduced the Career Readiness package of legislation focused on career and technical education. One of the bills in this package is the Counseling for Career Choice Act. This bill will help fund stakeholders in developing comprehensive career counseling models that emphasize guiding students to productive careers.

Our counselors are in unique position to help expose and guide our students to postsecondary opportunities—to help prepare them for high-demand careers. This bill makes sure our school counselors have the resources they need to emphasize all types of postsecondary education, not just the traditional 4-year degree. It focuses on opportunities such as apprenticeships, certificate programs, associate degrees, and, of course, 4-year degrees. It makes sure that business, economic development, and industry leaders are at the table providing information on available postsecondary training opportunities and career trends—basically making sure that we match what we are teaching to not only what is available in the market today but in the future. Our students need the best teachers and the best facilities.

I also have legislation that focuses on career technical education, CTE, professional development for teachers and principals.

Another career readiness bill provides funding to make sure we are modernizing our CTE facilities. We know students who are involved in career and technical education programs are engaged in their future careers. We have to keep making sure what our students learn is relevant to the real

world. We must align our educational system with the in-demand careers to fill those jobs in that pipeline, and we must keep our students engaged.

If we are going to compete in the 21st century as we did in the 20th century, we need to make sure our students have the very best skills—skills that are tailored to the 21st century economy. Career and technical education is the best approach, in my opinion, to give students those skills.

I am a big fan of the Manufacturing Jobs for America initiative led by Senator COONS and several of my colleagues. America's manufacturing sector has enormous potential to create new jobs and to speed up our economy and economic recovery. These are good jobs and they spin off into even more jobs.

According to the National Association of Manufacturers, every manufacturing job we create adds 1½ jobs to the local economy. So let's move forward, let's pass these bills to help with job training, career facilities and readiness, and let's do everything we can to get our manufacturing sector running full speed ahead.

Before I conclude my remarks, let me say that I know there is a lot of debate on the floor where we talk about health care, we are talking about a national defense authorization bill, and we are going to talk about a compounding bill, but at the end of the day, what Americans, what Alaskans, come to me to talk about on a regular basis—and certainly it was true in the 4½ days I just spent in Alaska—is what are we doing to create jobs for the future, not only for people today in the work environment but the kids of the future who will be in the work environment.

This legislation, and many other pieces that have been introduced in this package, help lead this economy and continue to move this economy. We have to remind ourselves where we are: This year, this month, we created over 200,000 jobs. The first month I came here, when I was sworn in, the economy was in a tailspin. We had lost over 700,000 jobs. So we have been in the positive trendline for several months here, but we have more to do. And an area that I think is an incredible opportunity not only for Alaska but for all across this country is improving our manufacturing sector and ensuring our young people are ready for the 21st century.

Again, I thank my friend Senator COONS for all the work he is doing to bring manufacturing to the forefront, as well as all my colleagues who have been coming to the floor to talk about an important piece of legislation to create jobs and improve our economy for the long term.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONDOLENCES TO SENATOR INHOFE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to express my deepest sympathy to the senior Senator from Oklahoma Senator JAMES INHOFE and his wife Kay on the sudden and untimely loss of their son, Dr. Perry Inhofe, this weekend in a plane crash. I extend my thoughts and prayers to the entire Inhofe family.

Perry Inhofe was an orthopedic surgeon as well as a licensed pilot and flight instructor, with a family of his own. Flying is integral to the Inhofe family—I know that from my service with Senator INHOFE on the Armed Services Committee and as cochair with him of the Army Caucus, a caucus he created along with Senator Dan Akaka to support the men and women serving in the Army. I know of his intense involvement in flying.

I hope, certainly, that the memories and the time he had with his son will help sustain and comfort him in the days ahead. Senator INHOFE is a man of great integrity, with great dedication to his faith, to the Nation. Again, at this time of loss, I only hope the memory and the example of his son, his son's service and his courage and faith and love will sustain the Inhofe family.

NOMINATION OF PATRICIA M. WALD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I commend President Obama for renominating Judge Patricia M. Wald to serve as a member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, ''PCLOB''. The Senate unanimously confirmed Judge Wald to this post on August 2, 2012. The President renominated Judge Wald to this position in March, and the Judiciary Committee favorably reported the nomination without objection months ago. During her tenure on this important oversight board, Judge Wald has served with great professionalism and dedication. And next week, she will receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor that the President can bestow.

For the past several months, we have been engaged in a national debate about the ever-growing need for limits on the government's surveillance powers. In the coming weeks, the House and the Senate will consider bipartisan legislation to rein in those expansive powers in an effort to protect Americans' privacy and to increase transparency and oversight. While I look forward to that debate and consideration of this important legislation, it is urgent that the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board continue to operate at full strength to safeguard our constitutional rights. The PCLOB has held two all day hearings on these surveillance matters in recent months, and plans to issue an important report to the President and Congress. Judge Wald has been a key participant in these proceedings. Should the Senate fail to confirm her nomination before we adjourn, however, Judge Wald would be forced to step down from the PCLOB at a critical time when the board is conducting its work to evaluate the privacy and civil liberties implications of the Nation's surveillance programs.

Democrats, Independents, and Republicans alike have supported the important work of this nonpartisan board. Unfortunately, a secret objection on the Republican side is needlessly delaying Judge Wald's confirmation. I urge the Senate to promptly confirm this well qualified nominee, so that the PCLOB can carry out its important responsibilities. If a single Republican Senator has a concern about Judge Patricia Wald's impeccable credentials, they should come forward with the reason they are holding up her confirmation.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this month, we commemorate Native American Heritage Month. It is an important opportunity to recognize the exceptional achievements and contributions of those in the Native American community. They are an integral part of this country's history, which has been both proud and painful. It is important to stop and reflect on how we as a nation can learn from the past and plan for our shared future as fellow Americans.

It is fitting that in this month we also celebrate Veterans Day. For over 200 years, Native Americans, including American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians, have served honorably and with distinction in the U.S. Armed Forces. Native Americans have served in every conflict since the Revolutionary War and contribute in disproportionately high numbers to our Nation's defense. No group of Americans has a higher per capita service rate in the military than Native Americans.

One of the most unique and extraordinary contributions was by the ''Code Talkers'' during both world wars. Using codes based on their distinct languages, these Native American soldiers transmitted orders and communications to troops and allies, which were indecipherable to our enemies. Later

this month, 33 tribes will be recognized with Congressional Gold Medals to celebrate this significant contribution during the Second World War. This recognition is both historic and overdue.

Throughout the military history of the United States, Native Americans have served bravely and honorably. We are grateful to these soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen for their tradition of unwavering patriotism.

As we celebrate Native American contributions to our country, we must also examine the unique struggles faced by these communities and work together to find solutions. I am proud of the significant steps we took earlier this year to confront the long-ignored epidemic of violence against Native women through reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, a bill I authored with Senator CRAPO. Nearly three out of five Indian women have been assaulted by their spouses or intimate partners. On some reservations, Native American women are murdered at a rate more than times the national average. Those statistics are chilling. Native women are being brutalized and killed at rates that simply shock the conscience.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization of 2013 addresses this problem directly and provides landmark protections for Native American women. These include expanding the jurisdiction of tribal courts in several ways. First, the law clarifies that tribal courts have the authority to issue and enforce tribal protection orders, a tool that is necessary to stop the escalation of violence. Second, and perhaps most importantly, it recognizes the jurisdiction of tribal courts to prosecute non-Indians who abuse Native women on tribal lands.

More than 50 percent of Native American women are married to non-Native American men. Before the Violence Against Women Act was reauthorized this year, tribal courts were unable to prosecute these men if they committed acts of domestic abuse. The Federal authorities who had jurisdiction were often hours away from tribal lands and ill-equipped to prosecute these crimes. As a result, countless victims were left without protection and offenders were allowed to prey upon women with impunity. As a former prosecutor, I was appalled, and I am proud that we fixed this glaring problem with the enactment of these historic changes.

Beyond resolving jurisdictional issues, VAWA improved the grant making process to Indian tribal coalitions to ensure tribes are better able to respond to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. It creates new Federal crimes with tougher penalties for offenses often committed against Native American women and encourages greater cooperation between the Federal Government and tribal governments.

The success of VAWA, and the inclusion of these historic provisions, was the result of years of careful investigation and creative problem solving. We worked closely with tribal leaders and the National Congress of American Indians and in close consultation with the Indian Affairs Committee. I would like to thank the former chairman of that committee, Senator Daniel Akaka, and current chairwoman MARIA CANTWELL for their cooperation and persistence on these important measures.

Another area of law critical to the protection of civil rights for Native Americans is the Voting Rights Act. I am working hard with members from both sides of the aisle to restore the vital protections of this landmark law, undermined by the Supreme Court's recent decision in Shelby County v. Holder.

The Voting Rights Act is the most successful piece of civil rights legislation in this Nation's history. It has worked to protect the Constitution's guarantees against racial discrimination in voting for nearly five decades. It has helped minorities of all races—including Native Americans—overcome major barriers to participation in the political process. For example, in 2008, in Charles Mix County, SD, the Department of Justice found evidence of discriminatory intent by the officials of the county, who had attempted to dilute the voting strength of Native Americans. The Voting Rights Act prevented these discriminatory actions from taking place. It is imperative that we reinvigorate and restore these protections.

In addition to our legislative efforts, we are also making strides in confirming Native American judges to our Federal courts. President Obama nominated Diane J. Humetewa, a Native American woman, to serve on the U.S. district court for Arizona on September 19, 2013. Humetewa, a member of the Hopi Tribe, was the U.S. attorney in Arizona between 2007 and 2009, a position to which she was nominated by former President George W. Bush at the urging of Senator JOHN MCCAIN. If the Senate confirms her nomination, she would become the only active member of a Native American tribe to serve in the Federal judiciary and the first Native American woman ever to serve on the Federal bench.

This month, let us celebrate the Native American contributions that make this Nation better and stronger. And let us renew our commitment to work together with leaders of these sovereign nations to address ongoing challenges to ensure that all who live in this great country are afforded the respect, dignity and opportunities they deserve.

EMPLOYEE BENEFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the Employee Benefit Research Institute on their 35th anniversary. EBRI was founded in 1978 with the purpose of conducting research on employee benefit plans and distributing that information to the public. Their mission ''is to contribute to, to encourage, and to enhance the development of sound employee benefit programs and sound public policy through objective research and education.''

EBRI has fulfilled its mission and purpose for 35 years in a nonpartisan and unbiased manner. That is why EBRI's research staff is frequently asked to testify before Congress, including several times before the Finance Committee. EBRI produces trustworthy analysis on both health and retirement issues. EBRI does not take policy positions and they do not lobby—they provide us with just the facts without spin. When it comes to retirement and health policy, EBRI is an indispensable source of expert data. And that is why both Members and our staff on Capitol Hill depend on their expertise and reliability.

I salute EBRI and its staff for 35 years of exceptional work and look forward to their continued help in the future.

TRIBUTE TO GARY OSTROSKE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I wish to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Gary Ostroske, who retired on July 1, 2013, as President and CEO of the United Way of Southeast Louisiana. Mr. Ostroske has been an integral part of the United Way Worldwide system for 40 years and has served as President and CEO of the Southeastern region for the past 25 years.

Throughout his tenure at the United Way, Mr. Ostroske implemented important changes to a wide breadth of programs to improve the lives of residents of Southeast Louisiana. Mr. Ostroske has worked tirelessly to provide citizens with quality healthcare, education, and human services and has undoubtedly provided many opportunities for residents of Southeast Louisiana to succeed and improve their lives.

As the President and CEO of United Way of Southeast Louisiana, Mr. Ostroske worked collaboratively with community organizations and Greater New Orleans leaders to create innovative ways to deliver critical services to Southeast Louisiana residents. Through these community partnerships, Mr. Ostroske strengthened United Way's impact and allowed it to play an integral role in crafting a strong economic agenda for our region.

Mr. Ostroske's unwavering leadership in the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Isaac and the Deepwater Horizon oil spill was truly remarkable. Mr. Ostroske's diligent efforts to rebuild our region after these disasters ensured our region's renewed sense of vitality and economic strength.

Upon his retirement, Mr. Ostroske is looking forward to volunteering in our community and spending time with his wife of 35 years, Mary Ann and his family—their son, Peter Ostroske, president of O Look!, an internet company

based in São Paulo, Brazil and their daughter, Jenny Ostroske Luke, who is a veterinarian, married to Fletcher Luke. Gary and Mary Ann are the proud grandparents to Jenny and Fletcher's children—Ellis and Myles.

Mr. Ostroske's service to the people of Louisiana has been truly extraordinary and serves as an inspiration to us all. It is with my greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me along with Mr. Ostroske's family in recognizing his dedicated service to the people of Louisiana, as well as wishing him well in his retirement.

HOLT INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, Senator WYDEN and I wish to recognize Holt International Children's Services during this year's celebration of National Adoption Month.

On July 27, 2013 we celebrated the 60th anniversary of the end of the Korean war. By signing the armistice agreement, the border between the Koreas near the 38th Parallel was established. It was in the wake of this armistice that Holt International Children's Services first began its compassionate work, and today continues to be a leader in the field of adoption and child welfare issues.

Harry and Bertha Holt of Eugene, OR were of humble means—Harry a lumberjack and a farmer and Bertha a nurse. In 1954, the Holts went to a small high school auditorium to view a film about Amerasian children living in South Korean orphanages. Moved by the film, their faith and a firm belief that all children deserve permanent, loving homes, the Holts began their lifelong mission in 1955 to revolutionize intercountry adoption.

At the time, there were no laws allowing children to immigrate to one country from another for the purpose of adoption. Overcoming legal and cultural barriers, Mr. and Mrs. Holt sought families for children orphaned by the Korean war. The Holts persuaded Oregon U.S. Senator Richard Neuberger to introduce legislation titled ''The Relief of Certain Korean War Orphans.'' The legislation became law on August 11, 1955, enabling the Holts to adopt eight Korean war orphans: Joseph Han, Mary Chae, Helen Chan, Paul Kim, Betty Rhee, Robert Chae, Christine Lee and Nathanial Chae. With this act of love and the founding of their agency—Holt International Children's Services—two farmers from rural Oregon became pioneers in international adoption.

Today, Holt International strives to uphold Harry and Bertha's vision of finding loving homes for children regardless of race, religion, ethnicity or gender. Holt is committed to finding families for children, not children for families, an important distinction that sets the tone and priorities for Holt. Since the 1955 act, Holt has placed 49,630 children from 31 countries with families in all 50 States. As the oldest intercountry adoption agency, Holt is the only organization that has more than three generations of adult adoptees.

Holt continues to play an active and vital role in establishing policy and practice for intercountry adoption. In 1993, Holt adoptees Susan Cox and David Kim were members of the U.S. delegation to the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption, an agreement which sets international standards for intercountry adoption that protects the child, the birth family and the adoptive family. Later, in 2008, Holt was a leading advocate in ensuring U.S. ratification of the Hague Convention treaty. Holt believes that adoption is a life long experience and has been at the forefront of developing post adoption services to ensure that adoptees grow and develop to their fullest potential.

In addition to these monumental accomplishments, Holt International has become much more than an adoption agency. When considering a child's future, Holt always keeps the child's best interest at the forefront of every decision. For some children adoption is the only option, but Holt realizes that it is not the first option for children without families. Holt believes that it is best if children can stay with their birth family. Over the years, Holt has worked to develop and maintain programs overseas to give orphaned, abandoned and vulnerable children safe and nurturing environments in which to grow and thrive. These overseas programs include initiatives directed at family preservation, nutrition support, child and maternal health, income generation, assisting children with special needs, and shaping and establishing intercountry child welfare systems. Through these initiatives, Holt impacts approximately 30,000 children each year and helps to ensure that children at all stages of need are provided for in an effort to avoid the separation of families.

In November, as National Adoption Month is celebrated, it is appropriate to recognize Holt International Children's Services for its diligent efforts and accomplishments in the field of child-welfare and intercountry adoption that have impacted thousands of children in the U.S. and around the world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CHARACTERPLUS

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to honor CHARACTERplus, an organization based in my State of Missouri, which helps build strong school communities where students feel valued and can succeed. As a former classroom teacher, I appreciate the work CHARACTERplus does to help educators instill positive character traits in students—such as responsibility and respect—by teaching, encouraging and living these values at school.

Created by Sanford N. McDonnell in 1985, CHARACTERplus is the largest community-wide character education organization in the country. More importantly, because of the efforts of CHARACTERplus, Missouri leads the Nation in character education.

Currently more than 75 school districts across several States are members of CHARACTERplus, which serves more than 330,000 students and 29,000 teachers at 645 schools to transform school climate.

Member districts and schools have unlimited access to professional development, national experts, the most current research on social, emotional and character development, skill training modules, survey tools to access school climate and opportunities to network with others in the field.

Each year, the Character Education Partnership, CEP, recognizes schools that have demonstrated a commitment to character education by naming them a National School of Character. In 2013, CEP chose 29 schools, 9 of which were members of CHARACTERplus, making Missouri the national leader in character education.

Those schools include Independence Elementary in the Francis Howell School District; Jefferson City Academic Center in the Jefferson City School District; Beasley Elementary, Bierbaum Elementary, Hagemann Elementary, and Mehlville High School in the Mehlville School District; Chesterfield Elementary and LaSalle Springs Middle School in the Rockwood School District; and Discovery Ridge Elementary in the Wentzville School District.

CHARACTERplus also works closely with the Missouri Department of Secondary and Elementary Education on several projects and runs the State School of Character Awards.

I would like to congratulate CHARACTERplus for all of their hard work and commend them for helping the State of Missouri be a leader in character education.•

TRIBUTE TO LARRY WILCOX

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to offer my heartfelt congratulations to Larry Wilcox who is retiring as superintendent of the Michael J. Fitzmaurice State Veterans Home in Hot Springs, SD. The retirement is effective November 14, 2013.

Born in Burke, Larry grew up in Winner, SD. After graduating from Winner High School in the mid-1960s, Larry joined the South Dakota Army National Guard. He remained in the National Guard for nearly four decades, including 26 years in the Medical Services Corps. A Gulf War veteran, Larry rose to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel before retiring in 2003.

Larry's service to our State continued when he was named superintendent of South Dakota's only State Veterans Home in May 2004 by Maj. Gen. Michael

Gorman. He has provided excellent stewardship of the State Veterans Home, including overseeing plans to construct a new facility. On November 11, 1889, the cornerstone for the first State Home was laid in Hot Springs. The much-anticipated groundbreaking for a new South Dakota Veterans Home was held in late September 2013. Thousands of veterans and their families have enjoyed the services of the State Veterans Home over these many years. Aging veterans have found solace on the beautiful, aesthetic grounds of the State Veterans Home and have benefited from the dedicated medical care and support services provided.

Larry has played a major role in providing consistent and superior levels of care and comfort to veterans at the State Home during his time as superintendent. He has been passionate about providing the highest degree of compassionate care, understanding and service to the residents. Larry is a strong advocate for the Veterans Home, promoting the importance of the Veterans Home to the general public and making sure the congressional delegation is aware of any challenges veterans may face. Over the years I have appreciated Larry's insight on issues and the open line of communication between our offices.

I thank Larry for all he has done for veterans in South Dakota and wish him all the best in his retirement.●

NORTHWEST NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator CRAPO, I wish to recognize the 100-year anniversary of Northwest Nazarene University in the city of Nampa in the great State of Idaho.

On September 13, 1913, this education institution began as an elementary school—the Idaho Holiness School. With a strong and unstoppable vision for the future, the founders quickly developed it into a secondary school and then a university. Highly respected in the community and, indeed, all across the great State of Idaho and in several other States in the region, Northwest Nazarene University has conferred degrees upon thousands of college graduates since 1917.

Dr. David Alexander, who began his association with NNU as a member of the faculty and in 2008 became its 12th president, continues to carry out the early vision of growth, excellence and the Great Commission. The university offers a world-class, multi-discipline education, which now serves more than 2,000 undergraduate and graduate students; more than 6,000 continuing education students; and 2,300 high school students through its concurrent credit program. On its 90-acre campus in Nampa, 60 education disciplines are offered as well as 11 graduate-level programs. The university also offers programs of study in other Idaho cities including nearby Boise, Twin Falls and Idaho Falls, and works in cooperation with education programs in 10 countries.

NNU, a nonprofit Christian school, is affiliated with the Church of the Nazarene and is one of the premiere universities in our State. Through education and spiritual development, students become leaders in business, public service, education and in faith-based careers. At NNU, they have become students of scholarship, strong in character and robust contributors to their communities.

As Governor, Lieutenant Governor and State Senator, I have had a long and good working relationship with NNU, which I tremendously value. I mark their achievements and continued growth as terrific highlights for the Treasure Valley and the State of Idaho. Their commitment to their original vision and the foundations of their beliefs as they recognize changing times has made NNU an institution of stability and a vital resource for Idahoans.

I remember well participating in the dedication of the Thomas Family Health and Science Center, which further moves NNU into the ranks of a competitive university with state-of-the-art laboratories and researchers. In addition, I am proud to have had their participation on the Nursing Task Force, which I initiated as governor, and which continues to make a significant impact on reducing the shortage of nurses in Idaho and beyond.

For 100 years, Northwest Nazarene University has proved itself a strong asset to our community and state. It is a proverbial shining light, making a positive difference on its campus, in nearby neighborhoods and across oceans. We are very proud to have this institution serving our young people and those continually updating their skills and education. Our country stands stronger because NNU goes the extra mile, perseveres and stays the course.

May God bless Northwest Nazarene University with another 100 years of being a top-rated institution of higher learning.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:19 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hanrahan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2747. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 2:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hanrahan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 330. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

S. 893. An act to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

At 4:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2871. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the southern judicial district of Mississippi to improve judicial efficiency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2922. An act to extend the authority of the Supreme Court Police to protect court officials away from the Supreme Court grounds.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 252. An act to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:

Report to accompany S. 1681, An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–120).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1688. A bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), collectively, in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1689. A bill to treat payments by charitable organizations with respect to certain firefighters as exempt payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1690. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1691. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the security of the United States border and to provide for reforms and rates of pay for border patrol agents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1692. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1693. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to extend the initial open enrollment period; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1695. A bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1696. A bill to protect a women's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1697. A bill to support early learning; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1698. A bill to provide for the establishment of clean technology consortia to enhance the economic, environmental, and energy security of the United States by promoting domestic development, manufacture, and deployment of clean technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1699. A bill to permit individuals to renew certain health insurance coverage offered in the individual or small group markets and to provide that such individuals would not be subject to the individual mandate penalty; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. Res. 292. A resolution expressing support for the victims of the typhoon in the Philippines and the surrounding region; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. THUNE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 293. A resolution designating the week beginning on November 18, 2013, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week" ; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KING, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 294. A resolution expressing support for the goals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Con. Res. 25. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for activities associated with the ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 252

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 252, a bill to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) were added as cosponsors of S. 381, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the "Doolittle Tokyo Raiders", for outstanding heroism, valor, skill, and service to the United States in conducting the bombings of Tokyo.

S. 544

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 544, a bill to require the President to develop a comprehensive national manufacturing strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 878, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 908

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 908, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diagnosis and treatment of hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia, and for other purposes.

S. 917

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 949

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 949, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1143

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1187

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1187, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to require meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 1262

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1262, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a veterans conservation corps, and for other purposes.

S. 1291

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1291, a bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children.

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1364, a bill to promote neutrality, implicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services.

S. 1419

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1419, a bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1462

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1462, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 1622

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1622, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1644

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1644, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for preliminary hearings on alleged offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

S. 1661

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1661, a bill to require the Secretary of State to offer rewards of up to $5,000,000 for information regarding the attacks on the United States diplomatic mission at Benghazi, Libya that began on September 11, 2012.

S. 1675

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1675, a bill to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and for other purposes.

S. 1683

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1683, a bill to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign recipients, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 203

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 203, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution.

S. RES. 284

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 284, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to immediately release Saeed Abedini and all other individuals detained on account of their religious beliefs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1690. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I join with Senator PORTMAN to introduce the bipartisan Second Chance Reauthorization Act, a bill that builds on recent successes and takes important new steps to ensure that people coming out of prison have the opportunity to turn their lives around, rather than returning to a life of crime. Investing in community-based reentry programs prevents crime, reduces prison costs, improves public safety, and saves taxpayer dollars. It is also the right thing to do.

This important legislation improves Federal reentry policy and funds collaborations between State and local corrections agencies, nonprofits, educational institutions, service providers, and families to ensure that former offenders have the resources and support they need to become contributing members of the community. Our bill also seeks to expand upon the successes of the original Second Chance Act by continuing, improving, and consolidating its programs, while reauthorizing these important grant programs at reduced levels in recognition of current fiscal constraints.

In 2008, I joined with Senators BIDEN, SPECTER, and BROWNBACK as an original cosponsor of the Second Chance Act, and helped to shepherd that legislation through the Senate. I was proud when the Senate recognized the value

of the Second Chance Act and, after a great deal of work and compromise, passed the bill unanimously.

The bipartisan spirit of this legislation also continues in the House, where today Representatives SENSENBRENNER and DAVIS will introduce an identical version of the Senate bill authored by myself and Senator PORTMAN. Together, we have been working hard for the past several months to reach an agreement that is fair, fiscally responsible, and meets the needs of key stakeholders. As a result, we have the support of faith groups, law enforcement, and community groups who provide services to the mentally ill and those struggling with addiction. This broad coalition has one thing in common—we all want to see our justice system work better.

In the past few decades, Congress and the states have passed new criminal laws creating longer sentences for more and more crimes. As a result, our country currently incarcerates more than two million people, and more than 13 million people spend some time in jail or prison each year. This has resulted in severely stretched budgets and we have fewer resources for programs that actually prevent crime in the first place. We cannot afford to stay on our current path, and I am working on separate legislation to address the exploding costs of our Federal prisons. The Second Chance Reauthorization Act helps support innovative reentry programs at the state and local level which have brought down costs and reduced recidivism, and the federal system should replicate these efforts.

More than 650,000 ex-offenders are released from prison each year. The experience inmates have in prison, how we prepare them to rejoin society, and how we integrate them into the broader community when they are released are issues that profoundly affect the communities in which we live.

The Second Chance Act funds grants for key reentry programs and requires that these programs demonstrate measurable positive results, including a reduction in recidivism.

The Second Chance Act of 2008 authorized research into educational methods used in prisons and jails. Today's reauthorization bill directs the Attorney General to review that research, identify best practices, and implement them in our prisons and jails.

The bill also makes nonprofit organizations eligible for grants promoting family-based substance abuse treatment and training in technology careers. It gives priority consideration to applicants that conduct individualized post-release employment planning, demonstrate connections to employers within the local community, or track and monitor employment outcomes.

This legislation also makes improvements to federal reentry policy that have the added benefit of reducing Bureau of Prison costs. It continues the successful Elderly and Family Reunification for Certain Non-Violent Offenders Pilot Program and expands the pool of inmates eligible to apply for the program.

Finally, the Second Chance Reauthorization Act promotes accountability by requiring periodic audits of grantees to ensure that federal dollars are spent responsibly. Grantees who have unresolved audit problems will not be eligible for funding in future years.

As a former prosecutor, I believe strongly in securing tough and appropriate prison sentences for people who break our laws. But it is also important that we do everything we can to ensure that when people get out of prison, they enter our communities as productive members of society, so we can start to reverse the dangerous cycle of recidivism and violence. The Second Chance Reauthorization Act helps break this cycle.

I thank Senator PORTMAN, Representative SENSENBRENNER, and Representative DAVIS for their hard work and cooperation in leading these efforts. We have come together in a truly exceptional way in this bipartisan, bicameral effort. I am proud of the work we have done so far and I look forward to joining with Democrats and Republicans to get this bill passed and signed into law.

Mr. President, President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1690

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 ''Second Chance Reauthorization Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION OF ADULT AND JUVENILE OFFENDER STATE AND LOCAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Section 2976 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall make grants to States, local governments, territories, or Indian tribes, or any combination thereof (in this section referred to as an 'eligible entity'), in partnership with interested persons (including Federal corrections and supervision agencies), services providers, and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of strategic planning and implementation of adult and juvenile offender reentry projects.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''or reentry courts,'' after ''community,'';

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

(C) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) promoting employment opportunities consistent with the Transitional Jobs strategy (as defined in section 4 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17502)).'';

(3) by striking subsections (d), (e), and (f) and inserting the following:

''(d) COMBINED GRANT APPLICATION; PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall develop a procedure to allow applicants to submit a single application for a planning grant under subsection (e) and an implementation grant under subsection (f).

''(2) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—The Attorney General shall give priority consideration to grant applications under subsections (e) and (f) that include a commitment by the applicant to partner with a local evaluator to identify and analyze data that will—

''(A) enable the grantee to target the intended offender population; and

''(B) serve as a baseline for purposes of the evaluation.

''(e) PLANNING GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Attorney General may make a grant to an eligible entity of not more than $75,000 to develop a strategic, collaborative plan for an adult or juvenile offender reentry demonstration project as described in subsection (h) that includes—

''(A) a budget and a budget justification;

''(B) a description of the outcome measures that will be used to measure the effectiveness of the program in promoting public safety and public health;

''(C) the activities proposed;

''(D) a schedule for completion of the activities described in subparagraph (C); and

''(E) a description of the personnel necessary to complete the activities described in subparagraph (C).

''(2) MAXIMUM TOTAL GRANTS AND GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—

''(A) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The Attorney General may not make planning grants and implementation grants to 1 eligible entity in a total amount that is more than a $1,000,000.

''(B) GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—The Attorney General shall make every effort to ensure equitable geographic distribution of grants under this section and take into consideration the needs of underserved populations, including rural and tribal communities.

''(3) PERIOD OF GRANT.—A planning grant made under this subsection shall be for a period of not longer than 1 year, beginning on the first day of the month in which the planning grant is made.

''(f) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

''(1) APPLICATIONS.—An eligible entity desiring an implementation grant under this subsection shall submit to the Attorney General an application that—

''(A) contains a reentry strategic plan as described in subsection (h), which describes the long-term strategy and incorporates a detailed implementation schedule, including the plans of the applicant to fund the program after Federal funding is discontinued;

''(B) identifies the local government role and the role of governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations that will be coordinated by, and that will collaborate on, the offender reentry strategy of the applicant, and certifies the involvement of such agencies and organizations;

''(C) describes the evidence-based methodology and outcome measures that will be used to evaluate the program funded with a grant under this subsection, and specifically explains how such measurements will provide valid measures of the impact of that program; and

''(D) describes how the project could be broadly replicated if demonstrated to be effective.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Attorney General may make a grant to an applicant under this subsection only if the application—

''(A) reflects explicit support of the chief executive officer, or their designee, of the State, unit of local government, territory, or

Indian tribe applying for a grant under this subsection;

''(B) provides extensive discussion of the role of Federal corrections, State corrections departments, community corrections agencies, juvenile justice systems, and tribal or local jail systems in ensuring successful reentry of offenders into their communities;

''(C) provides extensive evidence of collaboration with State and local government agencies overseeing health, housing, child welfare, education, substance abuse, victims services, and employment services, and with local law enforcement agencies;

''(D) provides a plan for analysis of the statutory, regulatory, rules-based, and practice-based hurdles to reintegration of offenders into the community;

''(E) includes the use of a State, local, territorial, or tribal task force, described in subsection (i), to carry out the activities funded under the grant;

''(F) provides a plan for continued collaboration with a local evaluator as necessary to meeting the requirements under subsection (h); and

''(G) demonstrates that the applicant participated in the planning grant process or engaged in comparable planning for the reentry project.

''(3) PRIORITY CONSIDERATIONS.—The Attorney General shall give priority to grant applications under this subsection that best—

''(A) focus initiative on geographic areas with a disproportionate population of offenders released from prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities;

''(B) include—

''(i) input from nonprofit organizations, in any case where relevant input is available and appropriate to the grant application;

''(ii) consultation with crime victims and offenders who are released from prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities;

''(iii) coordination with families of offenders;

''(iv) input, where appropriate, from the juvenile justice coordinating council of the region;

''(v) input, where appropriate, from the reentry coordinating council of the region; and

''(vi) other interested persons, as appropriate;

''(C) demonstrate effective case assessment and management abilities in order to provide comprehensive and continuous reentry, including—

''(i) planning for prerelease transitional housing and community release that begins upon admission for juveniles and jail inmates, and, as appropriate, for prison inmates, depending on the length of the sentence;

''(ii) establishing prerelease planning procedures to ensure that the eligibility of an offender for Federal, tribal, or State benefits upon release is established prior to release, subject to any limitations in law, and to ensure that offenders obtain all necessary referrals for reentry services, including assistance identifying and securing suitable housing; and

''(iii) delivery of continuous and appropriate mental health services, drug treatment, medical care, job training and placement, educational services, vocational services, and any other service or support needed for reentry;

''(D) review the process by which the applicant adjudicates violations of parole, probation, or supervision following release from prison, jail, or a juvenile facility, taking into account public safety and the use of graduated, community-based sanctions for minor and technical violations of parole, probation, or supervision (specifically those violations that are not otherwise, and independently, a violation of law);

''(E) provide for an independent evaluation of reentry programs that include, to the maximum extent possible, random assignment and controlled studies to determine the effectiveness of such programs;

''(F) target moderate and high-risk offenders for reentry programs through validated assessment tools; and

''(G) target offenders with histories of homelessness, substance abuse, or mental illness, including a prerelease assessment of the housing status of the offender and behavioral health needs of the offender with clear coordination with mental health, substance abuse, and homelessness services systems to achieve stable and permanent housing outcomes with appropriate support service.

''(4) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant made under this subsection may not be more than $925,000.

''(5) PERIOD OF GRANT.—A grant made under this subsection shall be effective for a 2-year period—

''(A) beginning on the date on which the planning grant awarded under subsection (e) concludes; or

''(B) in the case of an implementation grant awarded to an eligible entity that did not receive a planning grant, beginning on the date on which the implementation grant is awarded.'';

(4) in subsection (h)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(B) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving financial assistance under subsection (f), each application shall develop a comprehensive reentry strategic plan that—

''(A) contains a plan to assess inmate reentry needs and measurable annual and 3-year performance outcomes;

''(B) uses, to the maximum extent possible, randomly assigned and controlled studies, or rigorous quasi-experimental studies with matched comparison groups, to determine the effectiveness of the program funded with a grant under subsection (f); and

''(C) includes as a goal of the plan to reduce the rate of recidivism for offenders released from prison, jail or a juvenile facility with funds made available under subsection (f).

''(2) LOCAL EVALUATOR.—A partnership with a local evaluator described in subsection (d)(2) shall require the local evaluator to use the baseline data and target population characteristics developed under a subsection (e) planning grant to derive a feasible and meaningful target goal for recidivism reduction during the 3-year period beginning on the date of implementation of the program.'';

(5) in subsection (i)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''under this section'' and inserting ''under subsection (f)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''subsection (e)(4)'' and inserting ''subsection (f)(2)(D)'';

(6) in subsection (j)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''for an implementation grant under subsection (f)'' after ''applicant'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (E), by inserting '', where appropriate'' after ''support''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (F), (G), and (H), and inserting the following:

''(F) increased number of staff trained to administer reentry services;

''(G) increased proportion of individuals served by the program among those eligible to receive services;

''(H) increased number of individuals receiving risk screening needs assessment, and case planning services;

''(I) increased enrollment in, and completion of treatment services, including substance abuse and mental health services among those assessed as needing such services;

''(J) increased enrollment in and degrees earned from educational programs, including high school, GED, vocational training, and college education;

''(K) increased number of individuals obtaining and retaining employment;

''(L) increased number of individuals obtaining and maintaining housing;

''(M) increased self-reports of successful community living, including stability of living situation and positive family relationships;

''(N) reduction in drug and alcohol use; and

''(O) reduction in recidivism rates for individuals receiving reentry services after release, as compared to either baseline recidivism rates in the jurisdiction of the grantee or recidivism rates of the control or comparison group.'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''facilities.'' and inserting ''facilities, including a cost-benefit analysis to determine the cost effectiveness of the reentry program.'';

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''subsection (f)''; and

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''subsection (f)'';

(7) in subsection (k)(1), by striking ''this section'' each place the term appears and inserting ''subsection (f)'';

(8) in subsection (l)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''beginning on the date on which the most recent implementation grant is made to the grantee under subsection (f)'' after ''2-year period''; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''over a 2-year period'' and inserting ''during the 2-year period described in paragraph (2)'';

(9) in subsection (o)(1), by striking ''appropriated'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''appropriated $35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''; and

(10) by adding at the end the following:

''(p) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'reentry court' means a program that—

''(1) monitors juvenile and adult eligible offenders reentering the community;

''(2) provides continual judicial supervision;

''(3) provides juvenile and adult eligible offenders reentering the community with coordinated and comprehensive reentry services and programs, such as—

''(A) drug and alcohol testing and assessment for treatment;

''(B) assessment for substance abuse from a substance abuse professional who is approved by the State or Indian tribe and licensed by the appropriate entity to provide alcohol and drug addiction treatment, as appropriate;

''(C) substance abuse treatment from a provider that is approved by the State or Indian tribe, and licensed, if necessary, to provide medical and other health services;

''(D) health (including mental health) services and assessment;

''(E) aftercare and case management services that—

''(i) facilitate access to clinical care and related health services; and

''(ii) coordinate with such clinical care and related health services; and

''(F) any other services needed for reentry;

''(4) convenes community impact panels, victim impact panels, or victim impact educational classes;

''(5) provides and coordinates the delivery of community services to juvenile and adult eligible offenders, including—

''(A) housing assistance;

''(B) education;

''(C) job training;

''(D) conflict resolution skills training;

''(E) batterer intervention programs; and

''(F) other appropriate social services; and

''(6) establishes and implements graduated sanctions and incentives.''.

(b) GRANTS FOR FAMILY-BASED SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.—Part DD of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797s et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2921 (42 U.S.C. 3797s), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''nonprofit organizations,'' before ''and Indian'';

(2) in section 2923 (42 U.S.C. 3797s–2), by adding at the end the following:

''(c) PRIORITY CONSIDERATIONS.—The Attorney General shall give priority consideration to grant applications for grants under section 2921 that are submitted by a nonprofit organization that demonstrates a relationship with State and local criminal justice agencies, including—

''(1) within the judiciary and prosecutorial agencies; or

''(2) with the local corrections agencies, which shall be documented by a written agreement that details the terms of access to facilities and participants and provides information on the history of the organization of working with correctional populations.''; and

(3) by striking section 2926(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797s–5(a)), and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(c) GRANT PROGRAM TO EVALUATE AND IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL METHODS AT PRISONS, JAILS, AND JUVENILE FACILITIES.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating part KK (42 U.S.C. 3797ee et seq.) as part LL;

(2) by redesignating the second part designated as part JJ, as added by the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–199; 122 Stat. 677), relating to grants to evaluate and improve educational methods, as part KK;

(3) by redesignating the second section designated as section 3001 and section 3002 (42 U.S.C. 3797dd and 3797dd–1), as added by the Second Chance Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–199; 122 Stat. 677), relating to grants to evaluate and improve educational methods, as sections 3005 and 3006, respectively;

(4) in section 3005, as so redesignated—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) implement methods to improve academic and vocational education for offenders in prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities consistent with the best practices identified in subsection (c).'';

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(C) by inserting after subsection (b), the following:

''(c) BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Second Chance Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Attorney General shall identify and publish best practices relating to academic and vocational education for offenders in prisons, jails, and juvenile facilities. The best practices shall consider the evaluations performed and recommendations made under grants made under subsection (a) before the date of enactment of the Second Chance Reauthorization Act of 2013.''; and

(5) in section 3006, as so redesignated, by striking ''to carry'' and all that follows through ''2010'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 for grants for purposes described in section 3005(a)(4)''.

(d) CAREERS TRAINING DEMONSTRATION GRANTS.—Section 115 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17511) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''and Indian'' and inserting ''nonprofit organizations, and Indian''; and

(B) by striking ''technology career training to prisoners'' and inserting ''career training, including subsidized employment, when part of a training program, to prisoners and reentering youth and adults'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''technology careers training'';

(B) by striking ''technology-based''; and

(C) by inserting '', as well as upon transition and reentry into the community'' after ''facility'';

(3) by striking subsections (c) and (e);

(4) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—Priority consideration shall be given to any application under this section that—

''(1) provides assessment of local demand for employees in the geographic areas to which offenders are likely to return;

''(2) conducts individualized reentry career planning upon the start of incarceration or post-release employment planning for each offender served under the grant;

''(3) demonstrates connections to employers within the local community; or

''(4) tracks and monitors employment outcomes.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.''.

(e) OFFENDER REENTRY SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE COLLABORATION PROGRAM.—Section 201(f)(1) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17521(f)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(f) COMMUNITY-BASED MENTORING AND TRANSITIONAL SERVICE GRANTS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 211 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17531) is amended—

(A) in the header, by striking ''**MENTORING GRANTS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS**'' and inserting ''**COMMUNITY-BASED MENTORING AND TRANSITIONAL SERVICE GRANTS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS**'';

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''mentoring and other'';

(C) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) transitional services to assist in the reintegration of offenders into the community, including—

''(A) educational, literacy, and vocational, services and the Transitional Jobs strategy;

''(B) substance abuse treatment and services;

''(C) coordinated supervision and comprehensive services for offenders, including housing and mental and physical health care;

''(D) family services; and

''(E) validated assessment tools to assess the risk factors of returning inmates; and''; and

(D) in subsection (f), by striking ''this section'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''this section $15,000,000 for fiscal years 2014 through 2018.''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17501 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 211 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 211. Community-based mentoring and transitional service grants.''.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17502) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act—

''(1) the term 'exoneree' means an individual who—

''(A) has been convicted of a Federal, tribal, or State offense that is punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 1 year;

''(B) has served a term of imprisonment for not less than 6 months in a Federal, tribal, or State prison or correctional facility as a result of the conviction described in subparagraph (A); and

''(C) has been determined to be factually innocent of the offense described in subparagraph (A);

''(2) the term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given in section 901 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3791);

''(3) the term 'offender' includes an exoneree; and

''(4) the term 'Transitional Jobs strategy' means an employment strategy for youth and adults who are chronically unemployed or those that have barriers to employment that—

''(A) is conducted by State, tribal, and local governments, State, tribal, and local workforce boards, and nonprofit organizations;

''(B) provides time-limited employment using individual placements, team placements, and social enterprise placements, without displacing existing employees;

''(C) pays wages in accordance with applicable law, but in no event less than the higher of the rate specified in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) or the applicable State or local minimum wage law, which are subsidized, in whole or in part, by public funds;

''(D) combines time-limited employment with activities that promote skill development, remove barriers to employment, and lead to unsubsidized employment such as a thorough orientation and individual assessment, job readiness and life skills training, case management and supportive services, adult education and training, child support-related services, job retention support and incentives, and other similar activities;

''(E) places participants into unsubsidized employment; and

''(F) provides job retention, re-employment services, and continuing and vocational education to ensure continuing participation in unsubsidized employment and identification of opportunities for advancement.''.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17501 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 4 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 4. Definitions.''.

(h) EXTENSION OF THE LENGTH OF SECTION 2976 GRANTS.—Section 6(1) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17504(1)) is amended by inserting ''or under section 2976 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w)'' after ''and 212''.

SEC. 3. AUDIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF GRANTEES.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''unresolved audit finding'' means an audit

report finding or recommendation that a grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved during a 1-year period beginning on the date of an initial notification of the finding or recommendation.

(b) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in fiscal year 2013, and every 3 years thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct an audit of not less than 5 percent of all grantees that are awarded funding under—

(1) section 2976(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w(b));

(2) part CC of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797q et seq.), as amended by this Act;

(3) part DD of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797s et seq.);

(4) part JJ of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797dd et seq.); or

(5) section 115, 201, or 211 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17511, 17521, and 17531).

(c) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A grantee that is found to have an unresolved audit finding under an audit conducted under subsection (b) may not receive grant funds under the grant programs described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b) in the fiscal year following the fiscal year to which the finding relates.

(d) PRIORITY OF GRANT AWARDS.—The Attorney General, in awarding grants under the programs described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b) shall give priority to eligible entities that during the 2-year period preceding the application for a grant have not been found to have an unresolved audit finding.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL REENTRY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) RESPONSIBLE REINTEGRATION OF OFFENDERS.—Section 212 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17532) is repealed.

(b) FEDERAL PRISONER REENTRY INITIATIVE.—Section 231 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17541) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''carried out during fiscal years 2009 and 2010'' and inserting ''carried out during fiscal years 2014 through 2018''; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''65 years'' and inserting ''60 years''; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking ''or 75 percent'' and inserting ''or ⅔'';

(2) by striking subsection (h);

(3) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (h); and

(4) in subsection (h), as so redesignated, by striking ''2009 and 2010'' and inserting ''2014 through 2018''.

(c) ENHANCING REPORTING REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS.—Section 3624(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), in the second sentence, by inserting '', and number of prisoners not being placed in community corrections facilities for each reason set forth'' before '', and any other information''; and

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking ''the Second Chance Act of 2007'' and inserting ''the Second Chance Reauthorization Act of 2013''.

(d) TERMINATION OF STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF DEPOT NALTREXONE FOR HEROIN ADDICTION.—Section 244 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17554) is repealed.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESEARCH.—Section 245 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17555) is amended—

(1) by striking ''243, and 244'' and inserting ''and 243''; and

(2) by striking ''$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 and 2010'' and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018''.

(f) FEDERAL PRISONER RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PROGRAMMING ENHANCEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3621 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) PARTNERSHIPS TO EXPAND ACCESS TO REENTRY PROGRAMS PROVEN TO REDUCE RECIDIVISM.—

''(1) DEFINITION.—The term 'demonstrated to reduce recidivism' means that the Director of Bureau of Prisons has determined that appropriate research has been conducted and has validated the effectiveness of the type of program on recidivism.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PARTNERSHIP.—A faith-based or community-based nonprofit organization that provides mentoring or other programs that have been demonstrated to reduce recidivism is eligible to enter into a recidivism reduction partnership with a prison or community-based facility operated by the Bureau of Prisons.

''(3) RECIDIVISM REDUCTION PARTNERSHIPS.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall develop policies to require wardens of prisons and community-based facilities to enter into recidivism reduction partnerships with faith-based and community-based nonprofit organizations that are willing to provide, on a volunteer basis, programs described in paragraph (2).

''(4) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall submit to Congress an annual report on the last day of each fiscal year that—

''(A) details, for each prison and community-based facility for the fiscal year just ended—

''(i) the number of recidivism reduction partnerships under this section that were in effect;

''(ii) the number of volunteers that provided recidivism reduction programming; and

''(iii) the number of recidivism reduction programming hours provided; and

''(B) explains any disparities between facilities in the numbers reported under subparagraph (A).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) REPEALS.—

(1) Section 2978 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w–2) is repealed.

(2) Part CC of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797q et seq.) is repealed.

SEC. 5. TASK FORCE ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES RELATING TO REENTRY OF OFFENDERS.

(a) TASK FORCE REQUIRED.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the heads of such other agencies of the Federal Government as the Attorney General considers appropriate, and in collaboration with interested persons, service providers, nonprofit organizations, States, tribal, and local governments, shall establish an interagency task force on Federal programs and activities relating to the reentry of offenders into the community (referred to in this section as the ''Task Force'').

(b) DUTIES.—The Task Force shall—

(1) identify such programs and activities that may be resulting in overlap or duplication of services, the scope of such overlap or duplication, and the relationship of such overlap and duplication to public safety, public health, and effectiveness and efficiency;

(2) identify methods to improve collaboration and coordination of such programs and activities;

(3) identify areas of responsibility in which improved collaboration and coordination of such programs and activities would result in increased effectiveness or efficiency;

(4) develop innovative interagency or intergovernmental programs, activities, or procedures that would improve outcomes of reentering offenders and children of offenders;

(5) develop methods for increasing regular communication among agencies that would increase interagency program effectiveness;

(6) identify areas of research that can be coordinated across agencies with an emphasis on applying evidence-based practices to support, treatment, and intervention programs for reentering offenders;

(7) identify funding areas that should be coordinated across agencies and any gaps in funding; and

(8) in collaboration with the National Adult and Juvenile Offender Reentry Resources Center, identify successful programs currently operating and collect best practices in offender reentry from demonstration grantees and other agencies and organizations, determine the extent to which such programs and practices can be replicated, and make information on such programs and practices available to States, localities, nonprofit organizations, and others.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Task Force shall submit a report, including recommendations, to Congress on barriers to reentry.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall identify Federal and other barriers to successful reentry of offenders into the community and analyze the effects of such barriers on offenders and on children and other family members of offenders, including—

(A) admissions and evictions from Federal housing programs;

(B) child support obligations and procedures;

(C) Social Security benefits, veterans benefits, food stamps, and other forms of Federal public assistance;

(D) Medicaid Program and Medicare Program procedures, requirements, regulations, and guidelines;

(E) education programs, financial assistance, and full civic participation;

(F) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program funding criteria and other welfare benefits;

(G) employment and training;

(H) reentry procedures, case planning, and transitions of persons from the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons to a Federal parole or probation program or community corrections;

(I) laws, regulations, rules, and practices that may require a parolee to return to the same county that they were living in before their arrest and therefore prevent offenders from changing their setting upon release; and

(J) trying to establish pre-release planning procedures for prisoners to ensure that a prisoner's eligibility for Federal or State benefits (including Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security and veterans benefits) upon release is established prior to release, subject

to any limitations in law, and to ensure that prisoners are provided with referrals to appropriate social and health services or are referred to appropriate nonprofit organizations.

(d) UPDATED REPORTS.—On an annual basis, the Task Force shall submit to Congress an updated report on the activities of the Task Force, including specific recommendations on issues described in subsections (b) and (c).

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1694

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 ''Hearing Aid Assistance Tax Credit Act''.

SEC. 2. CREDIT FOR HEARING AIDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25D the following new section:

''SEC. 25E. CREDIT FOR HEARING AIDS.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter an amount equal to the amount paid during the taxable year, not compensated by insurance or otherwise, by the taxpayer for the purchase of any qualified hearing aid.

''(b) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount allowed as a credit under subsection (a) shall not exceed $500 per qualified hearing aid.

''(c) QUALIFIED HEARING AID.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified hearing aid' means a hearing aid—

''(1) which is described in sections 874.3300 and 874.3305 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, and is authorized under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for commercial distribution, and

''(2) which is intended for use—

''(A) by the taxpayer, or

''(B) by an individual with respect to whom the taxpayer, for the taxable year, is allowed a deduction under section 151(c) (relating to deduction for personal exemptions for dependents).

''(d) ELECTION ONCE EVERY 5 YEARS.—This section shall apply with respect to any individual for any taxable year only if there is an election in effect with respect to such individual (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe) to have this section apply for such taxable year. An election to have this section apply with respect to any individual may not be made for any taxable year if such an election is in effect with respect to such individual for any of the 4 taxable years preceding such taxable year.

''(e) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) for any expense for which a deduction or credit is allowed under any other provision of this chapter.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25D the following new item:

''Sec. 25E. Credit for hearing aids.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1698. A bill to provide for the establishment of clean technology consortia to enhance the economic, environmental, and energy security of the United States by promoting domestic development, manufacture, and deployment of clean technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Consortia-Led Energy and Advanced Manufacturing Networks Act.

For more than a century, America's innovation community has been the foundation of our high-tech economy and generated broad-based growth to support a strong middle class. While our innovators remain the best in the world, we have seen a disturbing trend in recent years. When it comes to moving innovations out of the lab and into the factory, we are getting beat. Breakthroughs achieved in U.S. research universities and laboratories are all too often being commercialized and manufactured overseas. As recent research by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and others has demonstrated, innovation and production are closely related. When manufacturing facilities move overseas, we lose more than just those manufacturing jobs. We can lose our ability to continue to innovate in that industry and lose our hold on those jobs forever.

At the same time, we have some industries in the United States dominated by deeply entrenched companies that are resistant to innovation or adaptation of century-old business models. In those sectors, we need to look at ways of partnering with our innovators on proof-of-concept and demonstration projects so that more breakthroughs can bridge the so-called ''Valley of Death'' between the lab bench and commercialization of a new technology. That will ensure that innovative and potentially disruptive technologies can actually reach the market, and provide badly needed competition in industries where incumbents may be failing to innovate. This is what my legislation is intended to address.

In order to reach their full market potential, scientific breakthroughs must be translated into commercial applications, demonstrated, connected to appropriate markets, and scaled up. The bill I am introducing today would fertilize America's innovation ecosystems by making available $100 million to 6 or more consortia to support these types of activities and help shepherd innovations through the commercialization process. Consortia could include a mix of research universities, large and small companies, national laboratories, venture capital, and state and nonprofit entities with expertise in technology commercialization. The bill includes rigorous cost-share requirements to ensure that taxpayers are only partnering on the best ideas in which the private sector also has significant capital committed.

We have seen the benefits of regional innovation ecosystems in places like Silicon Valley; Boston, Cambridge and the Route 128 Corridor; the Research Triangle in North Carolina; Austin, TX; and elsewhere. The geographic proximity of institutions in these areas improves the flow of information between scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs, and it facilitates the sharing of skilled human resources and facilities. Most critically when it comes to commercializing innovations, these regions have demonstrated a unique ability to pull investor capital off the sidelines and channel it into new production. We need to bolster these existing ecosystems and help nurture new ones.

America's universities and research institutions are truly national treasures. Our venture capitalists and entrepreneurs are the sharpest in the world. When we sprinkle the right mix of scientific brain power and capitalist drive, we get something uniquely American and extremely potent.

This legislation will help link inventors with investors, professors with producers, and get technologies out of laboratories and into factories. It provides the type of responsible and forward-looking partnership that we need with the private sector right now. This legislation builds on provisions I included in both the Waxman-Markey bill and the America COMPETES reauthorization, bills that passed the U.S. House of Representatives in 2009 and 2010, respectively.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 292—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE TYPHOON IN THE PHILIPPINES AND THE SURROUNDING REGION

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 292

Whereas on November 8, 2013, Typhoon Yolanda, also known as Typhoon Haiyan, struck the Republic of the Philippines and the surrounding region;

Whereas Typhoon Yolanda is the strongest typhoon in recorded history to make landfall;

Whereas President Benigno Aquino III declared a state of national calamity after Typhoon Yolanda hit the central Philippines;

Whereas the typhoon caused widespread flooding and landslides, particularly in the provinces of Eastern Samar and Leyte, which experienced storm surges of up to 13

feet and sustained winds of more than 175 miles per hour;

Whereas authorities in the Philippines have confirmed at least 1,798 deaths, a toll that is expected to rise as thousands of individuals remain missing as of the date of this resolution;

Whereas unofficial estimates project the number of deaths to be over 10,000;

Whereas, according to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, more than 670,000 people have been displaced and 11,300,000 people have been affected by Typhoon Yolanda;

Whereas, according to the Philippine National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council, the typhoon destroyed or damaged approximately 149,015 houses, as well as public infrastructure and agricultural land across 41 provinces;

Whereas, in Ormoc City, the second largest city in the province of Leyte, the typhoon damaged or destroyed approximately 80 to 90 percent of housing;

Whereas the United Nations World Food Program estimates that 2,500,000 people will need food assistance in the aftermath of the typhoon;

Whereas the Government of the Philippines has been leading and coordinating the disaster response in the Philippines, including the evacuation of more than 792,000 people to temporary shelters and pre-positioning food commodities and emergency relief supplies in advance of the typhoon, and deploying military assets and road-clearing equipment to assist with relief operations;

Whereas the response by the United States Government to this tragedy has included $20,000,000 in aid;

Whereas a United States Agency for International Development Disaster Assistance Response Team, elements of the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Brigade, and other United States military and civilian personnel have deployed to the Philippines to provide aid and coordinate United States relief efforts;

Whereas the Philippines and the United States fought side-by-side during World War II to defend the Bataan Peninsula and subsequently liberate the Philippines from Japanese control;

Whereas the Philippines and the United States share a long, close relationship as allies, as evidenced by the 1951 U.S.-Philippines Mutual Defense Treaty, which was reaffirmed by the Manila Declaration signed in 2011, and the United States designation of the Philippines as a Major Non-NATO Ally;

Whereas the Philippines and the United States share strong economic, security, and people-to-people ties, including approximately 4,000,000 Americans of Philippine ancestry living in the United States, and more than 300,000 United States citizens residing in the Philippines; and

Whereas the Philippines and the United States share a long tradition of mutual support and cooperation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) mourns the loss of life resulting from the typhoon;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the families of the victims of this tragedy;

(3) expresses solidarity with the survivors, and all those who have lost loved ones or otherwise been affected by the tragedy;

(4) supports the efforts of the Government of the Philippines to lead and coordinate assistance to address immediate humanitarian needs and to begin reconstruction efforts;

(5) supports the ongoing efforts of the United States Government, the international community, relief agencies, and private citizens to assist the governments and peoples of the Philippines and the surrounding region in their time of need; and

(6) encourages the United States and the international community to provide additional humanitarian assistance to aid the survivors and support reconstruction efforts, as appropriate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 293—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2013, AS ''NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK''

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. THUNE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 293

Whereas there are 37 tribal colleges and universities operating on more than 75 campuses in 15 States;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities are tribally or Federally chartered institutions of higher education and therefore have a unique relationship with the Federal Government;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities serve students from more than 250 Federally recognized Indian tribes;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities offer students access to knowledge and skills grounded in cultural traditions and values, including indigenous languages, which enhance Indian communities and enrich the United States as a whole;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities provide access to quality higher education opportunities for American Indians, Alaska Natives, and other individuals living in some of the most isolated and economically depressed areas in the United States;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities are accredited institutions of higher education that effectively prepare students to succeed in a global and highly competitive workforce;

Whereas open enrollment policies have resulted in non-Indians constituting nearly one-fifth of the students at tribal colleges and universities;

Whereas tribal colleges and universities are effectively providing access to quality higher education opportunities to residents of reservation communities and the North Slope of Alaska; and

Whereas the mission and achievements of tribal colleges and universities deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on November 18, 2013, as ''National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week''; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for tribal colleges and universities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 294—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOALS OF NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY AND NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH BY PROMOTING NATIONAL AWARENESS OF ADOPTION AND THE CHILDREN AWAITING FAMILIES, CELEBRATING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES INVOLVED IN ADOPTION, AND ENCOURAGING THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES TO SECURE SAFETY, PERMANENCY, AND WELL-BEING FOR ALL CHILDREN

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KING, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 294

Whereas there are millions of unparented children in the world, including 399,546 children in the foster care system in the United States, approximately 102,000 of whom are waiting for families to adopt them;

Whereas 60 percent of the children in foster care in the United States are age 10 or younger;

Whereas the average length of time a child spends in foster care is approximately 2 years;

Whereas for many foster children, the wait for a loving family in which they are nurtured, comforted, and protected seems endless;

Whereas in 2012, nearly 26,000 youth ''aged out'' of foster care by reaching adulthood without being placed in a permanent home;

Whereas every day, loving and nurturing families are strengthened and expanded when committed and dedicated individuals make an important difference in the life of a child through adoption;

Whereas a 2007 survey conducted by the Dave Thomas Foundation for Adoption demonstrated that although ''Americans overwhelmingly support the concept of adoption, and in particular foster care adoption . . . foster care adoptions have not increased significantly over the past five years'';

Whereas while 4 in 10 Americans have considered adoption, a majority of Americans have misperceptions about the process of adopting children from foster care and the children who are eligible for adoption;

Whereas 50 percent of Americans believe that children enter the foster care system because of juvenile delinquency, when in reality the vast majority of children who have entered the foster care system were victims of neglect, abandonment, or abuse;

Whereas 39 percent of Americans believe that foster care adoption is expensive, when in reality there is no substantial cost for adopting from foster care and financial support is available to adoptive parents after the adoption is finalized;

Whereas family reunification, kinship care, and domestic and inter-county adoption promote permanency and stability to a far greater degree than long-term institutionalization and long-term, often disrupted foster care;

Whereas both National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month occur in the month of November;

Whereas National Adoption Day is a collective national effort to find permanent, loving

families for children in the foster care system;

Whereas since the first National Adoption Day in 2000, nearly 45,000 children have joined forever families during National Adoption Day;

Whereas in 2012, a total of 390 events were held in 47 States and the District of Columbia, finalizing the adoptions of 4,615 children from foster care and celebrating an additional 500 adoptions finalized during November or earlier in the year; and

Whereas the President traditionally issues an annual proclamation to declare the month of November as National Adoption Month, and National Adoption Day is on November 23, 2013: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month;

(2) recognizes that every child should have a permanent and loving family; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to consider adoption during the month of November and all throughout the year.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 25—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE CEREMONY TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO NATIVE AMERICAN CODE TALKERS

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 25

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR GOLD MEDAL CEREMONY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN CODE TALKERS.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on November 20, 2013, for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2024. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3204, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2025. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2026. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2027. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2028. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2029. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2030. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2031. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2024. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3204, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. TRANSPARENCY OF COVERAGE DETERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives and the Financial Clerk of the Senate shall make publically available the determinations of each member of the House of Representatives and each Senator, as the case may be, regarding the designation of their respective congressional staff (including leadership and committee staff) as ''official'' for purposes of requiring such staff to enroll in health insurance coverage provided through an Exchange as required under section 1312(d)(1)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(1)(D)), and the regulations relating to such section.

(b) FAILURE TO SUBMIT.—The failure by any member of the House of Representatives or Senator to designate any of their respective staff, whether committee or leadership staff, as ''official'' (as described in subsection (a)), shall be noted in the determination made publically available under subsection (a) along with a statement that such failure permits the staff involved to remain in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program.

(c) PRIVACY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit the release of any individually identifiable information concerning any individual, including any health plan selected by an individual.

SA 2025. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 130, beginning on line 3, strike ''**SKILLS AND TRAINING REQUIRED FOR CIVILIAN CERTIFICATIONS AND LICENSES**'' and insert ''**ELIGIBILITY, SKILLS, AND TRAINING REQUIRED FOR CIVILIAN CERTIFICATIONS, CREDENTIALS, AND LICENSES**''.

On page 130, line 19, strike ''skills and training'' and insert ''eligibility, skills, and training''.

On page 131, line 11, insert ''eligibility and'' after ''including''.

On page 132, line 15, insert ''in connection with military occupational specialites'' before the period.

SA 2026. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1003. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REPORTING ON THE LONG-TERM BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the reductions in discretionary appropriations and direct spending accounts under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) (in this section referred to as ''sequestration'') were never intended to take effect;

(2) the readiness of the Nation's military is weakened by sequestration;

(3) sequestration has budgetary and cost impacts beyond the programmatic level; and

(4) there is limited information about these indirect costs to the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Office of Management and Budget should establish a task force to report on the long-term budgetary costs and effects of sequestration, including on procurement activities and contracts with the Federal Government.

SA 2027. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CHAMBLISS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1032.

SA 2028. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1033 and insert the following:

SEC. 1033. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR THE TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2014 may

be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after January 20, 2009, at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SA 2029. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1031 and insert the following:

SEC. 1031. REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATIONS RELATING TO THE TRANSFER OF DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND OTHER FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED PRIOR TO TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may not use any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014 to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity unless the Secretary submits to Congress the certification described in subsection (b) not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this subsection is a written certification made by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, that—

(1) the government of the foreign country or the recognized leadership of the foreign entity to which the individual detained at Guantanamo is to be transferred—

(A) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(B) maintains control over each detention facility in which the individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(C) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(D) has taken or agreed to take effective actions to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(E) has taken or agreed to take such actions as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity; and

(F) has agreed to share with the United States any information that—

(i) is related to the individual or any associates of the individual; and

(ii) could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies; and

(2) includes an assessment, in classified or unclassified form, of the capacity, willingness, and past practices (if applicable) of the foreign country or entity in relation to the Secretary's certifications.

(c) PROHIBITION IN CASES OF PRIOR CONFIRMED RECIDIVISM.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may not use any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to the custody or control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual who was detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, at any time after September 11, 2001, who was transferred to such foreign country or entity and subsequently engaged in any terrorist activity.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any action taken by the Secretary to transfer any individual detained at Guantanamo to effectuate an order affecting the disposition of the individual that is issued by a court or competent tribunal of the United States having lawful jurisdiction (which the Secretary shall notify Congress of promptly after issuance).

(d) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability to a detainee transfer of a certification requirement specified in subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), or the prohibition in subsection (c), if the Secretary certifies the rest of the criteria required by subsection (b) for transfers prohibited by (c) and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, determines that—

(A) alternative actions will be taken to address the underlying purpose of the requirement or requirements to be waived;

(B) in the case of a waiver of subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the paragraph to be waived have been completely eliminated, but the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate such risks with regard to the individual to be transferred;

(C) in the case of a waiver of subsection (c), the Secretary has considered any confirmed case in which an individual who was transferred to the country subsequently engaged in terrorist activity, and the actions to be taken under subparagraph (A) will substantially mitigate the risk of recidivism with regard to the individual to be transferred; and

(D) the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) REPORTS.—Whenever the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, not later than 30 days before the transfer of the individual concerned, the following:

(A) A copy of the determination and the waiver concerned.

(B) A statement of the basis for the determination, including—

(i) an explanation why the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States;

(ii) in the case of a waiver of paragraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1), an explanation why it is not possible to certify that the risks addressed in the paragraph to be waived have been completely eliminated; and

(iii) a classified summary of—

(I) the individual's record of cooperation while in the custody of or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; and

(II) the agreements and mechanisms in place to provide for continuing cooperation.

(C) A summary of the alternative actions to be taken to address the underlying purpose of, and to mitigate the risks addressed in, the paragraph or subsection to be waived.

(D) The assessment required by subsection (b)(2).

(e) RECORD OF COOPERATION.—In assessing the risk that an individual detained at Guantanamo will engage in terrorist activity or other actions that could affect the security of the United States if released for the purpose of making a certification under subsection (b) or a waiver under subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may give favorable consideration to any such individual—

(1) who has substantially cooperated with United States intelligence and law enforcement authorities, pursuant to a pre-trial agreement, while in the custody of or under the effective control of the Department of Defense; and

(2) for whom agreements and effective mechanisms are in place, to the extent relevant and necessary, to provide for continued cooperation with United States intelligence and law enforcement authorities.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(A) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is—

(i) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(ii) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(3) The term ''foreign terrorist organization'' means any organization so designated by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).

SA 2030. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1035. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 by this Act or any other Act may be used to construct or modify any

facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense unless authorized by Congress.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''individual detained at Guantanamo'' means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—

(A) the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

SA 2031. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1197, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 646. SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR GOLD STAR SPOUSES AND DEPENDENTS.

(a) GOLD STAR FAMILY ADVOCATES.—

(1) ADVOCATES REQUIRED.—Each Secretary of a military department shall designate for each Armed Force under the jurisdiction of such Secretary a member of such Armed Force or civilian employee of such military department to act as an advocate for spouses and dependents of members of such Armed Force (including members of the National Guard or Reserve of such Armed Force, as applicable) who die on active duty in the Armed Forces. The individual so designated shall be known as the ''Gold Star Advocate'' for the Armed Force concerned.

(2) DUTY AS OMBUDSMAN.—An individual designated as a Gold Star Advocate for an Armed Force pursuant to paragraph (1) shall serve as the ombudsman for spouses and dependents of members of such Armed Force who die on active duty in the Armed Forces with respect to complaints regarding casualty assistance or receipt of benefits authorized by law for spouses and dependents of members of the Armed Forces who die on active duty in the Armed Forces. In performing such duty, an individual may do the following:

(A) Address complaints by spouses and dependents, and provide support, regarding such casualty assistance or receipt of such benefits.

(B) Make reports to appropriate officers or officials in the Department of Defense or the military department concerned regarding resolution of such complaints, including recommendations regarding the settlement of claims with respect to such benefits, as appropriate.

(C) Perform such other actions as the Secretary of the military department concerned considers appropriate.

(b) TRAINING FOR CASUALTY ASSISTANCE PERSONNEL.—

(1) TRAINING PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall implement a standardized comprehensive training program on casualty assistance for the following personnel of the Department of Defense:

(A) Casualty assistance officers.

(B) Casualty assistance calls officers.

(C) Casualty assistance representatives.

(2) GENERAL ELEMENTS.—The training program required by paragraph (1) shall include training designed to ensure that the personnel specified in that paragraph provide spouses of members of the Armed Forces who die on active duty in the Armed Forces with accurate information on the benefits to which they are entitled and other appropriate casualty assistance following the death of such members on active duty.

(3) SERVICE-SPECIFIC ELEMENTS.—The Secretary of the military department concerned may, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, provide for the inclusion in the training program required by paragraph (1) that is provided to casualty assistance personnel of such military department such elements of training that are specific or unique to the requirements or particulars of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of such military department as the Secretary of the military department concerned considers appropriate.

(4) FREQUENCY OF TRAINING.—Training shall be provided under the program required by paragraph (1) not less often than annually.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 13, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''The Role of Manufacturing Hubs in a 21st Century Innovation Economy.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 13, 2013, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 13, 2013, at 2 p.m. in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Judicial Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 13, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office building to conduct a roundtable entitled ''Serving Our Service Members: A Review of Programs for Veteran Entrepreneurs.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVACY, TECHNOLOGY AND THE LAW

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 13, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Surveillance Transparency Act of 2013.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Teresa Danso-Danquah, Emily Flores, and Charles Hayes of my staff be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for my intern, Bruce Lehman, to have the privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer floor privileges to my staffer, Michael Inacay, for the remainder of the evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 293, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 293) designating the week beginning November 18, 2013 as ''National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BEGICH. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 293) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY AND NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed

to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 294, submitted earlier today by Senators LANDRIEU, INHOFE, and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 294) expressing support for the goals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the resolution.

Mr. BEGICH. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 294) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 25, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for activities associated with the ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BEGICH. I ask unanimous consent the concurrent resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2013

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 14, 2013, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 2 hours, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; and that following morning business, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the motion to proceed to H.R. 3204, the Pharmaceutical Drug Compounding bill; finally, that the Senate recess from 1 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BEGICH. The vote on adoption of the motion to proceed to the compounding bill is expected to be a voice vote.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BEGICH. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:03 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, November 14, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

TIMOTHY G. MASSAD, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2017, VICE GARY GENSLER, TERM EXPIRED.

TIMOTHY G. MASSAD, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION, VICE GARY GENSLER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARK GILBERT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF SAMOA.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. STEPHEN E. RADER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

COREY N. DOOLITTLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER W. ACOR
GIEORAG M. ANDREWS
BENJAMIN M. BEARMAN
CLAYTON C. BEAS
JEFFREY R. BERNHARDT
MATTHEW D. COLLINSWORTH
GREGORY M. COY
KIRK T. DELPH
THOMAS D. DOTSTRY
PAUL S. DUBOSE
PETER C. FLYNN
MICHELLE A. GIRE
JOSEPH GUNTA
DAVID C. HAERTEL
DANIEL W. HARKINS, JR.
MICHAEL S. HARTZELL
THOMAS H. HAWKINS
JAMES F. HOPP
JAMES J. IRRGANG, JR.
DANIEL T. JONES
JOHN D. KINMAN
MICHAEL J. KOS
FRANK J. MORALES
JASON R. PATTON
NATHAN J. PECK
BRIAN A. ROSS
MATTHEW N. RYAN
JEREMIAH S. SHUMWAY
CHRISTOPHER R. SMITH
JOSEPH P. SNELGROVE
THEODOSIUS SOILES II
EDWIN M. SPENCER
JASON W. SPRAY
JAMES A. STEELE
RYAN A. STEWART
ERIC F. STILES
ROBERT W. VILLANUEVA
AMANDA H. ZAWORA

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF MRS. RICHIE JEAN SHERROD JACKSON

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Richie Jean Sherrod Jackson, a phenomenal woman and beloved teacher, author, and civil rights activist who departed this life on Sunday November 10, 2013. For her dedicated service to the City of Selma and the State of Alabama, I pay tribute today to the life work of Mrs. Richie Jean Sherrod Jackson.

Mrs. Jackson was born August 30, 1932 the only child of the late John W. and Juanita Richardson Sherrod. Her early years were spent in York and Selma, Alabama.

Mrs. Jackson graduated from Cardoza High School in Washington, D.C. and completed her Bachelor's degree in Education from Alabama State University and Master's degree in Education from the University of Montevallo.

Mrs. Jackson was married to Dr. Sullivan Jackson and together made Selma, Alabama their home. To this union was born one child; Jawana Virginia Jackson to whom they were devoted.

In addition to her strong commitment to family, Mrs. Jackson in 1961 began a 30 year teaching career with Selma Public Schools serving as both a teacher to countless numbers of children and as an administrator with the school system.

Because of her family's dedication and allegiance to civic and social justice, the Jackson home on Lapsley Street became a focal point for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and other leaders as they planned the Selma to Montgomery Civil Rights March.

In 2011, Mrs. Jackson's book, The House by the Side of the Road: The Civil Rights Movement was published by The University of Alabama Press. The book detailed her personal memoirs reflecting on how her home in Selma served as the informal headquarters for Dr. King during the Civil Rights Movement. She and her husband Dr. Jackson were influential and prominent supporters of the movement. Dr. King and other national leaders, including Ralph David Abernathy and John Lewis, held strategy sessions at the Jackson house and also met with Assistant Attorney General John Doar to negotiate plans for the Selma to Montgomery march.

This firsthand account showed the heart of Dr. and Mrs. Richie Jean Jackson, and the pivotal role they played to carefully create a safe haven for civil rights leaders. They also courageously dealt with the challenges of living through events that would forever change America through the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Mrs. Jackson demonstrated an exemplary commitment to community and enjoyed membership in the Historic Brown Chapel AME Church; the Alabama State Dental Wives Auxiliary; Delta Sigma Theta Sorority and numerous civic and community endeavors in Selma, Alabama.

On a personal note, I will always remember Mrs. Jackson as my sixth grade teacher at Cedar Park Elementary School in Selma, Alabama. Mrs. Jackson was a gifted teacher and strict disciplinarian. She expected the best from her students and settled for nothing less. I am grateful to have her as a guiding influence in my life and I will cherish the memories of being in her class. Mrs. Jackson was also a longtime member of my home church, Btown Chapel where she would faithful sit in same pew each Sunday. I was always aware of the special role she and her home played in the civil rights movement but I believe one of her greatest gift is embodied in the hearts and minds of the many students she taught and mentored in her 30 year teaching career.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the life and legacy of Mrs. Richie Jean Sherrod Jackson. May we strive to emulate her servant heart and pay tribute to her distinguished humanitarian efforts and contributions to the betterment of society.

IN RECOGNITION OF FLAHERTY DRIVE

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the completion of the Flaherty Drive Project in New Bedford.

Greater New Bedford is a working city, constantly progressing and growing. The New Bedford Business Park allows local businesses to set up shop and participate in our community's—and nation's—economy. Of course, with emerging businesses, space is limited. When two million dollars were allocated to extend the park by 45 acres, an opportunity was given to new businesses, and existing businesses were given the opportunity to expand. The Flaherty Drive Extension has been completed by the Bourne Financial Development Corporation, and currently offers water, sewer, gas, electric, and telecommunication services to the New Bedford businesses looking to operate in the new section of the Business Park.

This project would not be possible without Bill Flaherty, the longtime Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Greater New Bedford Industrial Foundation's Executive Committee. He served on the Committee from 1987 until 2002. Mr. Flaherty passed away in 2003 at the age of 57 after a courageous battle with cancer. He is survived by his wife, Joan, and his daughters, Megan and Mary. At the Celebration of the Flaherty Drive Project, a memento of dedication to Mr. Flaherty will be presented to his family. It's essential to highlight the progression of local businesses, especially in the current economy. It is the hard work and dedication, as exhibited by Bill Flaherty, that allows for our country to advance and thrive economically.

Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pride to recognize the completion of the Flaherty Drive Project in New Bedford. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the importance of this newly expanded business park, the insurmountable role it will play in the lives of local business owners, and the devotion of Bill Flaherty in his work to better the City of New Bedford.

TRIBUTE TO LINDA BISIGNANO

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Linda Bisignano of Des Moines, Iowa who passed away on November 11th at age 64 following a long struggle with breast cancer.

Linda and her family have been a foundation of the Des Moines' culinary scene for more than half a century. In 1956, the Bisignano family opened the now renowned Chuck's Restaurant in Highland Park. Specializing in traditional, homemade Italian recipes, Chuck's has been an area favorite for its great service, atmosphere, food and live music.

Linda will fondly be remembered for her invaluable contributions not only to her cherished family business, but also to the community as a whole. Each year, ''Dinner at Chuck's'' provides a free Thanksgiving dinner to the area's homeless, seniors, families and shut-ins. Last year, nearly 3,500 meals were provided with 2,600 meals delivered to homes across the area.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who had the pleasure of witnessing Linda's hospitality firsthand can tell you she was a one-of-a-kind spirit who truly embodied the sense of community and strong work ethic that Iowans are known for. In her passing, we are reminded of her compassion and her dedication to excellence in doing what she loved. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in offering the Bisignano family my prayers and deepest sympathies during this difficult time.

KRISTEN MOLINARO, HAZLETON LIONS CLUB

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Past President Kristen Irene Molinaro of the Hazleton, Pennsylvania Lions Club.

Ms. Molinaro served as president of the Hazleton Lions Club from 2011 to 2013. Since its

founding, the Hazleton Lions Club has been extremely active within the community, completing numerous projects and making donations in support of many other organizations. In her time as president, the club donated $1,000 for a security camera in Hazleton and $5,000 to Lions International for Campaign Sight First. Other donations were made to a local Boy Scout troop, the Lions Beacon Lodge, Rails to Trails tree planting and the All American Girl Softball League. For her hard work Ms. Molarino was awarded the District 14W Lion of the Year 2012/2013.

Mr. Speaker, for her devotion to the Hazleton Lions Club and the improvement of our community, I commend Past President Kristen Irene Molinaro.

RECOGNIZING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF EAST PIKELAND TOWNSHIP, CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday November 13, 2013

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate East Pikeland Township, Chester County, Pennsylvania on the occasion of its 175th anniversary.

In 1705, William Penn granted 10,000 acres of Pennsylvania land to his friend and fellow Quaker, Joseph Pike of Kilcreagh farm, County Cork, Ireland. ''Pike's Land'' was the first name given to this acreage. By the end of the 18th century, the character of various portions of Pike's Land had become divergent from each other and so a division into the Townships of East Pikeland and West Pikeland was agreed upon to reflect these differences.

East Pikeland Township's rich history includes playing a key role in the Revolutionary War. During the ''Philadelphia Campaign'', East Pikeland's farms, mills and cottage industries were important sources of food and supplies for the Continental Army. The Continental Powder Mill at Rapps Dam on French Creek proved a key element in munitions supply as well.

Today, East Pikeland Township and its citizens continue to make invaluable contributions to the quality of the economic and social life of Chester County while, at the same time, preserving the rich and storied heritage of their past.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of its 175th anniversary, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing East Pikeland Township, Chester County, Pennsylvania, and its long and storied history.

IN HONOR OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF ZION MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the rich heritage of Zion Missionary Baptist Church whose members are celebrating its 150th anniversary. In 1863, shortly after President Abraham Lincoln gave the Emancipation Proclamation, thirty-six freedmen founded a church at the Pepperton Community in Jackson, Georgia. Since then, Zion Missionary Baptist Church has become a thriving fellowship, dedicated to ministry and service in the African-American community.

It is worth noting that before there were African-American mayors, governors, or even a president, Black churches, like Zion, thrived with leadership from African-American Sunday school teachers, deacons, and pastors. As with many churches, over the years the members of Zion were seen as community leaders, who helped mentor, educate, and counsel many in the Black community. Today, Zion serves not only as a place of worship, but as a people with a mission to serve as a source of encouragement, inspiration, and pride for members of the community for more than a century.

The 150 year history of Zion Missionary Baptist Church includes many pastors, challenges, and changes, but its unwavering commitment to being a place where the community gathers to help and support one another is to be commended. No matter the cause, event, or activity, God has used Zion to influence its community. Therefore, I close by asking you to support and pray for what God is doing at Zion Missionary Baptist Church. May it continue as a pillar of strength for the residents of Butts County for generations to come.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF THOMAS S. WILMETH

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Thomas S. Wilmeth whose work ethic, entrepreneurship, philanthropy, and commitment to education are a tribute to what makes this country great. Mr. Wilmeth, who celebrated his 100th birthday this year, lives in Daingerfield, Texas and describes himself as ''someone who always wanted to do something.'' He most certainly has.

Thomas Wilmeth was born October 2nd, 1913 in Indianapolis. While his father served in World War I in the U.S. Army, his grandmother and mother—both math teachers—began teaching him at an early age. Mr. Wilmeth attributes this early education to much of his success—it was through their tutelage that he was able to skip ahead three grades and graduate from Broad Ripple High School at age 15. At age 16, Mr. Wilmeth enrolled at Purdue University. While there, he was a member of Alpha Chi Rho, Tau Beta Pi, and Eta Kappa Nu. In 1935, at age 21, Mr. Wilmeth graduated magna cum laude with a degree in electrical engineering. In May of 2013, Purdue University awarded Mr. Wilmeth with an honorary doctorate for engineering information literacy.

In addition to a keen mathematical and analytical mind, from an early age Mr. Wilmeth also demonstrated particular business savvy. At age 10, he sold hot-roasted peanuts; at age 12, he sold strawberries; and at 15, he opened his own radio repair business. During his senior year at Purdue University, Mr. Wilmeth worked as business manager of the Purdue Yearbook, Debris, earning $1,100 in profit.

In 1949, Mr. Wilmeth combined his education and entrepreneurial ambitions and started Scot Industries, Inc. with his brother, Harvey. After exploring a number of different businesses and products, Scot Industries established itself as a metal honing business focused on increased efficiency, productivity, and affordability. Nearly 45 years later, their business has 10 locations nationwide, and Mr. Wilmeth continues to assist with the management and operation of Scot Industries.

Mr. Wilmeth has stated that his philosophy is ''to develop the ability to train and teach oneself to learn.'' His philosophy is lived out daily through his work ethic, and it is extended through charitable giving. He continues to donate to his alma mater, Purdue University, as well as the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Wilmeth was himself a Boy Scout who earned the rank of Eagle at the age of 15.

The hard work, dedication, and generosity Mr. Wilmeth lives by are an inspiration and should encourage all Americans. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Mr. Wilmeth a Happy 100th Birthday. I thank him for his entrepreneurial spirit that helps make our country great, and wish him continued health and happiness.

IN HONOR OF JOHN AND MARTHA MANILLA

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John and Martha Manilla. John and Martha have been married for 57 years. John served in World War II in the 8th Army Air Force in the European Theater. He flew 33 missions over France and Germany before returning home and beginning work with a construction company. He married Martha, a school teacher, in 1956 and started a family. John soon began his own construction company, with constant aid and support from Martha. Together they raised a family of four in Skaneateles, New York, a town John has called home for his lifetime. Martha taught in the Skaneateles Central Schools for 23 years, influencing the lives of hundreds of students. They are loving grandparents to 11 grandchildren, friends of many and a warm presence in the town they love. At 90 years old, John still participates in the Memorial Day parade and is an active veteran. They represent the best in America; pride in their nation, purposeful civic duty and a love for family and friends. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

CONGRESSWOMAN CELEBRATES DR. EDMUND GRAY, RECIPIENT OF THE 2013 SISTER PETER CLAVER AWARD

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Edmund Gray, recipient of the 2013 Providence Sacred Heart Medical Center's Sister Peter Claver Award.

In receiving this reward, Dr. Gray joins the ranks of many like himself who have gone out of their way to help and serve others, doing it humbly and without seeking recognition.

The Sister Peter Claver Award is given in honor of its namesake each year. Sister Peter Claver gave over twenty years of her life to the Sacred Heart Medical Center in Spokane, Washington. She led this institution by her example of charity, service, and integrity. Today, Dr. Ed Gray exemplifies the mission and message of Sister Peter Claver.

Dr. Gray became a rural family practice physician in 1953. Working at Providence Mount Carmel Hospital in Colville, he cared for outpatients, delivered babies, and performed surgery. During his five decades of practice, Dr. Gray served in regional and statewide leadership roles to improve sanitation, vaccination, and other public health policies that affect eastern Washington State.

Access to quality medical care was always a priority for Dr. Gray. He helped to develop the first Basic Health plan in Washington State. This plan expanded access to those who could not afford coverage.

He worked with the University of Washington to develop a rural medicine training track that would teach student physicians about the special health care needs of people living in rural communities. Dr. Gray was a role model for many physicians.

So today, I rise to acknowledge and thank Dr. Gray for his compassionate service to the citizens of eastern Washington. I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Ed Gray on receiving the ''Sister Peter Claver Award'' and in thanking him.

HONORING MS. SARA LOMAX-REESE

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Ms. Sara Lomax-Reese. A graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, Ms. Lomax-Reese is the President and General Manager of WURD Radio LLC, Pennsylvania's only African-American owned talk radio station.

Ms. Lomax-Reese is an accomplished journalist who has been widely published in The Miami Herald, The Philadelphia Inquirer, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Essence Magazine, American Visions Magazine, and Modern Maturity. Additionally, she co-founded HealthQuest: Total Wellness for Body, Mind, and Spirit, the first nationally circulated African-American consumer health magazine in the country. Due to her outstanding leadership abilities, the magazine quickly grew from a small 25,000 quarterly to a bi-monthly publication with a distribution of 500,000. She has received many awards for her dedication to her community, including the Woman of Substance Award, the Tree of Life award, the Beacon of Light award, the Woman of Distinction award, and most recently the PECO Power to the Community Award. Ms. Lomax-Reese stands committed to continuing her work of empowering the community and building a powerful voice for the African-American community at WURD radio.

It is a privilege to recognize a person whose leadership and commitment to our city has enriched the lives of countless individuals. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Ms. Lomax-Reese for her lifetime of service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

TO RECOGNIZE ARIA HEALTH

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Aria Health has been providing quality medical care to residents of the Philadelphia region since July 4th, 1903 when it began as Frankford Hospital in Northeast Philadelphia.

In the 110 years that have followed, Aria Health has grown to six facilities—three inpatient and three outpatient—and is the largest healthcare provider in the Northeast Philadelphia and Lower Bucks County area. Through that time it has continued to serve the medical needs of millions in the Philadelphia and Bucks County regions with the same commitment to care as the day they were founded.

I rise today in recognition of their continued service to our communities, and congratulate them on their reception of the Crystal Vision Award—given each year by the Greater Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce.

This award is a testament to the lasting impression Aria—its physicians, nurses and staff—have left on the lives of those they have, and continue to help. I am pleased to join with members of the Chamber in recognizing Aria for their accomplishments and wish them constant success in the future as they continue to care for our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 908TH AIRLIFT WING

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today Mrs. ROBY and I ask for the House's attention to honor the 908th Airlift Wing, an Air Force Reserve Command wing located at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Alabama.

What is now known as the 908th Airlift Wing began as the 908th Troop Carrier Group at Bates Field, Mobile, Alabama on February 11, 1963. Six years later, the 908th moved to Maxwell Air Force Base, where it remains today.

The mission of the 908th Airlift Wing is to recruit, organize and train Air Force reservists to provide unrivaled theater airlift and flexible combat support across the spectrum of military operations.

During its 50 years, the 908th has followed its mission with a dedication to excellence. Its members have served in operations and humanitarian relief efforts at home and abroad. The 908th has an impeccable safety record with over 150,000 hours logged over 47 years without a Class A or B mishap. Since 2003 the men and women of the 908th have logged over 10,500 combat flight hours in overseas missions.

During their 50 years, the 908th has been awarded some of the US Air Force's highest honors. The men and women of the 908th are seven time winners of the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award. They finished FY 2013 with a 90.4 percent aircraft mission capable rate, among the highest ever recorded for a C–130 unit. They were also named the 2012 Small Command Post of the Year for two commands, AFRC and AETC. Their 2012 virtual inspection was the best the Inspector General had seen to date. In 2012, they had 78 Programs rated excellent and 8 Superior performers, which was more than any other wing.

The 908th will celebrate its 50th anniversary on December 7th with a celebration in Montgomery. The 908th has been widely recognized as an elite unit, one in which its members consider it a privilege to serve. It is an honor to join the state of Alabama in congratulating the 908th Airlift Wing on 50 years of excellence.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE VETERANS LEGAL SUPPORT ACT OF 2013

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when 900,000 veterans and 5,000 active duty service members face Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program cuts, I introduce a bill to allow the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to provide financial support to law school clinical programs that provide pro bono legal and support services to veterans, including, among other things, assistance with disability claims and appeals and foreclosures. The enormous backlog of disability claims at the VA and homelessness among veterans remain critical problems for our veterans. Approximately 107,000 veterans are homeless on any given night in this country and over 600,000 veterans are waiting for their disability claims to be processed by the VA. Providing clinical programs with the resources to assist veterans can result in faster processing of claims and quicker housing assistance to our veterans, who have repeatedly put their lives on the line for this country.

This bill, introduced by my colleagues Senators JEANNE SHAHEEN, AMY KLOBUCHAR and CHRIS MURPHY in the Senate, would allow the

VA to work with and support clinical programs for veterans. This bill merely builds on what some law schools have begun to do for the last several years while providing vital legal services to our veterans and reducing the backlog that has plagued the VA for many years. However, more needs to be done to sustain these programs and to recruit and retain qualified attorneys to supervise law students.

Mr. Speaker, just as we honored our veterans on Veterans Day, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, which would further honor and assist our veterans in their daily lives.

OBAMACARE—HURTING THE HARDWORKING MIDDLE CLASS

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I have received far too many heartbreaking stories from the people of the 2nd District about how government-run healthcare is impacting their lives.

Today, I rise to put a face on the horrors of ObamaCare and tell Jim and Kim Curtis's story who hail from Arnold, in Missouri.

This is their story in their own words.

We, the working middle class, are the ones who are being hurt by this law.

We struggle every day to make ends meet.

But now, because of Obamacare, we received a notice from the insurance company that the plan we currently pay for does not meet the guidelines and we will no longer be covered on January 1st, 2014.

''Now we have to find an extra $500 to $600 minimum per month to cover the insurance that is comparable to what we had before. I have no idea how we will afford that kind of money and pay our bills and mortgage each month ''

This is just one of the millions of examples of real people being hurt by ObamaCare.

This story is from Kim Curtis, a Senior Underwriter at an insurance company in Saint Louis, MO:

We, the working middle class, are the ones who are being hurt by this law.

We struggle every day to make ends meet. The one bright spot is that the middle sized family owned company that my husband works for paid 100% of both of our health care and dental premiums on a very good PPO plan. That was a huge benefit and a saving grace.

But now, because of Obamacare, we have received notice from the insurance company that the plan that they currently pay for does not meet the marketplace guidelines and we will no longer be covered effective on January 1st, 2014. They are not paying anything towards our insurance at all.

So now we will be trying to scramble to come up with an extra $500–$600 min per month to cover the insurance that is comparable to the plan that we had. I have medical issues so I have quite a few doctor visits and bills each year so I am not cheap to cover so it may even be more than that.

Thanks for your time and again thanks for standing up for us. Someone needs to help us before we all go bankrupt and lose everything we have worked so hard to build up during our lifetimes.

From: Kim Curtis (Kim.Curtis@cmgmi.com)
Received: 10/27/13

DEAR ANN, I comes as quite a shock to me on how much of an impact Obamacare is having on myself and the country as a whole. Let alone the fact that I feel it was NEVER really explained very well to the American people let alone very well thought out by law makers when this plan was put together. This will further hurt our economy and drive it back possibly to the brink of another recession.

My husband had already taken over $10,000/year cut in pay a couple years ago and I at the same time took over a $20 000 cut in pay, but we looked at it that at least we still had jobs. We struggle every day to make ends meet. The one bight spot is that the middle size family owned company that my husband works for paid 100% of both of our health care and dental premiums on a very good PPO plan. That was a huge benefit and a saving grace.

But now due to Obamacare we have received notice from the insurance company that the plan that they currently pay for does not meet the ''market place'' guidelines and we will no longer be covered effective on January 1st, 2014. My husband approached his employer and the comment that he received is that we will probably have to go out to the market place and get insurance from there because they don't feel that they will be able to afford the insurance that is now being required by the new ''LAW''. So along with that they are NOT paying anything towards our insurance AT ALL. So this will now along with cuts in pay, we will be trying to scramble to come up with probably around $500–$600 min per month to cover the insurance that is comparable to the plan that we had. I have medical issues so I do have quite a few Doctor visits and bills each year so I am not cheap to cover so it may even be more than that.

I have no idea how we will be able to afford that kind of money each month and pay the mortgage and other bills that we have let alone be punished with a penalty if we do not have insurance. That is ridiculous. You should have been able to put together a plan that would BENEFIT the people not PENALIZE the majority of them.

If the ''PLAN'' is that good why did they have to make it a law for everyone to participate. If it was done correctly people would WANT to participate. THAT is the ''PLAN'' that they should have put into place.

Thanks for your time and again thanks for standing up for us. Someone needs to help us before we all go bankrupt and lose everything we have worked so hard to build up during our lifetimes.

KIM CURTIS,
SENIOR UNDERWRITER,
CMG Mortgage Insurance Company.

CONGRATULATING BILL DE BLASIO ON HIS ELECTION AS MAYOR OF NEW YORK CITY

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate former Public Advocate and a dear friend of mine Bill de Blasio on his election as Mayor of New York City. He will be New York's 109th Mayor and the first Democrat to hold the office in 20 years.

Mr. de Blasio is a compassionate and intelligent man who believes that every person in New York should have access to a quality education, attend college or vocational training, find a job, and start a family.

He is ready to address the enormous challenge that income inequality poses for New York City and our nation, which threatens to undermine our shared commitment to the American Dream. This is a great victory for the people of New York City, and I know that he will unify all New Yorkers and lead the City forward into a new era.

New York City has a new incredible leader and I look forward to working with him on initiatives that will keep New York City and our nation on the path to prosperity. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the election of Bill de Blasio, and urge us all to continue the fight for an America that is a true champion of equity and opportunity.

HONORING RICHARD AND LEE LASTER

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituents and good friends Richard and Lee Laster on the occasion of his 90th birthday and their 65th wedding anniversary. The Lasters have called Chappaqua, New York, home for 50 years.

Born in Vienna, Austria, Richard came to the United States in 1940. After graduating in 1944 from the Polytechnic Institute of New York, Richard began his long career with General Foods Corporation. He became President of the Maxwell House Coffee Division, Executive Vice President and a Director at General Foods. Following his retirement from General Foods, Richard helped build DNA Plant Technology Corporation and WellGen. Richard has also served on the Board of Directors of RiceTec, Inc., The Prince of Liechtenstein Foundation, Bowater Incorporated, The Firestone Tire & Rubber Company, and Peptor Ltd.

Richard has been a strong and committed community leader, generously sharing his wisdom and skills with a myriad of civic and educational organizations. These include serving as a Director of The American Committee for the Weizmann Institute of Science, Trustee of Temple Beth El, Chairman of the Purchase College Foundation, Trustee of Polytechnic University, Chairman of the Westchester Education Coalition, a member and Deputy Supervisor of the New Castle Town Board, President of the Chappaqua School Board and Vice President of the United Way of Westchester.

Richard and his beloved wife, Lee, are both Holocaust survivors. Their experiences in 1938 led to a deep and abiding commitment to fighting the evils of hatred and bigotry by teaching tolerance to young students. In 2011, the Holocaust and Human Rights Education Center presented Richard and Lee with its Spirit of Humanity Award as recognition for Richard's 14 years as Chairman and Lee's longtime service as a board member. Lee has also volunteered on the board of The Chappaqua Orchestra.

I am proud to recognize Lee and Richard Laster of Chappaqua, New York for their extraordinary contributions to our community and beyond. I wish them happiness on the double celebrations of their 65th wedding anniversary and his 90th birthday.

HOYT LIBRARY, KINGSTON PA

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Hoyt Library in the Borough of Kingston, Pennsylvania which is celebrating its 85th anniversary this year.

In January 1928, the Borough of Kingston opened the first free lending library on the West Side of the Susquehanna River. The building was donated to the town by Frank Weston Hoyt who recognized the need for a community library. Throughout its existence, the facility has been updated to meet the needs of the citizens of Kingston. In 1987, an addition was built to house much of the collection. Tragedy struck in February 2007, when the roof of that addition collapsed in a heavy snowstorm, and a large portion of the Library's collection was destroyed. In October 2009, a new two story addition was opened. Today, Hoyt Library continues to be an important part of the Kingston landscape.

Mr. Speaker, for 85 years Hoyt Library has served as an important site to the citizens of the Borough of Kingston, Pennsylvania. Therefore, I commend those individuals who have dedicated their time to working and learning at this community asset.

TO RECOGNIZE THE UPPER BUCKS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S 60 YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Upper Bucks Chamber of Commerce is preparing for their 60th year by celebrating several decades of partnership with businesses in the Upper Bucks region.

The mission of the Upper Bucks Chamber of Commerce is to build strong liaisons within the region's business community in order to progress the principles of free enterprise and enhance the quality of life in Upper Bucks County. The UBCC is a membership based non-profit organization comprised of local non-profit and for profit businesses and community associations. Representing over 1,000 businesses with the purpose of strengthening the local economy, the UBCC works to encourage business and consumer commerce. Through connection building, regional promotion, and services which endorse and protect interests, the UBCC is able to accomplish their mission.

The UBCC has provided these invaluable services to businesses in the community for the past 60 years and I commend their dedication to building a strong local economy and wish them the best in the future.

HONORING MARTYL LANGSDORF, CREATOR OF THE BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS' DOOMSDAY CLOCK

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Martyl Langsdorf, who created the image of the now-iconic Doomsday Clock for the June 1947 cover of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, a publication founded by University of Chicago scientists who had worked on the Manhattan Project, including her husband, physicist Alexander Langsdorf. Martyl's Clock remains a singular reminder of the risks we face from nuclear weapons and the effects of climate change.

A renowned landscape painter and longtime resident of Schaumburg, Illinois, Martyl died at the age of 96 on March 26, 2013, and will be remembered tomorrow at the Bulletin's Fifth Annual Doomsday Clock Symposium here in the nation's capital. Fittingly titled "Communicating Catastrophe," the Symposium will reflect Martyl's sensitivity to the urgency of existential threats—and her brilliance in using art and design "to move past the numbness and create new ways of feeling, just as we tap science for new ways of knowing," said Bulletin Executive Director Kennette Benedict.

Martyl's legacy continues as members of the Bulletin's Science and Security Board annually assess the state of world affairs and use the hands of the Clock to signal humanity's capacity to meet the challenges of nuclear weapons and climate change. World attention to the Doomsday Clock confirms the impact of what designer Michael Bierut, in a 2010 tribute to Martyl titled "Designing the Unthinkable," called "the most powerful piece of information design of the 20th century."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the late Martyl Langsdorf for raising the world's awareness about grave threats, and also the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists for providing information and analysis that points to a safer world.

And to close on a personal note, it was at one of Martyl Langsdorf's annual "Peony Parties" at her garden in Schaumburg, during a long conversation with wise old lawyer and Bulletin stalwart Lowell Sachnoff, that was one of the first times I began seriously considering stepping away from my career in science to begin one in public service.

IN RECOGNITION OF DELANO-EARLIMART IRRIGATION DISTRICT

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District on its 75th anniversary.

The Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District was organized in 1938 to protect the underground water resources in the area and to secure a long-term surface water contract with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Since 1950, the District has delivered more than 7.7 million acre-feet of water to water users in the Delano-Earlimart area of California.

Water is the lifeblood of the Central Valley's economy because of the strong agricultural industry in the region. Ensuring adequate supply of water is important for both farmers and families in the Central Valley. The investments and improvements to water infrastructure made by the Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District over the past 75 years have played a vital role in ensuring water resources are available to the farmers who feed the nation, and the families who call the Central Valley home.

The efforts made by the Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District have helped create a district comprised of 56,500 acres that annually produce more that $360 million in crop value.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District in celebrating 75 years of staying true to its mission to protect, enhance, and manage the District's water and energy resources and related assets to benefit its growers, the community, and the region it serves through outstanding customer service, commitment to quality, and leadership on the water resources industry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT PITTENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote Nos. 571–572, I am not recorded because I was absent from the U.S House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner.

On rollcall No. 571, had I been present, I would have voted "yea". On rollcall No. 572, had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

RECOGNIZING PROJECT HOPE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Project HOPE, an international non-profit organization in Millwood, Virginia dedicated to providing quality and sustainable healthcare to people around the world. I want to highlight their recent medical outreach to Syrian children, who make up half of Syria's refugee population from the current crisis.

I travelled to the region in February and spent time with Syrian refugees in Lebanon, hearing firsthand their accounts of the horrific civil war that was ripping apart their nation. Over two million refugees have fled and are living in refugee camps or trying to survive on their own in neighboring countries.

Last month, I had the opportunity to visit Project HOPE in Millwood. I was pleased to learn that they recently delivered 186,000 doses of a vaccine to infants and young children at the Al Za'atari refugee camp in Jordan to combat the potentially deadly rotavirus. The virus is highly contagious and spreads rapidly in crowded encampments with inadequate sanitation.

Project HOPE is also trying to help other vulnerable refugees, including individuals with

disabilities and the elderly. Often, in global disasters, children, the disabled and the elderly are most at risk. These are the people for whom Project HOPE can make a difference.

In addition to Project HOPE's vital work among the Syrian refugee population, they are also serving the victims of Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines. Project HOPE has a proven track record in the region and is urgently working to provide much needed emergency medicine and medical supplies to the survivors of this devastating natural disaster.

I applaud Project HOPE's 55-year legacy of tireless service to the poor and vulnerable, both here and abroad.

I submit the following article from the Winchester Star, which details Project HOPE's outstanding work to bring medical relief to Syrian refugees.

[From the Winchester Star, Sept. 21, 2013]

HOPE ARRIVES FOR REFUGEES FROM CIVIL WAR-TORN SYRIA

(By Val Van Meter)

MILLWOOD.—The disadvantaged children affect Frederick Gerber the most.

He is at the Al Za'atari refugee camp in Jordan this week, delivering 186,000 doses of vaccine from Project HOPE in Millwood to children there.

Gerber is a director of operations in Iraq for Project HOPE (Health Opportunities for People Everywhere) and helped to build a hospital for children in Basrah, the first new hospital in Iraq—a country with a population of about 33 million—since the 1980s.

His organization is trying to help Jordan and other countries in the area to cope with the influx of refugees from the two-year-old civil war in Syria.

The conflict has generated a flood of refugees into countries neighboring Syria, Gerber said.

Al Za'atari opened two years ago, with 60,000 men, women and children.

Now, Gerber said, Jordan is sheltering more than 600,000, with more than 200,000 in United Nations refugee camps. Al Za'atari is the second-largest refugee camp in the world, and would qualify as Jordan's fourth-largest city.

''It's the size of 600 football fields,'' Gerber said.

Those in the camps could be said to be the lucky ones. He noted that they receive deliveries of clean water, food and blankets.

Other refugees try to find shelter with family members or friends, or simply squat in empty or abandoned buildings.

''They live in dire circumstances,'' Gerber said.

Project HOPE, with its focus on health projects, has been working in the Middle East for a dozen years, he said.

This situation, with the refugee totals of those who have left Syria expected to top 3.5 million by year's end—and another 4.5 million believed to be displaced in the war-torn country—is swamping the resources of its neighbors.

''Jordan needs a lot of help to help them,'' Gerber said.

Project HOPE's donation of vaccines to fight rotavirus is a preventative operation, he said.

Rotaviruses are known to cause diarrhea and dehydration, especially in children, and break out where people are crowded together and clean water and good sanitation are lacking.

Project HOPE is also readying some $30 million in medical supplies in its Winchester warehouse for shipment to Jordan.

Much of that shipment will be used in the camps—but, Gerber said, he hopes some can be moved over the border into Syria, where about 2,500 medical professionals are working under battlefield conditions to help casualties from the fighting.

''These are the real heroes,'' he said.

Estimates indicate that 70 percent of Syria's doctors have fled the country, Gerber said. Most of the nation's hospitals have been damaged or destroyed.

The physicians remaining are working in field hospitals and aid stations, dealing with battlefield casualties with sparse modern supplies or equipment.

Without proper retractors, Gerber said, he has heard of doctors holding a chest open for surgery ''with a pair of pancake flippers.''

In addition to immediate medical emergencies, he sees a future threat in post-traumatic stress disorder for all refugees and a dim future for the children who may live in refugee camps for years without any hope of getting an education.

Gerber would like to find ways to have Jordanian professionals trained to handle the ''stress, depression and anxiety that are so palpable'' in and outside the camps.

''Very few have any training in psychosocial illnesses,'' he added.

But his first focus now is keeping the children healthy.

''I love what I'm doing,'' said Gerber, a Washington, D.C., resident who spent 32 years in the Army health services.

''And it's wonderful to do it with an organization like Project HOPE.''

But seeing children starved or injured ''never fails to bring a tear to my eye.''

TO RECOGNIZE THE PENNCO TECH'S 40-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Pennco Tech for celebrating 40 years of success in our community. The school and its branch campuses have been training individuals in electronic, automotive, and technological fields for decades. They also specialize in HVAC, building trades, and healthcare—helping prepare young students to excel in good paying jobs in my community.

In 1961, Pennco Tech was established in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In 1966, they founded the School of Automotive Technology through the Ford Motor Company. Together, these companies were acquired by Pennco Institutes Incorporated in 1973. The schools then united in Bristol, Pennsylvania in 1975. Since then, the school has opened branch campuses in Pennsauken, New Jersey and Blackwood, New Jersey. The Pennsauken campus has also been granted accreditation from ACCSC. Today, both schools offer a wide range of majors that allow students to gain hands on experience within their field of study.

Pennco Tech is a vital educational institution in our community, as they teach necessary skills that further the knowledge of those who are entering the workforce and contributing to the local economy. Once again, congratulations on 40 years of success.

COMMENDING THE CLEMENTS HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING BAND

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Clements High School Marching Band from my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas. They won top honors at the 2nd annual Texas Marching Classic in Round Rock, Texas. Not only did Clements take home the championship trophy, but they also received awards for best music, best visual and best general effects. Their award winning performance of ''Resistance is Futile'' featured music from J.J. Abrams' Star Trek.

After winning the Texas Marching Classic, the band and color guard followed their win with a grand champion victory at the Sam Houston Marching Contest the very next weekend. In both cases, the band headed into the finals in second place but came out on top in the end.

The Texas Marching Classic hosts 22 of the top marching bands in the State of Texas. I can only imagine the preparation that these young students had to put in these last few months. Their hard work and dedication has certainly paid off. The Marching Band has made Clements High School and our community proud. I'm proud to extend a Texas-sized congratulation to the Clements High School Marching Band for their musical achievements.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF BRAHMIN SAMAJ OF USA

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brahmin Samaj of USA (BSOU) on its 25th Anniversary. For 25 years, BSOU has represented the Brahmin community in New Jersey, the surrounding region and all Brahmins across the United States.

Established in New Jersey in 1988, BSOU has grown from 11 members to more than 500 members today. In addition to its growth in membership, BSOU has also expanded to each U.S. state, Canada and other international countries. Likewise, it has seen the establishment of sister organizations in New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Florida and Ontario. It was registered as the official Brahmin organization in New Jersey in 1989.

Since its founding, BSOU has been led by ten presidents, including Founding President the late Shri Manibhai Joshi, Arunbhai Kantharia, Pramodaben Joshi, Begavatbhai Pandya, Rasikhbai Bhatt, Vishnubhai Bhatt, Dr. Hitendra Upadhyay, Naishad Pandya, Bhogilal Jani and current President Abhay Shukla. The organization is also represented by a Board of Trustees and Executive Committee which work toward advancing BSOU.

BSOU hosts various social, religious and cultural activities to promote and maintain the traditions and heritage of the Brahmins. It has hosted youth activities, large conventions and

participated in the India Day Parade in New York City, New York for five years. BSOU continues its mission to honor and celebrate the Brahmin history and culture.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Brahmin Samaj of USA as it celebrates its 25th Anniversary. Its commitment to promoting the Brahmin culture and serving the Indian community is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

HAZLETON LIONS CLUB

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Hazleton Lions Club which is celebrating its 90th anniversary this year.

Since 1917, Lions Clubs have offered people the opportunity to give something back to their communities. On October 23, 1923, the Hazleton Lions Club was formed by its Charter President Roy D. Snyder, making it the 20th oldest Lions Club in Pennsylvania. Since its founding, the Hazleton Lions Club has been extremely active within the community, completing numerous projects and making donations in support of many other organizations. These volunteer service projects include the Keep Pennsylvania Beautiful Project, Red Cross Disaster Response Team, Nescopeck State Park Project, Can-Do Board of Directors, Greater Hazleton Area Fun Fest and the American Cancer Society. Recipients of the club's donations range from national organizations such as the United Rehabilitation Services and Catholic Social Services, to local groups such as Hazleton Little League and the Hazleton Integration Project. The members of this club continue to find ways to give back and improve their community.

Mr. Speaker, for 90 years the Hazleton Lions Club has been a vital asset to the city of Hazleton, Pennsylvania. Therefore, I commend all those who have served to improve their community as part of this important organization.

RECOGNIZING MR. EUGENIO ''GENE'' GARZA JR.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Eugenio ''Gene'' Garza Jr. for his retirement from his position as the Director of Field Operations with the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) in Laredo, Texas. Mr. Garza has dedicated his service in protecting our nation's borders and its communities.

As Director for Field Operations for the Laredo Field Office since January 2011, Mr. Garza has lead the agency, providing oversight and guidance to the operation of eight ports of entry extending from Brownsville to Del Rio, including 23 crossings, 6 airports, and one seaport and overseeing more than 2,600 employees and imports exceeding $134 billion annually processed through South Texas.

Previously, Mr. Garza was the Port Director of the Laredo Port of Entry, first with the U.S. Customs Service and then with U.S. Customs and Border Protection. As Port Director, Mr. Garza oversaw the largest inland port in the U.S., managing more than 800 employees, four international bridges, one airport and a railroad bridge, with an annual budget of $12 million dollars and with employees in Laredo, Del Rio, Eagle Pass, Roma, Hidalgo/Pharr and Brownsville/Los Indios.

Mr. Garza started his federal career in 1971 with the U.S. Air Force as a Military Policeman, at which time he was introduced to the U.S. Customs Service, Customs Narcotics Detector Dog Training Center at Lackland Air Base in San Antonio, Texas. In 1976, Mr. Garza began his civilian career as a Canine Enforcement Officer with the then U.S. Customs Service at the Port of Laredo. Today, the CBP Canine Program is the largest and most diverse law enforcement canine program in the country.

Mr. Garza has held numerous supervisory positions at the district and headquarters level since his initial appointment, serving an assignment in the Port of Eagle Pass, Canine Enforcement Branch Chief and Chief in Laredo and Acting National Canine Program Director, prior to being selected as the Port Director in Laredo. Under his leadership, the Port of Laredo has earned a number of Commissioner Unit Citations for outstanding performance by the Laredo passenger, trade and outbound, and enforcement teams.

During the course of his career, Mr. Garza has been widely recognized as an expert in international border security management issues and border trade and recognized by CBP, the trade industry and the Vice President of the United States for his expertise. Under Mr. Garza's leadership, the Port of Laredo has undergone significant facilities enhancements, including lane expansions at the Lincoln-Juarez Bridge and the World Trade Bridge. These projects significantly facilitated processing of passenger and commercial traffic and a boost to economic benefits.

In 2007, Mr. Garza was recognized by Texas A&M International University and the Smithsonian Institute as a Distinguished Alumnus in the Smithsonian Institution's Portraits of Latino Achievement. In 2011, Mr. Garza was recognized as a 2010 Tejano Achiever by LULAC Council 12. In that same year, Mr. Garza was selected to the Senior Executive Service in Laredo. Mr. Garza is an active participant in numerous civic organizations and community activist.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored and privileged to have the opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. Garza for his outstanding service in protecting our communities and his extraordinary commitment to our country. He has truly contributed to this nation in his efforts to protect our borders.

THE NEED TO REVITALIZE AMERICAN MANUFACTURING

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the efforts to revitalize American Manufacturing.

Manufacturing has long been a central part of the American economy. Right now, there are more than 11 million Americans employed in high-paying manufacturing jobs. And in 2010, manufacturing accounted for 60 percent of all U.S. exports and contributed $1.7 trillion to our GDP.

These figures are impressive and lend support for the importance of maintaining a vibrant manufacturing sector. Unfortunately, the dominance of the United States in manufacturing has been steadily challenged. The U.S. share of global manufacturing value added declined from one-third in the early 1980s to just one-fifth today. At the same time, manufacturing activity has rapidly increased in emerging economies such as China and Korea.

Even more troubling, is the fact that countries such as Korea, Japan, and Germany have a more R&D-intensive manufacturing sector than the United States. Additionally, each of these countries has a positive trade balance in advanced manufacturing products unlike the $81 billion dollar trade deficit observed in the United States in 2010.

The truth is that the perception of manufacturing as low-skilled, assembly line work is outdated and no longer applies. The future of manufacturing is advanced manufacturing, a high-tech endeavor that uses sensors, robotics, and cutting-edge modeling and simulation. If we do nothing and settle for the status quo, our position will almost certainly decline further and our economy will continue to struggle.

Thankfully, the Administration has renewed its commitment to American manufacturing and is focused on ensuring that the United States is the global leader in advanced manufacturing. The President has put forward a number of initiatives, including the creation of the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation. The purpose of the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation is to establish up to 15 public-private manufacturing institutes across the country. These institutes will serve as centers of manufacturing excellence and will accelerate manufacturing and help transition cutting-edge technologies from the lab to the factory floor.

The Administration has also called for a number of tax reforms that will provide incentives to companies that bring jobs back to the U.S. These include making the R and D tax credit permanent, reducing tax rates for manufacturers, and doubling the tax deduction for high-tech manufacturers.

The President's commitment to advanced manufacturing appears to be paying off. We are adding manufacturing jobs for the first time since the 1990s. These jobs will have a downstream impact on our economy since it's been shown that for every manufacturing job we create, we add five additional jobs along the supply chain. And for every dollar in manufacturing value added, we create $1.40 in new value in other sectors of the economy.

We need to continue to move forward with policies and programs that will expand and support the development of advanced manufacturing. I have worked on two such efforts.

First, my bill, H.R. 1421, the AIM Act makes strategic investments in advanced manufacturing research, development, and education. It brings the public and private sectors together to tackle the research needs of industry. It provides small and medium-sized manufacturers with innovation vouchers that will allow them to make their companies and products more competitive. And finally, H.R. 1421

ensures that our community colleges are preparing students for the manufacturing jobs of the future.

Secondly, I have circulated a discussion draft of the America Competes Reauthorization Act which includes several initiatives that would help revitalize American manufacturing such as innovative technology federal loan guarantees to small- and medium-sized manufacturers to help them become more efficient and stay competitive and the creation of a network of industry-led manufacturing centers that will accelerate the development and commercialization of manufacturing technologies and processes.

I strongly believe that if the United States is to remain competitive in the long term, we need to ensure that American companies maintain the capacity to manufacture new and innovative products here at home.

The decline of U.S. manufacturing is a threat to middle class jobs and our economy. We need our manufacturing sector to be the most sophisticated in the world, using transformative technologies and innovative manufacturing processes. H.R. 1421, the manufacturing provisions in the Competes Act, and the "Make it in America" agenda will help to ensure that U.S. companies have the tools and the workforce they need to meet the challenge ahead.

HONORING MS. VIRGINIA DAVENPORT

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of Ms. Virginia Davenport. At a young age Ms. Davenport, along with her five siblings, was put up for adoption due to unfortunate circumstances following the family's move to Philadelphia. In and out of foster homes during these early years, Ms. Davenport faced the myriad of challenges children can experience within the foster care system. Despite these difficult times, Ms. Davenport pressed on with faith in a God above and the determination to improve her situation.

Ms. Davenport went on to attend the Power Sewing School, Simon Gratz High School, Government Nurses Aid Training School, and various other educational institutions. She recently graduated from the first level of the Deliverance Bible Institute (DEBI) with outstanding marks and will continue with the next level of DEBI this upcoming semester. Throughout all of this, she has made every effort to reach out and support young people at every opportunity she is afforded. She is active in Intercessory Prayer, the Home Care Department, and Helping Hand Ministries. Ms. Davenport intends to continue to dedicate her time to bettering herself and her community and hopes to be an inspiration to those around her.

It is a privilege to recognize a person whose leadership and commitment to community has enriched the lives of countless individuals. I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending Ms. Davenport for her lifetime of service and dedication to Pennsylvania's First Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND CELEBRATING 40 YEARS OF ITS WASHINGTON PROJECT CENTER AND 25 YEARS OF ITS VENICE, ITALY PROJECT CENTER

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) Washington Project Center opened 40 years ago to bridge the divide between scientific research and social policy recommendations. Since 1973, more than 1,100 WPI students have completed more than 400 projects for government agencies, community-based companies and institutions, multinational corporations, and nonprofit partners.

The Center's success became the model for the WPI Global Studies Program, which has seen more than 22,000 budding scientists and engineers successfully complete and implement 3,600 projects across a wide range of areas, including environment, consumer protection, patents and copyrights and art and history.

At WPI's 39 centers across the world—covering four continents and cities ranging from Alberta to Zurich to Bangkok to Cape Town to Panama City—students work with some of the world's largest companies, most influential non-profit and non-governmental organizations and most important scientific governmental agencies.

Among the centers is the Venice Project Center, founded in 1988 by WPI Professor and native Venetian Fabio Carrera. In his 25 years of leading students to Venice, Carrera has spearheaded invaluable research about, among other areas, erosion within the city's famed canals, which was captured in a book by the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

These great young minds bring ingenious approaches to an outstanding array of challenges—and the projects fundamentally change the students, building leaders who possess passion, proficiency, and a certainty that their life's work can change the world.

Mr. Speaker, I'm so proud to represent WPI, a world renowned institution for higher learning committed to educating our next generation of leaders. While WPI students are working to better communities across the globe, their longstanding history of service to my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts, should also be recognized.

I commend WPI students, faculty, leadership, and staff for their commitment to science education and global leadership. I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing their incredible achievements.

TO RECOGNIZE THE WOODS SERVICES' 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of 100 years of committed dedication by Woods Services to children, adults and families affected by developmental disabilities.

Founded in 1913 by Philadelphia school teacher Mollie Woods, the organization has worked for the last century to advance the quality of life and the standard of care for individuals with disabilities—a cause worth acknowledgment each day, but especially on this monumental anniversary. Today, Woods offers exceptional and experienced care for those with autism, brain injuries, learning disabilities and emotional and behavioral challenges.

The loyal staff at Woods provides a vital service in our community, and a remarkably important role in the life and development of those they care for. I am honored to represent those who do such important work at Wood, and wish them continued success in the next 100 years.

BRIDGE DEDICATION

HON. WM. LACY CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great tribute to have the Poplar Street Bridge renamed in my honor. I wish to thank those who participated in making this happen. Let me personally thank . . .

Let me especially thank my friend, Representative Penny Hubbard, for her untiring effort in managing the bill through the legislature.

Let me say to Rep. Penny and those that participated in naming this bridge in my honor that prior to this dedication, two bridges have had a special meaning in the life of the Clay family and me. The first was the McKinley Bridge, where the electric train carried my father, five days a week, back and forth, to work in Venice, Illinois, for more than 30 years.

He earned a good living that enabled him to take care of his wife of 60 years and us 7 children. How can the Clay's not remember and appreciate what that fabulous bridge meant in our lives?

The second bridge that had a tremendous influence in my life was the Edmund Pettis Bridge in Selma, Alabama. It was there on a Sunday that John Lewis and 600 other marchers attempted to cross on their way to Montgomery. They were peacefully demanding the right to register and vote like all other Americans.

But Governor George Wallace ordered local and state police to stop the march on the flimsy ground of "public safety."

What followed is now infamously known as "Bloody Sunday." Police, armed with billy clubs, dogs, and tear gas, were seen around the world on television beating men, women, and children unmercifully.

That scene on the Edmund Pettis Bridge was the stimulus for passing the 1965 Voting Rights Act and subsequently my election to Congress. At the time, there were only five blacks in Congress. Today, because of what happened on that bridge, there are 42 blacks.

My mission while in Congress for 32 years was to build bridges that carried resources to the economically underprivileged, and to those discriminated against because of race, gender and age.

My message to those of you still battling the forces of hatred and ignorance is to ignore that group of idiots that want to destroy bridges provided by government assistance. Do not join those chanting the idiotic slogan of ''government is the problem and should get out of the way.''

Government has a sacred responsibility to play a major role in building bridges that elevate the standard of living for its citizens. It must build roads leading to bridges that take our children to schools, our adults to jobs, our sick to hospitals.

Bridges must enable the working poor to move into the middle class and our seniors to live the remainder of their lives in dignity.

You in the legislative body must always remember that bridges take people to untold opportunities. I am proud of the bridges I helped build while in Congress that now provide for family and medical leave, that gave political freedom to federal employees, that assured that after five years you are vested in your pension plan, that rewrote the higher education law, the elementary and secondary education bill, and, yes, Rep. Hubbard, the one that makes our workplace safe.

Yes, Rep. Penny Hubbard, I know you will continue building bridges that take people from poverty to prosperity, from hopelessness to dreams fulfilled.

Government must not let the excessive greed of some exploit the helpless in the name of providing jobs that pay less than a living wage.

Government must provide the bridges that guarantee a good education for its citizens, a decent job with adequate pay and health benefits, a nice home in a safe neighborhood. If building bridges that establish a strong, vibrant middle class is seen as government being in the way, I say to those . . . well, I say that, and much more.

OK, I have had my say. So, Rep. Penny Hubbard, let me thank you again for remembering that bridges have played an indispensable role in my life. Thanks for remembering that building bridges has made my life worth living.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF GENERAL C. ROBERT KEHLER

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, Mr. COOPER and I ask for the House's attention to honor General C. Robert ''Bob'' Kehler, Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, on his imminent retirement from the United States Air Force.

General Kehler has been an exemplary officer and an outstanding leader. Over the course of his 38 year career in the Air Force, he has made countless sacrifices for our country. We wish to commend his service; the sacrifices of his family, including his wife Marjorie and their two sons; and to express our great appreciation for his leadership and devotion to our nation's security.

It would not be possible for us to do justice to the many and various accomplishments of General Kehler's distinguished 38 year career in the Air Force, but please allow us to highlight a few.

General Kehler's selection as Commander of U.S. Strategic Command was apt—he started his career as a young nuclear missile officer in 1975. Rising quickly through the Air Force, he went on to command space and missile units at Whiteman, Malmstrom, Vandenberg and Peterson Air Force Bases. His positive leadership has directly influenced countless men and women in our Armed Forces, and the positive effects of his service to our country will be felt for generations to come.

General Kehler has been a vigilant champion of our nation's nuclear deterrent. As Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, he's spent nearly three years ensuring our nation's nuclear forces remain strong and ready—not counting his earlier tour as Deputy Commander of Strategic Command. His efforts were instrumental in our nation's Nuclear Posture Review, and he has worked closely with Congress to ensure that our military has been able to accomplish the essential missions of Strategic Command, including nuclear deterrence. Through his leadership at Strategic Command, General Kehler has been an essential defender of our nation's critical space assets. He has worked closely with the Armed Services Committee, and it has been our great pleasure to work with him. As chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, we are grateful for General Kehler's wise counsel and firm resolve to always do what is best for the nation and for the men and women he leads.

Mr. Speaker, with nearly four decades of exemplary service to our nation, General C. Robert ''Bob'' Kehler deserves our most heartfelt gratitude and praise. He has been a credit to the military and we hope he will continue to find ways to serve the United States. Thank you, General—and best wishes to you and your family.

CONGRATULATING MICHAEL LINN AS NEW CEO EMERITUS OF NIADA

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael R. Linn as the new CEO Emeritus of the National Independent Automobile Dealers Association (NIADA) that is headquartered in Arlington, Texas, in my district.

Prior to his new position, Mr. Linn served as the CEO of NIADA from 1999 to 2013. Under his leadership, membership rose beyond 20,000 members. In addition, NIADA added significant value to the automotive industry with its legislative and regulatory presence in the Nation's capitol. Expanded education programs, which include the Certified Master Dealer (CMD) Program and Certified F&I Professional Program, have greatly enhanced the professionalism of the industry. In 2004, the NIADA Educational Television Network (NIADA–TV) was created to better educate the nation's automotive dealers. In 2006, another educational TV network, Automotive Consumer Television, was developed to also educate consumers about the motor vehicle industry. All of these occurred during Mr. Linn's tenure. He also currently serves as a Board Member on the National Automotive Advisory Board at Northwood University in Midland, Michigan.

Prior to joining NIADA, Mr. Linn served as the Executive Director of the Carolinas Independent Automobile Dealers Association that serves the industry in both North and South Carolina. With over 26 years of extensive experience in the motor vehicle industry, he is extremely knowledgeable of industry issues and the issues facing today's professional automobile dealer.

Prior to working in the motor vehicle industry, Mr. Linn enjoyed a career in the motion picture and television industry as an Executive Producer. He is a graduate of LaSalle University with a Masters Degree in Business Administration (MBA) and is a Certified Program Planner. He has written several training manuals on the car rental industry, Federal labor laws and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. Michael Linn is a native of North Carolina.

The National Independent Automobile Dealers Association, founded in 1946, has represented the used motor vehicle industry for over 67 years. NIADA's mission is to assist its members in becoming more successful within the automotive industry by bringing valuable information, services and benefits designed to prepare them for an ever-changing and ever-challenging marketplace.

Again, congratulations to Michael Linn as the new CEO Emeritus of NIADA.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,154,624,205,951.04. We've added $6,527,747,157,037.96 to our debt in 4 years. This is $6.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING RIO HONDO TRUSTEE ANGELA ACOSTA-SALAZAR

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Angela Acosta-Salazar, a member of the Rio Hondo College Board of Trustees, for her tireless work in increasing access to higher education.

Professionally, Angela has committed herself to the issues of higher education and community empowerment. Through her service as Trustee she fostered relationships and strengthened communications between the college and its student body. As an educator, Angela has educated hundreds of students in the Social Sciences and has created a space

that encouraged personal development and academic excellence. As a public servant, Angela has generously dedicated her time to the Rio Hondo College Foundation.

Having served as a Los Angeles Community College District adjunct instructor for over ten years, her commitment to education should be an inspiration to all at Rio Hondo College. Although she now completes nine years of service to Rio Hondo College's Board of Trustees, she leaves behind a legacy and a mission that will not end when she steps down.

Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, please join me in honoring Ms. Angela Acosta-Salazar. Let us congratulate her on her many accomplishments to the Rio Hondo Community College District and our community. We wish her good health and success in all future endeavors.

TO RECOGNIZE THE LIFE OF MR. FREDDIE SLACK

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Frederick Slack, Sr. who passed away at the age of 90 on his beloved farm in Forest Grove, Bucks County.

Fred, a lifelong resident of the Village of Forest Grove, was a school bus driver, a farrier, a pilot, a World War II veteran, a baseball fan and a loving family man. However, many knew him for his farm which was his pride and joy. In 1996, The Fred Slack Farm became the first farm in Buckingham Township to be added onto The Pennsylvania Farm Preservation. Fred and Evelyn were so proud.

Fred was a member of the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau and was an avid proponent of Farm Preservation efforts, both in Bucks County and across the state.

For decades, Fred and his late-wife Evelyn were proud to grow some of the best tasting corn and tomatoes in the area. Visitors to their farm were always greeted with warm and welcoming smiles and the couple treasured the memories made at their humble property.

My thoughts and deepest sympathies go out to Fred's friends and family—his four children, eight grandchildren and his great grandchild. May they all take comfort in knowing that Fred's legacy lives on in the fields he worked and the lives he touched—neither soon to be forgotten.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF LETICIA DIAZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize a great leader in the Central Florida community.

Leticia M. Diaz, a native of Cuba, is one of the founding faculty of Barry University Dwayne O. Andreas School of Law and was appointed dean in 2007. During her tenure as dean, the law school has emerged as a leader in legal education in Florida, featuring nationally recognized Moot Court and Trial Team programs, a growing faculty, and a $7 million expansion of its campus with the opening of a 32,400-square-foot Legal Advocacy Center in 2011. Diaz is the first Cuban-American female to hold the position of dean at an ABA-accredited law school in the United States.

Under Dean Diaz's leadership, Barry Law School's student enrollment has increased nearly 40 percent—from 571 in 2006 to 793 in 2013. Diaz was instrumental in launching the Summer in Spain study abroad program in 2009. Under her leadership, the school has opened three centers: the Juvenile Justice Center, the Juvenile Life Without Parole Defense Resource Center, and the Center for Earth Jurisprudence. The school's Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program has been honored eight years in a row by the American Bar Association for its service to the community.

Diaz's publications range from analysis of the FDA's role in consumer protection to environmental law with a focus on consumer health. In 2009 she spoke at the Harvard University Kennedy School of Government on international piracy issues, with an emphasis on environmental law.

Her professional involvement includes serving on the ABA Commission on Hispanic Legal Rights and Responsibilities. She has taken a leadership role on Hispanic issues, including penning an article on the DREAM Act that was entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in December 2010 and hosting a White House Hispanic Action Summit at the law school in September 2011. She and alumni met with U.S. Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor in December 2011 when the inaugural group of Barry Law graduates was sworn in to practice before the Supreme Court. Diaz is also a past member of the Board of Directors of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando.

Diaz was listed as one of 25 influential Hispanics in Central Florida in a 2012 issue of Visión magazine, a publication of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Metro Orlando. She received the Outstanding Hispanic Female in the Legal Field award at the inaugural Hispanic Women Who Make the Difference Awards in 2008 and earned the ''Leading Lawyers'' recognition from the South Florida Business Journal in 2009. In 2013, Diaz was named Outstanding Female in Education during La Prensa's Mujeres Destacadas awards.

Before joining Barry's faculty, Diaz practiced law in the areas of personal injury, toxic torts, and workplace chemical exposure, while teaching part-time at the law school. She currently teaches in the area of environmental law, environmental justice, toxic torts, and product liability.

Diaz earned her Juris Doctor degree at Rutgers Law School in New Jersey in 1994. Prior to entering law school, she earned her PhD in organic chemistry from Rutgers University. She spent two years as a postdoctoral research chemist at Hoffman-LaRoche in New Jersey, where she primarily worked on the synthesis of anti-HIV compounds.

Dean Diaz has brought together leaders from throughout the country to the Central Florida area to discuss the important issues of the day and has convened meetings and events that bring together varying perspectives on issues that affect our community. Central Florida is a better place for the work and leadership that Dean Diaz has provided to our community.

I am happy to honor Leticia M. Diaz, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her service and her work to educate, train, and inspire the leaders of tomorrow.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ZULMA VELEZ-ESTRADA

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize Zulma Velez-Estrada, an outstanding Central Floridian who has dedicated her life to lifting up the voices and pioneering the causes of Hispanics.

Zulma Velez-Estrada was born and raised in San Juan, Puerto Rico. She received a Bachelor's Degree in Management from the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus and her Master's Degree in Finance Management from American University, Puerto Rico. Zulma began her professional career at Health Care Manufacturing Industries in Puerto Rico. She was also a Management Consultant for the Energy and Environmental Research Studies Department for the University of Puerto Rico for three years until she decided to migrate to Florida in 1991.

Moving to Florida was a significant change for her and her five children. Since moving to Florida, Zulma has dedicated her life to working with her community. She became a Governmental Operations Consultant and began doing Community Outreach for the Department of Children and Families (DCF) in Osceola County. Zulma developed and coordinated a Community Awareness Program with the goal of empowering frontline staff and engaging communities in Osceola and Orange counties. She also organized the first Hispanic Leaders Meeting with the Department of Children and Families and developed their Hispanic Media Database. Zulma coordinated the participation of Osceola County employees at their first 150k Meals Packing Event for underprivileged Osceola County children. Zulma also coordinated the first Pastor's Seminar on Domestic Violence in Osceola and Orange counties in cooperation with the DCF and domestic violence prevention organizations.

Zulma was the Hispanic Outreach Coordinator for the Democratic Party, Puerto Rico Federal Affairs Administration (PRFAA) Interim Manager, and Director for the Non-Partisan Education and Registration Program ''Que Nada Nos Detenga'' for the PRFAA. Under her leadership, 63,000 new voters were registered from 2003 to 2004. While at PRFAA, Zulma also developed the First International Voting & Education Festival at Lake Eola Park in Orlando.

Ms. Velez-Estrada worked for four years as International Business and Trade Specialist for the Metro Orlando International Affairs Economic Development Commission, where she worked with the Latin and Hispanic European markets, lead business missions and hosted international governmental and private industry representatives, and found new businesses opportunities for Central Florida. She developed and implemented the International Export Roadshow and counseled over 125 companies on how to export products abroad. She also developed Trade Missions to Venezuela, Chile, Argentina, and Puerto Rico.

Zulma has helped increase Hispanic participation in elections. She managed political

campaigns for state Senators and Commissioners. Zulma also served as the feminine voice on the first non-partisan radio program in Osceola County directed toward educating the Spanish speaking Community on political issues. She has also worked as a volunteer on the presidential, gubernatorial, congressional, and state representative election campaigns as well. She was elected Secretary of the Osceola County Democratic Party, and is an active member of the Orange County Democratic Party.

Zulma has been honored with awards from Estrellas Cristianas Ministries for Chaplain of the Year, Tu Revista Mujer as one of the ''Eleven Most Distinguished Women,'' the Florida Department of Children and Families for Community Partnership, Impacto Newspaper as a ''Pioneer of the Past Shining Today,'' Hispanic Women Assembly, LULAC, United Third Bridge, and the Santa Maria Municipality of Peru for Outstanding Service with Twin Cities Development.

I am happy to honor Zulma Velez-Estrada, during Hispanic Heritage Month, for her service to the Central Florida Hispanic community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOSE LA LUZ

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month to recognize Jose La Luz, an educator and an advocate for workers' rights.

A native of Santurce, Puerto Rico, La Luz comes from a working-class family and spent his primary years living on the Island. La Luz credits his grandfather, a self-made merchant in the mountain town of Ciales, and his mother, a rural school teacher who nurtured and educated poor children in nearby barrios, with being his role models and instilling a sense of compassion and justice in him. They inspired La Luz to advocate for workers' rights such as better wages and working conditions as an adult.

While growing up in Puerto Rico in the 1950s and 1960s, La Luz's grandfather used to take him to the tobacco, coffee and sugarcane fields in Puerto Rico where he witnessed firsthand the plight of poor Puerto Ricans who were toiling these fields to earn their meager livelihoods. Having seen the poor conditions under which workers lived and worked, La Luz began to understand the importance of advocating for the human rights of those who had no voice. The fight for basic rights and justice for all people, no matter who they are or where they are from became his life's passion.

La Luz attended the University of Puerto Rico where he studied social sciences before receiving a sports scholarship from the YMCA and transferring to Springfield College in Massachusetts. He is a graduate of SUNY's Empire State College with a Bachelor's degree in Labor Studies. He also has a Master's Degree in labor studies from Rutgers University.

Widely recognized as a labor strategist and intellectual, La Luz has served as a Visiting Labor Leader in residence at Cornell University. He has also written white papers on organizing strategies in labor unions, and served as an instructor in the Labor Studies Programs at Michigan State and Rutgers University. He became a Wurf Fellow in the Kennedy School State and Local Government Program at Harvard University in 2007. In 2011, La Luz received a lifetime award for his distinguished career as one of America's outstanding labor educators from the United Association for Labor Education.

During his college years, La Luz was involved in the Students for a Democratic Society, and spoke out on issues such as the Vietnam War. He also became involved with local Puerto Rican Farm Workers organizations in the Tobacco Valley in Connecticut and Massachusetts. As a community organizer, La Luz helped secure new rights for migrant workers in the area by putting public pressure on the Labor Department of Puerto Rico and denouncing the deplorable conditions that the migrant workers were working under. He also helped merge the local farm workers with Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers of America.

Among La Luz's most recent achievements is the restoration on May 17, 2011 of public worker rights in Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico Law 45 had been nullified by the passage of a new fiscal austerity law, Law 7. Law 7 effectively suspended collective agreement clauses in an effort to repress public employees and strip them of collective bargaining rights. Law 7 also caused the layoffs of over 19,000 public sector employees in Puerto Rico and aggravated an already dismal unemployment rate. La Luz was fundamental in speaking out against the injustices by insisting on the need to restore bargaining rights for public workers. La Luz made the case for the restoration of rights as he led a grassroots lobbying campaign along with other union leaders and the President of Puerto Rico's Senate. His efforts resulted in the passage of Law 73 which restored the employee contracts and rights that had been suspended by Law 7.

It is with great honor and pride that I honor Jose La Luz's exemplary contributions to workers' rights and the Hispanic community.

CONGRATULATIONS ON A JOB WELL DONE TO RICK CRAIG AND LAURA DYBERG

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the incredible job Rick Craig and Laura Dyberg have done as board members of the Rim of the World Recreation and Park District. Both of these individuals have enriched and fulfilled the lives of the citizens they have worked for.

Rick Craig served four years on the Board of Directors and three of those four years, as chairman. During his tenure with the board, he served on the Planning and Facilities Committee and was instrumental in helping their ''Measure N'' program to succeed.

Laura Dyberg served on the board since 2005 and was the Board Secretary for many years. She served on the Planning and Facilities, Personal and Public Relations and Program Committees. She was instrumental in finding a qualified general manager, in the dedication of Harich Field, and with the renaming of the Twin Peaks Recreation complex.

Luckily for the community, both of these exceptional individuals will continue their service in various capacities for the betterment of the recreational community. I wish both of them well and look forward to hearing about their new accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO DR. RICHARD G. RAJARATNAM

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose dedication and contributions to the community of Riverside County, California are exceptional. Riverside County has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Richard G. Rajaratnam, MD, FRCS, FACS, is one of these individuals. This year, Dr. Rajaratnam will end his tenure as Medical Director for the Kaiser Permanente Riverside Medical Center.

Dr. Rajaratnam has managed and led the Kaiser Permanente Riverside Service Area as Area Medical Director for the Southern California Permanente Medical Group. He has been instrumental in achieving breakthroughs in research and medical advancements. These breakthroughs include the A.L.L. program, Diabetes Care advancement, Choosing Wisely, Patient-Centered Medical Home, and the development of the UCR Medical School to create physician leaders for tomorrow. Dr. Raj aratnam has embraced advancements in technology and science to improve the health of the over 370,000 Kaiser Permanente members in Riverside County.

Through his leadership, Dr. Rajaratnam has led the Kaiser Permanente Riverside Medical Center to be the recipient of multiple prestigious awards, including Leapfrog, California Award for Performance Excellence (CAPE–Baldridge Criteria), Independent Health Care Association for Excellence in Medical Groups, Medicare 5–Star status, and the Office of Patient Advocate in the State of California maximum four-star rating for quality excellence. He is a vital member of the local medical community, having served as a Board Member of Riverside County Health Foundation, California Delegate to the American Medical Association, CMRI Physician Reviewer for the state of California, Board member of Inland Empire Health Information Exchange, Past President of the Riverside County Medical Association, UCR School of Medicine Graduate Medical Education Committee as well as Community Advisory Board.

While retiring from his current position as Medical Director, Dr. Rajaratnam will continue to be a participant in the medical field and contribute his experience, knowledge and expertise to his peers and future physicians.

In light of all Dr. Rajaratnam has done for Riverside County, it is only fitting that he be honored for his many years of dedicated service. Dr. Rajaratnam's tireless passion for the industry in which he serves has contributed immensely to the betterment of Riverside County and I am proud to call him a fellow community member, American and friend. I commend Dr. Raj aratnam for his tireless work with the Kaiser Permanente Riverside Medical Center and express sincere thanks and appreciation for his years of dedication to health care advancements, research, and the overall health of his fellow citizens. I know that many are grateful for his service and salute him as he prepares to end his tenure later this year.

TRIBUTE TO JUSTIN ELDRIDGE

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Justin Eldridge, a former Marine from Waterford, Connecticut whom we lost on October 28, 2013.

Born and raised in eastern Connecticut, Justin served in the Marine Corps from 2001 to 2008. During his time in the Marines, he served a tour in Afghanistan from 2004 to 2005. After being honorably discharged and medically retired in 2008, Justin went on to take an active part in his community—particularly in serving the needs of fellow veterans and their families. Justin was instrumental in the formation of the Thames River Marine Corps Detachment that formed in 2009. During the nearly four years that Justin served as the organization's Commandant he grew the membership to more than 40 people. The Detachment annually participated in Toys for Tots drive and in 2012 distributed more than 2,000 toys to local children.

Like so many of our veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, Justin struggled with traumatic brain injury that occurred during his Afghanistan deployment and post-traumatic stress disorder upon returning home. Justin's passing is a reminder that our nation must continue to do all it can to care for the men and women who have served our country and return home with wounds—both visible and invisible.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring Justin and his dedicated service to our nation, his community and his fellow veterans, and extending our thoughts and prayers to his family in this difficult time.

TO CONGRATULATE HENRY ROSENBERGER ON RECEIVING PENN FOUNDATION'S ADVENTURES IN EXCELLENCE AWARD

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Henry Rosenberger on receiving Penn Foundation's prestigious Adventures in Excellence Award, which is presented to a respected local leader who promotes the Foundation's charitable mission.

Mr. Rosenberger has a commitment to excellence and is a community volunteer, who serves on the Board of Directors of Living Branches, Living Hope Farm. In presenting the award, the Penn Foundation highlighted his entrepreneurship, community leadership, service and philanthropy.

Henry and his wife, Charlotte, operate Tussock Sedge Farm in Upper Bucks County, where they have preserved more than half the farm's 450 acres as open space through the Bucks County Farmland Preservation Program. In 2007, they preserved an additional 140 acres in perpetuity.

With our best wishes for continued good works, we acknowledge Henry Rosenberger as a committed leader and respected member of the Bucks County community who has set an outstanding example for others to follow.

HONORING YOUNG KIM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a former member of my staff, Young Kim, who recently left my office to pursue her passion for public service. Young has had an exceptional career, representing Orange County through my office for over 20 years.

After graduating from the University of Southern California and a stint in the private sector, Young began working for me in 1990, while I was a California State Senator. She continued working with me when I was elected as a U.S. Representative in 1992.

As my congressional staff member, Young served as District Representative and Director of Asian Community Affairs. In her capacity, she was a liaison to the cities within my district, advised me on issues pertaining to the Asian community, and helped keep the community involved and informed about my legislative priorities.

Young also helped to establish the Asian Pacific Congressional Advisory Council (APCAC) to foster a better relationship between the Asian-American community and the U.S. Congress and served as the APCAC Coordinator.

She also assisted me with my work on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. She traveled to Washington, DC, and Asia to coordinate the activities of the U.S.-Republic of Korea Interparliamentary Exchange (USROKIE) and the International Parliamentarians Coalition on North Korean Refugees and Human Rights (IPCNKR). Through USROKIE and IPCNKR, Young played a key role in addressing the issues affecting U.S.-Korea relations, including human rights, comfort women and trade.

Outside of work, Young has always been very active in the local community. Young is most proud of her involvement with the Orange County Chapter of the Korean American Coalition (KAC–OC), having served as President, Treasurer, and a member of the Board of Directors. Young played an instrumental role in establishing KAC's presence in Orange County.

Young also is a well-known Television Talk Show Host, and radio commentator. She hosted Season 2 episodes of REAL TALK on Arirang-TV, produced and hosted LA Seoul on KSCI–TV Channel 18, and KTE Journal on Korean Television Enterprise. Since July 2007, Young has provided weekly commentaries on political and public affairs through the 24-hour Radio Seoul, 1650 AM.

Young's dedication to community service has earned her many honors, including the distinction of ''Rising Asian Woman'' by the World Affairs Council, and ''Community Bridge Builder'' by the Korean American Federation. She has been presented with the prestigious American Marshall Memorial Fellowship (AMMF) by the German Marshall Fund, the ''Advocate for Asians Dedicated to the Community through Political Empowerment'' Award from the Asian Business Association of Orange County, and the ''International Leadership'' Award by the International Leadership Foundation.

One of Young's greatest joys is her family. She is married to Charles Kim. They reside in Fullerton and have raised four wonderful children. On behalf of California's 39th Congressional District, thank you Young for your service, and best wishes in your future endeavors.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, November 14, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 18

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine Silk Road, focusing on potential risks, threats and promises of virtual currencies.
SD–342

NOVEMBER 19

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine housing finance reform, focusing on the fundamentals of transferring credit risk in a future housing finance system.
SD–538

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine improving financial accountability at the Department of Defense.
SD–342

11 a.m.
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings to examine people of African descent and Black Europeans, focusing on issues of inequality, discrimination, and inclusion for Black Europeans, and discussing similarities and work with African-American civil rights organizations.
TBA

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the Federal Workforce
To hold hearings to examine the roles and effectiveness of oversight positions within the Federal workforce, focusing on strengthening government oversight.
SD–342

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Subcommittee on Economic Policy
To hold joint hearings to examine the present and future impact of virtual currency. SD–538

NOVEMBER 20

10 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sarah Bloom Raskin, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, and Rhonda K. Schmidtlein, of Missouri, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission.
SD–215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging
To hold hearings to examine health relating to social and economic status.
SD–430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider S. 1486, to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service, and the nomination of Jeh Charles Johnson, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.
SD–342

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine continued oversight of United States government surveillance authorities.
SD–226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine Affordable Care Act implementation, focusing on how to achieve a successful rollout of the small business exchanges.
SR–428

2 p.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection
To hold hearings to examine regulating financial holding companies and physical commodities.
SD–G50

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Federal Programs and the Federal Workforce
To hold hearings to examine the national security workforce.
SD–342

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine soldiers as consumers, focusing on business practices relating to the military community.
SR–253

Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs
To hold hearings to examine rebalance to Asia IV, focusing on economic engagement in the Asia-Pacific region.
SD–419

Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine Carcieri, focusing on bringing certainty to trust land acquisitions.
SD–628

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.
SD–226

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine S. 182, to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversion interest to the City, S. 483, to designate the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Conservation Area in the State of California, S. 771, to provide to the Secretary of the Interior a mechanism to cancel contracts for the sale of materials CA–20139 and CA–22901, S. 776, to establish the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness in the State of New Mexico, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State, S. 841, to designate certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado as wilderness, S. 1305, to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado, S. 1341, to modify the Forest Service Recreation Residence Program as the program applies to units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain by implementing a simple, equitable, and predictable procedure for determining cabin user fees, S. 1414, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, S. 1415, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, S. 1479, to address the forest health, public safety, and wildlife habitat threat presented by the risk of wildfire, including catastrophic wildfire, on National Forest System land and public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to expedite forest management projects relating to hazardous fuels reduction, forest health, and economic development, and S. 339, to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land.
SD–366

NOVEMBER 21

2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7965–S8011

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1688–1699, S. Res. 292–294, and S. Con. Res. 25.

Pages S7999–S8000

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 1681, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. (S. Rept. No. 113–120)

Page S7999

Measures Passed:

National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 293, designating the week beginning on November 18, 2013, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week".

Page S8010

National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 294, expressing support for the goals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children. **Pages S8010–11**

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 25, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for activities associated with the ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers. **Page S8011**

Measures Considered:

Drug Quality and Security Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 3204, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security. **Pages S7973–96**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 11:30 a.m., on Thursday, November 14, 2013, Senate vote on adoption of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Page S8011

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2017.

Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Mark Gilbert, of the District of Columbia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Independent State of Samoa.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

Routine list in the Navy. **Page S8011**

Messages from the House: **Page S7999**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S8000–01**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S8001–08**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7998–99**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S8008–10**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S8010**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S8010**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:03 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 14, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S8011.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SEQUESTRATION AND THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine sequestration and the defense industrial base, after receiving testimony from Mayor Larry Morrissey,

Rockford, Illinois; Marion Blakey, Aerospace Industries Association, and Lawrence P. Farrell, National Defense Industrial Association, both of Arlington, Virginia; Greg Bloom, Seal Science, Inc., Irvine, California; Stephen S. Fuller, George Mason University Center for Regional Analysis, Fairfax, Virginia; Larry Williams, BRS Aerospace, South Saint Paul, Minnesota; and Owen Herrnstadt, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

MANUFACTURING HUBS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the role of manufacturing hubs in a 21st century innovation economy, after receiving testimony from Senator Brown; Penny Pritzker, Secretary of Commerce; Eric Spiegel, Siemens Corporation, Washington, D.C.; Martin A. Schmidt, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge; Michael S. Garvey, M–7 Technologies, Youngstown, Ohio; and Terry Brewer, Brewer Science, Inc., Rolla, Missouri.

NOMINATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Jeh Charles Johnson, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Menendez and Booker, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

SURVEILLANCE TRANSPARENCY ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law concluded a hearing to examine S. 1452, to enhance transparency for certain surveillance programs authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, after receiving testimony from Senator Heller; Robert S. Litt, General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; J. Bradford Wiegmann, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, National Security Division, Department of Justice; Richard Salgado, Google, Inc., Mountain View, California; and Kevin S. Bankston, Center for Democracy and Technology, and Paul Rosenzweig, Red Branch Consulting, PLLC, both of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Moran, Sheryl H. Lipman, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, Stanley Allen Bastian, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington, who was introduced by Senator Murray, and Manish S. Shah, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, who was introduced by Senator Kirk, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

VETERAN ENTREPRENEURS PROGRAMS

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine a review of programs for veteran entrepreneurs, after receiving testimony from Rhett Jeppson, Associate Administrator, Small Business Administration; Lieutenant Colonel Jason C. Anderson, USAF, Active-Duty Entrepreneur LLC, Springfield, Virginia; Louis J. Celli, The American Legion, and Joe Wynn, Vets Group, Inc., both of Washington, D.C.; Robin D. Kistler, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge; Aaron Dirks, PosiGen, New Orleans, Louisiana; Robert Rehder, Fayetteville State University Veterans Business Outreach Center, Fayetteville, North Carolina; Mike Haynie, Syracuse University Institute for Veterans and Military Families, Syracuse, New York; Chris Ferguson, Shoulder 2 Shoulder Inc., Arlington, Virginia; and C. E. Rowe, America's SBDC, Burke, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 20 public bills, H.R. 3461–3480; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 102–103; and H. Res. 408–410 were introduced. **Pages H7050–51**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H7052–53**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Hartzler to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H7001**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H7005**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Rabbi Joshua Gruenberg, Congregation Beth El Yardley, Yardley, Pennsylvania. **Page H7006**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H7006, H7034**

Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2013: The House passed H.R. 982, to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos, by a recorded vote of 221 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 579. **Pages H7009–34**

Rejected the Owens motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with amendments, by a yea-and-nay vote of 197 yeas to 224 nays, Roll No. 578. **Pages H7032–33**

Rejected:

Cohen amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 113–264) that sought to exempt from the bill asbestos trusts with internal anti-fraud procedures (by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 575); **Pages H7025–26, H7030**

Nadler amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 113–264) that sought to protect public health and safety by adding a requirement that any party seeking payment information from a trust must also make available information relevant to such action that pertains to public health or safety (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 226 noes, Roll No. 576); and **Pages H7026–27, H7030–31**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 113–264) that sought to apply the transparency rules in the bill equally to asbestos industry defendants by requiring asbestos companies to report information about the location of their asbestos-containing products and provides an exception for trade secrets (by a recorded vote of 195 ayes to 226 noes, Roll No. 577). **Pages H7027–29, H7031–32**

H. Res. 403, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2655) and (H.R. 982), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 194 noes, Roll No. 574, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 573. **Pages H7009–17**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:55 p.m. and reconvened at 4:17 p.m. **Page H7029**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and agree to the following measure which was debated yesterday, November 12th:

Supporting the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the right to counsel: H. Res. 196, amended, to support the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the right to counsel. **Page H7034**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and a message received from the Senate today appear on pages H7040.

Senate Referrals: S. 1499 and S. 1512 were referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; S. 1557 was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and S Con. Res. 25 was held at the desk. **Pages H7017, H7050**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7016, H7017, H7030, H7030–31, H7031–32, H7032–33, H7033–34. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

Committee Meetings

KEEPING COLLEGE WITHIN REACH: SIMPLIFYING FEDERAL STUDENT AID

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Keeping College Within Reach: Simplifying Federal Student Aid". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing on H.R. 1518, to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing on S. 1009, the "Chemical Safety Improvement Act". Testimony was heard from Senators Vitter; and Udall (NM); and Jim Jones, Assistant Administrator, Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE 5 GHZ SPECTRUM BAND

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled "Challenges and Opportunities in the 5 GHz Spectrum Band". Testimony was heard from Julius Knapp, Chief Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission; and public witnesses.

FUTURE OF TERRORISM INSURANCE: FOSTERING PRIVATE MARKET INNOVATION TO LIMIT TAXPAYER EXPOSURE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled ''The Future of Terrorism Insurance: Fostering Private Market Innovation to Limit Taxpayer Exposure''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WHAT IS CENTRAL ABOUT CENTRAL BANKING?: A STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MODELS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled ''What Is Central About Central Banking?: A Study of International Models''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS: IRAN AFTER ROUHANI'S FIRST 100 DAYS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining Nuclear Negotiations: Iran After Rouhani's First 100 Days''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CONTINUING THREAT OF BOKO HARAM

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations; and Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''The Continuing Threat of Boko Haram''. Testimony was heard from Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a markup on H. Res. 147, calling for the release of United States citizen Saeed Abedini and condemning the Government of Iran for its persecution of religious minorities. The resolution was ordered reported, without amendment.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD IRAQ

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Iraq''. Testimony was heard from Brett McGurk, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Iraq and Iran, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State.

CYBER SIDE-EFFECTS

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Cyber Side-Effects: How Secure is the Personal Information Entered into the Flawed Healthcare.gov?''. Testimony was heard from Roberta ''Bobbie'' Stempfley, Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Cybersecurity and Communication, Department of Homeland Security; Soraya Correa, Associate Director, Enterprise Services Directorate, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

INSIDER THREAT TO HOMELAND SECURITY: EXAMINING OUR NATION'S SECURITY CLEARANCE PROCESSES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled ''The Insider Threat to Homeland Security: Examining Our Nation's Security Clearance Processes''. Testimony was heard from Merton W. Miller, Associate Director of Investigations, Federal Investigative Services, Office of Personnel Management; Gregory Marshall, Chief Security Officer, Department of Homeland Security; Brian Prioletti, Assistant Director Special Security Directorate, National Counterintelligence Executive, Office of Director of National Intelligence; and Brenda S. Farrell, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Military and DOD Civilian Personnel Issues, Government Accountability Office.

IMPLEMENTATION OF AN ENTRY-EXIT SYSTEM: STILL WAITING AFTER ALL THESE YEARS

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Implementation of an Entry-Exit System: Still Waiting After All These Years''. Testimony was heard from David F. Heyman, Assistant Secretary, Office of Policy, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

OBAMACARE IMPLEMENTATION: THE ROLLOUT OF HEALTHCARE.GOV

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''ObamaCare Implementation: The Rollout of Healthcare.gov''. Testimony was heard from Frank Baitman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Information Technology, Department of Health and Human Services; Henry Chao, Deputy Chief Information Officer and Deputy Director of the Office of Information Services, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services; Todd Park, Chief Technology Officer, Office of Science and Technology Policy, The White House; Steve VanRoekel, Chief Information Officer and Administrator, Office of Electronic Government, Office of Management and Budget; David Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

KEEPING AMERICA FIRST: FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN RESEARCH, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY AT NSF, NIST, OSTP AND INTERAGENCY STEM PROGRAMS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Keeping America FIRST: Federal Investments in Research, Science, and Technology at NSF, NIST, OSTP and Interagency STEM Programs''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CORRECTING KERFUFFLES—ANALYZING PROHIBITED PRACTICES AND PREVENTABLE PATIENT DEATHS AT JACKSON VAMC

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Correcting Kerfuffles—Analyzing Prohibited Practices and Preventable Patient Deaths at Jackson VAMC''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

VA'S INDEPENDENT LIVING PROGRAM—A PROGRAM REVIEW

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''VA's Independent Living Program—A Program Review''. Testimony was heard from Daniel Bertoni, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; Margarita Devlin, Acting Director, Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment, Veterans Benefit Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the current economic outlook, after receiving testimony from Jason Furman, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to the call.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard, to hold hearings to examine Southeast regional perspective on ''Magnuson-Stevens Act'' reauthorization, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider S. 753, to provide for national security benefits for White Sands Missile Range and Fort Bliss, S. 1169, to withdraw and reserve certain public land in the State of Montana for the Limestone Hills Training Area, and S. 1309, to withdraw and reserve certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for military uses; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Steven Croley, of Michigan, to be General Counsel, and Christopher Smith, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, both of the Department of Energy, and Esther Puakela Kia'aina, of Hawaii, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Insular Affairs, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. 1271, to direct the President to establish guidelines for the United States foreign assistance programs, an original bill entitled, ''Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2013'', and the nominations of Daniel W. Yohannes, of Colorado, to be Representative to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador, Anthony Luzzatto Gardner, of New York, to be Representative to the European Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, Amy Jane Hyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau, and Elizabeth Frawley Bagley, of the District of Columbia, Theodore Strickland, of Ohio, and Stephen N. Zack, of Florida, all to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-eighth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, all of the Department of State, 11:15 a.m., S–116, Capitol.

Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on developments in Egypt, 2 p.m., SVC–217.

Subcommittee on European Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the Eastern Partnership, focusing on the outlook for Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Belarus, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine ensuring access to higher education, focusing on simplifying Federal student aid for today's college student, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine threats to the homeland, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine contract support costs and sequestration, focusing on Indian country, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 619, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments, S. 1410, to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders, S. 1675, to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, S. 975, to provide for the inclusion of court-appointed guardianship improvement and oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009, and the nominations of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Pamela L. Reeves, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, Vince Girdhari Chhabria, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, James Maxwell Moody, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and Peter Joseph Kadzik, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Peter C. Tobin, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Ohio, and Amos Rojas, Jr., of Florida, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Florida, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, to hold hearings to examine cartel prosecution, focusing on stopping price fixers and protecting consumers, 2:45 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Effects of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on Schools, Colleges, and Universities'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Obamacare Implementation Problems: More than Just a Broken Website'', 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''The Impact of Patent Assertion Entities on Innovation and the Economy'', 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled ''EPA's Proposed GHG Standards for New Power Plants; and a measure regarding the Whitfield-Manchin legislation, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, markup on the following legislation: H.R. 3329, to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes; H.R. 3468, the ''Credit Union Share Insurance Fund Parity Act''; H.R. 1800, the ''Small Business Credit Availability Act''; H.R. 2274, the ''Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013''; and H.R. 3448, the ''Small Cap Liquidity Reform Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation Security, hearing entitled ''TSA's SPOT Program and Initial Lessons From the LAX Shooting'', 9:30 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Over-Criminalization Task Force, hearing on Regulatory Crime: Solutions, 10:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee markup on the following legislation: H.R. 1308, the ''Endangered Salmon and Fisheries Predation Prevention Act''; H.R. 2798, to amend Public Law 106–206 to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to require annual permits and assess annual fees for commercial filming activities on Federal land for film crews of 5 persons or fewer; H.R. 2824, the ''Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America''; H.R. 3008, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in Los Padres National Forest in California, and for other purposes; H.R. 3188, the ''Yosemite Rim Fire Emergency Salvage Act''; and H.R. 3189, the ''Water Rights Protection Act'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled ''Reviewing Alternatives to Amtrak's Annual Losses in Food and Beverage Service'', 9:30 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled ''Border Security Oversight, Part III: Border Crossing Cards and B1/B2 Visas'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 3350, the ''Keep Your Health Plan Act of 2013'', 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Strengthening Transparency and Accountability within the Environmental Protection Agency'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Health and Technology, hearing entitled ''Self-Insurance and Health Benefits: An Affordable Option for Small Business?'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Progress Report: Hurricane Sandy Recovery—One Year Later'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Addressing Operational Challenges to Ensure Accurate and Optimal VA Third Party Collections'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, November 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond two hours), Senate will vote on adoption of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 3204, Drug Quality and Security Act.

(Senate will recess from 1 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, November 14

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 2655—Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2013 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1641, E1645, E1647
Barton, Joe, Tex., E1649
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E1643, E1648
Broun, Paul C., Ga., E1642
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E1651
Clarke, Yvette D., N.Y., E1644
Clay, Wm. Lacey, Mo., E1648
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1649
Cook, Paul, Calif., E1651
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1652
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E1647
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1642, E1643, E1645, E1646, E1648, E1650, E1652
Foster, Bill, Ill., E1645
Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E1642
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E1650
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E1642
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1647
Keating, William R., Mass., E1641
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E1641
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E1644
McGovern, James P., Mass., E1648
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E1643
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1643
Olson, Pete, Tex., E1646
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1646
Pittenger, Robert, N.C., E1645
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1643, E1649
Royce, Edward R., Calif., E1652
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E1649
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1641
Valadao, David G., Calif., E1645
Wagner, Ann, Mo., E1644
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1645

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.