United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2013 No. 175

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 11, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. 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, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

NOTICE

If the 113th Congress, 1st Session, adjourns sine die on or before December 24, 2013, a final issue of the *Congressional Record* for the 113th Congress, 1st Session, will be published on Tuesday, December 31, 2013, to permit Members to insert statements.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT–59 or S–123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through Monday, December 30. The final issue will be dated Tuesday, December 31, 2013, and will be delivered on Thursday, January 2, 2014.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the *Congressional Record* may contain subject matter, or relate to any event, that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be formatted according to the instructions at http://webster/secretary/cong__record.pdf, and submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at "Record@Sec.Senate.gov".

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at http://clerk.house.gov/forms. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, and signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT–59.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the *Congressional Record* may do so by contacting the Office of Congressional Publishing Services, at the Government Printing Office, on 512–0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CHARLES E. SCHUMER, *Chairman.*

AMENDMENT TO FERS ANNUITY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, on the June 13 of this year, I introduced a bill, H.R. 2357, to provide that Members must complete 12 years of credible service to become vested into the retirement system. I have not professed to be an expert on pensions, Mr. Speaker, but 5 years appear to be very generous. So in my bill I had extended that from the 5-year timeframe to 12 years.

Printed on recycled paper.

Taxpayers subsidize this plan. I believe by increasing the minimum timeframe, I think it would, obviously, result in considerable savings. I have conducted no survey to support that, but commonsense tells me that. In fact, this is a commonsense proposal.

For example, Mr. Speaker, a Member of Congress now must complete only 5 years of credible service to become vested. I know of no plan, other than this one, that would vest at 5 years. Such a Member would be required, if my bill is enacted, to complete at least 12 years of service prior to becoming vested.

I figured after 4 or 5 weeks I would have attracted at least 20 to 25 cosponsors. Today, I have no cosponsors. So, to walk you through how it would work if my plan is adopted, a Member of the Congress must complete not 5 years, but 12 years of service. That can be done through six 2-year House terms or two 6-year Senate terms or a combination thereof.

It is a commonsense proposal. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I will anxiously await the knock on the door for cosponsors willing to sign up. The welcome mat is out. It is a good proposal.

GIVE DIPLOMACY A CHANCE TO SUCCEED

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in the rush to wrap up and go home, there is too much unfinished business, including leaving 2.15 million long-term unemployed in the lurch.

But one item should not be on the agenda: an attempt to undermine the diplomatic breakthrough with Iran, the most encouraging development with that country in 34 years. We would give the hardliners in Iran who really hate the preliminary agreement an excuse to walk away. It would be a continuation of 60 years of mismanagement by the United States with our relationship with that proud nation with deep ties to America.

The worst thing we did was team with the British to overthrow their democratically elected government in 1953 and replace most of that with the Shah, who for 25 years, was a repressive dictator.

Few remember, if they ever knew, that the Iranians helped stabilize Afghanistan after we drove the Taliban from power. They don't know that the people in Tehran had candlelight vigils in sympathy to the United States after 9/11 where some of the supposed allies of the United States were celebrating our loss in the streets. For that, the Iranians were rewarded with the label of being part of the Axis of Evil.

We must make diplomacy the key. We are not going to be able to bomb away the knowledge of how to develop nuclear weapons. Experts I have talked to say they could have made a nuclear bomb years ago if they had really been bent on that creation.

Torpedoing the agreement will be counterproductive. It risks collapse of sanctions which depend on the Chinese, the Indians, and the Japanese not buying Iranian oil. If we appear unreasonable, we lose international support, and we can lose ground.

It would undercut President Hassan Rouhani, elected by the Iranians who want change and a more moderate approach to the world. Iranians—people who have been there and testify—actually like Americans. They don't much like the repressive government. But that support can help reach more than just a nuclear deal.

Iran is key to solving the nightmare that is Syria, prying them back from supporting the insurgents in support for a long-term solution. Iran is key to holding Iraq together and not having it spin off into civil war and to defeat or at least contain the Taliban resurgents in Afghanistan.

A recent poll showed 57 percent of the American public supports the agreement. When they are given greater detail about what it entails, that support increases to 63 percent.

Don't undercut the best chance to reorder the Middle East in a third of a century. I think we ought to give diplomacy a chance to succeed for a change.

THE NEW YEAR OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, a great tragedy is now unfolding across America as we prepare for the new year.

Millions of Americans are losing their health plans. Millions more are facing staggering price increases. Millions more are having their hours cut back at work or seeing their salaries pared back because of ObamaCare.

Sadly, this is just the beginning. In coming days, millions of employer-provided plans face cancelation, multiplying this disaster many fold.

The administration recently held a contest for videos to promote ObamaCare. Its grand prize winner featured this message: Don't worry about the price tag. Don't worry about the price tag? Isn't that helpful and compassionate advice to the millions of Americans who are struggling through the fifth year of Obamanomics and who are now also facing the reality of seeing their premiums doubling or tripling.

Just don't worry about the price tag, skip the House payment, and cough up the extra cash. That is the best that this administration can offer? Many millions of Americans who had health coverage on New Year's Eve will not have it on New Year's Day because of ObamaCare.

What awaits those who actually can sign up? According to the government's own numbers, about two-thirds of exchange applicants have been forced into Medicaid. That includes many on limited incomes who have maintained bare-bones policies because they are desperately trying to stay out of Medicaid. Some have found that nearly by looking at prices they have ended up trapped in this dreaded welfare program.

A major study documents that Medicaid patients have worse health outcomes than those without any insurance. If you doubt that, just see how long it will take you to see a Medicaid doctor, if you can find one, for a bad cold.

If you are a part of the one in three exchange visitors who escaped this fate, the next problem will be to find a doctor—any doctor. The president of the California Medical Association reports that 70 percent of California doctors will not accept ObamaCare patients. That means the remaining 30 percent will be overwhelmed, resulting in life-threatening waiting lines.

As patients desperately seek doctors in emergency rooms, actual emergencies will go waiting. Top-flight specialized doctors and facilities will become increasingly inaccessible as they opt out of the system.

Those patients who actually can get an appointment may then discover that there is no record of their policy because the government hasn't been able to connect patients with their new insurers. Patients will next face the cold reality of sky-high deductibles and copayments that many will be unable to pay. Many hospitals that serve large populations of the poor can only do so because of supplemental payments, but ObamaCare is phasing those out. Some may be forced to close their doors.

Those ObamaCare patients fortunate enough to stay well in this brave new world can expect a highly elevated risk of identity theft in what the founder of McAfee Security Software calls a ''hacker's dream.'' And there is no need to wait for hackers. In some cases, the government has already accidentally released patients' private financial and medical information.

Since so many people—particularly the young—are choosing not to pay inflated prices to subsidize others, we can expect another major round of rate increases next fall on those remaining in the system in order to make up the shortfalls.

That is what the new year will bring to our country. Many of us in the House warned of this coming train wreck, and we tried at least to delay it. For this, we were called arsonists, terrorists, jihadists, and demagogues; but now those warnings have proven chillingly and entirely accurate.

This program has devastated the lives of millions of Americans. This damage now cannot be undone by delaying it or tinkering with it. It must be repealed and replaced with the patient-centered plan proposed by House

Republicans, a plan guided by individual freedom of choice and open competition.

This will only happen if there is a massive change of heart by the congressional Democrats who imposed this nightmare on our country. Now is the time for all Americans whose lives have been upended by their folly to share their stories with their Representatives and to pray that they actually can touch some hearts and change some minds during this holiday season. Otherwise, I am afraid that New Year's Day will be nothing to celebrate.

CLOSING GUANTANAMO BAY

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, when it was first opened in the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, the Guantanamo Bay prison may have seemed a reasonable stopgap measure as a shocked Nation marshaled its resources and figured out how to dispose of detainees taken in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

But even in those early days, the problems we were creating with Guantanamo's patchwork of military rules and commissions were readily apparent. Since 2002, I have introduced numerous bills and amendments to try to bring Guantanamo into conformity with American and international law and to stop it from becoming a jihadi recruiting tool.

But reform of this prison system has been elusive and progress towards bringing its detainees to justice almost nonexistent, as U.S. courts have taken strong issue with its improvised legal process.

In one of his first acts as President, Barack Obama ordered the closing of Guantanamo, but the Congress almost immediately stepped in and erected a series of statutory barriers that have prevented the transfer of detainees to the United States and made transfer to third countries extremely difficult.

Today, there is a renewed push by the administration to shutter Guantanamo for good. Doing so will not be easy, but the cost of keeping the prison open—to our values, to our pocketbook, to our reputation, and to our security—have become too great to bear.

There are now 164 detainees at Guantanamo, 84 of whom have been cleared for transfer to their home country or another country willing to accept them. These detainees should be processed and transferred as soon as security considerations will allow.

This would leave 80 remaining detainees, who are roughly split into two groups. The first group, which includes Khalid Sheikh Mohamed and other key 9/11 plotters, consists of detainees slated for trial under the military commissions that were established by the Bush administration.

These proceedings have been mired in pre-trial wrangling; and the longer they drag on, the less legitimate the overall system appears. Meanwhile, our civilian judicial system, which many congressional critics have derided as not up to the task of handling terrorism cases, has disposed of a long line of defendants—from Richard Reid, the Shoe Bomber, to Omar Farouk Abdulmutallab, the Underwear Bomber, and Faisal Shaizhad, the Times Square Bomber—all successfully prosecuted in America's civilian courts, and none will ever be released again.

□ 1015

By lifting its restriction on transferring these detainees to the United States for trial, Congress could give the administration the flexibility to transfer many of those now in the military commission system to Article III courts for prosecution. These civilian courts can be more expeditious, more effective, and, in the eyes of the world, more just than military tribunals.

The remaining detainees—some 46 men—will be the most difficult cases. These are detainees considered too dangerous to release or transfer, but who cannot be prosecuted. For some, evidence cannot be presented without revealing critical sources of intelligence and methods. Others were tortured, or evidence against them was collected through torture or some other unlawful means. For still others, the evidence of past acts and future dangerousness, while not sufficient to prosecute, argues compellingly against any release or transfer.

The administration announced over the summer that it would begin a review of these cases, and as a result, others may be cleared for transfer or prosecution. It is likely that many, if not most, of the detainees in this final category will remain in American custody. But where?

Even if we ultimately decide to maintain these detainees in custody, that does not justify continued operation of Guantanamo Bay. Instead, they should be transferred to civilian or military confinement in the United States, an option currently blocked by Congress.

Every day that it remains open, Guantanamo Bay damages the United States. Because there are other, better options for prosecution and detention of these inmates, we are not safer for Guantanamo's existence. In fact, it makes us more vulnerable by drawing new generations to the jihad.

The Congress, the administration, and the military can work together to find a solution that protects our people even as we maintain our principles and devotion to the rule of law. The President has indicated that he would like to work with Congress to end the Guantanamo era. We should take him up on that important challenge.

SUPPORTING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Food Network recently broadcast an episode of their hit reality-based cooking television series, ''Chopped.'' Aspiring teen chefs highlighted their culinary skills and competed for a scholarship that would be put towards a leading culinary school. Competition aside, these young chefs are ambassadors of career and technical education programs. They amazed professional judges and made the viewing public second-guess mom's cooking.

As cochair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, which I am proud to lead with my good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), I congratulate the Food Network and ''Chopped'' for promoting these young culinary professionals.

Mr. Speaker, inspiration is like lightning; it doesn't strike in the same place twice. With 2014 quickly approaching, we should do everything in our power in order to support the culinary arts and the entire range of other career and technical education programs and fields that offer aspiring young minds and transitioning adults a gateway to success in a rapidly evolving and dynamic job market. The future of America deserves as much.

RECOGNIZING LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LABORATORY FOR OUTSTANDING WORK

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory for its outstanding scientific work and the dedicated scientists who played a role in the effort that was recently awarded the 2013 Nobel Peace Prize.

Yesterday, in Oslo, Norway, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, OPCW, received the 2013 Nobel Peace Prize for its work enforcing the global ban on chemical weapons. The OPCW received this prestigious award in part because of the contributions from over 21 scientific laboratories around the world. That work, in different capacities, led to identifying and destroying chemical weapons across the world. One of these laboratories is from the 15th Congressional District, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

Over the past 13 years, Lawrence Livermore Forensic Science Center has worked closely with the OPCW to analyze samples and test for the possible presence of chemical weapons. The OPCW and Lawrence Livermore Laboratory were recognized specifically for actions that OPCW has recently taken in Syria—to identify, destroy, and dismantle the Assad regime's chemical weapons that they most recently used back in August on their own people.

I have been a sharp critic of proposed military action in Syria. I believed all along that there was a third way, that it was not a false choice between isolationism, not doing anything, and taking military action in Syria. The actions of OPCW and the United Nations have shown, in working in collaboration with the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, that diplomacy can work. We can go into Syria and identify these dangerous chemical weapons; we can dismantle them and make sure that a ruthless dictator never again can use them on his own people.

Together, the work of OPCW and Lawrence Livermore Laboratory has created a safer world. But they recognize that their work will not be complete until the world is free of chemical weapons.

I have been a tireless advocate for funding of both Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the other laboratory that is in my district, Sandia National Laboratory. The work that is being done right now with OPCW shows that the work being done at our national laboratories has value and that we cannot continue to chip away at Federal funding for our national laboratories.

Congratulations again to OPCW for receiving the Nobel Peace Prize, and I am very proud of the scientific community, the engineers at Lawrence Livermore for your work in support of OPCW and their efforts.

ADDRESSING CHALLENGING FISCAL ISSUES

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a framework I have designed which will begin to address the challenging fiscal issues we face as a Nation. This proposal is to deal with the impending debt ceiling crisis that will be coming upon us in February or shortly thereafter.

I am pleased to hear recent news today of a budget agreement dealing with a potential government shutdown resolution that avoids governing by crisis, but we have the debt ceiling issue right behind. What I have put forth, Mr. Speaker, is an honest, sincere proposal consisting of three steps to reduce our spending on the Federal level, address our Nation's broken Tax Code, and ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I outlined the proposal in a letter sent to the President on November 15 of this year, and that letter reads:

Dear Mr. President,

It is time. As I have expressed before in writing to you and members of your administration, I am very interested in working with you in a bipartisan manner to implement long-term solutions to America's debt problems. Our impending debt crisis and threats to the solvency of Social Security and Medicare must be solved now before they reach catastrophic levels. I urge you to work with Congress to achieve a long-term solution. As such, I would like to take you up on your public offer to discuss ideas and implement solutions that will no longer force us to govern through crises, cliffs, or shutdown deadlines.

On October 16, 2013, you stated you are ''Willing to work with anybody . . . Democrat or Republican, House or Senate Members on any idea that will grow our economy, create new jobs, strengthen the middle class, and get our fiscal house in order for the long term.'' To that end, I submit the following honest proposal which I truly believe will take a small but significant step forward toward more responsible governance. Also, I hope it might change the culture of Washington, D.C., to an environment where good policy triumphs over politics.

As you can see, the honest proposal is a multistep vision and plan summarized as follows:

Step 1, raise the February 7, 2014, debt ceiling limit in an amount equal to the total CBO score of spending reductions, reforms, and removal of waste, fraud, and abuse within government operations that have already been identified and supported on a bipartisan basis. Attached, please find a list of $573 billion of such government reforms and spending reductions already identified to date.

Step 2a, upon completion of step 1, we will then move to step 2. In step 2, what we would propose is votes in the House and Senate on their respective visions for comprehensive tax reform and also for reform of our entitlement programs to ensure their solvency for another generation would occur. If those votes occur in the House and Senate, there would be automatic relief of the debt ceiling cap for an additional year.

And then we would move to step 3, Mr. President. Step 3 would essentially say, if in the House or the Senate we enact either one of those long-term solutions through our Tax Code or through our entitlement crisis with our Social Security and Medicare insolvency coming down on us, we would immediately, in step 3, relieve the debt ceiling for an additional 2-year period of time. This would mean, Mr. President, the debt ceiling restraint would no longer impact your administration as it would be automatically extended beyond the end of your administration's term.

I kindly request you review this proposal and then meet to discuss how it can be improved and implemented. To me, this is an honest proposal which will put Americans first and begin to address the pressing issues of our day. We have major debt issues that cannot wait any longer. Our arcane Tax Code stifles economic growth, and the fiscal health of Social Security and Medicare is worsening beyond control. If we solve these two challenges, we will place our children and grandchildren and our Nation's finances in a far better position than where they are now projected to be. To me, this adheres to a fundamental rule that we must pass America on to our next generation in a better condition than which we found her.

I look forward to hearing your thoughts and working with you to prevent the dire consequences of failing to address these challenges.

Mr. Speaker, I have yet to receive a response from the President, not even a courtesy response so I know it was received and not lost in the mail between my office in the Longworth Building and the White House, less than 2 miles away.

So I take to the floor of the House today to have my proposal officially recorded and to lay out this framework to get our Nation on a path of fiscal sustainability, to get our American fellow citizens back to work by fixing our Tax Code, and solving the entitlement crisis that is impending upon us.

With that, I ask us to join in this proposal and ask the President to join us in a bipartisan manner to address these concerns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

FOOD INSECURITY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the Republican leadership has decided we will adjourn for the holidays. Notwithstanding the fact that we haven't done immigration reform, we haven't passed a jobs bill, we haven't extended unemployment insurance, they have all decided it is time to go home and enjoy the holidays. So on Friday, we will all leave and go back to our districts.

The one thing we will all have in common, Democrats and Republicans, is we will go back and we will enjoy the holidays, and we will partake in many celebrations. And the one thing that we will not have to worry about is whether or not we will have enough to eat. Our concern, quite frankly, will be overeating.

But the fact is, for millions of our fellow citizens, close to 50 million Americans, they will have to worry about whether they will have enough to eat for them and their families. Fifty million people in this country, the richest country in the history of the world, are hungry; 17 million are kids. All kinds of people fall in that category. Sadly, close to 1 million of our veterans rely on food assistance programs because they don't have enough to eat.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that so many people in the United States of America are hungry is a national disgrace. We should be outraged. There should be outrage in this Chamber. There should be a sense of urgency that we need to solve this problem. Yet what we see is indifference and, in some cases, outright hostility toward those Americans who happen to be poor.

The House of Representatives recently passed a farm bill that cut the SNAP program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, which is designed to ensure people have enough to eat. They cut that program by $40 billion. In the Senate version, they cut it by about $4.5 billion. There is now a conference committee going on, and press reports say that maybe they will decide on an $8 billion cut.

Eight billion dollars, what does that mean? That means that 850,000 families in this country will be impacted in a negative way by that cut; 1.7 million people.

□ 1030

For those people who would be impacted by that $8 billion cut, it is about a $90 cut per month in the benefit that they get. Every single person on the SNAP program received a cut. That cut that happened on November 1 for an average family of three would be about a $30 cut. So you add the $30 plus the $90 that we are now talking about, that is now a $120 cut per month for these families. That is a lot of money.

The fact of the matter is the SNAP benefit, as it stands, is not overly generous. In fact, I would say it is too stingy. It doesn't provide enough for people to be able to afford food, never mind nutritious food. A lot of the people who show up at our food banks and our food pantries are on the SNAP program. But to cut an average family of three's benefits by about $120 per month is outrageous. We don't have to worry. No one in this Chamber has to worry about whether or not they can afford to put food on the table for their families. Why aren't we more concerned with the fact that there are so many people in this country who are food insecure and who are outright hungry? We need to do something about this.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues say, Well, we are not really trying to cut people's benefits; all we are trying to do is reform the program. We are trying to combat a culture of dependency. When you cut this program that provides food to poor people, what you do is you don't deal with an issue of a culture of dependency. What you do is make their lives more miserable. The fact of the matter is the majority of people on SNAP are children, senior citizens, and disabled people. Of those who can work, a majority of them work. There are people who work full time and still are so poor they qualify for SNAP assistance.

And the response of this Congress is going to be to make their lives more miserable? I ask my colleagues who support these cuts, is that what you came here for, to make the lives of the most vulnerable in this country more miserable? Is that what you are here for? Is that the purpose of your service in the United States Congress? Give me a break. We need to solve these problems.

The fact of the matter is that increasing hunger in America costs us a great deal. Hungry kids don't learn in school. Senior citizens who can't afford their food and their medication and take their medication on an empty stomach end up in our emergency rooms. There is a cost to hunger. In fact, it is more expensive to tolerate the hunger in America than it is to solve the problem. We were elected to solve problems, to lift people up, and not put people down.

I would just finally close, Mr. Speaker, by saying I urge the White House to get more involved in this issue, to get involved in this fight. There are some things worth fighting for. Ending poverty and ending hunger in America is worth fighting for.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to reject cuts in the SNAP program that will increase hunger in America.

COMPUTER SCIENCE EDUCATION WEEK

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, to kick off this year's annual Computer Science Education Week taking place from December 9 to December 15, I had the pleasure of visiting with students at Capital High School in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

We took part in the global Hour of Code campaign organized by Computing in the Core and code.org that offers introductory coding activities and tutorials.

I also engaged with students about the importance of computer science by hosting a panel of industry professionals to highlight how diverse and exciting a career in computer science can truly be.

It is conversations like these that can be useful in helping young people navigate toward careers in computer science and STEM. In today's world, a degree in computer science translates into high-paying, in-demand jobs.

At a time when people are struggling to find work in our recovering economy, the computer science industry is growing, and New Mexico is predicted to add 15,360 computing jobs by 2018.

It has become increasingly essential for students to learn the language of code, the same way that they learn reading, writing, and mathematics. If we are to remain economically competitive and have a highly skilled workforce, access to computer science curricula and coding instruction must be a priority.

However, nationwide, only one in 10 schools offers computer science, and there is a great lack of diversity in those that do. Just 4 percent of students enrolled are female and 3 percent are students of color. In New Mexico, only 57 students took the computer science AP exam in 2012. This is a result, in part, of the fact that New Mexico does not offer computer science teacher certifications for middle and high school teachers and is one of the 36 States that does not count computer science courses toward high school graduation requirements for math and science.

Computer science provides students with the 21st-century skills necessary for innovation by teaching design, logical reasoning, and problem-solving. Yet, too few students have access to this rigorous coursework. That is why I cosponsored H.R. 2536, the Computer Science Education Act, that will help ensure that more students have access to computer science education by making it a core academic subject and including computer science teachers in professional development.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Computer Science Education Week and Computer Science Education Act. It is critically important that every student have the opportunity to learn computer science at an early age.

When we show them that they have the power to create the next great app, not just use it, I believe we will capture their hearts and minds and foster the next generation of innovators.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN REDNOUR

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of one of my constituents, Mr. John Rednour of Du Quoin, Illinois.

John passed away on December 1, and I had the privilege of attending his funeral service last week. All of us came to honor a man who did so much for southern Illinois. John had many titles, and most of us knew him as the mayor of Du Quoin, a position he held for 24 years. He was a businessman, a banker, and an ironworker. He served for many years on the Illinois State Police Merit Board. But none of those titles do the man justice. He was one of the foremost civic leaders in Illinois, and he worked tirelessly to improve southern Illinois and to create opportunity and jobs for its people.

John was a self-made man who rose from humble beginnings, but never forgot where he came from. His passing is a loss to our region. Most of all, it is a loss for his family; and today I ask my colleagues to remember the Rednour family, especially John's wife of 61 years, Wanda, who was his true partner.

Southern Illinois is a better place because of John Rednour, and today I am proud to honor my friend's memory.

URGING UKRAINE TO SETTLE ITS INTERNAL DISAGREEMENTS PEACEFULLY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the political turmoil in Ukraine demands the world's attention.

It is now 5 p.m. in Kiev where protesters in Independence Square are regrouping after a night of violent crashes with Ukrainian security forces. As of now, the security forces have begun to pull back from the crackdown; and despite intimidation and threats of violence, the opposition has retained control of Euromaiden, the name given to Independence Square in a clear sign of solidarity with Europe.

The United States has sided unequivocally with those Ukrainians who are demonstrating for an independent Ukraine, for their rights to free assembly and free speech under provisions of

international law, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Our Secretary of State has called upon the Government of Ukraine to respect the rights of all people and expressed the disgust of the United States with the use of force against peaceful protesters as unbefitting a democracy.

As Secretary Kerry noted, the right to free assembly is ''a universal value, not just an American one.''

The House Ukrainian Caucus, which I cochair with Mr. LEVIN and Mr. GERLACH, has expressed its support for the rights of the Ukrainian people to exercise their rights to political speech and free assembly.

Yes, these are difficult, yet hopeful, times for Ukraine, which is trying to find its rightful place among the community of nations despite daunting domestic challenges. The country is gripped by uncertainty, which is exacerbating an already difficult economic situation.

The current crisis was triggered by the decision of the current political leadership to pursue free trade with Ukraine's eastern neighbor, Russia, rather than neighbors to the west, the European Union.

Regardless of the political discord in Ukraine, this Congress should urge all parties to settle their internal disagreements peacefully and without violence.

Ukraine's soils historically have been showered with the precious blood of their country men and women at a higher rate than most human beings could even imagine. The brilliantly recounted ''Bloodlands,'' written by Yale scholar Dr. Timothy Snyder, tells their story. Yes, though Ukraine's very name means borderland, she too often has been a bloodland. May this not happen now.

Ukraine must adapt to embrace a world in which her own independence from interference surpasses any other priority. She should be free to engage all directions, east, west, south, and north, without fear of retaliation. She is a bridge to all nations, and therein will lie her prosperity.

As Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security adviser to President Carter writes in today's Financial Times:

> Two decades of independence, of growing pride in rediscovering Ukrainian history, and of observing the country's western neighbors economically benefiting from their European connections is creating a new mindset. That mindset is not embracing anti-Russianism, but it is asserting Ukraine's own historic identity as culturally an authentic part of a larger Europe.

Mr. Brzezinski believes the current political change in Ukraine is part of an historically significant, yet inevitable, political transformation. He believes Ukraine and Russia, too, will eventually orient to the west. I have ultimate respect in his opinion and pray he is correct.

Those of us who love Ukraine have longed for the day when it is no longer a prisoner of geography, hemmed in between Germany and Russia, but a free and willing member of the community of democratic nations.

Perhaps one day Ukraine will break free of the shackles of domination of the past. Perhaps one day Ukraine's geographic location will be an asset, not a liability, a day when Ukraine looks both east and west and, in fact, in all four directions.

But as we can see from the images coming to us from Kiev, the road will not be smooth. We know the future lies with freedom and with democracy and with opportunity, not repression in isolation; but that is cold comfort in the streets of Ukraine today.

The United States Congress must stand forthrightly with the liberty-loving people of Ukraine during this difficult hour. At this time of testing, the people of Ukraine and the people of the United States should be inspired by the words of Ukraine's most famous poet, Taras Shevchenko:

> Then in your own house you will see true justice, strength and liberty. There is no other such Ukraine.''

[From the Financial Times, Dec. 10, 2013]

RUSSIA, LIKE UKRAINE, WILL BECOME A REAL DEMOCRACY

(By Zbigniew Brzezinski)

Come what may, the events in Ukraine are historically irreversible and geopolitically transformatory. Sooner rather than later, Ukraine will be truly a part of democratic Europe; later rather than sooner, Russia will follow unless it isolates itself and becomes a semi-stagnant imperialistic relic.

The spontaneous outburst of distinctive Ukrainian patriotism—sparked by the mendacity of a corrupt and self-enriching leadership ready to seek Moscow's protection—signals that commitment to national independence is becoming the dominant political reality. This is especially the case among the younger Ukrainians who no longer feel that they are linguistically or historically just a slightly deviant part of ''Mother Russia''.

Yes, linguistic divisions persist and some parts of Ukraine still feel closer to Russia. But it is striking that even some of the most outspoken espousers of a European vocation have only recently embraced the Ukrainian language as their own. Two decades of independence, of growing pride in rediscovering Ukrainian history, and of observing the country's western neighbours economically benefiting from their European connections is creating a new mindset. That mindset is not embracing anti-Russianism but it is asserting Ukraine's own historic identity as culturally an authentic part of a larger Europe.

That is why, one way or another, Ukraine will unavoidably come closer to Europe. It is striking that even in neighbouring Belarus, ruled by the authoritarian Lukashenko regime, a similar western orientation is beginning to surface. Neither country is motivated by hostility towards Russia, but each senses that its independence as well as its cultural identity points increasingly in a westward direction.

In the next months some sort of a deal between the EU and Ukraine can still be contrived. To facilitate it, the EU must be more receptive to Kiev's need for economic and financial support. Ukrainians have to realise that European taxpayers are not enchanted by the prospect of paying for the misdeeds and corruption of the current Kiev elite. Belt-tightening will be the necessary precondition for an agreement as well as a test of Ukraine's resolve in asserting its European aspirations. Kiev will also need to show that the outcome of elections is not determined by the imprisonment of political rivals.

The impact of this on Russia will be felt over the longer run. Moscow's current geopolitical goal, shaped by President Vladimir Putin's nostalgic obsession with the country's imperial past, is to recreate in a new guise something akin to the old Russian empire or the more recent Soviet ''union''.

Mr. Putin seems to harbour the naive notion that the leaders of the post-Soviet states will genuinely accept a subordinate role in a Kremlin-led entity. Some of the leaders do pay occasional lip service to that formula—but out of necessity, not conviction. All prefer independence: it is more pleasant to be presidents, prime ministers, generals, ambassadors and economic moneymakers at home rather than to be the provincial equivalents thereof in a larger Russian empire. The historically proven fact is that national statehood, once attained, is infectious and almost impossible to undo except through massive external force.

Today's Russia is in no position to assert a violent restoration of its old empire. It is too weak, too backward and too poor. Its demographic crisis makes matters worse. The fact that the newly independent Central Asian states favour increasingly comprehensive arrangements with China is another concern for Russia, reawakening long lingering territorial nightmares.

It is only a question of time before it becomes evident to Russia's social elites that Mr. Putin's heavy-handed efforts have very limited prospects of success. Sooner or later, he will no longer be president. And not long thereafter Russia—and especially its emerging new middle class—will conclude that the only path that makes sense is to become also a truly modern, democratic, and maybe even a leading European state.

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

You have blessed us with all good gifts, and with thankful hearts, we express our gratitude. You have created us with opportunities to serve other people in their need, to share together in respect and affection, and to be faithful in the responsibilities we have been given.

In this moment of prayer, please grant to the Members of this people's House the gifts of wisdom and discernment that in their words and actions

they will do justice, love with mercy, and walk humbly with You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. 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. WILSON of South Carolina. 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 gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HULTGREN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

RECOGNIZING COMPUTER SCIENCE EDUCATION WEEK

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Computer Science Education Week.

On Monday, I participated in an international ''Hour of Code.'' PJ, a 12-year-old programming genius, helped me write basic computer code for the game Angry Birds.

Elgin Technology Center staff, along with local robotics team mentor Carol McKellar, organized an important educational event for students eager about coding. If these kids can accomplish what we did in just an hour, imagine how far students could go if computer science were more accessible at a younger age.

Currently, software jobs outnumber students 3 to 1. Teaching coding can help fill employers' growing needs for graduates in computing fields. Coding is not just for computer scientists. Fields such as advanced manufacturing require workers skilled in computer science.

If I can learn, it shows anyone can learn to code.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, in this holiday season of compassion and giving, we must not forget those who are still suffering from the effects of the worst recession to hit our country since the Great Depression.

Although the recent news about job creation is cause for optimism and the budget negotiations look promising, there are still too many trying every day to find work to allow them to put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads.

We must pass an extension of unemployment insurance. Unless we take action, millions of Americans, thousands of them Oregonians, will see unemployment benefits end in a few short weeks. Remember, benefits are contingent on continued job search. Our constituents are searching, but if they are still out of work, they are about to lose a lifeline. We can't let that happen.

I encourage House leadership to bring a resolution to the floor that will continue unemployment insurance for another year. We must act now. This is no time to end assistance to millions of Americans who are out of work through no fault of their own.

CONSTITUENTS ARE HURTING BECAUSE OF OBAMACARE

(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, people across America are hurting because ObamaCare is destroying jobs. Thousands of residents from North Augusta to Blythewood in South Carolina's Second Congressional District have appealed for answers to the difficulties they are facing because of the government health care takeover. Kathleen Sebelius has failed.

Over the weekend, I heard from constituents who were applying for a second or third job because their current income will not cover the increased costs of health care. Others have shared stories of sticker shock because they pay three times more for the same coverage.

Concerns have been vindicated by the projections of job losses by the National Federation of Independent Business because of the health care takeover.

We must repeal and replace ObamaCare with a patient-centered plan that creates jobs, which has been long proposed by Congressman Dr. TOM PRICE, and puts personal health care decisions back into the people's hands.

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

Congratulations to First Lieutenant Hunter Wilson for completing his service this year in Afghanistan.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of over 1 million Americans to urge my colleagues to extend unemployment insurance benefits so they can continue to meet their basic needs while searching for work.

Last week, we were encouraged by the labor report that showed the economy was adding jobs, the unemployment rate is shrinking, and companies are again investing. But there is still work to be done. For the 11 million Americans without a job, the economy is still in a state of emergency. When a mom in Chicago or a dad in Kankakee loses their job, the whole family feels it.

I have met with many people from Illinois with impressive qualifications who are weary from the job search. They want what we all want: a good job, a livable wage, and a Congress that will work to create new economic opportunities. But until that is achieved, they are asking for a hand up, not a handout, in these tough times.

It is for these Americans I urge my colleagues to extend unemployment insurance benefits now, because every citizen deserves support in their pursuit of the American Dream.

WHAT IS THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN?

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, what we know is this: on January 1, millions of Americans are scheduled to lose the health insurance plans they liked and wanted to keep. Nowhere near that many have managed to enroll in ObamaCare. Because Washington said those plans would be illegal on January 1, health care providers followed the law and took steps to cancel millions of plans on schedule.

But President Obama and Secretary Sebelius haven't been ready with a functional alternative, and certainly not an affordable alternative for the millions of Americans who will be without coverage on January 1 because of ObamaCare.

No one wants to see a situation where fewer Americans have coverage, but forcing an unready law and unwanted alternatives on the American

people might just have unintended consequences.

So what's the President's plan?

The American people are tired of waiting for clarity from an administration that keeps waiting until the last minute to change its mind and announce the next big delay.

RENEW SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, last year diabetes cost the U.S. economy $245 billion. That number will only continue to climb unless Congress supports critical medical research and treatment initiatives like the Special Diabetes Program.

The Special Diabetes Program contributes to groundbreaking research at the National Institutes of Health. Continued investment in this program will bring hope for a cure and a better life to the 26 million Americans living with diabetes. The Special Diabetes Program also funds treatment, education, and prevention programs for American Indian and Alaska Native families who are disproportionately affected by diabetes.

We must continue our commitment to fighting this deadly disease. Without a timely, multiyear renewal, work that could save hundreds of thousands of lives is put at risk. I urge my colleagues to support legislation to renew the Special Diabetes Program.

REPUBLICAN SOLUTIONS

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we still have a lot of improving to do. While last week's job report showed some encouraging signs, there is more work to be done.

What are House Republicans doing to help?

Well, for one, we want to get government out of the way of economic growth. We want to curb the excessive regulations coming out of Washington, D.C. We want to protect Americans from the harmful effects of ObamaCare.

And with so many Americans still struggling to make ends meet, it is not fair that Washington Democrats want to force people to pay more for their own health care. What is more, policy cancelations and technical problems have left many Americans unsure if they are even covered at all.

That is not going to help our economy. We need real pro-growth solutions that will create more jobs and give all Americans a shot.

AIRLINE FEE INCREASE

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the work that has been done by Senator MURRAY and Congressman RYAN as we work towards passing a budget deal before the end of this year. I think the end result is not perfect in anyone's eyes, but what they have done is something that symbolized what can be achieved when two sides come together in the best interests for our country.

However, there is one element of the agreement that I am raising with concern because my State of Hawaii has a very unique circumstance. We have six major islands where people live with no interisland railway, no highway or ferry system that connects each of these islands; and people who commute back and forth, people who look for access to health care, have no option other than to fly. In some cases, this air route is an essential lifeline in each of these areas.

In the past, Congress has recognized Hawaii's unique situation and exclusive reliance on air travel. We are concerned about the disparate impact of increased taxes and fees on this air travel in our State.

Again, the budget deal is a solid step in the right direction, but we must ensure that the people of Hawaii, who have no options available to them other than to fly, are not unduly burdened with the fee increase. I look forward to being able to address this issue.

ALICIA DAWN KOEHL RESPECT FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 1471, the Alicia Dawn Koehl Respect for National Cemeteries Act. I thank my Indiana colleagues, Senator DAN COATS and Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS, for their hard work.

The namesake of this bill is Alicia Dawn Koehl. She was the wife of Fort Wayne native Paul Koehl from my district and the mother of two children. She was also the daughter-in-law of Frank and Carol Koehl.

Last year, Alicia was tragically murdered, and after her killer, an Army veteran, committed suicide, he was buried in a national cemetery with military honors despite laws prohibiting such distinction.

This bill provides the Department of Veterans Affairs the authority to right such wrongs, ensuring our national cemeteries are reserved for our country's most deserving heroes.

Mr. Speaker, my sympathies go out to the family and friends of Ms. Koehl. It is impossible for any of us here today to fully grasp the hardship they have needlessly endured.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the nearly 40,000 unemployed Nevadans at risk of losing their benefits if Congress fails to act before the end of the year.

While our economy has slowly begun to recover from the recession and housing crisis, there are still 1.3 million fewer jobs today than when the recession started 6 years ago. Nearly 4 million jobless Americans have been unemployed for more than 27 weeks. And while a newly unemployed worker has a 20 to 30 percent chance of getting hired, a long-term unemployed worker has only a 1 in 10 chance of finding a new job in any given month.

Cutting off a critical lifeline to those already struggling to make ends meet would be irresponsible and reckless, causing significant damage to our economic growth and costing our economy nearly 310,000 jobs, including 3,000 in Nevada.

I am proud to cosponsor the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act that would extend this vital program and related provisions for another year.

So before Congress pats itself on the back about a budget deal, let's think about those families truly in need during these holidays and beyond.

□ 1215

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation's economy continues to improve, we still need to have a serious discussion about jobs in this country.

As Congress will soon debate whether to extend unemployment benefits for needy Americans, we must remember that there are young people that are graduating from high schools in our country that are not ready to take jobs that are in high demand.

For instance, from an article I read in The Wall Street Journal last year, an estimated 600,000 skilled middle class manufacturing jobs went unfilled in this country. That is absolutely unacceptable. Much of that can be attributed to kids who are simply unprepared.

Mr. Speaker, improved education must be included if we are serious about rebuilding the middle class in this country. And if we are really serious about looking out for the middle class, we have to do something about raising the minimum wage in this country. Any serious discussion about raising the standard of living in our country without addressing these two areas of education and raising the low minimum wage that we have is simply not addressing the issue seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to address these issues by having a job fair in my district on Friday, January 24, in Fort Worth at the Resource Connection. It is efforts like these and many others that will help get the middle class back on track in this country.

GABRIELLA MILLER KIDS FIRST RESEARCH ACT OF 2013

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, ''Stop talking; start doing.'' That is what Gabriella Miller, a passionate childhood cancer advocate asks of our Nation's leaders.

As an original cosponsor of the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act, I encourage my colleagues to honor her request and support this piece of legislation. The bill directs $126 million to fund a new pediatric research initiative at the National Institutes of Health. These dollars will fund research, clinical trials, and medical advancement aimed at discovering better treatments to help kids fight their battles against childhood diseases.

In my State, the University of Kansas Medical Center is making great strides in the fight against pediatric illnesses, including plans for a pediatric blood cancer program, research to prevent severe behavior disorders in children, and efforts to establish an institute for children's health and development.

Although Gabriella lost her battle to brain cancer in October, this bill supports programs that will find cures for brave kids like her.

NELSON MANDELA

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, our lives will go on, but the life of the world community was forever changed by the life of Nelson Mandela, who passed away this week.

He chose the principles of truth and reconciliation and democracy and peace through justice to guide his life, and he was willing to give his life for those principles.

It is unfortunate that the United States didn't support world sanctions against South Africa. I would hope if we had the opportunity to oppose apartheid wherever it exists throughout the world again that we would follow the lead of Nelson Mandela.

Treating people differently because of their race or their class or their religion is simply wrong. The way that we honor Nelson Mandela best is to follow his principles. He transformed this world. We have the opportunity now to learn from his life and to follow his principles.

COMPUTER SCIENCE EDUCATION WEEK

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Computer Science Education Week, a time in which educators, businesses, policymakers, and communities can come together to celebrate the important role of computer science.

In the next 10 years, there will be more than 1 million more computer science jobs than we have students studying computer science. We need to address that gap. That is why Representative BROOKS and I introduced the Computer Science Education Act, H.R. 2536. Without creating any new Federal programs or requiring any new spending, our bill would allow existing Federal funding to support computer science programs across our schools.

This week, students across the country can try out computer science by participating in the ''Hour of Code.'' On Monday in my district, St. Vrain Valley School District students worked with Oracle to develop apps to help get K–8 students excited about computer science. At CU-Boulder, college students designed their own video games that allow people with no coding experience to create their own 3–D worlds. Through the National Center for Women and Information Technology in my district, more than 300 companies are working to increase the participation of girls and women in computing.

I hope you join me in supporting Computer Science Education Week either by participating in the ''Hour of Code'' or supporting the Computer Science Education Act.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIES FOR THE BLIND

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish a happy anniversary to an organization that is actually helping people.

Seventy-five years ago, the Wagner-O'Day Act was signed here in the United States Congress. It is now known as the AbilityOne Program. It honors each individual person across our country with unique disabilities to be able to say as a Nation we are going to stand with you on that.

I believe firmly that every individual evaluates success in a different way, but I think part of how they evaluate success is do they have a great family experience, do they have a great community of friends around them, are they deep in their own personal faith, and do they have work that is meaningful.

The AbilityOne Program—and what is happening specifically in my State with an organization connected to them called NewView Oklahoma—they are helping people have great value and understanding that people that are blind and visually impaired can have great success in life and can contribute to society.

They are producing products that are sold commercially and to governments that are all over the world. In fact, 2 years ago I was in Afghanistan; and when we landed, as we got off the back of the aircraft there, there was one of the bright yellow chalks that is uniquely made in Oklahoma by people that are blind and visually impaired.

This is a great gift that we are doing, and I wish them happy anniversary.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Speaker BOEHNER to allow passage of the comprehensive immigration reform legislation. It is vital that we approach the issue of immigration with a sense of urgency, a spirit of compassion, and a commitment to security. Most important, reform must provide a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants and allow them to emerge from the shadows.

My congressional office has one of the highest volumes of immigration cases in California, and the stories that are shared with me are heartbreaking. I receive calls from constituents every day describing the hardships that our broken immigration system has placed on their families, and I have heard their pleas for help.

The current wait time for many family members to reunite in the United States can be 10 years or more. DREAMers who came to the United States as young children and are pursuing a college degree or serving in the military have limited or no career opportunities and are stuck in endless limbo.

Our broken immigration system takes a terrible toll on innocent families, local law enforcement, and our economy. We must not further delay action. The time to fix it is now.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House reach their conclusions on the budget deal announced by Congressman RYAN and Senator MURRAY, I might add it is a deal devoid of any support for the unemployed, real investment in jobs and education, and tax reform that produces fairness, pushing additional cost burdens on Federal employees. But it does avoid cuts to Social Security and Medicare and the Republican-inspired government shutdown and near default.

I want to remind my colleagues in the House that that same kind of effort, attention, and risk is needed on the issue of comprehensive immigration reform. If we can produce a budget deal through the crisis that we have been through, then it is time for the House of Representatives and the Republican leadership to step up and produce the same kind of effort, the same kind of attention to one of the most critical domestic issues affecting so many families and communities in this country, and that is the question of comprehensive immigration reform.

If we have the fortitude, the risk to compromise on a budget, we should certainly be able to do that for immigration reform.

NIH FUNDING

(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, the National Institutes of Health has helped make America one of the great engines of biomedical discovery.

NIH funding is critical for NIH to sustain its mission of improving health through scientific breakthroughs and maintain our international leadership.

I am proud that some of the world's best scientific research is taking place right here in New Hampshire. In New Hampshire, lifesaving research at Dartmouth College and UNH is made possible by NIH grants.

Unfortunately, the first year of sequestration required NIH to cut 5 percent of its budget. Many of America's young scientists are leaving the U.S. to pursue their research abroad for more stable positions.

If the sequestration were to continue for the full 10 years, NIH would lose a staggering $19 billion, and our Nation would lose precious time in its race against Alzheimer's disease, cancer, autism, HIV/AIDS, and countless other diseases that cause pain and suffering.

I urge congressional leaders to approve robust funding for NIH and to reverse the damaging impact of sequestration on research programs.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is moving in the right direction and delivering what the law was intended to do: delivering a wider range of medical services to all Americans, including improved access to mental health services.

The administration announced that $100 million of additional funding would be made available to expand and improve the way Americans receive mental health services.

According to the California HealthCare Foundation, nearly one in six Californian adults has a mental health need and approximately one in 20 suffers from a serious mental illness that makes it difficult to carry out major life activities. The rate among children is higher where one in 13 suffers from a mental illness that limits participation in daily activities.

While most mental illnesses are treatable, those with mental illness often struggle to get needed treatment if they do not have health insurance that covers mental health services. Starting next year, insurers would not be able to deny coverage or charge an individual more due to preexisting health conditions, including mental illnesses. The health care law would also require most health plans to cover recommended preventive services like depression screening for adults and behavior assessment for children.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, AND COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

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

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I wish to resign from my assignments to the House Committee on the Judiciary, the House Committee on Natural Resources, and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs effective the week of December 9th, 2013. My resignation is in order to facilitate my appointment to the House Committee on Appropriations. Thank you for the opportunity.

Sincerely,

MARK E. AMODEI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, AND COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 11, 2013.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Please accept this letter as resignation from my seats on the House Committee on Agriculture, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

I thank you for the opportunity to serve on these important Committees. I remain committed to supporting my district's unique military, agriculture, and educational interests in my new capacity on the House Committee on Appropriations.

Sincerely,

MARTHA ROBY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, AND COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Natural Resources:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 9, 2013.

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: As you are aware, the Steering Committee acted last week on my request to join the Appropriations Committee. In order to move on to the Appropriations Committee, I am writing to resign from my current committee assignments, including all subcommittees on:

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee;

The Homeland Security Committee; and

The Natural Resources Committee.

I have truly enjoyed my service on these committees. I similarly look forward to serving on the Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely,

CHRIS STEWART.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

□ 1230

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 437

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE—Mr. McAllister.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Mrs. Roby, Mr. Amodei, and Mr. Stewart.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES—Mr. McAllister.

Ms. JENKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS' MEMORIAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2013

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2319) to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2319

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 ''Native American Veterans' Memorial Amendments Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS' MEMORIAL.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL.—Section 3 of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 80q–5 note; 108 Stat. 4067) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''within the interior structure of the facility provided for by'' and inserting ''on property under the jurisdiction of the Museum on the site described in''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking '', in consultation with the Museum, is'' and inserting ''and the National Museum of the American Indian are''.

(b) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—Section 4(a) of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 80q–5 note; 108 Stat. 4067) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting ''AND NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN'' after ''AMERICAN INDIANS''; and

(2) in the first sentence, by striking ''shall be solely'' and inserting ''and the National Museum of the American Indian shall be''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2319 is a bill that would continue to recognize the efforts of all Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian veterans across the Nation. These brave soldiers, including my own grandfather, Kenneth Morris, sacrificed much for the country they love. It is important that we properly honor these brave soldiers and tell their story for generations to come.

As many of my colleagues know, last month Congress awarded Congressional Gold Medals to Native American code talkers from all over the country, a long overdue recognition for their bravery and valor. These men saved countless lives during World Wars I and II by using their native languages.

My bill amends a 1994 law that allows the National Museum of the American Indian more flexibility to design and raise funds for the building of a memorial. The memorial is currently authorized to be constructed inside the confines of the museum, but with the limited space within the museum itself, this bill provides for a more appropriate tribute.

This bipartisan bill has received overwhelming support from the National Congress of American Indians and the National Museum of the American Indian. As one of only two Native Americans in Congress, it has been my privilege to work to make this memorial a reality.

I ask for your support of this legislation which was reported by unanimous consent from the Committee on Natural Resources just last week and will require no cost to the American taxpayers.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2319 authorizes the construction of a Native American Veterans Memorial on the grounds of the National Museum of the American Indian. The memorial is already authorized to be built within the museum, but planning efforts have identified the needs for more space. This bill simply allows the memorial to be built outside.

Native Americans have a long and proud tradition of military service. Navajo code talkers were involved in every assault the U.S. Marines conducted in the Pacific from 1942 to 1945. Their heroics even inspired a Hollywood movie, but the proud tradition of Native American service goes all the way back to the Revolutionary War. Since then, the Nation's first Americans have fought in every U.S. engagement, and it is about time that we recognize their service with a national memorial. I cannot think of a better place to commemorate that tradition than on the grounds of the National Museum.

I also want to take time to thank Congressman MULLIN for his leadership and sponsorship of this legislation, overdue, and very, very appropriate and historically necessary.

We support H.R. 2319 and urge its passage.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisan support from my colleague from Arizona and definitely the support from the other side of the aisle that so often is needed inside this House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my friend and colleague from Oklahoma. He is a colleague on the Natural Resources Committee with me, as well as the Indian and Alaska Native Affairs Subcommittee, and Mr. MULLIN has demonstrated great leadership on this important legislation.

In my State of North Dakota, our citizens enlist in the military at a rate four times the national average. Much of the credit for this impressive statistic really belongs to the thousands of our native citizens who have enlisted at very, very high rates, citizens from the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa, from the Fort Berthold Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation, from our Sioux Nations at Fort Yates and Fort Totten, from the Standing Rock and Spirit Lake Nations as well as Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Nation who have demonstrated exemplary patriotism in their enlistment. And furthermore, they carry out this patriotism with incredible pride, understandable and appropriate pride in the way they participate with their honor and color guards at veterans' events throughout our State.

This memorial and these amendments are really a very appropriate and important recognition of their sacrifice and their service and their unique contribution to our society, especially given the history of our Nation's birth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of our colleagues to honor our native veterans by voting ''yes'' on this important legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), cochair of the Native American Caucus in the House.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Amendment Act.

Native Americans have served in our Armed Forces at higher rates than any other ethnic group, even while being denied the right to vote and full citizenship in this country.

Their contributions include 27 recipients of the Medal of Honor and code talkers, whose native languages became the unbreakable code, keeping

America safe, keeping America strong. A permanent memorial for these brave men and women will ensure all Americans are able to honor and remember their sacrifice.

While construction of such a memorial has been authorized since 1994, this bill offers critical amendments to make it a reality. It allows the National Museum of the American Indian to build the memorial on its grounds and permits the museum to work with the National Congress of American Indians in raising funding.

This honor is past due for the thousands of Native American veterans and servicemembers and their families, and I urge my colleagues to join me, to join all of us in giving thanks for their service by supporting this bill.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman MULLIN for the work he has done in leading this important bill and bringing it to the floor, as well as the bipartisan support from my distinguished friend and Member from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), as we are bringing something together here that is bipartisan in nature for a very important reason.

Montana is the proud home of seven federally recognized tribes, along with the State-recognized tribe the Little Shell. Montana's tribes not only represent an important part of Montana's history and our heritage, in fact, more than 2,500 Montana tribal members are veterans who serve as true examples of service, of bravery, of patriotism.

Last month, I was blessed with the opportunity to meet with some of those Montana veterans, their families, and other tribal members in Washington, D.C., for a Congressional Gold Medal ceremony honoring the Native American code talkers who served in both World Wars. In fact, it was a special moment.

I brought several of those members of the Crow Tribe, descendants of these Crow code talkers, to the House floor for a tour after Congress had adjourned. And here we were, in this great Chamber, as these members of the Crow Tribe presented a blessing in their native language that was helpful in allowing us to win the World Wars.

This recognition was long overdue and well-deserved for these brave and selfless men and women. I think it is important that all of our Native American veterans receive the honor they deserve.

This bill would help a memorial commemorating our Native American veterans to be constructed on the National American Indian Museum grounds here in Washington, D.C. This memorial will serve as an important symbol of gratitude for the thousands of native men and women who have fought to keep us free.

I hope all Members will join me today in supporting this effort to show our Native American veterans the appreciation and honor that is most deserved.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I just want to conclude by again thanking the sponsor of the legislation and, I think, to point out the obvious: this legislation is important, its timing is important, and the fact that this recognition, per capita, for contributions to our Nation in military service for Native American peoples and tribes across this country is a very important one. It speaks to real loyalty, real love of the land, and real love of this Nation. I am proud to be here and to lend my support to this legislation.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Arizona for his support on this very important piece of legislation.

We have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2319, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ALICIA DAWN KOEHL RESPECT FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1471) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1471

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 ''Alicia Dawn Koehl Respect for National Cemeteries Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO RECONSIDER DECISIONS OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OR SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO INTER THE REMAINS OR HONOR THE MEMORY OF A PERSON IN A NATIONAL CEMETERY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO RECONSIDER PRIOR DECISIONS.—Section 2411 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

''(d)(1) In a case described in subsection (e), the appropriate Federal official may reconsider a decision to—

''(A) inter the remains of a person in a cemetery in the National Cemetery Administration or in Arlington National Cemetery; or

''(B) honor the memory of a person in a memorial area in a cemetery in the National Cemetery Administration (described in section 2403(a) of this title) or in such an area in Arlington National Cemetery (described in section 2409(a) of this title).

''(2)(A)(i) In a case described in subsection (e)(1)(A), the appropriate Federal official shall provide notice to the deceased person's next of kin or other person authorized to arrange burial or memorialization of the deceased person of the decision of the appropriate Federal official to disinter the remains of the deceased person or to remove a memorial headstone or marker memorializing the deceased person.

''(ii) In a case described in subsection (e)(1)(B), if the appropriate Federal official finds, based upon a showing of clear and convincing evidence and after an opportunity for a hearing in a manner prescribed by the appropriate Federal official, that the person had committed a Federal capital crime or a State capital crime but had not been convicted of such crime by reason of such person not being available for trial due to death or flight to avoid prosecution, the appropriate Federal official shall provide notice to the deceased person's next of kin or other person authorized to arrange burial or memorialization of the deceased person of the decision of the appropriate Federal official to disinter the remains of the deceased person or to remove a memorial headstone or marker memorializing the deceased person.

''(B) Notice under subparagraph (A) shall be provided by the appropriate Federal official as follows:

''(i) By the Secretary in accordance with section 5104 of this title.

''(ii) By the Secretary of Defense in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe for purposes of this subsection.

''(3)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the next of kin or other person authorized to arrange burial or memorialization of the deceased person shall be allowed a period of 60 days from the date of the notice required by paragraph (2) to file a notice of disagreement with the Federal official that provided the notice.

''(B)(i) A notice of disagreement filed with the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall be treated as a notice of disagreement filed under section 7105 of this title and shall initiate appellate review in accordance with the provisions of chapter 71 of this title.

''(ii) A notice of disagreement filed with the Secretary of Defense under subparagraph (A) shall be decided in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe for purposes of this subsection.

''(4) When the decision of the appropriate Federal official to disinter the remains or remove a memorial headstone or marker of the deceased person becomes final either by failure to appeal the decision in accordance with paragraph (3)(A) or by final disposition of the appeal pursuant to paragraph (3)(B), the appropriate Federal official may take any of the following actions:

''(A) Disinter the remains of the person from the cemetery in the National Cemetery Administration or in Arlington National Cemetery and provide for the reburial or other appropriate disposition of the disinterred remains in a place other than a cemetery in the National Cemetery Administration or in Arlington National Cemetery.

''(B) Remove from a memorial area in a cemetery in the National Cemetery Administration or in Arlington National Cemetery any memorial headstone or marker placed to honor the memory of the person.

''(e)(1) A case described in this subsection is a case in which the appropriate federal official receives—

''(A) written notice of a conviction referred to in subsection (b)(1), (b)(2), or (b)(4) of a person described in paragraph (2); or

''(B) information that a person described in paragraph (2) may have committed a Federal capital crime or a State capital crime but was not convicted of such crime by reason of such person not being available for trial due to death or flight to avoid prosecution.

''(2) A person described in this paragraph is a person—

''(A) whose remains have been interred in a cemetery in the National Cemetery Administration or in Arlington National Cemetery; or

''(B) whose memory has been honored in a memorial area in a cemetery in the National Cemetery Administration or in such an area in Arlington National Cemetery.''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF EXCEPTION TO INTERMENT OR MEMORIALIZATION PROHIBITION.—Subsection (a)(2) of such section is amended by striking ''such official approves an application for''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to any interment or memorialization conducted by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of the Army in a cemetery in the National Cemetery Administration or in Arlington National Cemetery after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. DISINTERMENT OF REMAINS OF MICHAEL LASHAWN ANDERSON FROM FORT CUSTER NATIONAL CEMETERY.

(a) DISINTERMENT OF REMAINS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall disinter the remains of Michael LaShawn Anderson from Fort Custer National Cemetery.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF NEXT-OF-KIN.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) notify the next-of-kin of record for Michael LaShawn Anderson of the impending disinterment of his remains; and

(2) upon disinterment, relinquish the remains to the next-of-kin of record for Michael LaShawn Anderson or, if the next-of-kin of record for Michael LaShawn Anderson is unavailable, arrange for an appropriate disposition of the remains.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material and include that material on S. 1471.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1245

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

I rise today in support of S. 1471, the Alicia Dawn Koehl Respect for National Cemeteries Act. This bill would grant authority to the Department of Veterans Affairs to reconsider the decision to inter or memorialize an individual within a national cemetery in situations where it is later discovered that the deceased committed a capital crime.

Currently, section 2411 of title 38, United States Code, prohibits the interment or memorialization of persons who committed a Federal or State capital crime. Nonetheless, situations have arisen where the entity, such as a funeral home, or the individual who is charged with scheduling the interment or memorialization of a decedent either does not know of the decedent's crime or does not truthfully report such crime to Federal cemetery officials.

In situations where a funeral home had no knowledge that a decedent was involved in a capital crime at the time of the burial request, VA actually lacks the statutory authority to reconsider interment or memorialization decisions. Simply put, individuals who are buried or memorialized within national cemeteries cannot be disinterred on the basis of subsequently received information.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1471 would provide this authority to VA, as well as to the Department of Defense, in the case of Arlington National Cemetery.

VA supports this bill, as it would provide the Department with the ability to redress interment cases where eligibility is invalidated by information that is learned after a burial.

This bill would also specifically direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disinter the remains of Michael Lashawn Anderson from Fort Custer National Cemetery, as it was Mr. Anderson who murdered Alicia Dawn Koehl prior to taking his own life. In that case, the funeral home charged with Mr. Anderson's burial was unaware of the incident. Thus they did not properly report the crime, and Fort Custer National Cemetery provided the military funeral.

The interment of Mr. Anderson was brought to the attention of the Indiana congressional delegation; and I want to thank my colleague from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) for highlighting this tragic incident and for offering companion legislation to S. 1471. I also want to thank our colleagues in the Senate for addressing this need and for passing S. 1471. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I support this legislation to allow the VA or the Secretary of the Army to reconsider their decisions to inter individuals at our Veterans National Cemeteries, to include Arlington National Cemetery. With this legislation, individuals who may have committed a Federal or State capital crime, but were not convicted by reason of unavailability for trial due to death or flight to avoid prosecution, may be considered for disinterment.

Being buried in our national cemeteries is one of the highest honors our Nation bestows upon veterans and their dependents for their service and sacrifice.

This legislation also closes a loophole in the current law. Currently, veterans and their dependents who have been convicted of capital crimes may not be buried in Arlington National Cemetery or any national cemetery. If there is a mistake and they are inappropriately buried in one of these cemeteries, the Army and/or VA cannot correct the mistake. This legislation would correct this issue and allow the Secretaries of the Army and the VA to reconsider the original interment and exhume the body for interment elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), the Member who brought this matter to the committee's attention.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Chairman MILLER, and Subcommittee Chairman RUNYAN for bringing up this important piece of legislation today, S. 1471.

Mr. Speaker, during this season of Christmas, we seek to surround ourselves with our family and friends to give thanks for the blessings in our lives. But unfortunately, one family from my district will be spending yet another Christmas season without their wife, without their mother, without their daughter-in-law because of a senseless act of violence that took place at an apartment complex in Indianapolis, Indiana, on May 30, 2012.

On that date, Michael Anderson, a deranged Army veteran, went on a shooting rampage that took the life of Alicia Koehl, who was an apartment complex manager. After taking her life, he also severely injured three others. Mr. Anderson shot Alicia 13 times before taking his own life.

Alicia's killing left a hole in communities throughout Indiana. She was not only a mother to two young children and a loving wife but she was also a Girl Scout leader, the Volunteer of the Year at Spring Mill Elementary School, and an active member of her church.

Paul Koehl, Alicia's husband, provided testimony to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that Alicia was the ''glue that held our family together.'' He continued that her motto in life was ''live, laugh, love'' and that the saying could be found in almost every room of their home. He finally relayed her contagious optimism by telling that her smile and gentle nature never failed to light up a room.

So it is no wonder that her passing triggered an outpouring of sympathy throughout the State, with candlelight vigils being held and the Indianapolis City Council formally memorializing her as someone ''whose very presence

in the community is a stabilizing influence which lends a sense of purpose and direction.''

Mr. Speaker, you can only imagine the indignation when, in the midst of their grief, family and friends found out that the killer of Alicia was allowed burial in a national cemetery with full military honors. This is in spite of a Federal law explicitly forbidding the Department of Veterans Affairs from interring anyone who has committed a capital crime, including those never formally convicted.

At the request of Alicia's family and friends, Senator COATS and I began working on this case to rectify the mistake made by the National Cemeteries Association. The NCA informed us that they lacked the authority to disinter Michael Anderson or the ability to rectify their horrific mistake if something like this should ever happen again.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. I am outraged not only that the Koehl family has had to endure yet another injustice after Alicia's life was needlessly cut short but also that our brave servicemen and -women who, in some cases, have given the ultimate sacrifice to their Nation are buried next to a murderous criminal.

The legislation before the House today will simply give the Department of Veterans Affairs the ability to reconsider interment of veterans who lost their privilege of interment in our national cemeteries by committing a capital offense. Our Nation's cemeteries shouldn't be tarnished because of a legislative technicality, and the bill before us will close this loophole. Our bravest men and women should be buried next to fellow heroes, and today we can make sure they always are.

So I am proud to be a sponsor of the House version of this bill that garnered the support of all Hoosier Representatives, and I want to thank them for coming together in a bicameral and bipartisan way to get behind this meaningful and important piece of legislation.

I want to encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together to help give closure to the Koehl family, restore a sense of honor to our national cemeteries, and improve protocol so that an injustice like this will never happen again.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, today we can take a meaningful step to ensure the sanctity of our national cemeteries. These grounds are hallowed for the men and women who fought selflessly on our behalf.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, encourage our colleagues to join in support of S. 1471.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1471.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SEAN AND DAVID GOLDMAN INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION AND RETURN ACT OF 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3212) to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3212

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings; sense of Congress; purposes.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIONS

Sec. 101. Annual report.
Sec. 102. Standards and assistance.
Sec. 103. Memorandum of understanding.
Sec. 104. Notification of congressional representatives.

TITLE II—PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS

Sec. 201. Presidential actions in response to unresolved cases.
Sec. 202. Presidential actions in response to patterns of noncooperation in cases of international child abductions.
Sec. 203. Consultations with foreign governments.
Sec. 204. Report to Congress.
Sec. 205. Presidential actions.
Sec. 206. Presidential waiver.
Sec. 207. Publication in Federal Register.
Sec. 208. Termination of Presidential actions.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Sean Goldman, a United States citizen and resident of New Jersey, was abducted from the United States in 2004 and separated from his father, David Goldman, who spent nearly six years battling for the return of his son from Brazil before Sean was finally returned to Mr. Goldman's custody on December 24, 2009.

(2) The Department of State's Office of Children's Issues, which serves as the Central Authority of the United States for the purposes of the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, has received thousands of requests since 2007 for assistance in the return to the United States of children who have been abducted by a parent or other legal guardian to another country. For a variety of reasons reflecting the significant obstacles to the recovery of abducted children, as well as the legal and factual complexity involving such cases, not all cases are reported to the Central Authority of the United States.

(3) More than one thousand outgoing international child abductions are reported to the Central Authority of the United States every year.

(4) Only about half of the children abducted from the United States to countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention are returned to the United States.

(5) The United States and Convention countries have expressed their desire, through the Hague Abduction Convention, ''to protect children internationally from the harmful effects of their wrongful removal or retention and to establish procedures to ensure their prompt return to the State of their habitual residence, as well as to secure protection for rights of access.''.

(6) Compliance by the United States and Convention countries depends on the actions of their designated central authorities, the performance of their judiciaries as reflected in the legal process and decisions rendered to enforce or effectuate the Hague Abduction Convention, and the ability and willingness of their law enforcement to insure the swift enforcement of orders rendered pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention.

(7) According to data compiled by the Central Authority of the United States, approximately 40 percent of abduction cases and access cases involve children taken from the United States to countries with which the United States does not have Hague Abduction Convention obligations or other agreements relating to the resolution of abduction cases and access cases.

(8) According to the Department of State's April 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, ''parental child abduction jeopardizes the child and has substantial long-term consequences for both the child and the left-behind parent.''.

(9) Abducted children are at risk of serious emotional and psychological problems and have been found to experience anxiety, eating problems, nightmares, mood swings, sleep disturbances, aggressive behavior, resentment, guilt and fearfulness, and as adults may struggle with identity issues, personal relationships, and parenting.

(10) Left-behind parents may encounter substantial psychological and emotional problems, and few have the extraordinary financial resources necessary to pursue individual civil or criminal remedies in both the United States and a foreign country, even where available, or to engage in repeated foreign travel to attempt to procure the return of their children by evoking diplomatic and humanitarian remedies.

(11) Left-behind parents who are military parents may be unable to leave their military duties to pursue multinational litigation or take leave to attend multiple court proceedings, and foreign authorities may not schedule proceedings to accommodate such duties.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should set a strong example for Convention countries in the timely location and return of abducted

children in the United States whose habitual residence is not the United States.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) protect children whose habitual residence is the United States from the harmful effects of abduction and to assist left-behind parents to have access to their abducted child in a safe and predictable manner, wherever the child is located, while an abduction case is pending;

(2) provide left-behind parents, including military parents, their advocates, and judges the information they need to enhance the resolution of abduction cases and access cases through established legal procedures, risk assessment tools, and the practical means for overcoming obstacles to recovering an abducted child;

(3) establish measured, effective, and predictable actions to be undertaken by the President on behalf of abducted children whose habitual residence is the United States at the time of the abduction;

(4) promote an international consensus that it is in the interest of children to have any issues related to their care and custody determined in the country of their habitual residence;

(5) provide the necessary training for officials of the United States Armed Forces and the Department of Defense to establish policies and provide services to military parents that address the unique circumstances of abductions and violations of rights of access that may occur with regard to military dependent children; and

(6) encourage the effective implementation of international mechanisms, particularly those established pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention, to achieve reciprocity in the resolution of abductions and to protect children from the harmful effects of an abduction.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ABDUCTED CHILD.—The term ''abducted child'' means a child who is the victim of an abduction.

(2) ABDUCTION.—The term ''abduction'' means—

(A) the alleged wrongful removal of a child from the child's country of habitual residence;

(B) the alleged wrongful retention of a child outside the child's country of habitual residence; or

(C) the alleged wrongful removal or retention of a military dependent child from the exercise of rights of custody of a military parent.

(3) ABDUCTION CASE.—The term ''abduction case'' means a case involving an application filed with the Central Authority of the United States by a left-behind parent for the resolution of an abduction.

(4) ACCESS CASE.—The term ''access case'' means a case involving an application filed with the Central Authority of the United States by a left-behind parent for the establishment of rights of access.

(5) ANNUAL REPORT.—The term ''Annual Report'' means the Annual Report on International Child Abduction required under section 101.

(6) APPLICATION.—The term ''application'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the application required pursuant to article 8 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of an MOU country, the formal document required pursuant to the provisions of the applicable MOU to request the return of an abducted child or to request rights of access, as applicable; and

(C) in the case of a nonparty country, the formal request by the Central Authority of the United States to the Central Authority of such country requesting the return of an abducted child or for rights of access to an abducted child.

(7) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(8) CENTRAL AUTHORITY.—The term ''Central Authority'' means—

(A) in the case of a Convention country, the meaning given such term in article 6 of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) in the case of an MOU country, the official entity designated by the government of the MOU country within the applicable MOU pursuant to section 103(b)(1) to discharge the duties imposed on the entity in such MOU; and

(C) in the case of a nonparty country, the foreign ministry of such country.

(9) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means an individual who has not attained the age of 16.

(10) CONVENTION COUNTRY.—The term ''Convention country'' means a country other than the United States that has ratified, acceded, or succeeded to the Hague Abduction Convention and with respect to which the United States has entered into a reciprocal agreement pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention.

(11) HAGUE ABDUCTION CONVENTION.—The term ''Hague Abduction Convention'' means the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at The Hague on October 25, 1980.

(12) LEFT-BEHIND PARENT.—The term ''left-behind parent'' means an individual or entity, either individually or jointly, who alleges that an abduction has occurred that is in breach of rights of custody—

(A) attributed to such individual or entity, as applicable; and

(B) exercised at the time of the abduction or that would have been exercised but for the abduction.

(13) LEGAL RESIDENCE.—The term ''legal residence'' means the congressional district and State in which an individual either is residing, or if an individual is residing temporarily outside the United States, the congressional district and State to which the individual intends to return.

(14) MILITARY DEPENDENT CHILD.—The term ''military dependent child'' means a child whose habitual residence is the United States according to United States law even though the child is residing outside the United States with a military parent.

(15) MILITARY PARENT.—The term ''military parent'' means an individual who has rights of custody over a child and who is serving outside the United States as a member of the United States Armed Forces.

(16) MOU.—The term ''MOU'' means a memorandum of understanding between the United States and a country that is not a Convention country to resolve abduction cases and access cases.

(17) MOU COUNTRY.—The term ''MOU country'' means a country with respect to which the United States has entered into an MOU.

(18) NONPARTY COUNTRY.—The term ''nonparty country'' means a country that is neither a Convention country nor an MOU country.

(19) PATTERN OF NONCOOPERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''pattern of noncooperation'' means the persistent failure—

(i) of a Convention country to implement and abide by the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention; and

(ii) of an MOU country to implement and abide by the provisions of the applicable MOU.

(B) CRITERIA.—Such persistent failure may be evidenced by one or more of the following criteria:

(i) The existence of 10 or more unresolved abduction cases.

(ii) The failure of the Central Authority of the country to fulfill its responsibilities pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or the MOU, as applicable.

(iii) The failure of the judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the national government of the country to implement and comply with the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or the MOU, as applicable.

(iv) The failure of law enforcement to locate abducted children or to enforce return orders or determinations of rights of access rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of the national government of the country in abduction cases or access cases.

(20) RIGHTS OF ACCESS.—The term ''rights of access'' means the rights of contact between a child and a left-behind parent provided as a provisional measure while an abduction case is pending, by operation of law or by reason of judicial or administrative determination or by agreement having legal effect, under the law of the country in which the child is located.

(21) RIGHTS OF CUSTODY.—The term ''rights of custody'' means rights of care and custody of an abducted child, including the right to determine the place of residence of an abducted child—

(A) attributed to an individual or entity, either individually or jointly, and

(B) arising by operation of law or by reason of a judicial or administrative decision, or by reason of an agreement having legal effect,

under the law of the country in which the child was an habitual resident immediately before the abduction.

(22) UNRESOLVED ABDUCTION CASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ''unresolved abduction case'' means an abduction case that remains unresolved for a period that exceeds 180 days after the date on which the completed application for return of the child is submitted for determination to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, in the country in which the child is located.

(B) RESOLUTION OF CASE.—An abduction case shall be considered to be resolved if—

(i) the child is returned to the country of habitual residence, pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or MOU, if applicable;

(ii) the judicial or administrative branch, as applicable, of the national government of the country in which the child is located has implemented and is complying with the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention or the MOU, as applicable, and a final determination is made by such judicial or administrative branch that the child will not be returned to the country of habitual residence; or

(iii) the child attains the age of 16.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIONS

SEC. 101. ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an Annual Report on International Child Abduction.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each Annual Report shall include the following:

(1) A list of all countries with respect to which there were one or more abduction cases during the preceding year that identifies whether each such country is a Convention country, an MOU country, or a nonparty country.

(2) For each country with respect to which there were 5 or more abduction cases during the preceding year:

(A) The number of abduction cases and the number of access cases, respectively, reported during the preceding year.

(B) The number of abduction cases and the number of access cases, respectively, that are pending as of March 1 of the year in which such Annual Report is submitted.

(C)(i) For Convention and MOU countries, the number of abduction cases and the number of access cases, respectively, that were pending at any point for more than 180 days after the date on which the Central Authority of the United States transmitted the complete application for each such case to the Central Authority of such country, and were not submitted by the Central Authority to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of such country within the 180-day period.

(ii) The reason for the delay in submission of each case identified in clause (i) by the Central Authority of such country to the judicial or administrative authority.

(D) The number of unresolved abduction cases, and the length of time each case has been pending.

(E) The number of unresolved abduction cases in which a completed application has been filed and law enforcement has failed to locate the abducted child or to enforce a return order rendered by the judicial or administrative authorities of such country.

(F) The median time required for resolution of abduction cases during the preceding year, to be measured from the date on which the application with respect to the abduction case is transmitted by the Central Authority of the United States to the Central Authority of such country to the date on which the abduction case is resolved.

(G) The total number and the percentage of the total number of abduction cases and access cases, respectively, resolved during the preceding year.

(H) Detailed information about each unresolved abduction case described in subparagraph (E) and on actions taken by the Department of State to resolve such case, including the specific actions taken by the United States chief of mission in such country.

(I) Recommendations to improve resolution of abduction cases and access cases.

(3) The number of abducted children from the United States who were returned to the United States from Convention countries, MOU countries, and nonparty countries, respectively.

(4) A list of Convention countries and MOU countries that have failed to comply with any of their obligations under the Hague Abduction Convention or the MOU, as applicable, with respect to the resolution of abduction cases and access cases.

(5) A list of countries demonstrating a pattern of noncooperation, and a summary of the criteria on which the determination of a pattern of noncooperation for each country is based.

(6)(A) Information on efforts by the Secretary of State to encourage other countries to become signatories to the Hague Abduction Convention or to enter into an MOU.

(B) The efforts referred to in subparagraph (A) shall include efforts to address pending abduction cases and access cases in such countries.

(7) A description of the efforts of the Secretary of State to encourage Convention countries and MOU countries to facilitate the work of nongovernmental organizations within their respective countries that assist left-behind parents.

(8) The number of cases which were successfully resolved without abducted children being returned to the United States from Convention countries, MOU countries, and nonparty countries, respectively.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The Annual Report shall not include—

(1) the names of left-behind parents or children involved in abduction cases or access cases; or

(2) information that may identify a party involved in an abduction case or access case unless the party stipulates in writing to the Central Authority of the United States that such information may be included in the Annual Report.

(d) ADDITIONAL THEMATIC SECTIONS.—Each Annual Report shall also include—

(1) information on the number of unresolved abduction cases affecting left-behind parents who are military parents and a summary of assistance offered to such left-behind parents;

(2) information on the use of airlines in abductions, voluntary airline practices to prevent abductions, and recommendations for best airline practices to prevent abductions;

(3) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train domestic judges in application of the Hague Abduction Convention; and

(4) information on actions taken by the Central Authority of the United States to train United States Armed Forces legal assistance personnel, military chaplains, and military family support center personnel about abductions, the risk of loss of access to children, and the legal frameworks available to resolve such cases.

(e) REPEAL OF THE HAGUE CONVENTION COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 2803 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 11611) is repealed.

SEC. 102. STANDARDS AND ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of State shall ensure that United States diplomatic and consular missions abroad—

(1) maintain a consistent reporting standard with respect to abduction cases and access cases involving abducted children in the country in which such mission is located for purposes of the Annual Report;

(2) designate at least one official in each such mission to assist left-behind parents from the United States who are visiting such country to resolve cases involving an abduction or rights of access; and

(3) monitor developments in cases involving abducted children in the country in which such mission is located.

SEC. 103. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State should seek to enter into an MOU with every country that is not a Convention country and is unlikely to become a Convention country in the forseeable future, that includes—

(1) identification of the Central Authority;

(2) a protocol to identify, locate, and effectuate the return of an abducted child identified in an abduction case not later than 6 weeks after the application with respect to the abduction case has been submitted to the judicial or administrative authority, as applicable, of the country in which the abducted child is located;

(3) a protocol for the establishment and protection of the rights of access;

(4) identification of the judicial or administrative authority that will promptly adjudicate abduction cases and access cases;

(5) identification of a law enforcement agency and available law enforcement mechanisms and procedures to ensure the immediate enforcement of an order issued by the authority identified pursuant to paragraph (4) to return an abducted child to a left-behind parent, including by—

(A) conducting an investigation to ascertain the location of the abducted child;

(B) providing protection to the abducted child after such child is located; and

(C) retrieving the abducted child and making the appropriate arrangements for such child to be returned to the country of habitual residence;

(6) a protocol to establish periodic visits between a United States embassy or consular official and an abducted child to allow the official to ascertain the child's location and welfare; and

(7) such other provisions as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the United States from proposing and entering into a memorandum of understanding with a Convention country to further clarify the reciprocal obligations of the United States and the Convention country under the Hague Abduction Convention.

(2) TREATMENT OF OBLIGATIONS OF CONVENTION COUNTRY.—In those instances in which there is a memorandum of understanding as described in paragraph (1), the obligations of the Convention country under such memorandum shall be considered to be obligations of such country under the Hague Abduction Convention for purposes of this Act.

SEC. 104. NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall notify in writing the Member of Congress and Senators representing the legal residence of a left-behind parent when such parent reports an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The notification requirement under subsection (a) shall not apply if the left-behind parent does not consent to the notification described in such subsection.

(c) TIMING.—At the request of any person who is a left-behind parent, including a left-behind parent who previously reported an abduction to the Central Authority of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act, notification of a Member of Congress, in accordance with subsections (a) and (b), shall be provided as soon as is practicable.

(d) MEMBER OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Member of Congress'' means a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

TITLE II—PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS

SEC. 201. PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO UNRESOLVED CASES.

(a) RESPONSE TO INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.—

(1) UNITED STATES POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(A) promote the best interest of children abducted from the United States by establishing legal rights and procedures for their prompt return and by promoting such rights and procedures through actions that ensure the enforcement of reciprocal international obligations; and

(B) recognize the international character of the Hague Abduction Convention, and the need for reciprocity pursuant to and the uniform international interpretation of the Hague Abduction Convention, by promoting the timely resolution of abduction cases through one or more of the actions described in section 205.

(2) REQUIREMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTION.—Whenever the President determines that the government of a foreign country has failed to resolve an unresolved abduction case, the President shall oppose such failure through one or more of the actions described in subsection (b).

(b) PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the President, in consultation with

the Secretary of State, shall, as expeditiously as practicable in response to the failure described in subsection (a) by the government of a foreign country, take one or more of the actions described in paragraphs (1) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)) with respect to such country.

(2) DEADLINE FOR ACTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than March 31 of each year, the President shall take one or more of the actions described in paragraphs (1) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)) with respect to each foreign country the government of which has failed to resolve an unresolved abduction case that is pending as of such date.

(B) EXCEPTION.—In the case of an action under any of paragraphs (10) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b))—

(i) the action may only be taken after the requirements of sections 203 and 204 have been satisfied; and

(ii) the March 31 deadline to take the action shall not apply.

(3) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—The President may delay action described in any of the paragraphs (10) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)), as required under paragraph (2), if the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that an additional, specified period of time is necessary for a continuation of negotiations that have been commenced with the country to resolve the unresolved case.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (b), the President shall—

(A) take one or more actions that most appropriately respond to the nature and severity of the failure to resolve the unresolved abduction cases; and

(B) seek to the fullest extent possible to target action as narrowly as practicable with respect to the agencies or instrumentalities of the foreign government that are responsible for such failures, in ways that respect the separation of powers and independence of the judiciary in foreign countries.

(2) GUIDELINES FOR PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—In addition to the guidelines under paragraph (1), the President, in determining whether to take one or more actions under paragraphs (10) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)), shall seek to minimize any adverse impact on—

(A) the population of the country whose government is targeted by the action or actions; and

(B) the humanitarian activities of United States and foreign nongovernmental organizations in the country.

SEC. 202. PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO PATTERNS OF NONCOOPERATION IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTIONS.

(a) RESPONSE TO A PATTERN OF NONCOOPERATION.—

(1) UNITED STATES POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(A) oppose institutional or other systemic failures of foreign governments to fulfill their obligations pursuant to the Hague Abduction Convention or MOU, as applicable, to resolve abduction cases and access cases; and

(B) promote reciprocity pursuant to and compliance with the Hague Abduction Convention by Convention countries and compliance with the applicable MOU by MOU countries.

(2) REQUIREMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTION.—Whenever the President determines that the government of a foreign country has engaged in a pattern of noncooperation, the President shall promote the resolution of the unresolved abduction cases through one or more of the actions described in subsection (c).

(b) DESIGNATIONS OF COUNTRIES WITH PATTERNS OF NONCOOPERATION IN CASES OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.—

(1) ANNUAL REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the President shall review the status of abduction cases and access cases in each foreign country to determine whether the government of such country has engaged in a pattern of noncooperation during the preceding 12 months or since the date of the last review of such country under this subparagraph, whichever period is longer. The President shall designate each country the government of which has engaged in a pattern of noncooperation as a Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation.

(B) BASIS OF REVIEW.—Each review conducted under subparagraph (A) shall be based upon information contained in the latest Annual Report and on any other evidence available.

(2) DETERMINATIONS OF RESPONSIBLE PARTIES.—For the government of each country designated as a Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation under paragraph (1)(A), the President shall seek to determine the agencies or instrumentalities of such government that are responsible for the pattern of noncooperation by such government in order to appropriately target actions under this section in response.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Whenever the President designates a country as a Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation under paragraph (1)(A), the President shall, as soon as practicable after such designation is made, transmit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) the designation of the country, signed by the President; and

(B) the identification, if any, of responsible agencies or instrumentalities determined under paragraph (2).

(c) PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO A COUNTRY WITH A PATTERN OF NONCOOPERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) with respect to each Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation designated under subsection (b)(1)(A), the President shall, after the requirements of sections 203 and 204 have been satisfied, but not later than 90 days (or 180 days in case of a delay under paragraph (2)) after the date of such designation of the country under such subsection, take one or more of the actions under paragraphs (10) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)).

(2) AUTHORITY FOR DELAY OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—If, on or before the date that the President is required to take action under paragraph (1), the President determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that a single, additional period of time not to exceed 90 days is necessary—

(A) for a continuation of negotiations that have been commenced with the government of a country described in such paragraph to bring about a cessation of the pattern of noncooperation by such country, or

(B) for a review of corrective action taken by such country after designation of such country as a Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation under subsection (b)(1)(A) or in anticipation that corrective action will be taken by such country during such 90-day period,

the President shall not be required to take such action until the expiration of such period of time.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR ONGOING PRESIDENTIAL ACTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall not be required to take action under paragraph (1) with respect to a Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation if—

(i) the President has taken action pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to such country in a preceding year, such action is in effect at the time such country is designated as a Country with a Pattern of Noncooperation under subsection (b)(1)(A), and the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the information described in section 204 regarding the actions in effect with respect to such country; or

(ii) subject to subparagraph (B), the President determines that such country is subject to multiple, broad-based sanctions imposed in significant part in response to human rights abuses and that such sanctions also satisfy the requirements of this subsection.

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—If the President makes a determination under subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) the report under section 204 and, as applicable, the publication in the Federal Register under section 208, shall specify the specific sanction or sanctions that the President has determined satisfy the requirements of this subsection; and

(ii) such sanctions shall remain in effect subject to section 209.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A determination under this section that a foreign country has engaged in a pattern of noncooperation shall not be construed to require the termination of assistance or other activities with respect to such country under any other provision of law, including section 116 or 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151(n) or 2304).

SEC. 203. CONSULTATIONS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

As soon as practicable after the President makes a determination under section 201 in response to failures to resolve unresolved abduction cases and the President decides to take action under paragraphs (10) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)) with respect to that country, or not later than 90 days after the President designates a country as a country with a pattern of noncooperation pursuant to section 202(b)(1)(a), the President shall—

(1) request consultation with the government of such country regarding the failures giving rise to designation of that country as a Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation regarding the pattern of noncooperation or to action under section 201; and

(2) if agreed to, enter into such consultations with such country, privately or publicly.

SEC. 204. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), not later than 90 days after the President makes a determination under section 201 in response to failures to resolve unresolved abduction cases and the President decides to take action under paragraphs (10) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)) with respect to that country, or not later than 90 days after the President designates a country as a Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation pursuant to section 202(b)(1)(A), the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the following:

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—An identification of the action or actions described in section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)) to be taken with respect to such country.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF VIOLATIONS.—A description of the failure to resolve an unresolved case or the pattern of noncooperation, as applicable, giving rise to the action or actions to be taken by the President.

(3) PURPOSE OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—A description of the purpose of the action or actions.

(4) EVALUATION.—

(A) DESCRIPTION.—An evaluation, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the parties described in section 203(b), and other parties the President determines appropriate, of the anticipated impact of the Presidential action upon—

(i) pending abduction cases in such country;

(ii) the government of such country;

(iii) the population of such country;

(iv) the United States economy;

(v) other interested parties; and

(vi) if such country is a Convention country or an MOU country, the reciprocal fulfillment of obligations pursuant to such Convention or applicable MOU, as applicable.

(B) FORM.—The evaluation under subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(5) STATEMENT OF POLICY OPTIONS.—A statement that noneconomic policy options designed to resolve the unresolved case or bring about the cessation of the pattern of noncooperation have reasonably been exhausted, including the consultations required in section 203.

(b) DELAY IN TRANSMITTAL OF REPORT.—If, on or before the date that the President is required to submit a report under subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees, the President determines and certifies to such committees that a single, additional period of time not to exceed 90 days is necessary pursuant to section 202(c)(2), the President shall not be required to submit the report to such committees until the expiration of such period of time.

SEC. 205. PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.

(a) DESCRIPTION OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the Presidential actions referred to in this subsection are the following:

(1) A private demarche.

(2) An official public demarche.

(3) A public condemnation.

(4) A public condemnation within one or more multilateral fora.

(5) The delay or cancellation of one or more scientific exchanges.

(6) The delay or cancellation of one or more cultural exchanges.

(7) The denial of one or more working, official, or state visits.

(8) The delay or cancellation of one or more working, official, or state visits.

(9) A formal request to the foreign country concerned to extradite an individual who is engaged in abduction and who has been formally accused of, charged with, or convicted of an extraditable offense.

(10) The withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States development assistance in accordance with section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n).

(11) The withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of United States security assistance in accordance with section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304).

(12) The withdrawal, limitation, or suspension of assistance to the central government of a country pursuant to chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to the Economic Support Fund).

(13) Ordering the heads of the appropriate United States agencies not to issue any (or a specified number of) specific licenses, and not to grant any other specific authority (or a specified number of authorities), to export any goods or technology to such government or to the agency or instrumentality of such government determined by the President to be responsible for such unresolved case or pattern of noncooperation, as applicable, under—

(A) the Export Administration Act of 1979 (as continued in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act);

(B) the Arms Export Control Act;

(C) the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; or

(D) any other statute that requires the prior review and approval of the United States Government as a condition for the export or re-export of goods or services.

(b) COMMENSURATE ACTION.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the President may substitute any other action authorized by law for any action described in subsection (a) if such action is commensurate in effect to the action substituted and if such action would further the purposes of this Act as specified in section 2(c). The President shall seek to take all appropriate and feasible actions authorized by law to resolve the unresolved case or to obtain the cessation of such pattern of noncooperation, as applicable. If commensurate action is taken under this subsection, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on such action, together with an explanation for taking such action.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) HUMANITARIAN EXCEPTION.—Any action taken pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) may not prohibit or restrict the provision of medicine, medical equipment or supplies, food, or other life-saving humanitarian assistance.

(2) DEFENSE AND NATIONAL SECURITY EXCEPTION.—The President shall not be required to apply or maintain any action under section 205—

(A) in the case of procurement of defense articles or defense services—

(i) under existing contracts or subcontracts, including the exercise of options for production quantities, to satisfy requirements essential to the national security of the United States;

(ii) if the President determines in writing and transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a report that the government or the agency or instrumentality of such government to which such action would otherwise be applied is a sole source supplier of such defense articles or services, that such defense articles or services are essential, and that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available; or

(iii) if the President determines in writing and transmits to the appropriate congressional committees a report that such defense articles or services are essential to the national security of the United States under defense co-production agreements; or

(B) to products or services provided under contracts entered into before the date on which the President publishes in the Federal Register notice of such action in accordance with section 208.

SEC. 206. PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the President may waive the application of any of the actions described in paragraphs (10) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)) with respect to a country, if the President determines and so reports to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the government of such country has satisfactorily resolved any abduction case giving rise to the application of any of such actions and—

(A) if such country is a Convention country, such country has taken measures to ensure future compliance with the provisions of the Hague Abduction Convention;

(B) if such country is an MOU country, such country has taken measures to ensure future compliance with the provisions of the MOU at issue; or

(C) if such country was a nonparty country at the time the abductions or denials of rights of access resulting in the abduction cases or access cases occurred, such country has become a Convention country or an MOU country;

(2) the exercise of such waiver authority would further the purposes of this Act; or

(3) the important national interest of the United States requires the exercise of such waiver authority.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than the date of the exercise of a waiver under subsection (a), the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver or the intention to exercise such waiver, together with a detailed justification thereof.

SEC. 207. PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the President shall ensure publication in the Federal Register of the following:

(1) DETERMINATIONS OF GOVERNMENTS, AGENCIES, INSTRUMENTALITIES OF COUNTRIES WITH PATTERNS OF NONCOOPERATION.—Any designation of a country that the President has designated as a Country With a Pattern of Noncooperation under section 202(b)(1)(A), together with, when applicable and to the extent practicable, the identities of agencies or instrumentalities determined to be responsible for such pattern of noncooperation.

(2) PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—A description of any action under paragraphs (10) through (13) of section 205(a) (or commensurate action as provided in section 205(b)) and the effective date of such action.

(3) DELAYS IN TRANSMITTAL OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTION REPORTS.—Any delay in transmittal of a report required under section 204.

(4) WAIVERS.—Any waiver issued under section 206.

(b) LIMITED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The President may limit publication of information under this section in the same manner and to the same extent as the President may limit the publication of findings and determinations described in section 654(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2414(c)), if the President determines that the publication of such information—

(1) would be harmful to the national security of the United States; or

(2) would not further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 208. TERMINATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.

Any action taken under this Act or any amendment made by this Act with respect to a foreign country shall terminate on the earlier of the following two dates:

(1) Not later than two years after the effective date of such action unless expressly reauthorized by law.

(2) The date on which the President transmits to Congress a certification containing a determination of the President that the government of such country has resolved any unresolved abduction case or has taken substantial and verifiable steps to correct the pattern of noncooperation at issue, as applicable, that gave rise to such action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, every year more than 1,000 American families are confronted with the nightmare of their child being abducted to a foreign country by one parent in violation of legal custody and access rights, beyond the reach of U.S. courts, beyond the court of law enforcement. This illegal break in the tie between the child and the left-behind American mother or father is a tragedy, and many of us personally have constituents facing these wrenching separations in the family.

More than 30 years ago, the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction was created to provide a simplified mechanism for returning children to their countries of habitual residence so that parental rights are determined by applicable laws rather than by the act of abduction of that child.

Today, the United States has agreements with more than 75 Hague partner countries, and that has helped to return many American children safely home. But unfortunately, agreeing to the Hague Convention and complying with it are not the same thing, and countries sometimes do not abide by their obligations under the Hague Convention. In those countries, there is a heightened risk that a child could be kept there with impunity. American parents need to know about this situation; and they need to know especially, before planning or permitting travel to such destinations, that this, in fact, could happen.

This bill will strengthen the incentives and the tools that the Department of State has to address these unresolved abduction cases. It will also require the United States to identify and take action concerning countries that demonstrate a pattern of noncompliance with the obligations to return American children; and its enhanced annual reporting will provide American parents and judges with a clearer picture of actual Hague compliance and the risks of nonreturn associated with travel to certain countries.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his tireless work on behalf of left-behind American parents over the last several years. His efforts have kept hope alive for hundreds of other American parents who only want to be reunited with their children.

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

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3212, the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act. I would like to begin by thanking my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for his dedicated and tireless efforts on this critical issue, making a difference for families.

There are few crimes more heartwrenching than child abduction. As a parent myself, I can't imagine the anguish a mother or father goes through when their child is abducted by their partner and taken to another country. These left-behind parents currently have little leverage to have their children returned home. They are often at the mercy of foreign courts with different cultural conceptions of custody and what is or is not in the child's best interest.

Unfortunately, there is an increasing number of international parental child abductions. The State Department reported that in 2012 there were 1,144 children abducted from a parent in the United States and taken abroad.

□ 1300

The most effective tool the United States has to help return abducted children is the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. This treaty creates a global standard and requires signatories to return abducted children to the country of the child's habitual residence for a custody hearing.

Regrettably, there are significant gaps in the Hague treaty framework. The treaty has no enforcement mechanism, and 40 percent of abducted children are taken to non-Hague-compliant countries. This leaves far too many parents with no viable options. The purpose of this legislation before us today is to fill those gaps—providing pained parents with the appropriate tools to bring their children home.

Specifically, H.R. 3212 encourages the State Department to enter into MOUs with countries to bring them in line with accepted standards and return these children home. In addition, this bill gives the President the power to sanction countries that demonstrate persistent failure in returning abducted children. The legislation will also help us monitor progress in achieving greater compliance worldwide with the Hague standards by requiring reports on child abduction cases and on U.S. Government efforts to encourage their compliance.

Sadly, international parental child abduction is an underreported and often overlooked crime which dramatically and traumatically impacts the lives of the children and the parents involved. We need to send a message to the world that we take Hague compliance in returning abducted children back to the United States seriously. This bill represents an important step forward in empowering the President and the State Department to enforce the Hague Convention and to bring more countries in line with its standards.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Chairman ROYCE, for your total support of this legislation and the initiative behind it. You have been a great friend of all of the left-behind parents and abducted children. I want to thank you very sincerely, and I also thank ELIOT ENGEL, our ranking member.

At a time when there are very few bipartisan initiatives, you, as leader of our committee, have ensured that the committee is a bipartisan committee where we work on a global basis for all people on human rights and humanitarian issues. It really has made a difference. Thank you for your support in getting this legislation here today. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Speaker, David Goldman spent over 5 agonizing years trying to legally rescue his son, Sean, from an abduction to Brazil, which is a signatory nation, like the United States, to the Hague Abduction Convention.

Despite Mr. Goldman's airtight case that demonstrated an egregious example of both child abduction and wrongful retention, the Hague treaty was unavailing, and the outcomes in the Brazilian courts largely proved infuriating, infirm, and ineffective.

David Goldman had extraordinary legal counsel both in Brazil and in the United States. Patricia Apy, his American attorney, is a world-class expert in child abduction cases. He waged his case by the book and won judgments in the New Jersey courts. Yet both Sean and David were made to suffer emotional pain for over half a decade as one delaying ploy after another was employed by the abducting parties. In the end, Mr. Speaker, because of the father's abiding love for his son and an indomitable will, the Goldmans today are united and happy.

But the Goldmans are an exception in an ever worsening injustice that harms thousands of American children and many more kids worldwide. Most cases of parental abduction and wrongful retention have a bad ending. The child or children never return, and the left-behind parent often never sees them again. Even if left-behind parents are allowed access, the conditions are tightly supervised and of excruciatingly short duration.

Over the years, I have had the privilege of meeting many absolutely amazing, dedicated, yet heartbroken left-behind parents. Some of them are here today in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, up in the gallery, as they wage an effort on behalf of their abducted children. Out of deep love and a commitment to justice, they, too, like David Goldman, adamantly refuse to quit.

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, their stories are often eerily the same. In the beginning days and weeks post-abduction, they thought the Hague treaty, their government, and the rule of law would ensure a swift, just, and durable remedy. As the months and then years go by, however, the journey of the left-behind parent is filled with unbearable pain. The heartache they endure is severely compounded by the fact that child abductions and wrongful retentions significantly harm children in many ways, especially psychologically.

Mr. Speaker, more than 1,000 international child abductions are reported to the State Department's Office of Children's Issues, also known as Central Authority of the United States, each and every year. That is just those that are reported. There are many that are not. Between 2008 and 2012, 7,000 American children were abducted, according to the Department of State.

According to the State Department as well, only about half of those children abducted from the U.S. to countries with which this country has reciprocal obligations under the Hague Convention are ever returned. In other words, the other half are not. And when there is no treaty obligation, less than 40 percent of abduction and access cases are resolved. It is an awful record that Congress today can help change.

The purpose of H.R. 3212, as amended, the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention Act of 2013, is to protect children from the harmful effects of abduction and wrongful retention and to assist left-behind parents to not only have access to their children, but to significantly enhance the prospects of resolution.

My biggest policy takeaway from working on the Goldman case, Mr. Speaker, was the absence of incentives for nations to prioritize resolving parental abduction cases and the complete lack of penalty for callous governmental indifference or complicity.

The Goldman Act is based on two human rights laws: the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, or TVPA, which I authored in 2000, and the International Religious Freedom Act, or IRFA, which was authored by our distinguished colleague, FRANK WOLF.

The Goldman legislation seeks to hold countries to account by meticulously monitoring their performance in adjudicating parental child abduction and wrongful retention. After a vigorous analysis, if a country at its administrative, judicial, or law enforcement levels demonstrates what we call a pattern of noncooperation, that is to say, persistent failure to fulfill its Hague Abduction Convention responsibilities, or failure of a non-Hague nation to abide by a memorandum of understanding with the United States, the President is empowered to take any number of escalating Presidential actions against that nation.

Again, patterned after both the TVPA and IRFA, the message to all nations and all past, present, and future abductors is that the United States is very serious about preventing or resolving child abduction cases. In order to ensure that the administration has maximum flexibility in advancing solutions, the President is given generous waiver authorities.

The bill also encourages the Secretary of State to seek opportunities to enter into an MOU with non-Hague Convention countries—and, obviously those that are not non-Hague can also become a part of it even when they do become one—and to establish protocols to identify, locate, and effectuate the return of an abducted child as well as access issues.

Finally, in order to ensure more robust accountability and the potential of successful interventions, the bill significantly beefs up reporting.

Finally, let me just say also, Mr. Speaker, the bill has been endorsed by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. I will include in the RECORD a letter from that very august organization in support.

I have a letter from Robert Wallace, the executive director of the VFW, who has also endorsed the bill and made it very clear their concern, which is reflected in the text of the bill, about our servicemembers deployed abroad who find themselves in the unbelievably horrific position of having a child abducted while they are deployed and then not only not having access to but certainly not getting their children back.

And there are a number of cases. I have had four hearings so far where they have testified. In the case of Commander Toland, who was stationed in Japan, his daughter was abducted by his now-deceased wife, and he has not had access to his daughter in a decade, Mr. Speaker. She is now 11, and he has desperately, through the rule of law and by using the process, tried to have access to and to reclaim his precious daughter as the only surviving parent.

He is like so many others. Both children of Michael Elias, a combat-injured Iraqi war veteran, were abducted. He cannot even have access to them. I actually traveled to Japan, Mr. Speaker, with the grandparents. We could not even get to see those two wonderful children. That has got to change.

This legislation seeks to use the civil aspects of the Hague Convention to empower that treaty, which is very well-intentioned but lacks enforcement capability. This legislation gives the President the tool. It adds to those tools in the toolbox to make return and access a reality rather than a dream and a hope.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
December 11, 2013.

Hon. CHRIS SMITH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, House Foreign Affairs Committee, Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I am writing today to express the strong support of The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States (VFW) for H.R. 3212, the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013 (Goldman Act), as it is sorely needed to protect members of the armed services from the tragedy of international parental child abduction.

As you know, members of the armed services, by virtue of their deployments abroad, are particularly vulnerable to having their children abducted off base and into the jurisdiction of a foreign country, or in the case of marriage to foreign spouses, the flight of that spouse with the child to the country of origin. In both cases, our service members' pleas for help are too often met with bad legal advice, misinformation, or indifference. They are told that the abduction is a simple custody case, and that they should litigate in the foreign court system. The result is financial and emotional disaster for our soldiers and their children. In most cases, they are never reunited with the children. Japan, in particular, has been a ''black hole'' for the abduction of our service members' children—and yet the United States still has not covered abduction in the Status of Forces Agreement with Japan, or any other country.

It is time for the U.S. government to take concrete action to protect our service members from the dangers of international parental child abduction. The Goldman Act would require the President to take one or more specified actions, or a commensurate action, in response to a failure to resolve a child abduction case or a ''pattern of noncooperation.'' It would authorize the Secretary of State to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding where no legal framework exists for the return of abducted children. It would also strengthen reporting requirements on abductions, so that the DOD can make better decisions about how to educate and protect our service members from the dangers of international parental child abduction.

Thank you again for your work on this much needed bill. The Veterans of Foreign Wars offers our full I support, and we look forward to working with you on this issue.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. WALLACE,
Executive Director, VFW Washington Office.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING & EXPLOITED CHILDREN; CHARLES B. WANG INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S BUILDING,
Alexandria, VA, October 10, 2013.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights and International Organizations, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: On behalf of the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, and the searching parents we serve, I commend you for introducing H.R. 3212, the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013. This legislation is a critical step toward addressing the problem of U.S. children taken to and kept in foreign countries in violation of parental rights.

As you know, NCMEC is the nation's congressionally-designated resource center on

missing and exploited children. We have a unit within our Missing Children Division dedicated to international child abductions. From 1995 through 2008, per a cooperative agreement with the Departments of State and Justice, NCMEC handled cases in which a child was wrongfully brought into the United States and subject to the Hague Convention. While NCMEC no longer serves this role, we continue to provide legal technical assistance to attorneys and judges handling international child abduction cases as well as technical assistance and resources to parents, law enforcement and professionals involved in these matters. We are currently working cases involving more than 1,300 children believed to have been removed from the United States to a foreign country by a parent or family member.

Child abduction by a parent is a crime under both federal and state law. These children suffer extreme emotional abuse, including lack of identity and grief over the loss of a parent. Often the abductor gives the child a false explanation for the abduction, indicates that the left-behind-parent no longer wants the child, or worse. Abductors who move the child between cities, or between countries, amplify the child's lost sense of security and stability as well as making it difficult for law enforcement and the searching parent to locate and recover the child.

It is of the utmost importance that we hold all signatory countries to the standards and obligations of the Hague Convention. In addition, we must continue to encourage countries that have not yet done so to ratify the Convention. We must engage with countries to urge the adoption of policies consistent with those outlined in the Convention. And the U.S. must act as a role model by promptly returning children abducted into the U.S. This will foster good relationships with countries who will reciprocate with the return of American children.

This significant piece of legislation will strengthen our ability to bring our children home to their searching parents. Thank you, Chairman, for your unwavering commitment to America's children.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. RYAN,
Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), my friend and colleague and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for his important work and leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3212. I want to thank and recognize my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, CHRIS SMITH, and the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ROYCE, for their important leadership and hard work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I speak on behalf of all left-behind parents and, in particular, on behalf of a constituent of mine from Newton, Massachusetts, Colin Bower. Colin was granted full custody of his children, Noor and Ramsey, in 2008. In 2009, the boys' mother unexpectedly took them out of school, boarded a plane, fled to Egypt, and has never since returned. Through all that time, she has refused to return the children.

It has been nearly 2 years since Colin has seen or spoken with his sons. Despite the custody ruling of a U.S. court and a subsequent Egyptian court order granting him the right to visit with his children, Colin has been denied the opportunity to see his children time and time again.

I just got off the phone with Colin a few moments ago. He recapped the details of his ordeal yet again to me, but I guess, in the words that he said most poignantly: No parent should ever have to go through this.

Between the years of 2008 and 2012, Mr. Speaker, parents reported more than 4,800 cases of abduction involving more than 7,000 children, according to the State Department. Currently, 89 countries are party to a Hague treaty that provides a legal framework for children who are victims of international abduction.

This bill would require the Secretary of State to enter into a memorandum of understanding with those countries that have not signed the Hague agreement, creating a mechanism where none exists to bring children home safely. Additionally, it would provide better reporting to parents and to Congress.

No parent should have to suffer the unbelievable heartbreak that Colin has experienced over the past 5 years. No child should be torn away from a safe home and loving family because their country didn't have the proper protections in place to protect them.

We can do more to ensure that these children find a way home. I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1315

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act, authored by my good friend and colleague, Mr. CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH has been a stalwart supporter of the rights of children and for the left-behind parents, who all too often feel as though they have been abandoned by their government and have no place to turn.

According to our State Department, hundreds of parental transnational child abduction cases occur each year. In most of the cases, the left-behind parents here in the United States face a tremendous uphill battle with the foreign country's government to return their child. To make matters worse, they have no recourse, no legal basis to turn to, that would compel that foreign government to cooperate with them and return their abducted child to the United States. The effects that this has on both the child and the parents are significant and, in many cases, have unshakable, lifelong consequences.

Mr. SMITH's bill gives hope where there previously was none. It represents a new approach to resolving this issue by giving our government and the President the avenues needed to press the countries that are found to be habitually noncooperative and noncompliant to work with the United States in order to resolve these cases. For some countries that refuse to cooperate, it is clear that words are not enough—they must be convinced by action to do the right thing—and this bill sends that very message, which is that the United States will not rest until we bring every wrongfully abducted American child home.

Too many parents have been separated from their children for far too long and with little to no recourse, and we must change that now, Mr. Speaker. I would like to urge that we also not overlook that, in many instances, a parent will flee with his child or children internationally in order to escape domestic violence.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, too often, current U.S. law addressing international child abduction actually facilitates domestic violence and child abuse by forcing the return of a child despite a recognized risk to the child or parent.

It is my sincere hope that, with Mr. SMITH's bill and my bill and with the further corrective measures to international child abduction laws that I plan to soon introduce that can help strengthen this measure, we will be able to resolve these issues so that the interests of all involved can be addressed and so that the children's rights can be protected.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me note again that the tragedy of international abduction affects thousands of children every year here in the United States.

When the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered this bill back on October 10, we heard from multiple members whose constituents were dealing with the nightmare of being illegally separated from their children, and our human rights subcommittee heard directly from several left-behind American parents in a May 9 hearing. H.R. 3212, by Mr. SMITH, is a measured response to this pressing problem.

I want to again thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the vision and for the perseverance, frankly, reflected in his bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

For many years, David Goldman was my constituent, so I am intimately familiar with both the case and the incredible pain and heartbreak David endured after the kidnapping of his son, Sean, by David's estranged, Brazilian-born wife who illegally took Sean back to

Brazil. I will not recount now all of the details of the five-year long ordeal David endured to secure the return of his son. What I will say is that my experience in helping him bring Sean home helped me understand that the issue of parental child abduction needs greater attention from our government.

In his efforts to get his son returned to him, Mr. Goldman at least benefited from the fact that both Brazil (where the boy was being held illegally) and the United States are parties to the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. The Hague Convention creates an international legal framework for resolving such parental kidnappings. The treaty is anything but perfect; it lacks any genuine enforcement mechanism, which means that many of these cases drag on for years, just as the Goldman case did. However, the situation is far worse for parents whose spouse kidnaps their child and returns to their country of origin when that country is not a party to the Hague Convention. In those cases, the remaining parent has virtually no recourse to secure the return of their abducted child. The bill before us seeks to change that situation.

I especially support the language in the bill that directs the Secretary of State to engage in negotiations with non-Hague signatory nations where large numbers of American children remain illegally held by the offending parent to secure their release. Seeking the creation of a bilateral memorandum of understanding to help resolve these cases is an important interim step on the road to a larger, more enduring solution. I do have concerns about the language in this bill requiring the President to impose an escalating series of sanctions against nations who refuse to address parental kidnappings of American children. In my view, the language as written could potentially interfere with the President's ability to conduct effective diplomacy on this issue. However, once this bill reaches the Senate I am sure there will be opportunities to amend it in such a fashion that it will be able to accomplish the intended goal (the return of abducted children) without permanently damaging diplomatic relations with other nations.

One thing is clear: existing American parental child abduction cases are not being resolved expeditiously, and I agree with those who argue that the United States needs to send a clear message that the status quo on this issue cannot stand. Accordingly I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 3212—the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013, which would help prevent additional child abductions to foreign countries in the future.

Recently, I was able to meet with a constituent of mine—Michael Elias. Michael has worked in the Bergen County Sheriffs Department and honorably served our country in the Iraq War. Upon his return from his service to our country, Michael and his wife, a citizen of Japan, agreed to separate.

In 2008, a Bergen County judge ordered joint custody of their two children—Jade and Michael, Jr. The judge also ordered that the children's passports be surrendered and they were. After a few months, on a day like any other, Michael was expecting his ex-wife to drop off Jade and Michael, Jr. to his house after spending the day with her. They never showed up. Somehow, his ex-wife was able to obtain new passports for Jade and Michael, Jr. and had fled to Japan, which is not a party to the Hague Convention on Abduction.

Despite Michael's years of inquiries and toil, The Government of Japan has produced no answers on how his ex-wife was able to obtain the new visas for Jade and Michael, Jr. And nearly five years later, Michael has not been able see his own children.

This bill will help countless families across the country that face the same heartbreaking situation that Michael Elias is still dealing with today. Our State Department must be on the frontlines for people like Michael, who have literally put their life on the line for this country. H.R. 1951 will empower the State Department to advocate for the victims of these tragic abductions.

And that is why I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 3212, for people like Michael Elias and the countless families that have been wrongfully torn apart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3212, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ISRAEL QME ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1992) to amend the requirements relating to assessment of Israel's qualitative military edge over military threats, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1992

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 ''Israel QME Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ASSESSMENT OF ISRAEL'S QUALITATIVE MILITARY EDGE OVER MILITARY THREATS.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED; REPORTS.—Section 201 of Public Law 110–429 (122 Stat. 4843; 22 U.S.C. 2776 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''an ongoing basis'' and inserting ''a biennial basis''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''QUADRENNIAL'' and inserting ''BIENNIAL''; and

(B) in the text, by striking ''Not later than four years after the date on which the President transmits the initial report under paragraph (1), and every four years thereafter,'' and inserting ''Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the Israel QME Enhancement Act, and biennially thereafter,''.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(A) the range of cyber and asymmetric threats posed to Israel by state and nonstate actors; and

(B) the joint efforts of the United States and Israel to address the threats identified in subparagraph (A).

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to add any extraneous material to the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Let me begin by thanking both the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for their leadership and for their foresight in authoring this very important measure.

In shepherding this legislation through the committee, I was again reminded of the shared commitment of Members of both parties to come together to promote Israel's security. It is an example of bipartisanship at its best.

The United States' commitment to Israel rests on the assurance that the U.S., through a combination of Foreign Military Financing, the joint cooperative development of weapons systems and other measures, will ensure that Israel upholds its qualitative military edge. The standard definition of that is ensuring Israel's ability to counter and defeat credible military threats from any individual state or coalition of states or nonstate actors, and with the growing threat to Israel throughout the region—from the prospect of a nuclear Iran to an ascendant Hezbollah and widespread regional instability—Israel's retention of its QME is critical to its existence.

I had a chance to see this firsthand in 2006 during the second Lebanon war, which I, frankly, think should be called the ''Hezbollah war.'' Hezbollah was raining down rockets manufactured originally in Iran and Syria on a daily basis on Haifa. When I was in Haifa, I watched those rockets come in, and

they were being aimed at civilian neighborhoods. They were also being aimed at the hospital there. On one trip, I went down to the hospital to see the results.

Haifa is a very cosmopolitan city as one-third of Haifa is Israeli Jews, another third is Arab Israelis, another third is Druze and other minorities. The people in that city faced a constant bombardment for 30 days. While we were there, we had an opportunity to talk to some of the families, to some of the survivors—600 civilian victims from that attack in that trauma hospital. They told us how those missiles manufactured in Iran—this was before the invention of the Iron Dome, so there was no defense to this—would come into the civilian neighborhoods—90,000 ball bearings—and they would just go through the walls, through cars, through a shop. This is what led, basically, to a siege-like setting in which families were underground; but as they would try to come up at some point, they would be spotted from the other side, from the border, and once again, Hezbollah would try to hit that family, to hit that township.

This is what Haifa was going through. It is a reminder of the threat that Israel needs the best technology to combat these and other terrorist attacks. It is a relief that now Israel does have the Iron Dome, that there is warning, that there is the ability of some type of response other than the type of counterbattery work that we saw as they were trying to silence those rockets, which were never silenced, which came in for 30 days.

In 2008, Congress required the President to assess on an ongoing basis the extent to which Israel possesses a qualitative military edge over the threats that are arrayed against it. Those threats are all too real. Currently, the assessment is done every 4 years. Currently, it focuses only on the conventional military threats to Israel. This bill would require that Congress receive that assessment on a timely basis, at least every 2 years. It would also require the administration to specify a separate onetime report integrating cyber and asymmetric threats to Israel into this overall security assistance framework. This is very important given the new types of terror—suicide bombings and the rest of it and cyber warfare—that are being developed on either side of the border from Hamas to Hezbollah.

These provisions will provide Congress critical information that it requires in a timely manner to assess Israel's security requirements as Israel tries to deal with everything from the threat in Iran to all of the other terrorist organizations that are proxies for Iran. It also sends the right message at the right time to our mutual friends and foes alike that the United States and Israel stand together.

So I strongly support the immediate passage. I thank, again, Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. COLLINS for their good work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1992, the Israel Qualitative Military Edge Enhancement Act.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for working so diligently with my office, and I want to thank Congressman DOUG COLLINS for bringing this important legislation before the House floor. I want to personally thank my friend and colleague Mr. COLLINS for all of the work he has done and that we have done together to make sure this bill becomes a reality.

Israel stands at an historic juncture. In a very dangerous neighborhood, Israel must have the capabilities to deal with a broad spectrum of potential conventional and asymmetric threats. With the United States negotiating with Iran over its nuclear weapons program, it is vitally important that we continue to give Israel all of the tools necessary to address a growing list of threats. That is why Representative COLLINS and I have introduced this important and timely bill—to help further safeguard the technological edge Israel has in defending herself and in safeguarding human life for all of her citizens.

This bill expands upon existing requirements that the United States aid Israel in developing defense-capable systems for safeguarding the Israeli homeland against conventional and asymmetrical threats. Previously, this cooperation has resulted in the highly successful Iron Dome system along with the continued development of the Arrow and the David's Sling series of military hardware.

Despite this capability, Israel now faces the threat of regional insecurity with a virtual failed state on its border with Syria, hundreds of thousands of rockets and mortars being stockpiled by Hezbollah in Lebanon, ongoing rocket fire from Hamas on the Gaza Strip, increasing terrorist activity in the Sinai, and, most importantly, the continued existential threat of Iran and its accelerating nuclear program. The U.S. can and must do more to aid Israel in addressing all of these threats in a comprehensive way.

The bill before us would specifically encourage greater cooperation between Israel and the United States in developing new weapons, tactics and procedures that will safeguard them from the growing threats Of cyber warfare and asymmetrical military threats such as terrorist activity. Increased reporting and coordination will allow the United States and Israel to continue their mutually beneficial research and intelligence programs to create a more secure and prosperous region—one that can safeguard human life to the maximum extent possible. By increasing the frequency of assessment from 4 years to 2, the Israel Qualitative Military Edge Enhancement Act will help ensure Israel is always prepared to confront constantly evolving conventional and asymmetrical threats.

I again want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their support of this legislation. I also want to thank the other cosponsors of this bill, including Representative COLLINS, for their hard work to hone this bill over the last few months. I would especially like to thank Vernon Robinson, Jr., who worked so diligently with my staff to shepherd this bill to the House floor today.

I strongly ask my colleagues to join me in support of this important bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the author of this bill, and we want to thank him for being such an active member of our committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do appreciate that. I do appreciate what your staff and others have done, the ranking member, in moving this legislation through. And also my good friend from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) in where we have been able to work together. I would be remiss also if I did not recognize Vernon Robinson from my staff as well, who is with me today, who has kept this going while we have worked. So I appreciate his work and the rest of our staff in doing so.

I introduced H.R. 1992, the Israel QME Enhancement Act, to ensure our commitment to Israel's qualitative military edge remains substantial and meaningful.

This legislation allows Congress to conduct oversight of weapon sales in the Middle East with increased frequency. Due to the instability in the region, it is vitally important that the qualitative military edge review process be updated to reflect the needs of Israel. H.R. 1992 accomplishes this goal by directing the President to report to Congress every 2 years regarding the assessment of Israel's qualitative military edge over military threats to Israel and related weapon sales in the Middle East.

This is a marked improvement over our current law, which only requires such a report to be issued every 4 years.

H.R. 1992 also requires the President to issue a report to Congress on the criteria issued to include cyber and asymmetric threats in the QME report.

Large conventional armies are less likely to mobilize against Israel, but terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah and Hamas are a constant threat. I am very concerned by the cyber attacks that have been launched against Israel, as well as the continued onslaught of terrorist attacks that threaten the security and stability of this peace-loving nation.

The QME doctrine originated during the Johnson administration, but came

into practice during the Yom Kippur War in 1973 when the United States conducted one of the largest military airlifts in history to resupply Israel with military hardware. Since Israel's victory in the conflict, the United States has sworn to ensure Israel's qualitative military edge remains strong, as surrounding Middle Eastern countries often possess a quantitative advantage.

The benefits of the Israeli-American relationship are undeniable. Our alliance has been vital for each nation's intelligence efforts. Both nations have provided valuable information that has saved the lives of civilians, as well as military personnel.

I have recognized the value of America's partnership for many years, and I am humbled and grateful to now be in a position where I can support this alliance on the floor of the House.

America's support for Israel should be strong and responsive to the changing threats facing our ally. Their military threat is a vital component to promoting stability and peace in the Middle East. I am pleased by the steadfast commitment this body and our leadership have shown in maintaining a vibrant partnership with Israel.

As the vice chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, I am committed to promoting policy decisions that ensure Israel will be equipped to maintain the only stable democracy in the Middle East.

In recent weeks, there have been rounds of negotiations concerning Iran's nuclear capabilities. As a result of these negotiations, an agreement was reached with Iran, the details of which put Israel in a very difficult position.

Many questions remain about Iran's continued ability to enrich uranium and the billions of dollars they will gain in sanctions relief, questions such as: Where will these be used and how will the money be used for other attacks such as Hezbollah or others in this area?

One thing I am certain of, however, is the savings will not be spent on any effort advantageous to U.S. or Israel. Now more than ever, Congress must demonstrate its unwavering commitment to strengthening the U.S.-Israel relations during such an unpredictable time in the Middle East. This is something that is needed. It is something for our friend Israel. It protects our interests and protects Israel's interests.

With that, I would urge support of H.R. 1992.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman again for the time.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1992, the Israel Qualitative Military Edge Enhancement Act, authored by my colleague and the vice chair of our Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, Mr. COLLINS.

There is no better time than now, Mr. Speaker, to pass this bill and send our closest friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, and the rest of the world a strong message that the United States Congress stands resolutely with Israel and her right to defend herself.

The U.S. and other world leaders lamentably acquiesced and relented on the Iran nuclear deal and offered concessions to the regime in Tehran that do nothing to dismantle its nuclear program. Even as the negotiations carried on, Iran was busy making advancements to its nuclear weapons program. Shortly after the deal, Iran announced that it had made significant progress on its ballistic missile program. And just this last weekend, Mr. Speaker, the regime announced that it was moving ahead with testing on more efficient and sophisticated centrifuges.

There can be no mistaking these actions. They all add up to Iran continuing down its path of achieving a full nuclear weapons program. Mr. Speaker, we have heard this rhetoric that has been coming out of Iran for years now. The regime does not recognize Israel's right to exist. It denies the Holocaust. It repeats its calls to wipe Israel off the map, and ''death to Israel'' is chanted throughout the country.

Iran is an existential threat to Israel's very existence; and now more than ever, we need to ensure that Israel remains not just one step ahead of those who seek to do her harm, but light years ahead.

In conclusion, there is no room for error as Iran inches closer and closer to having nuclear breakout capability. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure, expressing our strong support for Israel to have a qualitative military edge.

I thank my chairman, as well as Mr. COLLINS, the author of the bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROSKAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my colleagues from Georgia and Illinois for their work on this matter. It is incredibly important; and, as Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN mentioned a minute ago, the challenges that Israel are facing are incredibly significant.

The challenges are moving very, very quickly, Mr. Speaker. There is a storm cloud that is brewing; and rather than waiting to recalibrate, this bill says let's evaluate how Israel is doing in terms of a qualitative military advantage and edge more frequently.

As we know, if Israel is strong in the Middle East, good things happen. If Israel is weak in the Middle East, good things don't happen.

We have an opportunity now for the House to stand with Israel. As mentioned before by Mr. COLLINS a minute ago, it is not just for Israel's sake; but it is clearly in the best interest of the United States.

There is one democratic ally in the Middle East, and that is the State of Israel. It is incumbent upon us as a coequal branch of government to encourage the administration to do the right thing, not just from Israel's point of view but from the long-term strategic interest of the United States.

I am a cosponsor of this legislation. I am pleased that it is being brought under the leadership of Chairman ROYCE and his committee to the House floor. I urge its passage.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, all around Israel things are in tremendous turmoil.

To Israel's south, Egypt is experiencing its worst period of unrest in 50 years. There is no elected government, and there won't be until next year. The economy is on a ventilator in Egypt. It is propped up only by billions of dollars of aid from Gulf countries.

The Muslim Brotherhood is openly fighting the interim government with armed mobs. Terrorists and vagabonds in the always lawless Sinai Peninsula are only encouraged by the weakened state of Cairo.

To Israel's north, Syria has become the world's hotspot for terrorists. Terrorists like al Qaeda and Hezbollah are streaming in, with no end in sight. Out-of-town criminals have come into the country to wreak havoc.

To Israel's east, already fragile Jordan is being overrun with Syrian refugees and infiltrated by terrorists as well.

A little further east, al Qaeda is wreaking havoc in Iraq. There is more violence there than at any point since 2008.

And to the far east, mischief regime of the desert, Iran is closer than ever to obtaining a nuclear weapon that can enable it to fulfill its threat to wipe Israel off the map.

When I met with Prime Minister Netanyahu 2 weeks ago, he was clear that Israel cannot accept Iran as a nuclear threshold power if Israel wants to continue to exist as a people. He called our interim deal with Iran the worst deal of the century. I agree with him. It seems that we not only gave away the farm; we gave away the mineral rights as well. We took our best diplomatic tool, sanctions, off the table. The biggest problem with the deal was that it made a peaceful solution more unlikely.

With all of these threats surrounding it, we need to stand side by side and let the world know—our enemies and our friends—that we are allies of Israel. They are the U.S.'s strongest ally.

Israel is the only democracy in the region and the only one that respects human rights. It is in their national security interest and our national security interest to ensure Israel can defend itself from the ever-changing military threats. The enemies they have in the neighborhood are enemies to us as well.

I support H.R. 1992. The bill will make sure, too, that Israel's enemies do not gain a military advantage over the State of Israel. I urge its passage.

And that's just the way it is.

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

Mr. Speaker, the United States has no more important relationship, not just in the region but in the world, than the strategic, unbreakable alliance with the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Israel's security is our security. Israel's security must not in any way be compromised.

As has been noted here already, Israel lives in a most dangerous neighborhood. Her security is dependent on a clearly demonstrated permanently sustained qualitative military edge. This bill, H.R. 1992, improves and enhances our relationship with Israel to guarantee her qualitative military edge in a very dangerous neighborhood.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1992 and to protect Israel's security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, let me again stress the importance of the relationship with our ally Israel.

Let me thank Mr. COLLINS for his leadership in authoring this important measure and thank Mr. SCHNEIDER. I am a cosponsor of this bill as well, and let me say we have many common threats, especially Iran's nuclear program.

This measure, H.R. 1992, is a testament to the American people's enduring commitment to the security of Israel. I hope to see it passed today.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1992—the Israel QME Enhancement Act. I would like to commend the author of this legislation and colleague from Georgia, Mr. COLLINS, for his leadership on this issue. I would also like to thank the Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROYCE of California and Ranking Member ENGEL of New York on quickly moving this bill through the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that our strongest ally in the Middle East is the State of Israel. It is, therefore, incumbent upon us to provide them with our unwavering support. In order to uphold this commitment, we must understand the ongoing security threats to Israel. H.R. 1992 helps achieve this goal by increasing the frequency by which the Secretary of State must report to Congress on Israel's qualitative military edge (QME).

Unfortunately, Israel is constantly on alert from various threats to its existence, particularly cyber and asymmetric ones. In fact, regional, Iran has stated that its desire to "wipe Israel off of the map." Therefore, despite the interim agreement between the P5+1 that was adopted on November 24, 2013, I still believe that it is critically important that we prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

Congress took an important step during 2012 by implementing economic sanctions on Iran through the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012. This important legislation punishes individuals who knowingly sell more than 1,000,000 barrels of refined product, or individuals that sell, lease, or provide Iran with goods, services, technology, or information.

However, despite these sanctions, Iran's nuclear program has continued to grow. Earlier this year in June, the International Atomic Energy Agency stated that Tehran was violating international regulations by increasing the number of centrifuges. Although the November 24th interim agreement caps Iran's proliferation at 5%, I remain skeptical of Iran's motive for continued nuclear activity.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the bill we have before today is absolutely essential in assisting Israel. By increasing the QME reports delivered to Congress, we can oversee the potential emerging threats that Israel will face in the future. I urge all of my colleague to join me in supporting H.R. 1992.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, given the geopolitical history of the region, the U.S. fully understands Israel's need to be better armed than its neighbors.

Potentially threatening Arab countries surrounding Israel have superior numbers, which is the reason why Israel needs to maintain a qualitative edge.

As Iran creeps ever closer to obtaining a nuclear weapon, this qualitative edge has become all the more important

As our closest ally in the region, we should do all we can to prevent Israel from being put in harm's way.

I believe the legislation before us today does precisely that and I thank the gentleman from Georgia and my colleague on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. COLLINS, for authoring this bill.

This legislation improves our policy of ensuring Israel's safety by better reflecting the security environment of its potential adversaries.

Israel is mostly attacked by unconventional weapons and those weapons should be considered into the QME.

As cyber-attacks are increasingly being used as a means of warfare, Israel needs to maintain a competitive edge, while countries such as Iran attempt to increase their cyber capabilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1992, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1436

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

GABRIELLA MILLER KIDS FIRST RESEARCH ACT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2019) to eliminate taxpayer financing of presidential campaigns and party conventions and reprogram savings to provide for a 10-year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2019

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 "Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act".

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF TAXPAYER FINANCING OF POLITICAL PARTY CONVENTIONS; USE OF FUNDS FOR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

(a) TERMINATION OF PAYMENTS FOR CONVENTIONS; USE OF FUNDS FOR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH.—Section 9008 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) TERMINATION OF PAYMENTS FOR CONVENTIONS; USE OF AMOUNTS FOR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—Effective on the date of the enactment of the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act—

"(1) the entitlement of any major party or minor party to a payment under this section shall terminate; and

"(2) all amounts in each account maintained for the national committee of a major party or minor party under this section shall be transferred to a fund in the Treasury to be known as the '10-Year Pediatric Research Initiative Fund', which shall be available only for the purpose provided in section 402A(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act, and only to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.".

(b) CONTINUATION OF PRIORITY OF PAYMENTS FROM ACCOUNTS OVER PAYMENTS TO CANDIDATES.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS TO CANDIDATES.—The third sentence of section 9006(c) of such Code is amended by striking "section 9008(b)(3)," and inserting "section 9008(i)(2),".

(2) AVAILABILITY OF PAYMENTS FROM PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT.—The second sentence of section 9037(a) of such Code is amended by striking ''section 9008(b)(3)'' and inserting ''section 9008(i)(2)''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ELIMINATION OF REPORTS BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.—Section 9009(a) of such Code is amended—

(A) by adding ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(B) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (4), (5), and (6).

(2) ELIMINATION OF PENALTIES.—Section 9012 of such Code is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking the second sentence;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(C) in subsection (e)(1), by striking the second sentence; and

(D) in subsection (e)(3), by striking '', or in connection with any expense incurred by the national committee of a major party or minor party with respect to a presidential nominating convention''.

SEC. 3. 10–YEAR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.

(a) ALLOCATION OF NIH FUNDS IN COMMON FUND FOR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH.—Paragraph (7) of section 402(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 282(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(7)(A) shall, through the Division of Program Coordination, Planning, and Strategic Initiatives—

''(i) identify research that represents important areas of emerging scientific opportunities, rising public health challenges, or knowledge gaps that deserve special emphasis and would benefit from conducting or supporting additional research that involves collaboration between 2 or more national research institutes or national centers, or would otherwise benefit from strategic coordination and planning;

''(ii) include information on such research in reports under section 403; and

''(iii) in the case of such research supported with funds referred to in subparagraph (B)—

''(I) require as appropriate that proposals include milestones and goals for the research;

''(II) require that the proposals include timeframes for funding of the research; and

''(III) ensure appropriate consideration of proposals for which the principal investigator is an individual who has not previously served as the principal investigator of research conducted or supported by the National Institutes of Health;

''(B)(i) may, with respect to funds reserved under section 402A(c)(1) for the Common Fund, allocate such funds to the national research institutes and national centers for conducting and supporting research that is identified under subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) shall, with respect to funds appropriated to the Common Fund pursuant to section 402A(a)(2), allocate such funds to the national research institutes and national centers for making grants for pediatric research that is identified under subparagraph (A); and

''(C) may assign additional functions to the Division in support of responsibilities identified in subparagraph (A), as determined appropriate by the Director;''.

(b) FUNDING FOR 10-YEAR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE.—Section 402A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 282a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and moving the indentation of each such subparagraph 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking ''For purposes of carrying out this title'' and inserting the following:

''(1) THIS TITLE.—For purposes of carrying out this title''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) FUNDING FOR 10-YEAR PEDIATRIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE THROUGH COMMON FUND.—For the purpose of carrying out section 402(b)(7)(B)(ii), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Common Fund, out of the 10-Year Pediatric Research Initiative Fund described in section 9008 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and in addition to amounts otherwise made available under paragraph (1) of this subsection and reserved under subsection (c)(1)(B)(i) of this section, $12,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.''; and

(2) in subsections (c)(1)(B), (c)(1)(D), and (d), by striking ''subsection (a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)''.

(c) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT; PROHIBITION AGAINST TRANSFER.—Funds appropriated pursuant to section 402A(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act, as added by subsection (b)—

(1) shall be used to supplement, not supplant, the funds otherwise allocated by the National Institutes of Health for pediatric research; and

(2) notwithstanding any transfer authority in any appropriation Act, shall not be used for any purpose other than allocating funds for making grants as described in section 402(b)(7)(B)(ii) of the Public Health Service Act, as added by subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act of 2013. H.R. 2019, authored by my colleague, GREGG HARPER, is a bill that will help countless kids and families across the country.

The Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act would prioritize funding for the research of pediatric diseases and disorders such as cancer, autism, and Fragile X. It would eliminate taxpayer financings of party conventions, political money, and use these funds instead to expand pediatric research at the NIH Common Fund through their common fund. This bill certainly does put kids first.

You know, Gabriella Miller was a little warrior in the battle against childhood cancer. At only 10 years of age, she had the courage miles beyond her years. A frying pan and a walnut is all you need to understand her brave outlook on life.

When she was diagnosed with brain cancer, she was told that the size of that tumor was about like a walnut; and from then on, Gabriella traveled with her trusty frying pan squashing countless walnuts along the way all over the world.

That is the kind of courage and outlook on life that she had. Advancing health research for millions of young patients who suffer from rare and genetic diseases has got to be a priority. While we have made great strides in the country in finding cures and treatments, we certainly have a great amount of work to do. Included in the work is pushing for research that is going to help uncover cures for pediatric diseases.

In order for clinical trials and other advancements to meet their full potential, adequate resources have got to be directed for pediatric research. The legislation is an example of how much can be accomplished by ending wasteful spending and redirecting those funds towards national priorities like pediatric research.

This effort is going to help families like the Kennedys in Mattawan, Michigan, my constituents. Eric and Sarah have two wonderful little girls, Brooke and Brielle, who have the rare disease called spinal muscular atrophy. Those two little angels, who are fighting SMA with the same vigor and sunny outlook exhibited by Gabriella, are decorated little generals in the effort to boost research for rare diseases and serve as inspiration for every one of us.

The sad reality is that it is often difficult to conduct research into rare diseases due to the small number of individuals with those diseases; but we are working to change that—yes, we are—and provide families with greater hope for a cure and in advances of treatment.

This bill has over 150 cosponsors and is supported by a long list of patient advocacy groups including Autism Speaks, Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Leukemia and Lymphoma Society, and FightSMA.

I wholeheartedly agree with the bill's Democrat sponsor, PETER WELCH from Vermont, who recently said last night on CNN:

> Can we just put the battle axes down for a while and take a step forward?

He thinks we can. We need to.

With all of us today with so many diseases, we need to pass this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANGELMAN SYNDROME FOUNDATION,
Aurora, IL, July 5, 2013.

Hon. ERIC CANTOR,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,United States Capitol, Washington, DC.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER CANTOR AND CONGRESSMAN HARPER: On behalf of the Angelman Syndrome Foundation, ASF, I write in strong support for H.R. 2019, the Kids First Research Act. This important legislation will

expand pediatric medical research activities at the National Institutes of Health, NIH, by approximately $130 million. Pediatric research should be a national priority, and ASF applauds Congressman Harper for his leadership on this issue. This legislation has the potential to develop treatments and unlock the cure for thousands of impacted children, including those with Angelman Syndrome.

Angelman syndrome is a single-gene neurodevelopmental disorder that is related to autism. Continued research for pediatric neurodevelopmental disorders, such as Angelman syndrome, will lead to effective treatments that will help combat the autism epidemic in the U.S. The Angelman Syndrome Foundation's mission is to advance the awareness and treatment of Angelman syndrome through education and information, research, and support for individuals with Angelman syndrome, their families and other concerned parties. We exist to give all of them a reason to smile, with the ultimate goal of finding a cure.

On behalf of ASF, thank you again for your leadership and for supporting the Kids First Research Act.

Sincerely,

EILEEN BRAUN,
Executive Director.

ASCO, *July 10, 2013.*

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives,Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: On behalf of the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), thank you for the introduction of The Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019). In this difficult budget environment, we are pleased to see any amount of available funds transferred to vital medical research and offer our endorsement of the legislation. We commend this bipartisan effort in acknowledging that medical research should be a priority for federal spending.

ASCO is the national organization representing more than 30,000 physicians and other health care professionals specializing in the treatment and research of both pediatric and adult cancers. Through its support of research leading to breakthrough improvements in cancer treatment, the NIH consistently provides a dramatic return on investment, both in the form of lives saved and economic growth. Our members witness first hand on a daily basis the high risk, high reward research that begins with NIH funding and results in safer, more effective treatment options for cancer patients.

Given its track record of unmatched successes, we are truly alarmed by the impact of recent budget cuts to the NIH and the National Cancer Institute (NCI). Budget stagnation in the last few fiscal years now compounded by cuts due to sequestration has led to the lowest number of new grants being funded at NIH since 1998. This is a devastating blow to the pace of medical research progress especially since it is occurring at a time of unprecedented basic and clinical science discoveries that point to rapid progress against many cancers. It has put life-saving discoveries on hold, stalled the careers of the young medical scientists who would be developing cures, and slowed one of our nation's areas of historical technology leadership that is also a key economic driver. Given the human and economic costs of these cuts, ASCO calls on Congress to repeal sequestration and return to regular order in budget negotiations. It is urgent that we prevent the $19 billion in sequestration cuts to the NIH expected over the next ten years and return the NIH to a priority position in federal budget negotiations.

The Kids First Research Act is a great step in the right direction to put the NIH back on a plan for reasonable growth and can make a difference. Through NIH's time-tested peer review process, this infusion of $130 million over the next ten years will turn available dollars into new hope for the health of America's children and all of our citizens. But it is important to note that it will not compensate for the larger cuts in this area of investment that have already happened and are on track to worsen.

ASCO stands ready to help in your efforts to support medical research at the NIH. If you have any questions or would like assistance from ASCO on any issue involving cancer research, please do not hesitate to contact Amanda Schwartz at Amanda.schwartz@asco.org or 571–483–1647.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD A. HUDIS, MD, FACP,
President, American Society of Clinical Oncology.

BEAR NECESSITIES,
PEDIATRIC CANCER FOUNDATION,
Chicago, IL, July 3, 2013.

Re: Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019)

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARPER: On behalf of the countless children waging their courageous battle against pediatric cancer, we strongly and respectfully urge you to support the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019).

This measure will provide much needed additional federal support to complement ongoing research supported by substantial private funding from national non-profit childhood cancer organizations, as well as by the National Institute of Health and National Cancer Institute. Passage of this bill will ensure that the investments of both public and private resources reach their fullest potential by enabling a critical mass of research and discovery required to culminate into promising medical treatments that are ''safe and effective'' for many childhood diseases, including childhood cancer.

As you may know, one in every 330 children in the United States develops cancer before the age of nineteen. The incidence of cancer among children is increasing. Each school day, enough children are diagnosed with cancer to empty two classrooms. Depending on the type of cancer and the development upon diagnosis, approximately 2,300 children will die from cancer in any given year. The number of children diagnosed with cancer in the U.S. each year puts more potential years of life at risk than any single type of adult cancer. Cancer remains the number one disease killer of America's children.

There are more than 360,000 childhood cancer survivors of all ages in the United States. Unfortunately, 74% of childhood cancer survivors have chronic illnesses, and some 40% of childhood cancer survivors have severe illnesses or die from such illnesses. Survivors are at significant risk for secondary cancers later in life. Current cancer treatments can affect a child's growth, fertility, and endocrine system. Child survivors may be permanently immunologically suppressed. Radiation therapy to a child's brain can significantly damage cognitive function, especially if given at a very young age. While currently there is very little in terms of ''safe and effective'' cures for any particular type of childhood cancer, the underlying genetics of the disease and recent research breakthroughs make such treatments foreseeable.

Bear Necessities Pediatric Cancer Foundation thanks you for sponsoring the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019) and we applaud your ongoing commitment to improving the lives of thousands of children diagnosed with life-threatening diseases and sparing families from the devastation that these types of diagnoses cause. We look forward to working with you to pass this important bill to help ensure a brighter future for America's children.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN A. CASEY,
CEO and Founder.

MARCH OF DIMES FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. TOM COLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. PETER WELCH,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES HARPER, COLE AND WELCH: On behalf of the March of Dimes, a unique collaboration of over 3 million volunteers affiliated with 51 chapters representing every state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, I would like to express our support for H.R. 2019, the Kids First Research Act. This legislation would provide a welcome infusion of resources directed to pediatric research at the National Institutes of Health, NIH.

Our nation must commit to a sustained investment in pediatric research to build our future by improving the health of the next generation of children. As one example, over 500,000 infants are born preterm in the U.S. each year. Among those who survive, one in five faces health problems that persist for life such as cerebral palsy, intellectual disabilities, chronic lung disease, and deafness. Research breakthroughs that allow us to reduce the rates of preterm birth would lead to significant declines in infant mortality and save millions in healthcare and special education costs.

The March of Dimes takes no position on H.R. 2019's elimination of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, but if this step is pursued, we strongly support directing the resultant funds to pediatric research. In addition, we urge Congress and the Administration to work together to find a balanced approach to deficit reduction that ensures the necessary resources are available to fund lifesaving research across the federal health agencies.

Thank you again for your leadership in introducing the Kids First Research Act. We look forward to working with you to make pediatric research a national priority.

Sincerely,

DR. JENNIFER L. HOWSE,
President.

BROOKE'S BLOSSOMING HOPE
FOR CHILDHOOD CANCER FOUNDATION,
December 10, 2013.

Hon. BLAKE FARENTHOLD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. FARENTHOLD: As a medical research organization working to accelerate the development of promising medical discoveries or cures for cancers common to children, adolescents, and young adults, we write to express our strong support for your legislation, the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019).

This measure provides much needed additional federal support to complement ongoing research supported by substantial private funding from national non-profit childhood cancer organizations, as well as by the National Institute of Health and National Cancer Institute. Passage of this bill will ensure that the investments of both public and private resources reach their fullest potential by enabling a critical mass of research

and discovery required to culminate into promising medical treatments that are ''safe and effective'' for many childhood diseases, including childhood cancer.

As you know, one in every 330 children in the United States develops cancer before the age of nineteen. The incidence of cancer among children is increasing. Each school day, enough children are diagnosed with cancer to empty two classrooms. Depending on the type of cancer and the development upon diagnosis, approximately 2,300 children will die from cancer in any given year. The number of children diagnosed with cancer in the U.S. each year puts more potential years of life at risk than any single type of adult cancer. Cancer remains the number one disease killer of America's children.

There are more than 360,000 childhood cancer survivors of all ages in the United States. Unfortunately, 74% of childhood cancer survivors have chronic illnesses, and some 40% of childhood cancer survivors have severe illnesses or die from such illnesses. Survivors are at significant risk for secondary cancers later in life. Current cancer treatments can affect a child's growth, fertility, and endocrine system. Child survivors may be permanently immunologically suppressed. Radiation therapy to a child's brain can significantly damage cognitive function, especially if given at a very young age. While currently there is very little in terms of ''safe and effective'' cures for any particular type of childhood cancer, the underlying genetics of the disease and recent research breakthroughs make such treatments foreseeable.

Brooke's Blossoming Hope for Childhood Cancer Foundation thanks you for sponsoring the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019) and we applaud your ongoing commitment to improving the lives of thousands of children diagnosed with life-threatening diseases and sparing families from the devastation that it causes. We look forward to working with you to pass this important bill to help ensure a brighter future for America's children.

Sincerely,

JESSICA HESTER, M.A. Ed.,
Chief Executive Officer and Founder.

RALLY FOUNDATION,
Sandy Springs, GA, December 10, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HARPER: As a non-profit organization that exists to fund childhood cancer research, the Rally Foundation for Childhood Cancer Research, we write to express our strong support for your legislation, the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019).

This measure provides much needed additional federal support to complement ongoing research supported by substantial private funding from national non-profit childhood cancer organizations, as well as by the National Institute of Health and National Cancer Institute. Passage of this bill will ensure that the investments of both public and private resources reach their fullest potential by enabling a critical mass of research and discovery required to culminate into promising medical treatments that are ''safe and effective'' for many childhood diseases, including childhood cancer.

As you know, one in every 330 children in the United States develops cancer before the age of nineteen. The incidence of cancer among children is increasing. Each school day, enough children are diagnosed with cancer to empty two classrooms. Depending on the type of cancer and the development upon diagnosis, approximately 2,300 children will die from cancer in any given year. The number of children diagnosed with cancer in the U.S. each year puts more potential years of life at risk than any single type of adult cancer. Cancer remains the number one disease killer of America's children.

There are more than 360,000 childhood cancer survivors of all ages in the United States. Unfortunately, 74 percent of childhood cancer survivors have chronic illnesses, and some 40 percent of childhood cancer survivors have severe illnesses or die from such illnesses. Survivors are at significant risk for secondary cancers later in life. Current cancer treatments can affect a child's growth, fertility, and endocrine system. Child survivors may be permanently immunologically suppressed. Radiation therapy to a child's brain can significantly damage cognitive function, especially if given at a very young age. While currently there is very little in terms of ''safe and effective'' cures for any particular type of childhood cancer, the underlying genetics of the disease and recent research breakthroughs make such treatments foreseeable.

The Rally Foundation thanks you for sponsoring the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019) and we applaud your ongoing commitment to improving the lives of thousands of children diagnosed with life-threatening diseases and sparing families from the devastation that it causes. We look forward to working with you to pass this important bill to help ensure a brighter future for America's children.

Sincerely,

DEAN CROWE,
Founder and CEO.

SOLVING KIDS' CANCER,
December 10, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: On behalf of Solving Kids' Cancer, I am writing to express our strong support for your legislation, the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019), which would supply critical funds to the National Institutes of Health for pediatric medical research.

As you know, cancer kills more kids in the U.S. than any other disease. Each school day, enough children are diagnosed with cancer to empty two classrooms. We at Solving Kids' Cancer believe that Every Kid Deserves to Grow Up. For kids with the deadliest childhood cancers, including neuroblastoma, sarcomas and brain tumors, their chances of ever living long enough to be able to cast their first ballot are less than 50 percent. This is unacceptable.

Children with cancer need new treatment options today. As we enter a new era in cancer research with advances in immunotherapy, innovative clinical trials that harness a child's own immune system to fight cancer will help change the future of childhood cancer. But without the necessary funding, children battling cancer will be left behind, with limited treatment options.

Solving Kids' Cancer is proud to lend our support of the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019). On behalf of the families and children with cancer, thank you for turning awareness into action and for helping to change the world for children.

Sincerely,

SCOTT KENNEDY, MBA,
Co-founder and Executive Director.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill before us today because it is a disingenuous and empty attempt by the Republicans to divert attention from the fact that they have voted to cut research time and time again. So instead, they will stand before the American public with words that they have no action to back up.

The National Institutes of Health serve a vital mission of supporting biomedical research so that we may better understand and better treat diseases that burden American families; and I stand firmly in favor of supporting NIH research funding, especially as it relates to pediatric research.

Let me be very clear for the record here today. H.R. 2019 does not achieve this purpose. Had this bill, which had been introduced back in May, gone through regular order and come to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for hearings and markup, we would have had the opportunity to discuss and debate the merits of the legislation.

This bill claims to support research on childhood diseases by authorizing—and I note not appropriating, but only authorizing—$12.6 million for NIH pediatric research grants through savings from ending the public contribution to the cost of political party nominating conventions.

I emphasize that the bill only authorizes funding because I would like to point out that the appropriations needed to actually make these funds available to NIH would still be subject to discretionary spending caps of the Budget Control Act and sequestration cuts.

Now, the sequester alone has cut $1.5 billion out of NIH'S funding in fiscal year 2013. Even worse, through the Ryan budget, the Republicans adopted spending allocations for fiscal year 2014 that would make additional cuts to NIH, which could result in $6.7 billion in cuts in total.

For pediatric research, the proportional cut would amount to $800 million, which is 60 times more than the increase that this bill claims to provide. That's why I think the Republicans are not making a sincere effort to support NIH research. This is a joke.

The best thing, Mr. Speaker, we can do to support NIH and research on pediatric diseases is to pass a balanced and constructive budget package and to provide the Appropriations Committee with a reasonable and realistic amount of funding to work with.

Until then, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this bill that is nothing but a guise. It is a ruse. It does nothing to ensure that we are increasing pediatric cancer research dollars.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the chair.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of legislation I have cosponsored, the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act. I particularly want to thank the bill sponsors, GREGG HARPER, ERIC CANTOR, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont, for honoring the memory of my constituent, Gabriella Miller, Loudoun County's volunteer of the year.

Gabriella was a 10-year-old straight A student at Loudoun County Day School, who died on October 26 after a courageous 1-year battle with an inoperable brain cancer tumor. In a short amount of time, they achieved many goals. She started the Smashing Walnuts Foundation—which refers to the walnut-sized tumor in her brain—a childhood cancer foundation; she co-wrote a children's book and received an honorary degree from Shenandoah University out in Winchester, Virginia.

Last December at her request I wrote to Macy's as part of the massive 250,000 letter campaign she organized to benefit the Make-a-Wish Foundation. Gabriella raised a lot of money, and more importantly she touched a lot of lives; and I am sure she touched a lot of lives of Members who are in this body.

The bill before us today will help supplement existing NIH research efforts for childhood cancers and disorders by creating a 10-year pediatric research initiative fund, paid for with the remaining Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

I know her parents, Mark and Ellyn, who are with us here today. Her younger brother Jake and her family and friends know of the remarkable impact she has had on our community, on our country, and on families that are facing this nationwide.

I urge, hopefully, a unanimous vote on this.

□ 1445

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise, reluctantly, to oppose this bill.

First of all, I want to express to Gabriella Miller's family my sincere sympathies.

We all want to fund more research to fight pediatric disease. Nothing could be a more worthy objective. If we could only reverse the cuts that this House has adopted under Republican leadership, the National Institutes of Health could make an even greater amount of progress in understanding and treating so many different devastating diseases for children and others.

This bill was never heard in committee. We never had a chance to have witnesses come forward and talk about it or debate how best to achieve the bill's stated goals. That is why many of us think it is more a statement than a credible proposal, especially when you look at the Republican House majority's record on biomedical research funding. It is a dismal one.

They wrote and passed a bill which would have significantly cut NIH. They supported sequestration, which similarly reduced the NIH budget by nearly $2 billion in 2013 alone. And now this bill comes along, where they claim to provide NIH with about $13 million a year for pediatric research. That is a miniscule amount compared to the funding for pediatric research NIH lost due to Republican budget cuts and sequestration.

The way we usually handle NIH is the Appropriations Committee issues a bill appropriating money for NIH. They can do that. If we increase the money for NIH, they can do that. They don't need this bill to increase funding for pediatric research. What they need is a higher spending cap. This bill doesn't bring about a higher spending cap.

And then I have concerns I want to express about the way they structure the investments in pediatric research by funding it through the NIH Director's Common Fund. By design, that fund is not disease or population specific, giving NIH flexibility to determine funding priorities each year. It also doesn't take into consideration the existing pediatric research initiative, which we strengthened with the recent enactment of pediatric research network legislation.

Researchers all across the country have echoed the importance of sustained NIH funding for our Nation's health, our economic growth, and our global leadership on biomedical research.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. WAXMAN. Regrettably, this legislation before us does nothing to truly advance research at NIH. If we really had a sincere commitment to strengthen research at NIH, let's work together on a bipartisan basis. Let's have hearings on the legislation. Let's make sure that we have funding for all the research activities.

I think that we need to find a solution to restore NIH funding rather than purely symbolic legislation.

This reminds me of the time when the Republicans closed the government. They refused to pass an appropriations bill for the government to function. And then people said, Well, what about the parks? They said, Well, we'll have a bill just to open the parks. What about NIH research? Well, we'll do NIH research, but not the Centers for Disease Control and not other things.

If you are going to do the job, do it right, and don't pretend, especially to a family that is grieving, that you are really doing more for pediatric research when the overall NIH funds are not increased.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my friends that this is bipartisan legislation. I congratulate Mr. WELCH for being the lead Democratic sponsor.

I just want to say, too, in terms of looking at the money, the bill itself says:

> All amounts in each account maintained for the national committee of a major party or minor party under this section shall be transferred to a fund in the Treasury to be known as the ''10–Year Pediatric Research Initiative Fund,'' which shall be available only for the purpose provided in section 402A(a)2 of the Public Health Service Act, and only to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

Tell me how to write it tougher. We did it.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank Chairman UPTON.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2019, named in the memory of a remarkable young lady, Gabriella Miller.

The Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act gives pediatric research a shot in the arm through additional targeted funding, funding that is fully offset by reining in taxpayer funding of political conventions.

The National Institutes of Health works admirably in distributing important Federal funding on basic medical research, but more can be done for childhood illness. In 2012, only 2 percent of NIH funding was spent on pediatric cases.

Today's bill provides additional funding for the NIH to help address the need for coordinated research on various childhood diseases, including cancer, autism, and juvenile diabetes. It helps provide a down payment to the promise that we have to our next generation by helping our scientists and researchers find the cures today to childhood illnesses.

There is no Republican or Democrat form of childhood illness, and there is no Republican or Democrat way to fight it. By working together on this bipartisan bill, we can put our children above the Presidential politics of every 4 years.

I want to thank my good friends Congressman GREGG HARPER and Congressman PETER WELCH for their work on this legislation. I also want to thank Majority Leader CANTOR for his continued leadership on these issues affecting America's families across the country.

Vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2019.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, but I want to go through the controversy.

First of all, the argument about campaign finance reform, this is about taking money away from political conventions. The majority on both sides of the aisle have supported that.

Number two, there is an argument that this does not restore NIH funding. That is absolutely true, and we should restore full funding for the National Institutes of Health. Passing this bill doesn't stop us from doing that. It may even put us a step forward.

Third, there is an argument that the money will not get to the intended target because of the way it is designed. But if there is any expression of good faith, it is that the appropriators have made a very clear indication that they

are willing to do everything they possibly can in order to make this happen.

Fourth, it is limited in its scope and in its funds. That is true. But the fact is it does do something. It takes a step forward.

We are having an argument here about whether this is bipartisan or not. We are having an argument about bipartisan or not. We are having an argument about process. But I think if we are candid, we have to acknowledge that, as an institution, both sides have failed when it comes to an overall comprehensive budget, including for the NIH.

On August 12, 2011, this Congress voted 269–161 to implement the sequester, and in the I-told-you-so brand of argument, I voted against that. I voted against it because, in my view, the consequences of that sequester were predictable and foreseeable. These across-the-board cuts from the NIH to the Pentagon made no sense, but that is the box this institution, this House of Representatives, has put itself in.

What we have with this bill, in my view, is an opportunity to lay down the battle axes for just a moment and take a step forward. No one is here—least of all, me, where I am being used, to some extent, as a bipartisan face—to suggest that this does more than it does. But what it does do is something good, and it can begin a process, which is my hope, where we restore full funding to the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), majority leader of the House.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act. I also would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont, for his courage in providing bipartisan support, along with some other colleagues in support of this bill, as well as the Republican cosponsors, GREGG HARPER from Mississippi and TOM COLE, my colleague from Oklahoma who is here in this Chamber.

For those colleagues who are here in the Chamber, we are joined by Gabriella Miller's parents, Ellyn and Mark Miller, who are in the gallery. I want to thank them for their courage in being here and for their understanding of what goes on on this floor and to not take it in any other way other than we are trying to do what is right in terms of delivering on the legacy of their daughter.

Mr. Speaker, Gabriella Miller, a young girl from Virginia, was only 9 years old when she found out she had an inoperable brain tumor the size of a walnut and wasn't given long to live. Despite her diagnosis, Gabriella and her family chose to fight and share her dream with others of overcoming childhood disease.

Gabriella was so determined that she captivated people's hearts at rallies, through online videos, and raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Make-a-Wish Foundation. She even wrote a book for other children about understanding cancer. She poured every remaining ounce of her life into raising awareness for pediatric research for other children, with the hope that they would not have to suffer the same fate. In her last few months, Gabriella left a mark on the world that will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that Washington has a spending problem. The problem is not only that we spend too much, but that we are spending taxpayer dollars on the wrong priorities. Medical research for children should be a national priority.

The first NIH bill I scheduled as majority leader was a bipartisan bill authored by Representative CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS and Representative LOIS CAPPS to strengthen pediatric research networks. The President signed the bill into law last month.

The bill before us today builds on that legislation by providing resources through the NIH Common Fund for high-risk, high-reward research that has the potential to transform pediatric research for children suffering from many different diseases and disorders. For the first time, Congress will establish a Pediatric Research Initiative Fund that will serve as an accountability mechanism to help ensure that dollars are reaching their intended target.

While all of us support the NIH, this bill is an opportunity to push the agency to make big discoveries that will improve and ultimately save so many lives. We don't have to accept the status quo as the best we can achieve. Yes, the NIH needs taxpayer resources, but it also matters how we invest and apply those dollars.

□ 1500

Now, Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say this is just a drop in the bucket compared to the sequester cuts. I agree. The sequester cuts were, unfortunately, indiscriminate, and I and my colleagues have proposed alternatives to them, but let's not let Washington politics get in the way of any effort to help these kids. This is one step of many that we should take together.

How many times do we meet parents and families who share their stories and ask for help? I recently had the privilege of meeting Gabriella's parents, Ellyn and Mark, and they personally shared with me Gabriella's fighting spirit. In fact, in one of her last interviews—and you can view this online—when asked what Gabriella would like to tell our political leaders, she said, ''Stop talking. Start doing. We need action.''

This, Mr. Speaker, is our opportunity to act.

Outside of this building, this legislation has tremendous support. The leading children's research hospitals, United for Medical Research, and over 100 patient advocacy groups support this bill. Currently, it leads all other bills on cosponsor.gov with over 2,500 citizen cosponsors. This kind of support is great, but what matters now are the Members of this House and how they vote. The question before the Members today is simple: What is more important—finding cures for our children or balloons for party conventions and catering for politicians?

The bottom line is that this bill is a choice between allocating moneys for political conventions or pediatric medical research. That is the choice. The bill isn't just about a government agency or taxpayer dollars. It is not about Democratic issues or Republican issues. It is about a cause, frankly, that should unite each and every one of us.

Yes, I would say to my colleague from California that this is a serious first step—it is not everything—but to not sit here and impugn anyone's motives, much less say something that is somehow a commentary that this isn't constructive towards the plight of the parents like the Millers who are around this country and who are searching for some indication that we can break the political gridlock on an issue like this. I align myself with the comments of my colleague from Vermont, who says, Can't we just put down the battle axes for something like this? Can't we all do that for somebody like Gabriella?

Now, Gabriella may no longer be with us, but her fight lives on. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that all of us stand united today and join in this fight.

Again, I want to thank Congressman GREGG HARPER, and I want to thank Congressman PETER WELCH for introducing this bill as well as to thank Congressman COLE from Oklahoma. Earlier this year, they began the effort to join with so many who have come before in order to raise awareness of the need for medical research and, yes, this time, of the need for us to prioritize the funding for pediatric research.

I would like to thank Gabriella's parents, the Millers, who are so brave in their commitment to this effort and who realize this is just a first step—being here with us today and joining us in this fight.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded that it is not in order to introduce or to bring to the attention of the House occupants of the gallery.

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. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation because it is window dressing, and it is not the big picture.

Thirteen million dollars is less than 1 percent of the $1.5 billion sequester cut. It is less than 1 percent. The NIH is our research institution. It is our Department of Defense. It defends us from cancer and heart disease and Alzheimer's and AIDS and diabetes, but it is not being prioritized. It should be the number one priority of this House—keeping Americans safe and alive. Now, the $13 million was picked because that is the amount of money we put into political conventions. It just so happened to fit. We could have picked the F–35 bomber and saved billions of dollars and taken that out, which we don't need, and put in that money, which would have made a real difference in research.

As for Kids First Research, I live in the city that has the best pediatric cancer facility in the world, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital. It needs more than this. Kids later will get Alzheimer's and AIDS and heart disease and cancer, and they need to be protected. In the long run, they can only be protected with the full funding for the NIH. I urge the full funding for the NIH and not smoke and mirrors.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HARPER. First of all, I want to thank Congressman PETER WELCH for his hard work on this bill, and I certainly thank Leader ERIC CANTOR and Congressman TOM COLE.

Mr. Speaker, creating a lifetime of hope and opportunity for our most vulnerable kids is more important than subsidizing weeklong political pep rallies for the Democratic and Republican parties. This is why the House must advance H.R. 2019, the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act, a bill that pays for children's medical research with the $126 million that the Federal Government currently sets aside for political conventions.

On November 14, 2013, I had the privilege to meet in Leader CANTOR's office with Ellyn and Mark Miller. I watched them struggle to come up with the words to express their grief, which I saw become steadfast determination to do something special for Gabriella by allowing this bill to be named after their precious daughter. I am wearing the yellow ''Smashing Walnuts'' bracelet that they gave me that day. I have watched numerous videos of Gabriella in which she has made moving and profound statements, such as, ''Once you get cancer, you kinda gotta be all grown up,'' and ''Sometimes you have to stop talking and start doing.''

As the father of a 24-year-old son who is living with Fragile X syndrome, I understand the challenges families face in raising children with special needs, but I also recognize the value of expanded and improved medical research. While raising a child with a genetic disorder can be very difficult, for my family, it has been a blessing, especially knowing that my son, Livingston, is here today.

Mr. Speaker, Evie Horton and her cousin, Reese McDonald, who are kids from Mississippi who fight with all of their strength to overcome the struggles of spinal muscular atrophy, are two more reasons that I introduced this bill. Recent scientific research breakthroughs have also given hope to so many families, but in order for clinical trials and other advancements to meet their full potential, additional Federal research must be directed to pediatric research.

Mr. Speaker, Members of both parties have an opportunity to demonstrate the priorities of this body. Will it be research for our most vulnerable kids or will lawmakers vote to continue funding political party conventions at the taxpayers' expense?

I have listened to how this has been described by the other side. It has been called a joke, a ruse, a fraud, not credible, window dressing, smoke and mirrors, and their referring to Republicans supporting sequestration, I guess, means that it has been forgotten by our friends on the other side of the aisle that 95 Members of the Democratic Party voted in favor of sequestration.

Mr. Speaker, let's get our priorities straight. Let's vote ''yes'' on the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act.

NATIONAL FRAGILE X FOUNDATION,
Walnut Creek, CA, June 12, 2013

ATTN: Scot Malvaney, Policy Director.

Representative GREGG HARPER,
Cannon Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: Confirming our earlier conversations with your office, the National Fragile X Foundation indeed agrees that additional research is needed to find the cures for fragile x syndrome, autism spectrum disorder, childhood cancer, and many other diseases impacting children.

We are therefore pleased to add our support to The Kids First Research Act (H.R. 2019) that you recently introduced with Representative Tom Cole.

As you well know, Fragile x syndrome is one of the conditions for which a cure (or targeted treatments) exist right around the corner.

We wholeheartedly support this critical research initiative which seeks both to identify much needed additional funding for the NIH and to promote collaborations and collaborative spending across related conditions like fragile x syndrome and autism.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

JEFFREY COHEN, JD,
Director, Government Affairs.

GLOBAL GENES, RARE PROJECT,
Aliso Viejo, CA.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARPER, Global Genes/RARE Project is one of the leading rare and genetic disease patient advocacy organizations in the world. What began as a grassroots movement in 2009 with a few rare disease parent advocates and foundations has grown to over 800 global organizations. Our mission is centered on increasing rare disease awareness, public and physician education, building community through social media and supporting research initiatives to find treatments and cures for rare and genetic diseases.

We, along with the organizations listed below, are writing to support The Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019). This bipartisan bill would eliminate taxpayer financing of presidential campaigns and party conventions and reprogram those savings to provide for a 10-year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health.

During these trying fiscal times, we are pleased to see efforts that would increase funds for pediatric research.

Unfortunately, pediatric research is terribly underfunded and largely overlooked, as medicines and devices are often untested in children. Children are usually prescribed medications that have only been tested in adults, which is unacceptable. Children are not adults. More efforts must be made to properly research drugs and devices in the pediatric population, and this is an important step in that process.

We are pleased to express our strong support for H.R. 2019, and believe this legislation will help to bring increased funding and awareness to pediatric medical research. We look forward to working with you and your staff to ensure this bill is enacted into law.

Sincerely,

Global Genes/RARE Project, Alstrom Angels, Cure AHC, Dravet Syndrome Foundation, FMDSA, Gavin R Stevens Foundation, GT23 Foundation, Gwendolyn Strong Foundation, Hannah's Hope Fund for GAN, Hereditary Disease Circle, I Have IIH Foundation, In Need of a Diagnosis, INOD, Jonah's Just Begun, Joshua Hellmann Foundation for Orphan Disease Klippel-Feil Syndrome Alliance.

Little Miss Hannah Foundation, MPS Society, National Gaucher Foundation, Inc., National Tay-Sachs & Allied Diseases Association, Inc., Noah's Hope, Noonan Syndrome Foundation, Peace, Love, and Trevor Foundation, Rasopathies Foundation, Sanfilippo Foundation for Children, Sarcoma Foundation of America, Stop ALD Foundation, Team Sanfilippo, United Leukodystrophy Foundation, U.R. Our Hope.

NATIONAL DOWN SYNDROME SOCIETY,
New York, NY, May 9, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN GREGG HARPER: On behalf of the National Down Syndrome Society (NDSS), I am pleased to offer this letter of support for your legislation H.R. 1724, the Kids First Research Act. This legislation will expand pediatric research at the National Institutes of Health by prioritizing resources for research for children with Down syndrome which are currently underrepresented in the NIH budget process.

NDSS supports over 400,000 Americans with Down syndrome along with their families, friends, teachers, coworkers and others who make people with Down syndrome a priority. Our mission is to be the national advocate for the value, acceptance and inclusion of people with Down syndrome.

The re-directing of federal dollars that are currently spent on presidential campaigns and party conventions will expand pediatric research at NIH through the NIH Common Fund. This funding will be used for research that is critical to improve the quality of life for individuals with Down syndrome other pediatric conditions.

NDSS is the largest nonprofit dedicated to advocating for people with Down syndrome

and their families at the federal, state and local levels of government. At NDSS, we envision a world in which all people with Down syndrome have the opportunity to enhance their quality of life, realize their life aspirations, and become valued members of welcoming communities. Your legislation aligns directly with our mission, and we are proud to support your efforts.

Our organization applauds your work on behalf of people with Down syndrome and other pediatric conditions, and looks forward to working with you. On behalf of all individuals and families from the Down syndrome community, I thank you for your leadership on this legislation and offer our enthusiastic endorsement.

Sincerely,

SARA HART WEIR,
Vice President,
Advocacy & Affiliate Relations.

JDRF,
New York, NY, May 10, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: On behalf of JDRF and its volunteers, I write to share JDRF's support for your legislation, the Kids First Research Act of 2013, which would provide additional funds to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for research on pediatric diseases and disorders.

Type 1 diabetes (T1D) is a costly and burdensome autoimmune disease for which there is no cure. The disease usually strikes in childhood, adolescence, or young adulthood, and lasts a lifetime. People with T1D must closely monitor their blood sugar levels and inject or infuse insulin in order to live. Even with the best of efforts and latest technology, blood sugar levels in patients still fluctuate widely and over the long-term can result in devastating complications, such as kidney disease.

Unfortunately, the incidence of type 1 diabetes (T1D) is rising at an alarming rate. From 2001 to 2009, T1D among youth increased 23 percent. If unabated, the prevalence of T1D in youth would double every generation.

JDRF is doing its part to advance research to better treat, prevent and ultimately cure T1D. Last year, JDRF spent $110 million on T1D research. Our work complements the research being done at NIH. The additional funding provided to NIH by the Kids First Research Act of 2013 could help us realize new therapies and research breakthroughs, that could improve the quality of life for people with T1D and help reduce the associated costs of the disease, sooner rather than later.

Your leadership on this issue and strong support of other issues that affect the T1D community are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY BREWER,
President & Chief Executive Officer.

AUTISM SPEAKS,
New York, NY, May 14, 2013.

Hon. GREG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARPER: I am writing to thank you for your leadership on behalf of America's autism community, as demonstrated by your commitment to prioritize autism and pediatric research through the Kids First Research Act. As you know, recent CDC data suggests the prevalence of autism is closer to 1 in 50 children. As you also know, many of these individuals also have Fragile X Syndrome and your commitment to this community has made a real difference during your time in Washington, DC. It is critical to the autism community that we have national leadership to address the epidemic growth of this disorder.

I am grateful that you and your colleagues recognize this crisis and are striving to address it in several policy areas, including research, disability savings accounts and improved services for our military families affected by autism. I am particularly encouraged by your desire to see autism and pediatric research elevated as a priority at the National Institutes of Health through the Kids First Research Act.

I look forward to working with you in the days and weeks ahead in addressing America's autism crisis.

Sincerely,

LIZ FELD,
President.

THE COALITION FOR
PEDIATRIC MEDICAL RESEARCH,
June 6, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman Committee on Energy & Commerce, U.S. Congress, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOE PITTS,
Chairman, Committee on Energy & Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy & Commerce, U.S. Congress, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy & Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN UPTON AND PITTS & RANKING MEMBERS WAXMAN AND PALLONE: On behalf of the Coalition for Pediatric Medical Research (CPMR), a group of more than 20 of our nation's leading children's research hospitals, I am writing to offer our support for H.R. 2019, the Kids First Research Act of 2013.

For too long, our nation has underinvested in pediatric research as a proportion of the overall population. Healthy living begins with a healthy infancy and childhood, and inadequate support for pediatric research negatively affects our nation's children, particularly those suffering from devastating diseases and disorders. It also hinders our ability to prevent and/or treat adult-onset disorders, such as diabetes and heart disease, whose causes are rooted in the childhood years.

H.R. 2019 is a much-needed step forward to address this imbalance. This legislation will help make clear that the health and well-being of our children is a national priority by reallocating scarce public resources to support pediatric research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). This infusion of funds would provide a much-needed boost to our pediatric research community, enabling it to expand research efforts to identify causes of and treatments for many of the most devastating diseases and disorders that affect children. The Coalition is particularly pleased that the legislation would fund multi-institute research activities under the Common Fund, helping drive coordination and collaboration.

The Coalition strongly believes that if enacted into law, a portion of this funding should be used to provide competitive awards to support the research infrastructure and resources necessary to conduct a comprehensive 21st Century pediatric research agenda. Such support should focus on shared and core resources such as biobanks, data warehouses, bioinformatics infrastructure, and the advanced computing technologies needed to process increasingly large data sets. It should also help expedite clinical trials in patients with rare diseases, helping link sites and enabling researchers to recruit a critical mass of kids with any one condition. In addition to the Kids First Research Act, the Coalition continues to strongly support H.R. 225 and S. 424, the National Pediatric Research Network Act, which would authorize NIH to establish a National Pediatric Research Network. We see these two proposals as highly synergistic and complementary and applaud your committees and the full house for quickly passing this bill—for the fourth time—earlier this year.

On behalf of the Coalition, I thank you for your attention to this. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 202.312.7499 or via nicholas.manetto@faegrebd.com.

Sincerely,

NICK MANETTO,
Coalition Advisor.

LEUKEMIA & LYMPHOMA SOCIETY,
Washington, DC, June 6, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon HOB, Washington, DC.

Hon. PETER WELCH,
House of Representatives, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

Hon. TOM COLE,
House of Representatives, Rayburn HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES HARPER, COLE AND WELCH: The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society (LLS) is the world's largest voluntary health agency dedicated to blood cancer. Each year, over 140,000 Americans are newly diagnosed with blood cancers, accounting for nearly 10 percent of all newly diagnosed cancers in the United States. LLS funds lifesaving blood cancer research around the world and provides free information and support services. The mission of LLS is to cure leukemia, lymphoma, Hodgkin's disease and myeloma and provide our patients with affordable, sustainable access to quality healthcare.

LLS is writing to support H.R. 2019, the Kids First Research Act, which will increase funding for pediatric medical research activities administered through the Common Fund at National Institutes of Health (NIH). H.R. 2019 provides much needed funding for crucial research projects, at a critical time in our nation's progress in medical research. In cancer research in particular, we are yielding unprecedented examples of precision based medicine that are fundamentally altering the way in which we will categorize and treat cancers going forward. These funds will help advance the important projects funded by the NIH in areas of high unmet medical need.

LLS understands and appreciates the tremendous challenges and fiscal constraints Congress currently faces and the need to identify a balanced approach to funding necessary national priorities. We appreciate the bi-partisan support that this legislation has received, and look forward to serving as a resource for your offices.

Best,

EMILY SHETTY,
Senior Director,
Federal Legislative Affairs.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, Overland Park, KS, June 8, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy & Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy & Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON AND RANKING MEMBER WAXMAN, On behalf of over 220 of the nation's children's hospitals, I am writing in support of H.R. 2019, the Kids First Research Act of 2013.

As you know, children are not just ''small adults.'' Children require highly-specialized care and equally specialized research. Despite children accounting for nearly 20 percent of our nation's population, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has historically invested a far smaller percentage of research dollars—between five and 10 percent—in pediatric biomedical research. Healthy living begins with a healthy infancy and childhood, and inadequate support for pediatric research does a disservice to our nation's children.

The Kids First Research Act of 2013 would enhance our nation's commitment to pediatric research and help make clear that the health and well-being of our children is a national priority. The legislation would provide a much-needed boost to the pediatric research community, supporting expanded research efforts to identify causes of and treatments for many of the most devastating diseases and disorders that affect children.

In addition to the Kids First Research Act, the Association continues to strongly support the National Pediatric Research Network Act, H.R. 225, and its companion bill in the Senate, S. 424. This legislation would authorize the NIH to establish a National Pediatric Research Network. The Association views these two proposals as collaborative and applauds the committee and the House for quickly passing H.R. 225 earlier this year.

IA On behalf of the Children's Hospital Association, thank you for your support on this important issue.

Sincerely,

JIM KAUFMAN,
Vice President, Public Policy.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad and, indeed, depressing debate because there is such a transparent effort underway to weaken our Nation's campaign finance laws even further by the perfectly legitimate, compelling case for sick children in our country. This represents the worst of Republican cynicism—I have just got to say it—and since this measure stands no chance of passing in the Senate, it is a fitting end to the least productive session of Congress in modern history.

The passage of this bill will do nothing to increase the Federal funding of pediatric disease research. That is why it is so cynical. Simply authorizing a new program will not translate into additional funding in the current appropriations environment. If the majority were really serious, it wouldn't have passed a budget that makes adequate funding for medical research impossible or, perhaps, it would actually try to negotiate a comprehensive budget agreement that lifts sequestration once and for all from pediatric research and many other priorities. To make matters worse, this bill would make it more difficult to modernize and reinvigorate one of the most successful examples of campaign finance reform in our Nation's history—the Presidential public financing program—which has given candidates a viable alternative to private and corporate fund-raising for more than three decades.

Now, I agree with my colleagues from both parties in that paying for Presidential nominating conventions is not a wise use of taxpayer dollars, but if the House majority is truly concerned about this issue, I would encourage it to schedule a vote on my bill, the Empowering Citizens Act, which not only would prevent taxpayer dollars from being used for conventions, but it would also include important ''soft money'' provisions to prevent high-dollar special interests from funding conventions. The Empowering Citizens Act would mend, not end, the Presidential public financing system, bringing it up to date with campaign realities. It would also establish a voluntary small donor public funding program for congressional campaigns as well as strong rules forbidding the coordination between super-PACs and political parties or campaigns.

I believe we are at a tipping point in the short history of campaign finance reform in our country. We can either choose to stand by the commonsense reforms that restored America's faith in elections after the Watergate scandal or we can choose to cede the control of political campaigns entirely to wealthy corporations and interest groups.

The responsible choice is clear, so I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this measure in the hope that the Republican majority will both get serious about medical research funding and will get serious about the oversized influence of millionaires and billionaires and super-PACs in our democracy.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a cosponsor of the bill and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act.

My colleagues have told the story of Gabriella Miller. She was one of the many young people every year who leaves this world too early due to disease. Too many families share this grief.

Today, we take a step in making a difference in the lives of those who are struggling with pediatric diseases and disorders, such as cancer and autism. Today, Congress, in working together, will target taxpayer funding for scientific research and lifesaving treatments that can lead to better outcomes and, I hope, someday, to a cure.

Especially during the holiday season, we should be thankful for our many blessings. I am thankful, in part, for the families and advocates whose challenges we may never understand but whose commitment and love for their children is unyielding and inspiring. Today, we take action in their name.

□ 1515

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, can I ask how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Thank you.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Gabriella Miller and her courage and the courage of her parents, but I oppose this hypocritical bill.

I have spent my career fighting to ensure that our researchers have every resource to find lifesaving treatments and cures. This bill would do nothing to increase investments in medical research.

It is unfathomable to me that those who championed the cuts of $1.55 billion to the NIH now try to authorize with no promise to fund. That cut of $1.55 billion led to a cut of $255 billion to the National Cancer Institute and $66 million to the Child Health Institute that funds pediatric research.

My heart is with the family of Gabriella Miller and my dear friends who lost a little girl of about 6 years old from a childhood cancer, and I will never forget it. Let's work together to truly fund, to appropriate money, not pretend by authorizing. It is a nice thing to do, but we have to vote ''no'' on this cynical bill.

I ask today that we join together to increase investments, to increase funding for pediatric research, not support cuts to the National Cancer Institute, cuts to the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Appropriations Committee and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by praising my friend GREGG HARPER and my friend PETER WELCH, who come to this floor with a very worthy purpose, and that is to redirect government funding toward something that is not particularly important toward something that is very important—medical research for children.

The question when you have a worthy goal is always: How do you pay for it? Where will you actually get the resources?

For many years, I have brought to this floor legislation that would eliminate public funding for political party

conventions and Presidential campaigns. I could go into debate ad infinitum. The President has never used any public funding—didn't feel the need for it—in either of his two campaigns. Neither did Mr. Romney. On the political conventions, both political parties this year actually did take the money.

I can tell you as a former chief of staff on the Republican National Committee who put on the convention in 2000, they do not need it. They absolutely do not need it. They can raise all the money they need from private sources, just as their nominees raised money from private sources.

That bill has actually passed this House on multiple occasions with a bipartisan vote. I was prepared to do that again and I got a call from Leader CANTOR. He said: TOM, I know you have been working on this problem for a long time. I know you are concerned about it. What if we redirected that money towards something that is a better purpose, a better use of public dollars? And he mentioned GREGG's bill. I couldn't agree with him more.

So for those of you that are looking for something sinister or trying to link this to something it is not connected to, like the sequester, it is simply a modest step in the right direction. It takes money that we know is wasted and puts it to good use.

For those of you that say it can't pass the other body, the other body in the last Congress on amendment voted 95–5 to take away public funding of political conventions. We still have a disagreement on Presidential campaigns. But funding political conventions really is more important than directing this money to a more worthy purpose? We are not even trying to take it out of the Federal budget. I just think that kind of logic defies imagination.

This is a good-faith effort to do something that ought to bring us together instead of pull us apart. It is a modest step. I would be the first to admit that. But let's take the modest step in the right direction, take public dollars that we are now wasting on political conventions, give them to researchers, and let them do their work. That is just simply a better use of the public purse in a time of limited means.

So I urge support for my friends' bill, H.R. 2019, Mr. HARPER and Mr. WELCH. I want to thank Leader CANTOR. This was his idea of bringing two ideas together. I think it is a good one. I hope this House embraces it in a bipartisan fashion.

I want to thank my friend, the chairman of Energy and Commerce, for his effort to bring this forward and advance it.

EVERYLIFE FOUNDATION FOR RARE DISEASE,
Novato, CA, June 10, 2013.

Hon. Gregg Harper,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARPER: The EveryLife Foundation for Rare Diseases is dedicated to accelerating biotech innovation for rare disease treatments through science-driven public policy.

We are writing to support the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019). This bipartisan bill would eliminate taxpayer financing of presidential campaigns and party conventions and reprogram those savings to provide for a 10–year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health.

During these trying fiscal times, we are pleased to see efforts that would increase funds for pediatric research. Unfortunately, pediatric rare diseases and cancer is terribly underfunded and largely overlooked by drug companies and research institutions. Public funding is essential to help spur the development of treatments for these children.

We are pleased to express our strong support for H.R. 2019, and believe this legislation will help to bring increased funding and awareness to pediatric medical research. We look forward to working with you and your staff to ensure this bill is enacted into law.

Sincerely,

EMIL D. KAKKIS, M.D., PH.D.,
President.

JUNE 27, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. HARPER: On behalf of United for Medical Research (UMR), a coalition of leading research institutions, patient and health advocates, and private industry joined together in support of medical research funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), we write to thank you for the introduction of the Kids First Research Act (H.R. 2019). We strongly support increased funding for NIH, and appreciate your identification of medical research as a priority in a time of deficit reduction and fiscal austerity.

The lifesaving research funded by NIH has already yielded extraordinary benefits to human health and serves as a beacon of hope for those still suffering from disease or disability, including the families of children afflicted with heartbreaking conditions. NM also plays a role in sustaining the U.S. economy, supporting over 400,000 jobs and generating nearly $60 billion in nationwide economic output in 2012 alone. Unfortunately, recent cuts to the NIH budget threaten both our ability to improve human health and our worldwide leadership in medical research. UMR believes it is critical to renew our commitment to funding NIH, and we are grateful for your effort to find creative solutions to support medical research.

To ensure continued success in our quest for treatments and cures to our most devastating childhood and adult diseases, as well as continuing to reap the substantial return on investment to our economy, it is imperative that funding for NIH be sustained through regular, annual increases in appropriations. The Kids First Research Act is an important step in mitigating the loss of funding caused by a decade of reduced budgets, we thank you for it, and we look forward to working with you to reinvigorate our investment in the life sciences.

Sincerely,

United for Medical Research.

JUST-IN-TIME NEUROBLASTOMA FOUNDATION, INC.,
Greenwood Village, CO, June 28, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HARPER: As a non-profit organization working to promote awareness of childhood cancer, we write to express our strong support for your legislation, the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019).

This measure provides much needed additional federal support to complement ongoing research supported by substantial private funding from national non-profit childhood cancer organizations, as well as by the National Institute of Health and National Cancer Institute. Passage of this bill will ensure that the investments of both public and private resources reach their fullest potential by enabling a critical mass of research and discovery required to culminate into promising medical treatments that are ''safe and effective'' for many childhood diseases, including childhood cancer.

As you know, one in every 330 children in the United States develops cancer before the age of nineteen. The incidence of cancer among children is increasing. Each school day, enough children are diagnosed with cancer to empty two classrooms. Depending on the type of cancer and the development upon diagnosis, approximately 2,300 children will die from cancer in any given year. The number of children diagnosed with cancer in the U.S. each year puts more potential years of life at risk than any single type of adult cancer. Cancer remains the number one disease killer of America's children.

There are more than 360,000 childhood cancer survivors of all ages in the United States. Unfortunately, 74% of childhood cancer survivors have chronic illnesses, and some 40% of childhood cancer survivors have severe illnesses or die from such illnesses. Survivors are at significant risk for secondary cancers later in life. Current cancer treatments can affect a child's growth, fertility, and endocrine system. Child survivors may be permanently immunologically suppressed. Radiation therapy to a child's brain can significantly damage cognitive function, especially if given at a very young age. While currently there is very little in terms of ''safe and effective'' cures for any particular type of childhood cancer, the underlying genetics of the disease and recent research breakthroughs make such treatments foreseeable.

The Just-In-Time Neuorblastoma Foundation thanks you for sponsoring the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 2019) and we applaud your ongoing commitment to improving the lives of thousands children diagnosed with life-threatening diseases and spearing families from the devastation that it causes. We look forward to working with you to pass this important bill to help ensure a brighter future for America's children.

Sincerely,

KATRINA M. BROHMAN,
Co-Founder & Vice President.

THE NICHOLAS CONOR INSTITUTE,
San Diego, CA, June 17, 2013.

Hon. GREGG HARPER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HARPER: As a medical research organization working to accelerate the development of promising medical discoveries or cures for cancers common to children, adolescents, and young adults, we write to express our strong support for your legislation, the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 1724).

This measure provides much needed additional federal support to complement ongoing research supported by substantial private funding from national non-profit childhood cancer organizations, as well as by the National Institute of Health and National Cancer Institute. Passage of this bill will ensure that the investments of both public and private resources reach their fullest potential by enabling a critical mass of research and discovery required to culminate into promising medical treatments that are ''safe and effective'' for many childhood diseases, including childhood cancer.

As you know, one in every 330 children in the United States develops cancer before the

age of nineteen. The incidence of cancer among children is increasing. Each school day, enough children are diagnosed with cancer to empty two classrooms. Depending on the type of cancer and the development upon diagnosis, approximately 2,300 children will die from cancer in any given year. The number of children diagnosed with cancer in the U.S. each year puts more potential years of life at risk than any single type of adult cancer. Cancer remains the number one disease killer of America's children.

There are more than 360,000 childhood cancer survivors of all ages in the United States. Unfortunately, 74% of childhood cancer survivors have chronic illnesses, and some 40% of childhood cancer survivors have severe illnesses or die from such illnesses. Survivors are at significant risk for secondary cancers later in life. Current cancer treatments can affect a child's growth, fertility, and endocrine system. Child survivors may be permanently immunologically suppressed. Radiation therapy to a child's brain can significantly damage cognitive function, especially if given at a very young age. While currently there is very little in terms of ''safe and effective'' cures for any particular type of childhood cancer, the underlying genetics of the disease and recent research breakthroughs make such treatments foreseeable.

The Nicholas Conor Institute for Pediatric Cancer Research thanks you for sponsoring the Kids First Research Act of 2013 (H.R. 1724) and we applaud your ongoing commitment to improving the lives of thousands children diagnosed with life-threatening diseases and spearing families from the devastation that is causes. We look forward to working with you to pass this important bill to help ensure a brighter future for America's children.

Sincerely,

BETH ANNE BABER, PH.D., M.B.A.,
Chief Executive Officer and Co-founder.

PULMONARY HYPERTENSION ASSOCIATION,
Silver Spring, MD, June 21, 2013.

Hon. JOE PITTS,
Chairmen, Subcommittee on Health Energy & Commerce Committee, Cannon House Building.
Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairmen, Subcommittee on Health Ways & Means Committee, Cannon House Building.
Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Health Energy & Commerce Committee, Cannon House Building.
Hon. JIM MCDERMOTT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Health Ways & Means Committee, Longworth House Building.

DEAR CHAIRMEN AND RANKING MEMBERS: I write you today on behalf of the Pulmonary Hypertension Association (PHA) to ask for your support of the public health goals of the Kids First Research Act (H.R. 2019). Please work to advance this legislation through the legislative process so that its provisions establishing a new pediatric research initiative at the National Institutes of Health (N111) might be enacted.

The pulmonary hypertension (PH) community understands the value of investing in critical pediatric medical research. PH is a disabling and often fatal progressive condition where the blood pressure in the lungs rises to dangerously high levels. In PH patients, blood flow between the heart and lungs is blocked or constricted. As a result, the heart must pump harder causing it to enlarge and ultimately fail. PH can be idiopathic, and occur without a known cause, or be secondary to other conditions, such as, scleroderma, lupus, blood clots, and sickle cell. PH impacts individuals of all races and ages, including children. Similar to other disease states, pediatric research into PH lags behind adult research. While there are nine FDA-approved treatments available for adults with PH, none are approved for children.

PHA supports a pediatric research program to improve the lives of children impacted by PH and we are pleased that Congress is interested in supporting pediatric research at NIH. In the interest of improving care for PH patients, PHA also engages in advocacy activity, including advocating for the Pulmonary Hypertension Research and Diagnosis Act (H.R. 2073), budget neutral legislation designed to improve diagnosis of PH before the condition reaches an advanced stage. We hope you will continue to support and advance legislative efforts focused on bolstering research activities and improving care for patients with PH, such as H.R. 2019 and H.R. 2073.

Sincerely,

RINO ALDRIGHETTI,
President & CEO.

FOUNDATION FOR ANGELMAN SYNDROME THERAPEUTICS,

Hon. ERIC CANTOR,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, DC.
Hon. GREGG HARPER,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER CANTOR AND CONGRESSMEN HARPER: On behalf of the Foundation for Angelman Syndrome Therapeutics (FAST), I am pleased to offer this letter of support for H.R. 2019, the Kids First Research Act. This legislation will expand pediatric medical research activities administered through the Common Fund at the National Institutes of Health. By prioritizing resources for pediatric research, this bill will provide much needed funding to bolster FAST's commitment to find treatments, and eventually a cure for Angelman Syndrome.

The Foundation for Angelman Syndrome Therapeutics (or FAST) is an organization of families and professionals dedicated to finding a cure for Angelman Syndrome and related disorders through the funding of an aggressive research agenda, education, and advocacy. Angelman Syndrome (or AS) is a neurodevelopmental disorder affecting approximately 1 in 15,000 live births. Although the cause of AS is known, there are currently no treatments available for this disorder. FAST is committed to assisting individuals living with Angelman Syndrome realize their full potential and quality of life.

On behalf of FAST, I thank you for your leadership and for supporting this important legislation. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

PAULA EVANS,
Chairperson.

BRAIN INJURY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Vienna, VA, June 26, 2013.

Hon. JOSEPH R. PITTS,
Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PITTS: The Brain Injury Association of America (BIAA) is the nation's oldest and largest brain injury patient advocacy organization. BIAA supports H.R. 2019, the Kids First Research Act. Thank you for introducing this very important legislation. The Kids First Research Act will ensure important pediatric research is funded at the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) is a misdiagnosed, misunderstood, under-funded neurological disease affecting at least 1.7 million children and adults in the U.S. each year. Depending on type and severity, brain injuries can lead to physical, cognitive, and psychosocial or behavioral impairments ranging from balance and coordination problems to loss of hearing, vision or speech. Fatigue, memory loss, concentration difficulty, anxiety, depression, impulsivity and impaired judgment are also common after brain injury. Even so-called ''mild'' injuries can have devastating consequences that require intensive treatment and long-term care. Often called the ''silent epidemic,'' brain injury affects people in ways that are invisible. The injury can lower performance at school and at work, interfere with personal relationships and bring financial ruin.

Thank you for supporting pediatric research at NIH. Please contact Amy Colberg, BIAA's Director of Government Affairs with any questions.

Sincerely,

SUSAN H. CONNORS,
President/CEO.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who is the ranking member of the Labor-HHS Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called Kids First Research Act, which despite its name does absolutely nothing to support kids or pediatric research.

This bill does not include a single additional dollar for pediatric research. It just ends another program. It merely suggests this money should be used to fund NIH if, and only if, a later appropriations bill calls for it. The money does not automatically go for pediatric research.

This is a feel-good messaging bill that plays a bait-and-switch on American families hoping and praying for research dollars to save their children. This majority wants to pretend that they are supporting medical research when, in fact, they have continually cut this fundamental priority since 2011.

Consider the very first bill passed in this House in 2011, H.R. 1. That bill was supported by all but three Republicans. Almost every single Member of this majority voted to cut $1.6 billion from the National Institutes of Health. Most of those who have spoken this morning were those who voted to make that cut.

That cut is 100 times larger than the $12.6 million increase that this legislation pretends to provide. Because of the deep and reckless sequestration cuts, NIH has been cut by $1.5 billion more. We don't know whether the budget deal that is being discussed today will put that money back.

Because of these misguided policies, the National Cancer Institute has been slashed by $255 million and the Child Health Institute by $66 million.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I strongly support investing in medical research. My heart goes out to the Miller family. I am a

cancer survivor. One of my proudest accomplishments in this body is working in a bipartisan fashion to double the NIH budget between 1998 and 2003. We did it then, and it is something that we need to do again; but this bill, this bill is a sham.

If the majority believes, as I do, that we should increase funding for pediatric research, then let us increase funding for pediatric research. Let us not waste time playing games and misleading the American people.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to add my name to the list of those who support this legislation. H.R. 2019 bears the name of a child whose bravery and wisdom should inspire us all.

Gabriella Miller reminds us that government has the ability and the obligation to strive for the greater good—to protect the innocent, to preserve their futures. If we lose sight of that goal, we have failed.

In the year that I have been in Congress, most of my time has been spent fighting against bad policies and bad politics, but today is different. Today, I stand before this body and proclaim we can do something and we can help. The Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act prioritizes pediatric research to help children with autism, cancer, and other diseases.

If you were to ask me what defines DOUG COLLINS, I would tell you three things: I am a man of faith; I am a husband; and a father, a father to a daughter who has spina bifida, but also inspires me to be the type of person that I would want to be.

She is a lot like Gabriella Miller. Gabriella Miller really won her fight. My daughter continues. It reminds us that you can help and when you can help, you should. When you can make a difference, no matter how small, it still matters. It is still worth doing.

I am a freshman here, but what amazes me is when you take a step forward in putting something productive on the floor which makes at least a small statement—and Congressman HARPER brings forth that with others—when you take a small step forward and bring something down to this floor and are ridiculed and it is said it is window dressing, I am sorry, this is not window dressing. It is a step to being the government we are called to be, and that is prioritizing, that is putting faith back into a system in which people have lost faith.

On the floor today, it is no wonder that they have lost faith. When a good-faith effort is put forward and it is criticized in light of children and research to make other political points, that is what is truly appalling today; that is what is bad.

This is a simple step that was brought forth in good faith. All I am saying is let's prioritize. I agree with my friends across the aisle: it is time we prioritize our mission; it is time we prioritize our battles here. This is one step forward.

I would encourage all Members to support something that actually does make a difference.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me said he is a freshman. I have been here for 33 years. For 23 of those years I served on the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee. I served under some extraordinary Republicans and some extraordinary Democrats who chaired that committee. The ones I served under made sure that the NIH got the resources it needed to investigate, research, and try to come up with the cures that will ameliorate the afflictions of mankind from a health perspective.

Of the sponsors of this bill, 134 of them voted for the Ryan budget. The Ryan budget—had it been adopted, had it been implemented—would have cut the National Institutes of Health by $6 billion.

The budget that we are going to consider will still require reductions in NIH funding by perhaps as much as 80 times to 100 times the money that is theoretically in this bill. By the way, there is no money in this bill. This is an authorization. As I am sure Ms. DELAURO, who is the ranking member, has pointed out it provides no money.

Many of you, perhaps, are going to vote for a budget that will cut NIH; but you are going to pass a bill, and that is what Mr. COLLINS apparently is concerned about, because we are saying that this is a facade, a pretense of support. Paper will not help pediatric research. Money will, investment will.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. To that extent, this is not real. It is a message. Everybody on this floor, I presume, is for children's health, is for pediatric research, is for trying to make sure that our children are healthy and saved from disease and affliction. I presume all of us are for it, but talk is cheap.

The Ryan budget would have cut $800 million from pediatric research alone; 134 of the sponsors of this bill voted for the Ryan budget. In other words, on one hand you are given—theoretically, if there was money available to do this—$11 million for pediatric research with this hand—that is 113 over 10—and $800 million being taken away with this hand.

Who do you think you are fooling?

□ 1530

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. So let's not fool the public that we are doing something for pediatric research. I know my friend, Mr. UPTON, has been a supporter of NIH in years past. And he is my dear friend and a good Member, but I tell my friend, this bill does not do anything for pediatric research.

You will have an opportunity to vote for pediatric research; vote to get rid of the sequester. Vote to invest in the National Institutes of Health, not to cut it. That will make a difference for pediatric research.

I urge the defeat of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I did appreciate the nice words that were directed to me by my friend, Mr. HOYER, in support of the NIH. And I will remind those that don't know that I was the Republican lead a number of years ago with Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. MCCAIN and Mr. Wellstone to double the money for the NIH, one of the most significant things that this Congress, I think, has ever done.

But I have got to say, I simply don't understand the opposition to this bill. Yes, I am absolutely supportive of the NIH bill, and will continue to do that, and more money. The Ryan-Murray budget agreement which we will be voting on tomorrow, I will be supporting it. It includes programs like the NIH, which I am told will be increased about $23 billion, or 2 percent over the current levels.

In today's ''The Hill,'' there is a full-page ad offered by First Focus Campaign for Children. It says, ''Thank you for making children your First Focus,'' and it lists maybe as many as 80 to 100 Members, including many of those who spoke today against the bill, but it says, ''Thank you for making children your First Focus.'' That is what this bill is about.

It is not just a simple authorization. Yes, we do pass those from time to time. This actually directs. The language of the bill says, ''shall be transferred.'' Shall. It doesn't use the word ''may,'' ''may be,'' whatever. ''Shall be transferred to a fund in the Treasury to be known as the '10-Year Pediatric Research Initiative Fund' which shall''—not may—''which shall be available only for the purpose provided in . . . the Public Health Service Act, and only to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.''

We made it pretty tight. The authors of this bill made it pretty tight. Tell me how we can make it tighter.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I will be glad to make a suggestion on how you could do that.

Mr. UPTON. Well, to me, we use ''shall'' a number of different times.

Mr. HOYER. You have got to have money.

Mr. UPTON. Well, that is what we do. We take money.

Mr. HOYER. If you don't have any money, you can't spend it.

Mr. UPTON. The money comes from the political conventions. I mean, that is the direct offset that is used.

All of us cry for these families that lose these beautiful little kids. This bill, if it passes and gets enacted, will provide money to help families like Gabriella's, who lost a beautiful little girl, who really used the last year of her life to promote a fund like this and work with the NIH. That is what this should be all about, and I commend Mr. CANTOR and others.

The rule that we hear is you have to find an offset when you increase spending. That is what this bill does. And it finds an offset that I think many of us could accept to actually fund the program and direct the dollars to a fund within the NIH to make sure that it works. That is what we want to have happen.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. Yes, it is under suspension, no amendments. We need a two-thirds vote, so I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2019, the Kids First Research Act. This among the most hypocritical bills I have seen during my time in Congress, and it should be rejected. My friends on the other side of the aisle say this bill will increase pediatric research funding at the National Institutes of Health, when in fact it does nothing of the sort. Furthermore, their record demonstrates that they have little interest in actually funding life-saving medical research for children.

This legislation does not give NIH a single dollar to spend on pediatric research. Instead, it only provides an authorization for future funding to be provided by the Appropriations Committee. The unfortunate fact is this funding is still subject to sequestration which has resulted in $1.55 billion being cut from NIH during fiscal year 2013. Therefore, this bill does not increase spending at NIH at all. It seems this is nothing more than a distraction to confuse people about the terrible record the GOP has on this issue.

Since my friends on the other side of the aisle have been in the majority, NIH funding has decreased by $4.2 billion, or 13 percent. Furthermore, the funding allocation provided to the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee for fiscal year 2014 is 22 percent below the enacted level, meaning more cuts are coming. The small, $16 million authorization that this bill provides will do nothing to reverse the damage that these policies have had on medical research across our country.

If my Republican colleagues are serious about helping children and, promoting medical research, they should work with Democrats in a bipartisan manner to repeal sequestration and replace it with sensible spending cuts, rather than allowing these damaging cuts to NIH to continue. NIH does not need another meaningless authorization that goes unfunded, they need actual dollars that go to research. I find it hard to believe that my friends on the other side of the aisle truly care about funding pediatric research when their record demonstrates just the opposite. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this cynical legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the ''Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act.'' H.R. 2019 purports to end the public's contribution to political party conventions and redirect the savings into research on childhood diseases at the National Institutes of Health. In fact, the bill does no such thing.

While I strongly support efforts to increase funding for pediatric research and other research at NIH, I do not believe H.R. 2019 does anything to advance this goal. This bill claims to make available to NIH, the $12.6 million per year raised as public support for the expenses of party conventions. In actuality, that bill would not do anything to restore the funding cuts that Republicans have strongly supported over the last few years, because it does not actually provide any additional funds to NIH. It only directs the money to be made available in appropriations.

These funds will still have to go through the regular appropriations process, fully subject to the Budget Control Act caps—as reduced by sequestration—and will have to comply with the spending allocations of the Appropriations Committee. It is this exact process, caps, and especially sequestration that cut $1.55 billion from NIH last year alone, dramatically reduced NIH funding for cancer and other research capabilities.

This bill only authorizes $12.6 million per year, which is four-tenths of one percent of the roughly $3.6 billion that NIH spent on pediatric research last year. Adding one more unfunded authorization will not interrupt the destructive downward trend this country is experiencing in research funding. It is not even an honest attempt to do this. NIH is already authorized to spend well beyond the $12.6 million a year this legislation allows.

Republicans aim to show that pediatric research is a priority, but you only have to look at H.R. 1, the House Republican spending proposal from the 112th Congress, to see what their true priorities are. That proposal, which the vast majority of Republicans supported, slashed total funding for the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee by 22 percent, which would have cost NIH $6.7 billion. The reality is that few Republicans are genuinely interested in providing adequate funding for the NIH.

Mr. Speaker, if my Republican colleagues truly want to support pediatric research, they should restore the $4.2 billion that has been cut from NIH's funding since they took the majority, and they could support my bill, H.R. 900, which fully repeals sequestration.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend this chamber for coming together to pass The Gabrielle Miller Kids First Research Act. Ask any parent, our kids always come first, so when it comes to utilizing taxpayer dollars; it only makes sense that Washington places the children of our nation ahead of partisan politics.

This bill prioritizes allocations for scientific research of pediatric diseases and disorders such as cancer and autism. By eliminating taxpayer funding for the Republican and Democratic national conventions, and applying these funds to critically needed research for cures to childhood disorders, we are truly doing important and lasting work for our constituents—including the most precious and vulnerable.

As a member of the Autism Caucus, the chance to prioritize federal dollars for critical research on Autism, and those families living with it, is a great opportunity. Ensuring the best for our children, especially those with pediatric disorders, is vital for the continued success of our nation. It is heartening that this Congress was able to come together and work on their behalf.

I am proud to have the opportunity to work with Autism groups in my community, in Pennsylvania's 8th District, that are ready to work with the us in putting an end to Autism and all other pediatric diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to quickly take up this bill and show that Washington is ready to put our kids first.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2019, The Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act. This bill completely bypassed procedure in the House, skipping any committee action prior to a full House vote and leaving no opportunity for discussion as to what could be the best way to fund pediatric research.

While my colleagues and I fully support increased funding to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and pediatric research, the ''Kids First Research Act'' would not provide any additional funds to the NIH for this purpose. The bill merely authorizes that the Presidential Election Campaign Fund be available to a certain extent. These funds would still be subject to the Budget Control Act caps and the normal Appropriations Committee process.

H.R. 2019 is merely a messaging tactic for House Republicans to appear to be supportive of biomedical research funding. House Republicans attempted to cut $1.6 billion from NIH funding in 2011. This year, sequestration cut the NIH budget by $1.55 billion and took an additional $255 million from the cancer institute and $66 million from the child health institute within the NIH.

If House Republicans intend to increase funding for NIH research, they should do so by replacing sequestration with a more balanced approach. This bill not only restricts funding for the NIH, it represents Congressional micromanagement of research. Overall, HR. 2019 does nothing to advance the goals of biomedical research. I urge my colleagues to support the work of our scientists and researchers and oppose the Kids First Research Act.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, today House Republicans forced a vote on the cynically misnamed ''Kids First Research Act.'' The bill purports to increase funding for pediatric research by transferring $12.6 million from the public financing for party nominating conventions. That might sound substantial if it weren't designed to mask the fact that House Republicans have slashed NIH funding by $4.2 billion in the last three years. In fact, their most recent budget proposal would have cut NIH funding by another 20%. It's one of the most cynical acts I've seen in a Congress and reminds me of what my friend, humorist Jim Boren, used to say, ''If you're going to be a phony, at least be sincere about it.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2019, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2019 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2319, S. 1471, H.R. 3212, and H.R. 1992.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 295, nays 103, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

YEAS—295

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
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
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—103

Andrews
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—33

Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Butterfield
Castro (TX)
Clarke
Conyers
Culberson
Cummings
Doyle
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Green, Al
Herrera Beutler
Jackson Lee
Lee (CA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McMorris Rodgers
Meeks
Moore
Nunnelee
Pastor (AZ)
Radel
Rangel
Ruppersberger
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Waters
Watt

□ 1600

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. TIERNEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. KINGSTON, CARNEY, DEUTCH, Ms. GABBARD, Messrs. GARAMENDI, YARMUTH, PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. HANABUSA changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to eliminate taxpayer financing of political party conventions and reprogram savings to provide for a 10-year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 632, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 632 I was at a medical appointment in Baltimore, MD and therefore unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS' MEMORIAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2319) to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

YEAS—398

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers

Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—33

Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Butterfield
Castro (TX)
Clarke
Conyers
Culberson
Cummings
Doyle
Fudge
Green, Al
Grijalva
Herrera Beutler
Jackson Lee
Lee (CA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McMorris Rodgers
Meeks
Moore
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Radel
Rangel
Ruppersberger
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Waters
Watt

□ 1608

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 633 I was at a medical appointment in Baltimore, MD and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

ALICIA DAWN KOEHL RESPECT FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1471) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

YEAS—398

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

Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—32

Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Butterfield
Castro (TX)
Clarke
Conyers
Culberson
Cummings
Doyle
Fudge
Green, Al
Herrera Beutler
Jackson Lee
Lee (CA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McMorris Rodgers
Meeks
Moore
Pastor (AZ)
Radel
Rangel
Ruppersberger
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Waters
Watt

□ 1615

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 634 I was at a medical appointment in Baltimore, MD and therefore unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

SEAN AND DAVID GOLDMAN INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION AND RETURN ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3212) to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 635]

YEAS—398

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

NOT VOTING—33

Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Butterfield
Castro (TX)
Clarke
Conyers
Culberson
Cummings
Doyle
Fudge
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Jackson Lee
Lee (CA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McMorris Rodgers
Meeks
Moore
Pastor (AZ)
Radel
Rangel
Ruppersberger
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Terry
Waters
Watt

□ 1622

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 635, I was at a medical appointment in Baltimore, MD and therefore unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

ISRAEL QME ENHANCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1992) to amend the requirements relating to assessment of Israel's qualitative military edge over military threats, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]

YEAS—399

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps

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

NOT VOTING—32

Bass
Beatty
Bishop (GA)
Butterfield
Castro (TX)
Clarke
Conyers
Culberson
Cummings
Doyle
Fudge
Green, Al
Hartzler
Herrera Beutler
Jackson Lee
Lee (CA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McMorris Rodgers
Meeks
Moore
Pastor (AZ)
Radel
Rangel
Ruppersberger
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Waters
Watt

□ 1628

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 636, I was at a medical appointment in Baltimore, MD and therefore unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on December 10 and 11, 2013, I was a part of an official congressional delegation to South Africa. I regret that I was not present to vote on H.R. 3521, H.R. 1402, H.R. 2019, H.R. 2319, S. 1471, H.R. 3212, H.R. 1992, and the Journal Vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 3521, H.R. 1402, H.R. 2319, S. 1471, H.R. 1992, and the Journal Vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H.R. 2019, and H.R. 3212.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 632 on H.R. 2019, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act of 2013, as amended", I am not recorded becaue I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 633 on H.R. 2319, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "Native American Veterans' Memorial Amendments Act of 2013", I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 634 on S. 1471, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "Alicia Dawn Koehl Respect for National Cemeteries Act", I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 635 on H.R. 3212, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2013, as amended", I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 636 on H.R. 1992, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "Israel QME Enhancement Act, as amended", I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1630

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

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.

HONORING AMORY HOUGHTON, JR.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor Amo Houghton for his 16 years of service on the board of directors of The Faith & Politics Institute.

Amo, my good friend and our former colleague, a tireless advocate for civil rights, is stepping down as cochair of the board of Faith & Politics, just this week. He and our esteemed colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, started the bipartisan Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage to Alabama, which in March of next year will celebrate its 14th year. This important trip brings to life the values The Faith & Politics Institute is determined to instill, as it indeed shows the attendees how to ''rise above narrow partisanship and respond to the quiet call of conscience.''

My wife, Amey, and I traveled to Selma on this pilgrimage, and we feel that it was one of the most moving and humbling experiences of our lives.

Amo was also responsible for organizing a Faith & Politics congressional visit to South Africa, which resulted in a relationship that has lasted for over a decade and is still strong. As said by the great Nelson Mandela:

A good head and a good heart are always a formidable combination.

My friend Amo Houghton is a formidable force.

Although The Faith & Politics Institute will miss his spirit and wisdom that he brought to the board of directors, his legacy and inspiration will always live on, as the Honorable Amory Houghton, Jr.'s status is now elevated to cochair emeritus for life.

OBAMACARE IS A FAILURE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, does anyone across the fruited plain think that ObamaCare has been a success?

Two of its major objectives were to bring down the costs of health care and increase the accessibility. Well, I ask you: Does anybody know anyone whose premium has decreased? My own 30-year-old daughter's premium went from $160 to $270. Indeed, our office is besieged with people whose premiums have skyrocketed.

And then let's talk about accessibility. We hear 5.9 million policies have been canceled. And what do we hear from the Obama folks about the enrollment? 200,000 people or so. Of course, they keep the numbers kind of fuzzy. It is kind of like the unemployment numbers. You can't quite tell what they really are. But the reality is the cancelations are going about 100 miles an hour and enrollment is going at about a 20-mile-an-hour pace.

ObamaCare has been a failure. We need to defund it. We need to start all over again. We need to have health care that is patient-centered and market-based that does in fact bring down the cost of medicine and make it more affordable and more accessible to the American people.

AN OBAMACARE SUCCESS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentleman and say that I walked into the Kiwanis pancake breakfast in Berea, Ohio, the other day and out of a crowd of probably a thousand people, a gentleman said, Congresswoman, Congresswoman, and came up to me and threw his arms around me. He said:

> Thank you so much for voting for the Affordable Care Act. I just got a plan 10 times better than I ever had—ten times better. My wife had a $5,000 deductible and I had a $5,000 deductible. I am a small business person. I now have a $1,000 deductible. I have much better coverage. Preventive health care is covered. I cannot believe how much better my plan is than what I had before.

It made me feel so good.

We had breakfast together. The pancakes and sausage were great, by the way.

It made me feel so good because I knew that in his business as a shoemaker and his wife as an alterations person in that same business, they would be protected as they grow older before they go onto Medicare. They have worked so very hard in their lives.

They went to the Web site, and guess what? It worked.

And so across America there are small business people saying thank you to those in Congress who voted for an Affordable Care Act that is working.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support volunteer fire and emergency services organizations by cosponsoring a bill introduced today by Pennsylvania Congressman LOU BARLETTA, H.R. 3685, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

This bill ensures that emergency services volunteers are not counted as full-time employees under the employer mandate in the Affordable Care Act. Because of the nominal fees that at times are given to volunteers and the rate at which the new definition of ''full-time'' is calculated, many volunteer companies are concerned about having to provide health coverage for firefighters or face a penalty. The IRS has been asked to rule on this determination, yet Congress has not received a response.

Having served as a firefighter and EMS volunteer since 1983, I know as well as anyone just how crushing this impact would be for these volunteer organizations. Fire department and municipality support for fire and EMS volunteers is important; however, incentives given to these community volunteers do not change the fact that these are volunteers serving their neighbors.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in support of the commonsense effort by cosponsoring H.R. 3685.

THE TRAIN WRECK CONTINUES

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia was absolutely right; the train wreck of ObamaCare continues.

This week, we have three pieces of news. First of all, people going to the exchanges that were told they qualify for Medicaid really aren't. In fact, they won't find out until months past January 1 that they won't have insurance.

In the State of Maryland, 25,000 people got cancelation notices and 3,700 have signed up so far on the ObamaCare exchange, leaving tens of thousands of Marylanders without insurance on January 1.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania just mentioned, volunteer firefighters are now given a mandate that their volunteer fire companies have to buy insurance for them because now, under strange definitions, they are considered employed. Mr. Speaker, my volunteer firefighters aren't employees. We are going to drive volunteer fire companies out of business.

This train wreck continues.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve better.

A LESSON IN HOW FAR THIS COUNTRY HAS MOVED

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was grateful to hear from my dear friend—and I do mean dear friend. I think greatly of Ms. KAPTUR. I was glad to hear somebody has gotten a good report on the so-called Affordable Care Act.

We are continuing to hear sad story after sad story of people continuing to be laid off, people continuing to be cut from full-time to part-time and people being forced onto food stamps because they just can't make it with the loss of income going from full-time to part-time, the loss of their insurance.

And as people have now realized across the country, though we were told there were 30 million without insurance, it looks like by next fall, November of next year, there will probably be many more than that that lost their insurance even though they liked it and wanted to keep it. Because, as we know, if you like your insurance, there is a good chance you won't be able to keep it.

There is a story from December 11, ''Four in Ten Would Rather Pay Fine Than Buy Insurance.''

I am sure there are people like me. You take a look at how much the insurance is going to cost, how much it has skyrocketed several times more than what I have been paying if I were going to keep insurance with the deductible now skyrocketing and dramatically increasing under the potential policies, higher than what I have now, and when I look at the costs several times higher than what I have now, and since I am not accepting the subsidy and I am not paying into the attending physician for that care, I will be going without insurance.

It has been amazing to me how many in the liberal media—and I say ''media'' loosely, because they are really in the business of trying to protect this administration and twist stories any way they can to make anyone who objects to something this administration has done look bad, so I will loosely

refer to them as ''media''—how they have been aghast that anyone would even consider going without insurance. And it really is a lesson in how far this country has moved, in so many ways.

□ 1645

I know, in the early sixties, there was no such thing as Aid to Dependent Children, that program born out of the best of intentions because deadbeat dads were not a small minority of Americans. Different races, different backgrounds—some even well-off—were just not assisting financially the children they had fathered, and so the government wanted to help.

So, in the mid-sixties, here came the Great Society. We want to help these people—these poor moms—who had to deal with deadbeat dads who wouldn't help. They said, We will help. We will give them a check for every child they can have out of wedlock. As people who study governments and government assistance, it is well documented: when you pay for an activity, you get more of that activity. We went from 6 to 7 percent of children in America being born without a father in the home to now over 40 percent, and it still seems to be heading upwards toward 50 percent. The United States Government in the 1960s, not by what it said but by where it put its money, decided we would be a lot better off with more fatherless homes. Nobody was saying that, and I don't believe anybody intended that result, but it is what they got. In the act of paying people for an activity, you get more of that activity. So we had more children growing up in fatherless homes.

Also, back in those days, health care was so much cheaper. It wasn't at the extraordinary level that it is now. It wasn't nearly as expensive. Even though I was a small child, I didn't know people who had health insurance because, for so long, nobody had health insurance. If you had a problem, you went to the doctor, and they assessed you a charge after your visit, after they saw what the doctor did. He would write something down on your chart. We went to a few different doctors there in my small hometown of Mount Pleasant—a great town. I still love it. There are still great doctors there—but back in those days, people in my hometown in east Texas knew what doctors were charging what for what. I mean, you could actually compare apples and apples when it came to health care. If you found out some doctor said he was going up on his prices and another doctor had not gone up on his prices, then you went to the doctor who was cheaper unless you felt like he wasn't as good, but we had a number of really excellent doctors, and they cared about their patients.

Then, eventually, you heard of somebody having health insurance, and it was true insurance. A small premium was paid either monthly, quarterly, semiannually or annually, but it was a small premium to insure against a catastrophe—a dramatic illness, a car wreck—something that you could not foresee. You paid a small premium to insure against this unforeseen event just in case it happened down the road because, during those days, Americans were very independent. Americans did not want to go on welfare. Most Americans did not want to receive government handouts—they felt like it was a matter of pride—and they certainly did not want an insurance company telling them what doctor they could go to, what hospitals they could go to or which hospitals they couldn't go to, which doctors they couldn't go to, which medicines they could not get if the doctor prescribed them. They didn't want an insurance company telling them, if they needed to go to this doctor because he was an expert on this type of treatment, that you couldn't go there because it wasn't in your plan. What plan? I am the only one who is planning for my life. No insurance company is going to tell me where I can or can't go. I mean, that was the type of independent thought that there was in America.

There were a lot of problems in those days, and I thank God for Martin Luther King, Jr., because, through his actions and his life and his efforts, through peaceful protest—some around him got upset and didn't always abide by peace, but the man proclaimed everything needed to be done in peace because he was an ordained Christian minister, and he knew those were the teachings of Jesus. Because he did what he did, some people say that what he did for America was he allowed African Americans to be treated as equals. I would submit to you, since I was very young, what he did was allow me to grow up and mature in an America in which as a young, white Christian I could treat brothers and sisters like they were brothers and sisters. It didn't have to matter what color anybody's skin was. They could be judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin. That was a great thing for America.

As we progressed toward making America a greater place with more liberties, more equality, more freedom, at the same time—really unrelated—there was this effort of let's start giving money from the government to individuals or to individual programs that, though unintended, would make them more dependent upon the government for their lives and their livelihoods. People quit thinking as independently. Oh, well. The government is giving me money, so maybe they would do good to tell me what I can or can't do with a few things. Then, eventually, more and more employers had employees saying, Hey, I know this other company. Their employer is buying health insurance for their employees. That would be helpful because then I wouldn't have to ever worry about having a terrible accident or some cancer or some terrible disease that would bankrupt my family. So more employers started adding health insurance to their benefits. Unfortunately, it created a system in which the employer owned the insurance policy instead of the employee. The employer was paying for it, so the employer owned it.

One of the reforms that many of us were proposing, instead of the catastrophe known as the so-called Affordable Care Act, was that we wanted employees to own their insurance policies. Fine and dandy if an employer wanted to pay for insurance, but the employees should own them so that, if the employees go somewhere else, they are still their policies. They are portable, and they go with them. They still pay the same rates, and they aren't jacked up through a COBRA plan or something like that. Somehow, along the way, we grew more and more dependent on insurance companies to manage our own health care, and at the same time, as things like Medicare were created to help those seniors who needed help, more and more dependence grew upon the government, itself. The problem with an insurance company or with a government managing someone's health care is that they get to say what you get and what you don't get in the way of treatment.

So it has been quite an evolution to the point at which we are now where your religious beliefs, under the United States Constitution, have been so weakened and so nullified that now the United States Government can pass a law like the so-called Affordable Care Act—it is hard for me to just call it the ''Affordable Care Act'' because it is so disastrously expensive and unaffordable for so many people, including for me now.

The government could say, You may believe with all of your heart because of your religious conviction that abortion is the murder of a life and being, but we, the government, now control your health care, and you don't have that religious choice anymore. Oh, it may be a matter of conscience. It may be that, without regard for religion, you believe that killing a life and being that could live on its own outside the womb would be murder, but we, the government, now say you have to help pay for that type of murder. Even 20 years ago, nobody would have believed that we would get to the point where the government could order an American to pay for the killing of another, albeit an unborn child.

I guess it really comes home to me because of our first child being born 8 to 10 weeks prematurely and holding her in two hands. I could have held her in one hand, and I kind of did from time to time, but usually, in those early days, I used two just because she was so fragile, and I just did not want to risk someone I loved so much being harmed. The doctor there at the hospital in Shreveport, where our child was taken—she was very fragile—said, Look, talk to your child. She knows your voice. Her eyes don't work very well, but she knows your voice because

she could hear your voice when she was in the womb. It is very comforting, and it really gives her a feeling of security to hear your voice. If you just caress her little arm or her little forehead while you talk to her, it is such a comfort. She knows you. She can't see you, and she doesn't know what you look like, but this child has known you from long before she was born, so talk to her and touch her.

I put my finger down by her hand. So many people have had this happen, but when it happens to you, it is so special. This tiny, little hand would wrap around the end of my finger and just hang on and not let go. She wanted to live. She knew me, as the doctor said, before she was ever born. The doctor pointed out later as he came by—as we noticed on the monitors—her breathing was still extremely shallow as her lungs were not quite developed, and her heart rate was still escalated, but they stabilized as long as she was holding on. He said, She draws security. She draws life. She draws your love. So, in my heart, in my mind, in my soul, I know that child knew me before she was born, and I was a comfort to her. My wife had to stay in the hospital in Tyler for a few days. It was really emotionally difficult, as well as physically, what she had been through.

But now the government would say, Though it may absolutely devastate you and break your heart to know of some young girl who wants an abortion, you are going to have to help pay for it—pay for the abortion.

□ 1700

Even 20 years ago, that would have seemed inconceivable that anybody in the United States, any governmental entity—whether it is executive, legislative or judicial—would say even though they support abortion they are going to make somebody who had religious beliefs fervently against it pay for it. But under ObamaCare, under the so-called Affordable Care Act, that has happened.

Some of us told the President we have solutions; we have sent word to the White House many times we have solutions. We have been told—and we heard the President say it again here recently in the last few days—that they don't have any solutions. I remember him saying those same things back 4 years ago when, obviously, it was spoken out of ignorance. I know he didn't intend to deceive anybody. He apparently did not know that there were people who had great alternatives.

For my part, the bill I proposed, the solution I proposed, would return control of people's health care to themselves. If you like Medicare and you are a senior, great, stay on Medicare; but if you would like a Cadillac policy, not a bronze but a gold-plated, platinum-plated policy, then we will pay for that. Say $5,000 now might be an appropriate—of course, some of the policies I was looking at, a $5,000–$6,000 deductible, policies like that makes them a lot cheaper for seniors—and then give the seniors the cash for the whole deductible so they wouldn't be out a dime.

I proposed that to representatives of the AARP. They were so gracious, came to my office, I explained it: this would be so awesome for seniors because it means they will never have to buy another supplemental policy; they will never have to buy another wrap-around insurance policy. And seniors' money is so tight on Social Security. It is really tight. I know a family that struggled, but they bought the supplemental policy.

Now, won't that be great? I know AARP cares so much about seniors. This would be great. Well, we will have to look at it, look at it closely, give us some more information and we will look at it. Stupid me, I was just too naive. I didn't know AARP made many more times off selling supplemental insurance than they did off membership dues or anything like that, that it was just a cash cow for AARP to sell supplemental insurance.

So, of course, they couldn't afford to say that a policy that just really was a wonderful thing for seniors—no more out-of-pocket for deductible, co-pay, this just took care of them, and they made their own choices, and they had a debit card to pay for their health care all the way through their deductible amount. How could I expect AARP when they are making hundreds of millions of dollars clear profit off of supplemental policies say, oh, let's forego the supplemental policies for the good of seniors. So, obviously, they didn't.

But we can and do have alternatives for health care reforms that are true reforms that get competition back in health care. How can you have a free market system working in health care if nobody knows what any procedure, anything really costs? If it is medicine, they know their co-pay.

We have got to get back to the point where people know what things cost and they have more direct control. If we get to a place where we are truly helping those who cannot help themselves and we make it advantageous for those to put in a health savings account money so that they can take care of their own deductible if they are under 65, they are not on Medicare and bill to that point, and then it becomes very clear that most people when they start at an early age will have so much money in their health savings account built up that they hadn't spent over the years that they not only will not want the government telling them what kind of health care they can have, they won't need it.

And then for those who are young and chronically ill that will never build up an HSA, those who are actually unable to help themselves, we help them. There is a very small percentage that would be; but under the Affordable Care Act, as it is called, unjustly, the government gets control. As I have said, it is all about the GRE, the government running everything. They get to run your lives because when they can control health care, they can control everything.

They control not only what is in your bedroom—I have heard so many folks on the other side of the aisle say, we don't want the government in the bedroom. Well, I don't either; but now by the bill they passed, ObamaCare basically puts the government in every room in your house. They tell you—well, it is just so invasive.

But if we can get back to the day where insurance companies and the government did not tell people what they could or couldn't have for their well-being, if we restored the independence to Americans by helping the economy just bring about a new economic renaissance—I have talked to so many people. They are in business and they are so afraid. They are afraid to hire anybody because of ObamaCare. They are afraid because of the EPA or the intrusiveness of the Justice Department, OSHA, all of these governmental agencies that come out of nowhere when you are trying to stay in business and keep your employees paid.

If they didn't have to worry so much about a government that is so invasive, this economy would take off. People would be making so many times more than what they are in so many places. We would end up being energy independent. What we thought we never could be 9 years ago when I first got here, we can be that. We use natural gas that we have got hundreds of years of. Just what we know, for goodness sake. Then we could be not only energy independent; that would mean we were not funding any country's terrorism where some of their energy money goes for terrorism. We would see an economic renaissance; we would see the economy explode, and people would have enough money.

With all the money they would be getting paid, they would be able to say, look, Doctor, I want to know how much you are charging and how much you are charging because you are both very good doctors. But if one of you is charging $6,000 for an MRI and one of you is charging $400 for an MRI—and I have been challenged on that and actually I am familiar with what some insurance companies have paid for MRIs over the years, because as an attorney when you help somebody who has been in a car wreck or been injured by the negligence of another, if you have a settlement or you win a court case, then you are required under Texas law to put that money in an escrow account and you cannot distribute it until such time as the medical has been paid. So you had to make sure everybody had been paid.

When they were paid in full, then you checked if there was a health insurance company. Okay, everybody says they have been paid in full; I have got documentation from all the health care providers you have paid them in full under

their agreement with you. So now all I need to know is how much you paid for these charges, and then I reimburse you, and then I can disburse what is in escrow.

There were companies that had paid less than $400 for an MRI, much less. So anyway, our CAT scans, it is amazing how little—and I have seen bills recently $6,000 being charged for an MRI. Well, they are not getting paid $6,000. But then, on the other hand, if you come in and say, I need an MRI, but I don't have insurance, then normally they will cut you a deal. Okay, you are paying cash, we may cut you a deal. Say they had a 50 percent off sale: we will only charge you $3,000. Well, for heaven's sake, why couldn't you just pay what Blue Cross paid? Why couldn't you pay what Aetna paid?

That is the kind of thing a real reform would get us back to. You don't get a bill for $6,000 or nobody goes to them anymore. You have to know what is being charged, and we have got to get control back to the individual.

Anyway, when you are looking at how much things cost, I can identify with people in America. We have three daughters; they finished their college. We had set money aside years ago when I was in private practice making more money—actually, in municipal bonds, and when they got in college it was going to more than take care of each year. But after I had a huge cut in pay to go become a State district judge—I felt like it was something of a calling, something to help my community, a way to give back, even though you really put a lid on what you can make financially—we ended up going through that money.

I was determined that my three girls would not have to pay college loans that they wouldn't have had to pay if their father had not gone into public service. This was my contribution to the community, to Texas, to the country. I shouldn't force a contribution onto my children when their college should have been taken care of. So my wife and I are paying the college loans for our children.

So when you start adding up the expenses and you see the amount of the loans and what has to be paid and then you see you have health insurance here that is now skyrocketing, deductible going dramatically up, wow. I know some have written, gee, what if you are in the hospital for a few days and run up $180,000 or so in health care costs? Well, the answer is easy. If I or my wife ran up $180,000 in health care costs and I don't have insurance, then I would go to the health care providers—as I have done back in the days when I was an attorney—what kind of deal can we cut here, because I pretty well know what the insurance companies are paying you and I expect to get the same kind of deal or we will go to another hospital that will do this kind of cash deal for us? Maybe you take out a note for $18,000 and pay everybody off.

I have been surprised, even conservatives in the media have not really been aware of how little health care actually costs. They see a bill, like one in the media that said, hey, my father had heart surgery, he could never have paid that $150,000 in expenses, but Medicare took care of it. And as I told him, if you think that costs $150,000, you are not near as smart as I used to think you were. But you negotiate and you work it out and you take out a note and you pay that off.

I know that there are people running around the country saying, oh, no, oh, no, what if you don't have insurance? Well, nobody in America had insurance at all not that long ago. I don't want to go back to those days. We have made so much progress. But why not build to the point where those who can build a health savings account do that?

I am encouraging our leadership: let's don't wait until ObamaCare comes crashing down and the world gets so angry that they demand a repeal and it does get repealed. Let's go ahead and start having hearings now on how good real reform would be, where we have competition, where people get to make their decisions, where people are encouraged to, and do, build a health savings account where they get to decide who they see, that there is no doctor that is out of the plan.

We need to restore liberty to Americans while giving them a safety net, not a trap net from which you can never arise. It ought to be a safety net where you can come out of; but it is more like we are capturing Americans with a net thrown over them and the government now has that net over you and you can never get out from under. We control everything about you.

And now we have added 18,000, or we are in the process of adding 18,000 IRS agents. If you think a proctologist looks closely into your situation, wait until the IRS agents get hold of you.

□ 1715

I mean it should not be that way. We have got to restore freedom in America. This article says, ''4 in 10, we would rather pay the fine than buy insurance.'' People in the media are freaking out, how stupid, how crazy. Well, actually, it doesn't help the survival of ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act, as it is improperly named.

My staff has given me this. We just had someone else report that here is another constituent whose policy expires July 2014, but they stand to lose $40,000 if they try to keep it. They can't get definitive information, but they had to make a decision by December 7, and they don't know what to do. And they are sure not getting that help from the Web site.

Here is an article, ''Oregon signs up just 44 people for ObamaCare despite spending $300 million.'' Well, there was a great investment. Well, probably as good as investing it in Solyndra and all the other solar companies. ''Paper Application Missing From Healthcare .gov,'' another great article, Jeryl Bier from the Weekly Standard. ''ObamaCare sign-ups rise, but 800,000 short of their goal.'' All of these are really harbingers of the complete failure of ObamaCare.

I don't mean anything derogatory by using the term ''ObamaCare.'' I am sure that President Obama didn't mean anything derogatory by calling health care in Massachusetts ''RomneyCare.'' So just as I am absolutely certain the President never meant—and Democrats never meant—anything offensive by using the term ''RomneyCare,'' we don't mean anything offensive or derogatory by using the term ''ObamaCare.'' The President embraced it one time.

Anyway, it requires looking at more closely the reforms that need to be made. I would rather have insurance. I wasn't crazy about my insurance, but I liked it okay. We had health savings accounts. We have got to work out what do we do with the money we built up in our health savings account. Hopefully, Aetna is not going to screw us over and not let us have the money we built up.

There were certainly some reforms that needed to be made to the health savings account law so that we do have more flexibility. You could put unlimited amounts in there, but once it is in there, it has to be used for health care. You can't pay a penalty and fine and take some out. So that you build some up, you could give some of your HSA out to, say, a Salvation Army HSA.

I know there is not one out there right now, but those kind of things. You could gift some of your HSA to your children without tax implications. You have money in your HSA when you pass away, then you could leave it to your heirs or to a charity HSA. I mean, there are all kinds of great things that we could do if we passed proper laws to make this work better.

But the goal would ultimately be to have health care affordable. The President and so many keep saying, you know, interchangeably, health care and health insurance. They are not the same thing. You can get health care without having any health insurance. I know that because I have waited hours behind people in the emergency room with children or with family, seniors. I have known that people ahead of us, that didn't have any money, didn't have any insurance, they got health care just like I did, at the emergency room. That was when I had insurance and my in-laws had insurance, Medicare, but everybody was getting the same kind of care.

So health insurance and health care for my liberal friends in the media, Mr. Speaker, they are not the same thing. They are not the same thing at all.

SYRIA

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I also want to comment before we're done here today about what is going on in Syria, because there is so much false information going on. There are many really fine people, including friends in

the Senate who are smart people but are just actually ignorant of the facts on the ground there.

This administration had decided that we should support the Syrian rebels. There are indications that this administration, because Congress has not specifically appropriated in so long, the administration figuratively has got sacks of money and so they decided, Oh, we will support the rebels in Syria.

Now, 2 to 3 years ago, it might well have been Syrians who were not radical Islamists, who wanted freedom, but this government didn't step in until the rebels were infused with and really governed by more radical Islamists.

The stories that are going on in Syria, just like others in the Middle East, the horrors of what the Muslim Brotherhood, the radical Islamists were doing in Egypt, especially after Morsi got arrested—this administration blamed the military when actually, as the Egyptian pope told me, this was not a coup. This was the Egyptian people rising up, wanting to be free of radical Islamists leading.

These were moderate Muslims, secularists, Christians, hand in hand, arm in arm, protesting, demanding Morsi be forced out by the military. It was an uprising of greater numbers than participated in the American Revolution. The Egyptians rose up in greater numbers than they ever have in the world. They were seeking both moderate Muslims, Christians, Jews, secularists, other religions. They were just wanting not to be ruled by radical Islam.

Instead, this administration and some Senators, including from my party, felt like we ought to be helping the rebels that were just really infused and overtaken by radical Islamists.

As moderate Muslims told a few of us in Congress back in September: What do you guys not understand? I mean, it was the Muslim Brotherhood that really was behind the attack on 9/11/2001. It was technically the Taliban, but basically it is Muslim Brotherhood you were at war with in Afghanistan. It is Muslim Brotherhood that you have now helped in Libya, helped in Egypt, now helping in Syria. What do you not understand? These are the guys that have been at war with you. We are moderate Muslims. We don't want them taking over things.

For some reason, it sure seems to be because of the advice this administration is getting from people that Egyptian media had indicated were Muslim brothers at the highest levels of advice that this administration gets. But as a result, this administration thinks we need to keep helping these radical Islamist-infused rebels that are absolute terrorists. They are doing the most unthinkable, unimaginable acts to Christians, especially Christians. And as a report in Britain has indicated recently, Christians are the most persecuted group in the world right now. This administration is choosing to help the people over and over, help the people, help the groups that are most radically brutalizing Christians.

Here is an article from The New York Times, ''Brutality of Syrian Rebels, Posing Dilemma in West.'' It talks about just the horror and the disgusting nature of the killings that were going on against unarmed civilians, and yet we are supporting the rebels?

Here is one, ''Media urge Syrian rebels to stop kidnappings.'' Hmm, well, fortunately that was written a long time ago.

Here is one, ''2 Bishops, Priest, 12 Nuns Still Missing After Being Kidnapped By Syrian Rebels,'' by Lee Keath of the AP. It talks about the horrible nature of those kidnappings.

I had the honor of having a visit today by Mother Agnes.

Some in the left-wing media who were so overwhelmed with trying to protect this administration, they don't want to look facts in the face. They want to try to destroy the reputation of anyone with whom they disagree. They have taken Voltaire's attributed line, ''I disagree with what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say that,'' and kind of disintegrated it into ''I disagree with what you say, and I want to destroy you for doing so.''

I have read a number of terrible things about Mother Agnes in the last couple of days, but I met with her. Some had written that she is just the basic primary defender of the Assad regime. She told me she is not defending Assad; he is a bad man. But, as she said with a little twinkle in her eye, the media is getting out in the open everything that seems to be done wrong by the Assad regime. Anything brutal, anything inappropriate the media is getting that out there. I am just trying to get the full story out.

Yes, Assad is not a good man, but the people that are trying to take over now are worse. She knew these nuns who had been kidnapped. She knew these people who had been persecuted and brutalized. She knew of people personally of having unthinkable acts done to them by these Syrian rebels that this administration has been choosing to help.

Well, we get finally to a story that says that the administration was going to cut off—I thought I had it here—but a story about the administration would suspend assistance to the rebels because of the horrors and the brutality of what they were doing. That is nice, but these stories have been coming out for years, for at least a couple of years. Stories even here from The New York Times, ''Brutality of Syrian Rebels Posing Dilemma in West,'' that story was September 5. And around those same times there were stories about this administration sending hundreds of tons of weapons to these people who were brutalizing Christians.

How long does it take? I realize there are all kinds of things that demand people's time when you are a leader of a great Nation like the United States. You have to stop and do a selfie from time to time. There are all kinds of things that disrupt your time. But at some point, somebody should have gotten information and said, Look, you know, you want to help the radicalist Islamist rebels in Syria. Really, some of the brutality on Christians has really gotten kind of rough even for us. Maybe we ought to suspend that. That should have gone on months ago. And yet this administration was determined to help.

''Syrian Rebels Attack Christian Village, Behead Priest,'' Katie Pavlich. Whew, man.

□ 1730

Rebels have attacked a Christian village in the war-torn country of Syria, beheading priests, brutally killing others. Not surprisingly, the rebels have ties to al Qaeda.

This is from townhall.com:

The rebels launched the assault on the ancient Christian village of Maaloula—which is on a UNESCO list of tentative World Heritage sites. The village, about 40 miles, 60 kilometers, northeast of Damascus, is home to about 2,000 residents, some of whom still speak a version of Aramaic, the ancient language of biblical times believed to have been spoken by Jesus.

Heavy clashes between President Bashar Assad's troops and Nusra Front fighters persisted in surrounding mountains Thursday, according to the Observatory, which collects information from a network of anti-regime activists.

Speaking by phone from a convent in the village, a nun told The Associated Press that the rebels left a mountaintop hotel Thursday after capturing it a day earlier. The nun said the frightened residents expect the Islamic militants to return to the Safir hotel and resume shelling of the community.

''It's their home now,'' the nun said.

Al Qaeda-led rebel force groups have also reportedly vowed to continue their attacks on Christians as soon as the United States ''liberates'' the country from its President Bashir al-Assad.

Yesterday, Republican Senator John McCain inserted an amendment into a resolution approving military force in Syria with a goal of shifting the power on the battlefield from the Assad regime and to rebel forces.

On September 4, 2013, JOHN MCCAIN said:

My amendment calling for changing momentum on the battlefield in Syria passed SFRC by voice vote, a significant measure.

Meanwhile in Egypt, Coptic Christians continue to be slaughtered and nearly 100 churches have been burned to the ground.

President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry haven't commented on the brutality against Christians in Syria and have done very little to protect Christians living in Egypt from violence being waged by the Muslim Brotherhood.

An objective look at what happened in Egypt is very clear. After the masses, the millions of Egyptians rose up and said, Enough. President Morsi has been usurping powers that don't belong to him under our Constitution. And under the Egyptian Constitution, there is no power of impeachment. So we demand that the military remove this unconstitutionally acting leader so that we can set up new elections.

I am urging the people in Egypt to go ahead and get those elections done so you get back to having a more democratic process, having a more republican form of government. I don't mean republican like the Republican Party. I am talking about Republic as Ben Franklin when the lady asked what have you given us, and he said, ''A Republic, Madam, if you can keep it.''

It was clear that Morsi was not going to allow the Egyptian people to keep their republic. The people rose up and demanded that they be able to keep their republic by having the military remove Morsi. They did remove him. I still can't find anyone in the media that is reporting what General al-Sisi said to me in the presence of our acting U.S. Ambassador to Egypt, in the presence of Democrat and Republican Members of Congress that, yes, they had evidence that Morsi was trying to contract to have General al-Sisi murdered before he was arrested.

Yet this administration, not only was very supportive of Muslim Brother Morsi, but when he was removed, they threatened to cut off aid if they didn't get him back. And after they refused to get him back, then this President cuts off all aid to Egypt. It is amazing because, as this article points out, it was not until Morsi was arrested that the Muslim Brotherhood started staging these violent acts—burning churches, killing Christians. They were persecuting anyone who disagreed with them. The military did a very good thing. They cracked down on the Muslim Brotherhood, they stopped the burning of churches, they stopped the killing of Christians. As the Egyptian Pope has told me:

> They did a good thing. We are not threatened like we were before they stopped it all. Please, tell your government that the military has stopped the burning of churches and killing of people. It is a good thing.

How did this administration respond to the Egyptian people ensuring that the burning of churches and the killing of Christians stopped? It rewarded those noble efforts by cutting off aid.

As we keep hearing from allies in the Middle East, Muslim, other religious beliefs, you guys keep helping the wrong people. How can you not understand you are helping the people that hate you. Now they are cutting a deal with Iran, led by Wendy Sherman, who was the policy director for North Korea when President Clinton and Madeleine Albright made that atrocious deal to give them nuclear power plants, nuclear help, and in return all they had to do was promise not to develop nuclear weapons, which they readily did. In return, the Clinton administration agreed not to inspect their nuclear facilities for what amounted to about 5 years. It gave them plenty of time to develop nukes.

If someone is evil enough to behead, to brutalize, to persecute innocent people, to somehow think it is a noble thing to terrorize and kill innocent people, how do you not understand that they are also capable of lying, as well? You want to trust people that want to kill you and have said so many times? I think it is time we wake up. The world is less safe because of some of the actions that we have taken. We need to be wise about what we do because just as Jesus said, To whom much is given, of him much will be required.

We have been given much. We have been blessed more than any nation in the world. We have more freedoms. We have more assets. We have been blessed more than any nation in history. Much is required, and part of that requirement is that we use wisdom and discernment in choosing those whom we wish to help; and we should not be helping people who choose to kill or brutalize, persecute people because of their religious beliefs, because of their tribe, because of their skin color, because of their national origin. That is un-American, and it is time we stopped helping people who are acting in ways contrary to what we hold dear.

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

THE DECLINE IN U.S. RESEARCH

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are going to discuss the National Institutes of Health.

In many respects, the National Institutes of Health is the goose that keeps laying the golden eggs, the golden eggs that help cure many of the maladies that many Americans suffer from, the goose that lays the golden eggs that create jobs, the goose that lays the golden eggs that help us bring down the cost of health care. But we are at the brink, we are at the tipping point of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Let's put it in perspective. Not so long ago, then-President George Bush was part of a bipartisan effort to double the funding for the National Institutes of Health. It was $21 billion. Doubling of the resources for the NIH was extraordinary and received with great fanfare and appreciation because there was so much that the researchers were ready to do with that money.

What have we done since then? Since then, in 2003 dollars, we have seen a gross decline in the money to fund the National Institutes of Health. Now it is down to the equivalent of $17 billion. So for the next hour, we are going to talk about what that means to every American who is suffering from a cancer, for every American that is suffering with a chronic disease like diabetes, for every American who is suffering from Alzheimer's and whose family is trying to cope with it.

Former Republican Senator and Majority Leader Bill Frist recently wrote:

> When Alzheimer's is cured, when HIV is cured, when MS is cured, I want it to be America that discovers the breakthroughs and shares it with the world.

I agree with Dr. Frist. I want to see that happen too. I would like to think that every Member in this House wants to see that too, but it is not going to happen if we keep starving the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Let me read you another quote:

> Whenever you hear about a research breakthrough in anything to do with cancer, diabetes, heart disease, HIV/AIDS, influenza, whatever, in the United States, it's extremely likely that NIH supported that effort.

That was Dr. Francis Collins, head of the National Institutes of Health who made that statement. He also doesn't mince words. Recently, in response to sequester cuts to the NIH budget, he said:

> I think we'll no longer be the world leader in the production of science, technology, and innovation. You can't look at the curves and say, Oh, well, it'll be fine, if we stay on this track. It will not be. China is coming up so fast, they are so convinced that this is their pathway towards world leadership; they're not going to slow down.

He recently recounted a trip that he took to China in 2011 where he was taken on a tour of a former shoe factory. You need to know a little bit about the history of Dr. Francis Collins. He is called the ''father of the human genome project.'' He and a number of other scientists are responsible for absolutely unlocking DNA sequencing. So he was invited to China to see what they were doing.

He was taken to this old shoe factory, except it is not a shoe factory anymore. Inside that factory were 3,000 scientists who were focused on sequencing the human genome and the medical and economic potential of this technology. In fact, the capacity at that one factory is more than all of the genome sequencing centers in the United States.

Dr. Collins said to me with great sadness, Within 3 to 5 years, China will eclipse us.

Mind you, we have invested billions and billions of dollars in unlocking the human genome with the intent of seeing great strides made; but we are on the verge, we are at the tipping point of seeing this all come to a screeching halt if we continue to ignore the fact that we are starving the NIH.

Here is an interesting chart. This shows how much R&D spending is going on around the world. China from 2012 to 2013 had an increase of 15 percent.

□ 1745

Germany, up 5 percent, Japan up 5 percent, South Korea up 5 percent, Canada down 3 percent, the United States down 5 percent.

This says it all. If we don't want to see the outsourcing of medicine in this country, the outsourcing of science in this country, we have got a huge wake-up call that we must listen to.

I am joined this evening by my good friend from San Diego, SCOTT PETERS, who I want to engage with him and have him speak a little bit to this issue as well. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS of California. Thank you, Ms. SPEIER. I would like to thank you, my colleague from California, for organizing this discussion and for your continued efforts to end the assault on NIH funding.

Mr. Speaker, for decades, our country has been at the forefront of scientific discovery. We have had the friendliest atmosphere for scientists to do their work, for innovators to start their new ventures, and for universities to invest in research laboratories.

We are in danger of losing that competitive advantage, and the across-the-board sequester cuts, which I adamantly opposed during my time here, is only amplifying the decline.

Now, instead of supporting and promoting our country's robust backing for scientific and health research, we are undercutting it through congressional gridlock and government shutdowns.

This inability to find bipartisan agreement has undoubtedly harmed our national reputation and limits our ability to bring the best and brightest here from around the world.

Earlier this year, I toured the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda to visit some of their labs, to meet with patients and hear from its director, Dr. Francis Collins, about the work that NIH does and how the sequester has affected them.

Dr. Collins, as Ms. SPEIER said, has been a constant voice against the sequester and has vocalized the impact it has had on the ability of NIH to invest in necessary research and grants. Just this year, more than 700 grants were cut and the agency was forced to pare down its operations by $1.5 billion.

Dr. Collins told Sam Stein of the Huffington Post on the 10-year outlook, should sequester not end, and I quote, I think we may have just heard this quote:

> I think we will no longer be the world leader in the production of science, technology, and innovation.

As the largest funder of biomedical research in the world, the NIH is not only a significant driver of research and innovation, leading to improvements in quality of life and better patient care, but it also drives job creation in related fields.

In 2011, more than 400,000 jobs and $62 billion of economic activity came from NIH research funding. And on a health level, advances from NIH research can have enormous economic benefit for the global economy.

A 1 percent reduction in cancer deaths has $500 billion in economic value. Imagine what the power would be of delaying the onset of chronic diseases or finding cures to various types of cancer.

Importantly, NIH is also a significant funder of research universities across the country through its competitive grants. According to NIH documents, more than 80 percent of their budget is awarded to our country's universities and institutes, including $884 million in grants to San Diego institutions just in 2012.

In the last fiscal year, institutions in my district received more than 1,300 NIH grants. UC San Diego received almost $400 million through 802 grants in 2012 alone, supporting thousands of jobs in the San Diego region, and advancing our local innovation economy.

San Diego, depending on how you calculate it, is either the second or third largest life science cluster in the country. These companies and research institutions make up approximately one-third of San Diego's regional economy, generating more than 200,000 jobs.

Nationwide, life sciences companies support more than 7 million jobs, adding $69 billion in activity to our national economy.

Locally, Amplyx Pharmaceuticals received more than $1.5 million in NIH grants to research and develop new drugs to fight functional infections, and Digital Proteomics received a grant to research antibodies that target specific antigens, leading to better treatments for numerous diseases.

Other examples are the La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology, where they are researching breakthrough vaccines to some of the world's most damaging immune diseases, including type 1 diabetes and various types of cancer, and the Veterans Medical Research Foundation, where studies on PTSD and brain imaging are underway to better understand the impact of violence and conflict on the body and brain. These institutions have received numerous grants this year, totaling more than $30 million.

As the last local example, in 2011, the Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute received more than $70 million in NIH funding as part of its research in metabolic rates and obesity. And Scripps Research, also in San Diego, was awarded more than $200 million, part of which went to their research on determining the structure of H1N1, also known as the swine flu.

Mr. Speaker, there are countless examples across San Diego and the country like the ones I just named where researchers are doing groundbreaking research that has the potential to improve and extend lives. That is good for our economy, for the American people, and for the health of people across the world.

Clearly, not all scientific research can or should be funded by the Federal Government or NIH. I wouldn't advocate that, nor my colleagues, but I can't stand for continuing down the path of sequester, where we cut support for the hardworking scientists and researchers who have brought the United States to the front of the pack.

Later this week, I will be introducing a bill to extend the research and development tax credit and lower the barrier to collaborative research by encouraging collaboration and consortia. That is just one piece of a larger discussion we have to have as we look to reform the Tax Code so we incentivize innovators, entrepreneurs, and researchers to start their endeavors here in the United States.

Sam Stein also reported in the Huffington Post in August that nearly 20 percent of scientists were contemplating moving their operations overseas in part due to the sequester.

Other countries, China, Brazil, Germany, South Korea, Japan, Israel, they are making investments in science and in research and development that will threaten to leave us in the dust. Brain drain will be a reality if we do not act quickly, a phenomena that would affect many communities across the country in a very negative way, including my own.

On first read, the budget deal proposed last night by Senator MURRAY and Congressman RYAN, if it passes Congress later this week, would allow the NIH more flexibility. It would potentially bring back some funding to NIH and NSF over the next 2 years.

But let's be clear. Scientists, universities, and institutions are still looking at unstable long-term budgets where sequester looms over their head. And as lawmakers, we can't rest on this foolish sequester cut until these cuts are fully reversed.

Again, I want to thank Ms. SPEIER for organizing this Special Order. NIH funding and our Nation's overall support for basic scientific research funding and the innovation economy are central to the economic future of San Diego, of California, and of the entire country.

So I appreciate the opportunity to speak about ending the sequester, about promoting and increasing funding for basic scientific research, especially at NIH, and to a continued discussion here in Congress.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman from California for his articulation of what profound impacts it has certainly to the economy of California, but also to the country. And the point he made about having some kind of continuity and some certainty is critical to the future of science in this country.

All we have to do is look back to what then-President George Bush did when he and a bipartisan group of Members of Congress supported doubling the budget for the NIH. That was a plan conceived of where it was going to take place over 5 years. So there was continuity and there was a sense of certainty that funding would be there for the near and the long term.

So what does a moderate investment in NIH have as a catalyst, so to speak, for economic growth?

Well, it is similar to what happened when the government invested in the Internet and spurred dramatic growth in the previous decades. Where would we be today if the government had not funded the research that created the Internet?

Before ''google'' became a verb and we actually had to write and mail letters to our friends and families and call the doctor to find out about medical symptoms, before there was the Internet, there was, in fact, the U.S. Government standing behind sound science and research. So let's talk about what the NIH-funded research has meant for our economy and for our lives.

The U.S. medical innovation sector employs 1 million Americans, generates $84 billion in salaries annually, and exports $90 billion in goods and services. The economic value of gains in the U.S. life expectancy has been estimated at roughly $95 trillion from 1970 to 2000.

Now, that is looking at it from dollars and cents. But think about it in terms of people's lives, extending their lives. That is what is truly significant about this.

Now, since 1990, our Nation has gained about 1 year of longevity every 6 years with the help of NIH research. Medical research, the most advanced of which is often done here in the U.S., has saved millions of lives over the last few decades. Death rates for heart disease have dropped 65 percent over the last 60 years. That is a phenomenal number. Deaths from heart disease have dropped 65 percent over the last 60 years, in part, in a great part, due to NIH funding.

The stent that we use so commonly now with heart disease, discovered, created at NIH. Death rates from cancer down 12 percent, and death rates from strokes down 34 percent, all because of medical research going on right here in the United States, spurred by the help of NIH funding.

I yield to my colleague from California, ERIC SWALWELL, to speak about issues from his perspective.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you. And I do wish to thank Ms. SPEIER, my neighbor across the San Mateo Bridge, for hosting this Special Order hour on NIH funding.

This is not the first time I have had the opportunity to work with Ms. SPEIER on these issues. In fact, in my short year in Congress, Ms. SPEIER has hosted a number of different roundtables, informal and formal, on the importance of NIH funding, and it is appropriate for her district, having the birthplace of the United States' biotechnology research.

But it is also important that we want the biotech research to stay in the South San Francisco area, to stay in the East Bay area. And the folks in the district who are making advances that will hopefully bend the health care cost curves are counting on the United States Congress to keep NIH funding from being cut. And actually, it is my hope that we can increase it.

The cuts to the NIH mean that there are fewer opportunities right now for biomedical research in the United States. It means that the decline in funding is meaning that there are more promising paths outside the United States for the promising minds who are putting their careers into this research.

Faculty at top universities across the country are reporting cutting labor spending by 7 percent and operating with skeleton staffs, severely limiting job opportunities for any researcher that would want to go into this field. Over 50 percent of university scientists surveyed by the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology said that they had a colleague who had lost their job or expects to soon because of sequester cuts to NIH funding.

Also, in the United States, while we have been cutting funding, even before the sequester, other countries are increasing and expanding up their biomedical engineering sectors. A study this year found that nearly 20 percent of scientists are considering moving their careers abroad.

I have worked in my first year in Congress to support the NIH, signing on to a letter circulated by Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD from southern California supporting the NIH behavioral and social science research.

I also signed on to a letter supported by Representatives JAN SCHAKOWSKY and BILL YOUNG supporting research at NIH, including through the BRAIN Initiative and, finally, signed on to a letter to the Appropriations Committee asking for support for funding of NIH.

This afternoon, I distributed a letter to my colleagues in the bipartisan United Solutions Caucus, a freshman group of 30 Republican and Democratic freshmen Members, and we are asking them to support this new compromise budget, not because it does what we want, because I would like to see NIH funding go up, but because it will roll back some of the sequester cuts and restore some of the funding at NIH.

□ 1800

In my district, Ms. SPEIER's district, and across California, scientists are counting on us to restore the NIH funding, to actually increase it with the long-term goal of using NIH funding—the technology and the research that we can put in to bend the health care cost curves. If we don't do that, we are going to continue to see the discretionary spending in the United States continue to contract, and nondiscretionary spending for Medicare costs and Medicaid costs will continue to rise and balloon unless we get a hold by putting funding and research dollars into what can control these diseases and ailments that people in our districts are suffering from. And that only happens by putting research dollars into NIH.

So, again, I want to thank the gentlelady across the San Mateo bridge for her leadership on this issue.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman from California. And I thank him for recognizing so early in his career here in Congress the critical need we have not only to support NIH but also the biotechnology companies that are part and parcel of what California has become.

I am now joined by my distinguished colleague from California as well, from the San Diego area, SUSAN DAVIS, who has much more to tell us from her perspective and from her neck of the woods.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I thank Congresswoman SPEIER for having this Special Order today because the focus on NIH—you know, for so many families, it actually comes down to care for their loved one. That is what they know can happen as a result of proper granting at appropriate levels for the NIH. Simply put, it is really vital to the Nation's health. Without NIH funding, we will not see the breakthroughs that we have seen in the past. NIH funding has led to cures. It has led to treatments and preventions for truly some of the most horrific diseases of our day afflicting everyone.

You know, diseases don't pick and choose between infants and seniors, lower, middle and, we might say, upper class. They don't distinguish. It is kind of equal opportunity for all, and that is why they have to be targeted.

I have been a consistent coleader of the annual NIH appropriations letter, requesting that the House appropriate full funding for the NIH, and the return to full funding is absolutely essential.

NIH is unique in its function. We know that we have an active private sector in our country. That is wonderful. And we certainly see that in my community of San Diego, and my colleague Congressman PETERS talked about this earlier.

But the private sector simply does not have the ability to replace public investment in the NIH. They don't have it. That kind of basic research in science has to come from the United States Government. That is where it has always come from. It has come from there when we even look at the advancements that we have had in technology. And it certainly makes a difference when we think about what we are doing and what our friends, our allies around the world, and even some who are not allies, are doing in this area. So we have got to be competitive. It doesn't make any sense not to be.

We know that the NIH conducts and funds research that is just too expensive—too expensive and too risky for private industry to undertake a loan; and it has led us to major advancements in the understanding of diseases like Alzheimer's, cancer, and Parkinson's.

The research coming out of and the grants coming from NIH are a huge driver of our biotechnology industry; and that, in turn, contributes heavily to our economy. Particularly in San Diego, we see that every single day because that is where the hundreds of jobs, good-paying jobs that allow people to really reach their potential and be purposeful about their work, that is where that comes from.

NIH funding keeps researchers and graduate students employed doing

what they do best, investigating answers to our most complex medical mysteries: cancer, premature birth, heart disease, and so on. I have had these young scientists in my office talking about the fact that they may not stay with the field, a field that they love, because they can't get the grants. As we cut back, only the most experienced scientists get those grants, and they are good. But our young people may be even better, but we have got to give them a chance. We have got to give them a chance to move forward and do that.

More than 80 percent of the NIH budget goes to over 300,000 research personnel at more than 2,500 universities and research institutions throughout the United States. So that is affecting a lot more than California. It is affecting our colleagues around the country, and maybe they don't even realize what an impact that has.

In San Diego, we are fortunate. We have got a lot of researchers, a lot of scientists working hard; and they received $1.13 billion in NIH funding in 2012. It has sparked major breakthroughs, brings jobs to the region, and creates potential breakthroughs for millions around the country.

So we are doing our part; but, tragically, the sequestration requires NIH to cut 5 percent, or $1.55 billion, of its fiscal year 2013 budget. NIH must apply the cut evenly across the board, the way things are today. That is why we have to change that. I hope we will be able to do that. NIH must apply the cut evenly across all programs, projects, and activities which are primarily NIH institutes and centers. This means that every area of medical research will be affected by that. Every area. Not just the few that maybe we think don't need the help, but every area. This is an irrational, backwards-thinking policy that will harm millions of Americans—current patients and future ones—and cost us millions in economic output.

As a result of the sequester and the slashing of NIH funding, already approximately 640 fewer competitive research project grants will be issued from what we have already done; approximately 750 fewer new patients admitted to the NIH Clinical Center; no increase in stipends for National Research Service Award recipients in 2013; and a delay in medical progress.

You know, these medical breakthroughs that we have that benefit many of our patients, many of our constituents—and I know I have friends who have been the beneficiaries of some of those breakthroughs—they just don't happen overnight. In almost all instances, those discoveries result from years of incremental research to understand how diseases start and progress. Even after the cause and the potential drug target of disease is discovered, it takes an average of 13 years and $1 billion to develop a treatment for that target.

And what is difficult is that we know that a lot of people are waiting for some of those clinical trials because you have to be careful how that is done, and that takes time. It takes enough patience, enough people willing to take that risk so that we can see what happens over time. That is so important. And when we start breaking this up, the whole process doesn't work.

Cuts to research are delaying progress in medical breakthroughs, including development of better cancer drugs that zero in on a tumor with fewer side effects; research on a universal flu vaccine that could fight every strain of influenza without even needing a yearly shot; and the prevention of debilitating chronic conditions that are costly to society and delay development of more effective treatments for common and rare diseases affecting millions of Americans.

And, as I mentioned earlier, we lose the promising, accomplished scientists and researchers who are leaving the industry because of the loss or inability to get grants.

We see that faculty at top universities across the country are reporting cutting labor spending by 7 percent and operating with skeleton staffs, severely limiting job opportunities for new researchers. Over 50 percent of scientists surveyed by the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology said they had a colleague who has lost his job or expects to soon. Some of the scientists are not coming back. They are going elsewhere. They are going to those areas where we are competing because they can take a more stable position outside of the research sector here in the United States.

Do we want that? I don't think so. Quite simply, we are inflicting decades of damage with the sequester policy that we have, and I hope that that is going to change. It is not rational to do that. It is cruel. It is backwards. It is insanity.

Let's join together and undo—what we can agree on in a bipartisan basis—a foolish policy with an untold number of victims from every State and every city and town in this country. Let us work together to restore NIH funding immediately.

I thank my colleague.

Ms. SPEIER. Would the gentlelady entertain a question?

You were here when then-President Bush worked in a bipartisan fashion with the House and the Senate, the Republicans and the Democrats, to double the funding for NIH; and all we have seen since then is just an absolute cliff decline in funding.

What happened then that isn't happening now? How can we reinstate that kind of bipartisan sentiment?

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Well, I think we saw the leadership coming from President Bush at that time. And because we also had—those of us here on this side of the aisle, I think, in support, it was a bipartisan effort. We saw that leadership coming from the top; and that is what made a difference, because it was written into the budget.

Now, I must say, we weren't able to sustain some of that because of a number of reasons. And we were fighting two wars and then had a number of other issues that we needed to look at. But the reality is that that was maybe unique in some ways because it really came from leadership at the top. It was here, on our side of the House, and the House was supportive. The Senate was supportive, and the President was supportive. So it was really altogether. We don't see that leadership right now from the other side of the aisle.

Ms. SPEIER. Well, I thank the gentlelady for her passionate and clear-minded commentary on how critical this is for the entire country and to all the lives that are at risk, should we not fund NIH at a level that is going to come up with the next cure, the next blockbuster drug that is going to save lives and create longevity for so many Americans.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I thank my colleague.

Ms. SPEIER. We are joined by the Congressman from northern California, my colleague for many years, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, who is no stranger to this floor for Special Orders, I might add.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative SPEIER, thank you so very much. It is good to be on the floor. I noticed thus far it has been Californians, but this is far more than California. I see Chicago, Illinois, just arrived, and we will pick up on that.

This is an issue that touches every single American. It is not a California issue. I represent northern California, not far from the Bay Area. The University of California/Davis campus is in my area. There are major, major programs in research, not just with the National Institutes of Health and the health issues that we are talking about here, but agriculture, energy research, and on and on.

It turns out that that powerful engine of research is found in every part of America. So listen out there, those of you that are watching. This is not just a California issue. This is an American issue, and it is an international issue because this particular National Institutes of Health is dealing with the health of this entire world. Every person in the world is, in one way or another, affected by the research done by the National Institutes of Health, the funding that they, then, provide to the 250 universities all around this Nation to deal with illnesses, to deal with the human body and beyond.

For example, Davis, which was originally known as an agricultural research institution and continues to do that, has discovered that, interestingly enough, with the mad cow issue, there is a virus that can be identified specifically with that illness so that for the cattle industry, if some cow goes a little weird, you can find out whether it has mad cow disease or it is just weird. And the very same thing applies to the

human body. So this virus can be identified both in a cow—is it mad or not? Well, it may just be angry but not crazed—and in a human.

Dealing with a very, very serious human issue and also a serious economic issue for those of us in the cattle business. This is a big thing. And what has happened—I love charts.

Ms. SPEIER. As do I.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I noticed, Representative SPEIER, that you love charts too. So I borrowed this. I think you used it earlier today. This is instructive.

You were just talking with the Representative, our friend from San Diego, about the enormous increase that took place for the National Institutes of Health during the George W. Bush conservative period of time. It is right there, $21 billion; and then over the years, it began to lose a little bit of its, I guess, interest. And then, as we went into the late years of the George Bush administration, it dropped down there. And then, of course, the great crash. A little bump here, which I think is the stimulus bill, pushing more money into research at the National Institutes of Health. And then we have seen, beginning in 2010, what has got to be one of the stupidest policies this Nation has engaged in.

□ 1815

It happened to be in 2011, when the House changed from Democratic control to Republican control. We have seen a very steep decline—a $1.5 billion reduction and annual decline in the National Institutes of Health.

This same decline in the last 3 years is what is the result of the austerity budgets that have been imposed upon us by the Republicans trying to solve the national deficit by cutting Federal expenditures. The entire European community has come to the conclusion that doesn't work. Austerity budgeting does not increase economic growth. It has caused stagnation. Certainly, in Europe we are beginning to see, I think, a large part of the slow growth in the United States caused by austerity budgets.

But specifically to the health care of Americans—our health, our well-being—this is really serious. This means people are going to have additional illnesses. You spoke earlier about some of those, like diabetes. Diabetic research funding is cut through the National Institutes of Health.

This one I really find frightening. I find this frightening because this is very personal. My mother-in-law spent the last 2 years of her life with a very, very serious case of Alzheimer's disease. She died in a hospice program in our home. We, I suppose, were a very small part of this because we took care of her. But right now we are spending $200 billion a year dealing with Alzheimer's.

We know that the population is going to increase and the elderly population is going to skyrocket as the baby boomers move into their later years. By 2050, it will be $1.2 trillion for Alzheimer's.

Is there anybody in America, any family in America, that is not concerned about Alzheimer's? I don't know who they are. I know my family is concerned about it. Every family that I know—and I know many because I have been in public life for a long time and met perhaps thousands, or hundreds of thousands, of people—and every single one of them is concerned about Alzheimer's.

This is the financial side of it. The human side of it, I can tell you, is serious. I can tell you the effect it has.

Ms. SPEIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would.

Ms. SPEIER. To your point, this $1.2 trillion in the year 2050 is coming from all the taxpayers in this country. Because these are Medicare patients. These are Medicaid patients. What would be really stunning is to understand that if we were able to delay the onset or progression of Alzheimer's by 6 years, it could produce an annual savings of $51 billion in 2015, $126 billion in 2025, and a whopping $444 billion—almost half a trillion dollars—in the year 2050, when that cost is going to skyrocket to $1.2 trillion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am so glad you interrupted because that is an extremely important fact.

Let's go back and look at that. In 2015, the savings are how much?

Ms. SPEIER. They are $51 billion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. They are $51 billion. We are going through this budget exercise where, by the way, the sequestration cut continues, although the across-the-board is eliminated. Half of the sequestration cut will continue because of this budget, but we will be able to try to balance out the prioritization.

But the total savings in 2015 is less than the $50 billion that you have suggested could be saved if we could extend the onset and the severity of Alzheimer's. We watched this very closely in my family. The fact of the matter is that the National Institutes of Health's funding for Alzheimer's is coming to understand the nature of Alzheimer's and, therefore, how to deal with it.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you for yielding. Both of you are absolutely right. It is so shortsighted to have us cut back on funding for the National Institutes of Health and their research agenda. When you make a cut in this area one year, it isn't like you can make it up the next year. Researchers go on to other fields.

It is shortsighted to make these kinds of cuts.

I also wanted to comment on the fact that every day members of the Safe Climate Caucus have come to this House floor and talked about the shortsightedness of the leadership of the House of Representatives in ignoring the science on climate change. And so every day we have had speakers—the gentleman from California has been one of them—to just use a minute to talk about this pressing issue.

Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal reported that China has released a national blueprint for adapting to climate change. This follows the International Energy Agency's recent prediction that China will install more renewable energy over the next two decades than the U.S. and Europe combined. And China has recently implemented a series of regional cap-and-trade programs which are putting a price on carbon in China.

According to the Chinese Government—and I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity—climate change has already cost its people tens of billions of dollars and potentially thousands of lives. These developments in China are important because China is the world's largest emitter of carbon pollution, and we are the second largest. Our two countries need to play a leading role in addressing this global threat.

President Obama is committed to global leadership. His climate action plan calls for working with China and other nations to bend the post-2020 emissions trajectory. He is bringing in John Podesta, an experienced leader with a deep understanding of climate issues, to help him succeed.

We in the House need to stop being part of the problem and start being part of the solution. We need to start taking the climate threat seriously and work to find solutions. If China can take action on climate change, so can the U.S. If we don't, we will lose the race to develop the clean energy technologies that will power the future.

Let's not be shortsighted. Let's invest in research—research to protect our health and research to protect our planet.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. WAXMAN, for bringing up the leadership that China has.

I notice that the leader of our hour talked about China's leadership in another field.

Let me turn back to our leader, Representative SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I just point out that China is eating our lunch, so to speak.

This is just the funding from 2012 and 2013. We referenced this earlier. And Congressman WAXMAN was talking about what they are doing relative to climate change. Look what they are doing in R&D spending in the last 2 years. It is up 15 percent. Germany, Japan, and South Korea are up 5 percent. Where is the United States, Mr. GARAMENDI?

Mr. GARAMENDI. In the red, going down.

Ms. SPEIER. That is right: a cut of 5 percent. So another example of how China is going to eclipse us in more ways than one. And those young researchers that we have been talking about are going to be going to China to do their research.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might just add to that, it is my understanding—and I get this from the University of California-Davis—that they are losing their new Ph.D.s to other countries, particularly to China and to India, because those countries are not only increasing their total research but they are also providing these very bright, innovative, forward-thinking Ph.D.s with a full laboratory and all of the support that they might need to continue to conduct their research not only on the issue of health care but also in all of the sciences and technologies, from high technology, energy, and so forth.

So we really need to get on it.

My final point is here twofold. First of all, if we are going to build this economy, there are five things we have to do consistently through time. And they require public investment.

First of all, education. You have got to have the best educated workforce in the world.

Secondly, you have to have the best, most advanced research because that is where the future is. That is where the future economic growth will come from.

You need to make the things that come from that. You need to have the infrastructure, and you need to think globally. We are not doing that.

The budgets that have been put forth by our colleagues on the Republican side go exactly the other direction. They cut educational funding, beginning with early childhood education. They cut the funding for research. You see it here.

Tomorrow, we are going to take up the new budget. It continues to cut research across the board, the National Institutes of Health probably included. It goes on and on. Transportation, infrastructure—forget it, there is no money for it.

We have got to turn that around. These are the fundamental investments of economic growth and, more important, social justice.

Congresswoman SPEIER, thank you so much. You have been at this, beating this drum. Don't stop. You stay with this. This is a message that the American public has to understand. These are the investments about our own personal health, our children's health, and our future economic growth, as well as addressing worldwide problems.

Thank you so very much for what you are doing here and for loaning me your charts.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman from California for lending his support and his articulation of this issue.

To his point about the jobs being lost, this year's sequester cuts were estimated to result in the loss of more than 20,000 jobs and $3 billion in economic activity.

The three scientists who won the Nobel Prize for medicine this year for their research on how cells swap proteins all received NIH funding at some time during their careers. Nobel Prize winner Rothman said he probably would not have started his research had NIH funding not been available.

So that, I think, speaks volumes about how important NIH funding is to young scientists.

I am now joined by my great friend, a great, passionate leader on so many issues before this House, my colleague from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you. I want to thank Congresswoman SPEIER for leading this really important debate.

We have been talking lately about how we are not going to be able to compete for the economic development in research and biotechnology and all the things that we do at the NIH. But I also want to show how economically—with one of your charts—it really doesn't work for us here at home as well.

Pretty much all you can see are the red lines, which are the costs every year in the United States of common diseases.

As my colleague, Congressman GARAMENDI, pointed out, we have $203 billion a year that Alzheimer's costs our society as a whole. This is cancer, $158 billion. We have hypertension, $131 billion; diabetes, $116 billion; obesity, $109 billion; heart disease, $95.6 billion; stroke, $18.8 billion, Parkinson's disease, $6 billion.

So it is really easy to see these red lines.

Teeny, tiny, and I think maybe the only one you can see here well is the amount of money that we are spending to address these diseases. NIH research funding and annual cost of care for major diseases in the U.S. is what this chart is about.

We spend $5.5 billion on cancer research. On Alzheimer's disease it has not even been a billion dollars. It is half a billion dollars for a disease that costs $200 billion to our economy. And on and on.

The teeny, tiny blue lines are barely very visible of how much we are actually investing in trying to deal with these diseases and diminish the tremendous costs to families and costs to government through our public health programs.

And so if we are smart investors, wise investors in how we can save ourselves money, we would put money into this kind of research.

I just want to give an example from my district of lack of being penny wise and pound foolish.

Northwestern University is developing one of the first major studies to look at the impact of contaminants from superfund sites—those are the most polluted sites in our country—on our reproductive health.

So Northwestern, which is in Evanston, Illinois, and I am proud to say in my district—a constituent of mine—proposed a study to examine the reproductive health impacts of exposure to metals, including zinc and lead, that are present in the DePue superfund site in Illinois—a very dirty site.

□ 1830

Initially, in the fall of 2012, the Northwestern University Superfund Research program, led by Dr. Teresa Woodruff, was awarded a positive score with a good chance of receiving funding in response to the NIH research application. Mind you, if we had been able to research this particular Superfund contaminated site, it would have helped all over the country where we have these kinds of contaminations.

Due to limited funding—due to the sequestration—in March of 2013, Dr. Woodruff and her colleague were informally given the option to receive a reduced amount for a reduced period of time since their application was deemed, in fact, meritorious. After electing to accept the reduced funding, the NIH informed the Northwestern University Superfund Research program that, due to the sequester cuts, their project would not be funded.

This lack of funding means Dr. Woodruff and her team are unable to perform this critical research which would be helpful all over the country to help us gain a better understanding of the reproductive health risks of Superfund sites and to help us determine the best practices for the future disposal of those toxic chemicals.

We are absolutely putting hands behind our backs in order to address critical health issues that are facing our country. We are hamstringing our ability to compete globally. We are hurting the health of Americans and of future Americans in not funding the study of reproductive health. It just makes no sense. It makes absolutely no sense to cut the funding from the National Institutes of Health. It is hard to figure out what that argument would be. You certainly can't say this is frivolous spending, excessive spending.

So I really thank you for calling attention to the one of many ways that the sequester has hurt our country, but it is a very significant one. I appreciate your leadership.

Ms. SPEIER. You, too, were here in Congress during the Bush administration when there was an extraordinary increase in the budget for the NIH. The Republicans at that time recognized the value of keeping the NIH robust in the funds that it had in order for it to do cutting-edge research and move us forward.

What is it going to take? What was it like then that we don't have today that might be able to enlighten us?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. There was some common sense on both sides of the aisle of things that were essential investments for our country, that it made sense from every angle at which you looked at this to make those kinds of investments in the National Institutes of Health.

I think, right now, we are dealing with some of our colleagues across the aisle who believe that government spending, regardless, is not a smart investment, that the sequester cuts, which are meat-ax cuts across the

board, do not distinguish in any way among the programs and that that is a smart way to go.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Congressman ROGERS, doesn't agree with that—the sequestration, he agrees, hurts us—but, unfortunately, we don't have the same kind of bipartisan consensus. I think Democrats see the wisdom of this and that we need help from our colleagues. We had it then. We don't now.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlelady for her support and for her involvement in this very critical issue.

I am really very grateful for the conversation we have had this hour on the National Institutes of Health, but I am also anxious for the millions of Americans across this country who are suffering with some diabolical disease—some cancer—some disease that has no cure, whether it is heart disease or glioblastomas or breast cancer. There are millions of Americans right now who are dealing with stage 4 cancers, who are holding on by just their fingernails, hoping against hope that there will be some cure, some breakthrough drug, some clinical trial they can participate in.

I think, for each and every one of us in this House, we have to think about those people in our districts, and there are thousands of them in each of our districts. If they knew that we were tying the hands of the National Institutes of Health in doing that kind of cutting-edge research, I think they would be so disappointed—more than disappointed. They would be so angry that the lives of their loved ones were in the offing.

I would like to continue with a brief discussion on our academic health centers in the United States. They are, really, the pulse of so much of the research that goes on when it comes to advanced medical research. Many of them are funded through the NIH, as was mentioned earlier—thousands of them across this country. I am going to tell you about one such researcher. Her name is Dr. Valerie Weaver. She is a professor in the UCSF Departments of Surgery, Anatomy and Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences.

She does think outside the box. Her lab is investigating not only tumors, themselves, found in patients afflicted with breast cancer, pancreatic cancer, or brain cancer, but the neighborhood of tissues and cells where those tumors take up residence. Unfortunately, her quest for cutting-edge solutions to rapidly improve cancer treatments is threatened by the sequestration of the NIH budget. Because of reduced funding on her existing grants, Dr. Weaver has had to lay off three existing personnel and has had to cancel three new hires. ''The only people I can take are those with their own funding. Each year, you get less and less, and you are asked to do more and more,'' she said, ''and you try to get more creative, but wonder what you are supposed to do.''

As a scientist, she finds herself spending less time thinking about how to battle cancer in the lab and more time struggling against funding cuts. ''I spend way too much time writing grants. My grant writing time has doubled,'' Weaver said, but added she still pushes to move her research forward. ''I have to do some type of science every day, at least once a day, even if it's only an hour. It should be the other way around—1 hour of administration and 12 hours of science—but it's not. That breaks my heart,'' she says.

For those suffering from the forms of cancer that Dr. Weaver hopes to treat, she points out that time is of the essence. Patients with brain tumors and pancreatic cancer, in particular, frequently live only a short time after diagnosis. ''Some of the studies we're doing in the next 4 to 5 years will have a direct impact on the clinic,'' she said. ''This could have huge implications for saving patients.''

Weaver also worries about the impact that sequestration is having on the next generation of talented researchers. ''You think: you can't let these people go under. If they go under, you lose them, because they don't come back,'' she stated soberly.

In truth, there is so much at stake that we must recognize that the sequestration of the NIH is killing the goose that lays the golden egg—that saves American lives, that creates opportunities for great trade, that provides us with, yet again, more and more and more research that leads to more and more cures. Alzheimer's alone will choke us—will choke the Medicare system—if we don't do more research in that area.

So I want to close by saying that the funding of the NIH is not a political issue. It is an economic and a medical imperative. Medical research makes Americans and the rest of the world healthier. It grows our economy, and it produces valuable jobs here at home. It is time for us to take the shackles off the NIH, to restore the funding that was there when George Bush was President and to regain the position that we have had for so long in terms of fine medical research.

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

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COTTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado, who has been having these sessions now for all the month of November. We began at the end of October and then have gone through the session in December. He has been an ardent champion of this issue. He has been a leader in our caucus. He has been doing the right thing, and I am very thankful for his efforts on our behalf.

I want to mention that, last week, when we were doing this, the Speaker made a ruling of something that I probably did incorrectly in my speech; but I want to now yield to the gentleman from Colorado because he spoke for millions of those who have no voice, who cannot come to this floor and claim something that is so American—a system that works, a system that makes sense, a system that is fair to all its citizens, in fact, to all of its people.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida. I will speak briefly, and then I will have more later.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many activists in our country who are fasting, who are sitting in offices, who are writing their Congresspeople, who are demanding action—action to unite their families, action to stop the deportations of family members—and answers to emerge from this indefinite state of limbo that has frozen the lives of so many would-be Americans that H.R. 15 and comprehensive immigration reform would address.

Today, I am disappointed that our Republican friends didn't show up to discuss and to debate the most pressing issue of our time—immigration reform. We extended an invitation to our friends on the other side of the aisle to join us today and have a discussion. Sadly, there is no one here to yield to. There are no solutions from the empty Chamber on the right. Some responded that they were double booked. Others responded that they had other engagements. Some simply didn't respond at all. The American people, Mr. Speaker, are demanding a response.

Just as House Speaker BOEHNER plans to close for business on Friday while hundreds of millions of Americans continue to have to work another week before Christmas, we have Reverend Samuel Rodriguez, who will mark the 40th day of his fast for immigration reform. He is chair of the National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference. He will be 40 days and nights—approaching fast—without solid food.

As the reverend said recently:

> There are 11 million people here right now who require intervention. We looked the other way when they came in. We use them on our farms; we use them in our hotels; and we use them in our restaurants. Then we have the audacity to deport them. It is morally reprehensible to play politics with 11 million people.

So said Reverend Samuel Rodriguez in his nearing his 40th day in fast.

Yet, in the entire first part of the 113th Congress—in the entire first session, in the entire year of 2013—there was only one vote on the floor on any measure relating to immigration. Was it a bill that would address even part of the immigration problem or any piece of the meal that was being promised? No. It was a bill to defund DACA, to defund the Deferred Action program, subjecting hundreds of thousands of DREAMers to deportation—a bill that Republicans voted for and that passed in this body.

Thankfully, it didn't become law. The Deferred Action program continues. Thank goodness that it provides at least a temporary reprieve for hundreds of thousands of aspiring Americans, but we owe to all Americans the restoring of the rule of law, allowing people to get on with their lives.

I yield to my colleague from Miami (Mr. GARCIA), the chief author of H.R. 15, the comprehensive immigration reform bill in the House.

Mr. GARCIA. I would like to thank my colleagues for joining me here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to discuss a vitally important issue. We need to pass comprehensive, commonsense immigration reform.

□ 1845

We feel the consequences of our broken immigration system every day. We may not agree on the best way to go about fixing it, but disagreement is no excuse for inaction.

With every day that passes, millions continue to live in the shadows and jobs continue slipping away overseas. This is not simply just an issue of fairness. It is about ensuring America's economic prosperity.

In Florida alone, legalizing those currently unauthorized to live would generate $1.3 billion in new tax revenue and create 97,000 new jobs. Fixing our broken immigration system will help small businesses expand, foster innovation, increase productivity, raise wages, and help create thousands of jobs. Comprehensive immigration reform makes all Americans better, makes our country richer, and creates opportunity for all.

We must work together to find a solution that secures our borders, builds our economy, and provides a way forward for millions of undocumented individuals living in the United States.

This week, a group of children dropped by my office. They were dropping by to express their wish for the new year. Their families have been ripped apart by our immigration system, and they came to deliver letters from a thousand children facing the same struggle. I would like to share one of those letters with you:

Dear Congress,

My name is Charlie Hoz-Pena and I am Anthony's brother. I'm 11 and I'm in fifth grade.

I'm writing to tell you my worst nightmare became real. Last year our dad was taken away from us and was sent to Mexico. We fought really hard to get him out of jail. I went to church and prayed, we did protests, vigils, wrote letters, petitions and I behaved well in school. But Immigration did not listen. They don't care about us.

I even thought about killing myself because I is sad when bad things happen to good people and because I love my dad very much. I am very angry at Congress and Obama.

It's really hard on me and Anthony and my mom. I love my mom too and she keeps us safe and comfortable but it's really hard for her too. Every time I hear her crying I feel sad, she cries because she misses him. She has to find a lot of jobs cleaning houses to support us.

So Congress, please get your act together. I want immigration reform please. You can do it. Do your job.

Obama, you have the power to stop deporting people. Congress, you are breaking families apart every day until you pass immigration reform. You have a chance to help families. So please do it now.

What if immigration broke up your family? Would you like it? Now just close your eyes and imagine your family destroyed. It is not a happy thought. It is a horrible feeling. It is like when somebody you care about dies. It is sad because you may never see them again. I don't know how long I am gonna have to wait to see my dad back. No child and family should suffer like we did.

Congress, we belong together. I hope you can understand what that means.

Sincerely,

Charlie

Charlie is right: we can't wait any longer. The time is now to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Although the Senate has acted in a bipartisan way to pass comprehensive immigration reform, the House of Representatives has not passed an immigration reform bill in this Congress. It is unacceptable.

Ultimately, all of us, Democrat and Republican alike, should want the same things: a secure border, a stronger economy, and more jobs for the middle class.

We should have a vigorous debate about this important issue, but a sensible one also that moves us forward. Unfortunately, that has not always been the case.

Just this week, my colleague from Iowa compared allowing the undocumented to earn their citizenship as letting bank robbers walk away with the loot. This type of rhetoric has no place in this debate.

We can do better. Our country demands we do better. Let's get this done. The time is now for comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, what is particularly frustrating is that Congress is going home on December 13, not to work for the remaining 2½ weeks of the year. I think most Americans would love to get off a week early for Christmas. They don't have the opportunity to set their own schedule at work. So it is not like there is not time to do this, Mr. Speaker. We can stay here next week.

It is not like there is not support on the floor to pass immigration reform, Mr. Speaker. There is. There is support today to pass H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform, brought to the floor. We could then send it to President Obama's desk. What a Christmas gift to our country that would make, a Christmas gift in the form of reducing our deficit by over $200 billion, creating over 6 million jobs for American citizens, restoring real security, and finally gaining operational control over our southern border and stemming the tide of people who are immigrating here illegally, requiring workplace authentication to make sure that employers no longer hire people under the table for cash outside of our system, strengthening Social Security and Medicare by making sure that people working here pay into our important programs that retirees stand to benefit from.

Immigration reform is not only demanded, but widely popular. Six in 10 Republicans support a path to citizenship for immigrants currently living in the United States; and a vast majority of every group—age, gender, ethnicity—here in this country knows that our immigration system is broken.

When we look at ourselves in the mirror at night, Mr. Speaker, how can we be proud of a system that betrays our values as a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants, a system that rewards lawbreaking, a system that encourages illegal activity, a system that, as my good friend and colleague Ms. LOFGREN from California likes to say, effectively places two signs at our southern border: one says ''help wanted'' and the other says ''keep out''?

That is the state of our current immigration system: confusing, expensive, job destroying, companies can't acquire the men and women they need to remain competitive so they are forced to expand overseas in other countries in offshore jobs rather than expand here in the United States.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, the answer is simple. Groups from across the spectrum—faith-based groups including evangelical and Catholic Americans, businesses including small family farms to large international companies that employ hundreds of thousands of people, law enforcement—all support H.R. 15. Based on the Senate bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, that would solve all of these issues that we have before us, create jobs for American citizens, and reduce our deficit.

And as we talk about the budget, at least frankly, Mr. Speaker, this week we are debating something very important for our country. In other weeks, my colleague, Mr. GARCIA, and I have taken to the floor when there has been nothing that has even been done that entire time that had any consequence to anybody. At least this week, Mr. Speaker, we are discussing something important. I don't bemoan that. I think it is legitimate to discuss the budget of our country this week. That is why I think we should stay here another week and discuss immigration next week.

This is an important discussion. But as we look for what we call ''pay-fors''—how do we pay for making sure the Medicare reimbursement rate doesn't go down as scheduled at the end of the year, how do we pay for reducing the sequester, how do we pay for the investments that we want to make—guess what, comprehensive immigration reform would fill our coffers

with over $200 billion of revenue. Now, how about that as a pay-for for what we call the ''doc-fix'' and making sure we don't reduce Medicare reimbursement rates or any of the other items that are on the budget table this week?

That is the kind of contribution that H.R. 15 and immigration reform can make.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Colorado. By the way, I love the fact you refer to me as the gentleman from Miami. I always thought we should have our own State.

Let me just mention that there is a very good article that was written last year in July by Jennifer Rubin in The Washington Post. It sort of listed all these phoney arguments that we have.

The first: the Senate bill is dead on arrival. We have heard this from the Speaker before. We have heard no agreements, no comprises. We heard that VAWA, the Violence Against Women Act, was going to be dead or, as they said, they were going to write their own. Well, of course, nothing came and we passed the Violence Against Women Act, which we should have passed earlier on.

The second argument: the Senate bill isn't strong enough on border security. Well, the Senate bill spends more money on border security, almost an insane amount. That is why we took it out of our bill, because we didn't think that this House would look at such an expensive bill. But the question is: Is what we have better than what we are looking at? Of course, the answer is, no, we are not moving forward.

This one is the one I love, but it is more of a Herman Cain type argument: the bill is long. This is a very complex issue and, of course, it is long because we are trying to solve worker issues, we are trying to solve innovation issues, we are trying to solve a lot of important things that affect us all.

The fourth argument: the Obama administration won't enforce it. Well, here I have to say that Obama must be one of anti-immigration's favorite Presidents because he has deported more people than any President before. In October, I think we reached 2 million people being deported. That is thousands upon thousands of families destroyed; that is workers being taken out of the economy. That is what the President did.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GARCIA. Yes, of course, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POLIS. Each of those deportations, Mr. Speaker, cost you and I, cost American taxpayers, approximately $15,000. So guess who is paying for the 2 million deportations? Guess what is one of the growing causes of our deficit spending? Our broken immigration system.

Mr. GARCIA. That is exactly right.

Another argument: you can't bring in low-skilled workers. Well, the bracero program proved that when you had a functioning program illegal immigration went down, not up. We know that for a fact. Here is what we also know. When President Reagan had an immigration bill, we know that the salaries for the middle class and working class went up for 5 years in a row because it worked.

The seventh argument: there aren't enough high-skilled workers being allowed in. All right, so let's write legislation that increases the high-skilled labor.

''Republicans don't need to pass immigration reform to keep their House seats.'' Well, if it doesn't affect their House seats, then why are they opposed to it? And, more importantly, this is, of course, the silliest of arguments when you understand the demographics. I know I have spoken to this with the gentleman from Colorado. When you look at the high water mark of a Republican Presidential race, it was achieved by George Bush, a pro-immigrant President; but when you look behind those numbers, and you look at the 44 percent that he achieved nationally, what you realize is he didn't receive those numbers from second- and third-generation Americans. He received it from first-generation Americans voting, and voting over 50 percent for George Bush for President. This is something that is a commonsense thing and makes sense for it.

The ninth argument: it was passed too quickly in the Senate. Well, unlike the House, they have had long debates on this. They had weeks of hearings, they had bipartisan meetings for over a year before, they had the commitment of the President of the Senate, the majority leader of the Senate to get this done.

Look, I could go on and on; but I think what is clear is that we can make a lot of silly arguments, but the time has come to act. We were promised by the Speaker that this would be taken up and it hasn't. The time has come to move forward. This is the time for immigration reform. It is good for the country, it is good for these folks, it is good for everyone.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

□ 1900

Mr. POLIS. I would like to point out that my friend from Miami, Florida, placed out some of the arguments that we hear our friends making as to why immigration reform is not happening. We did not present those as a straw man. We invited our friends from the other side of the aisle to come make the arguments themselves. There is no one here in this Chamber, despite our invitation, to represent why we are not staying here next week to vote on immigration reform. So we are guessing why. We are guessing, saying maybe it is because they don't like long bills. I don't know. A short bill can be pretty bad, too, if it is a bad bill. You can have a good short bill or a bad short bill, a good long bill or a bad long bill. I mean, you know, when you want to address border security, you need to make sure that you devote enough of the bill to border security to do it.

So we are here guessing at their reasons because our friends on the Republican side of the aisle are not here to explain, despite our invitation, why they are not bringing immigration reform up. And if they are not ready for H.R. 15 or comprehensive, why at least we are not making some kind of down payment on it next week, why we are not doing something, for instance, for the DREAMers, the kids that are currently in a deferred action program so that they can have some degree of certainty to get on with their lives. Why we are not making sure that we have working permits for the people who are already here and already have jobs and are an important part of our economy. We could be doing any of that next week. But instead, Mr. Speaker, the House is being sent home on vacation while most Americans have a full additional week to work before Christmas.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), who is a hard fighter for these issues.

I want to first relate a story. I was debating, the other day, a friend on this issue. He made what he thought was a commonsense argument. He said, Joe, if somebody broke into your house, you would like them to be arrested, right?

I said: Well, the truth is, if somebody broke into my House and filled my refrigerator with fresh fruit and vegetables, if they took care of my mom and got my kid to school, if they then went outside and cut the lawn and painted the house, worked on the roof, I think I might owe them money.

The reality is these folks are an essential part of our country. They make us work and they make us better.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to say a few words on this floor that I am so blessed to be a part of this great Congress of the United States of America. Yet at the same time, we are a country that talks about how we believe in the big picture, yet at the same time we focus on the little things. We focus on the plight of a child. We focus on the plight of a family. We focus on the ability of people to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. That is what we are proud of in this great country.

But what I am not proud of is being a part of a Congress where the Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, is not allowing comprehensive immigration reform to be voted for on this floor. I believe that today, if we had the opportunity to vote on comprehensive immigration reform in this Chamber, I think we have the votes to pass it. And I think if we did so, it would be much more consistent for us to do that than to do nothing, and that is what this House has been doing. We have been doing

nothing on comprehensive immigration reform.

And if we did pass comprehensive immigration reform, it would be the biggest economic boom that our country has seen in over 60 years. There are too many Americans out of work. But if we pass comprehensive immigration reform, what we are going to see is, for every 100,000 people in this country who are legalized, it is very likely that we will have 262,000 jobs occur. Do the math, ladies and gentlemen. If 100,000 people are legalized, a certain percentage of them are going to create businesses, and in those businesses they are going to hire American citizens. Americans will go to work. That makes sense. That sounds like the American Dream for Americans, not just for immigrants who come to our country.

One of the things that I would like to point out is, if comprehensive immigration reform were passed, then what would happen is the Federal deficit would go down by $200 billion just over the next 10 years; and over the subsequent 10 years, it would go down by another $700 billion. I think that is good for America. I think that any American, when you look at those numbers, would say why don't we pass that law, because when the economy improves, more Americans go to work.

As was mentioned earlier by my colleague, when you have a young boy who is an American citizen who writes a letter to his Congressperson, who writes a letter to the President of the United States as an American citizen who is in tears by telling us, exclaiming, I miss my mother, I miss my father, and they have been deported, that is not an America that we can feel proud of. That is an America that doesn't live its values.

What I say is, you know what, if in 2014 we don't vote on comprehensive immigration reform, why don't we just go ahead and dismantle the Statue of Liberty, because that is something I think, as your average American, we are very proud of. Bring me your huddled masses, your poor.

You know what is great about this country, whether you are Italian, whether you are Russian, whether you are Mexican, whether you are English, whether you are Irish, Canadian, when you come to the United States of America, you make dreams come true, not just your dream, but you employ Americans. You create jobs for American citizens, American-born people.

Comprehensive immigration reform, if you try to couch it as ''those people,'' comprehensive immigration reform is not about ''those people.'' Comprehensive immigration reform is about us, Americans. It is about us improving our economy. It is about us doing the right thing. It is about us welcoming the men, women, and children who come to this country and work as hard as any human being will dare to do, and that makes our economy stronger. That makes America great.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't speak to you as though comprehensive immigration reform is an emotional issue. I speak of comprehensive immigration reform as an American values issue. As my colleague said earlier about that silly analogy, what if somebody broke into your house, then what would you do. I think he actually put it very well. If somebody painted your house, they cut your grass and took care of your children and your grandmother, don't you think that you owe them something? Don't you think you should extend your hand and say, Welcome. Thank you. I like what you're doing for me.

And that is what immigrants do for our United States of America. They make our country stronger. This country was built on immigrants. Why in the world would we, as Americans, want to support the idea that they are ''those people'' and they are not part of who we are?

I am only one generation away from being an immigrant myself. My parents came from another country. I was born in this country, and I do live a better life than my parents were raised in, and so do my children. I am proud to be an American-born citizen. And I think as Americans, we should be proud and expect our United States Congress to have a vote on comprehensive immigration reform and to give that opportunity to the people that you have elected to do our job. And our job is to make our economy stronger. Our job is to make laws that make this country better. Our job is to be making laws that are true to our values.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman from California for those wonderful words.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. We have the chair of my committee to file a rule here on the floor the House. Sadly, it is not a rule for comprehensive immigration reform, but it is a rule for something very important, the budget, which hopefully we will be able to agree on in the next 2 days. And as we discussed earlier before the chair of the Rules Committee joined us, I think we all agree that passing the budget is a very good use of our time here on the floor.

Some of us, Mr. Speaker, in this hour, have talked about the need for immigration reform. We have in the past criticized the apparent urgency with which asbestos bills were somehow rushed out of committee and brought immediately to the floor when we weren't able to move forward on immigration, but this week we are working on something more important.

We need to continue our work to bring up immigration reform. I am speaking from the side of the Chamber traditionally used by Republicans. I had hoped to give this spot up to a member of the majority party, a Republican, who we hope to continue to extend this invitation to debate immigration reform and bring forward an immigration reform bill.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.J. Res. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 14, 2013, THROUGH JANUARY 6, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–290) on the resolution (H. Res. 438) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; providing for proceedings during the period from December 14, 2013, through January 6, 2014; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 9, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3626. To extend the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 12, 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:

4062. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Derivatives Clearing Organizations and International Standards (RIN: 3038-AE06) received November 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4063. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report and

certification pursuant to subsection (c) of section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2004, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4064. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-71; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2013-0078, Sequence No.7] received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4065. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Amendments to the 2013 Mortgage Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) [Docket No.: CFPB-2013-0031] (RIN: 3170-AA37) received December 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4066. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Version 5 Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standards [Docket No.: RM13-5-000] received December 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4067. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Small Generator Interconnection Agreements and Procedures [RM13-2-000; Order No. 792] received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4068. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regional Reliability Standard BAL-002-WECC-2 Contingency Reserve [Docket No.: RM13-13-000; Order No. 789] received December 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4069. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-25, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4070. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-32, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4071. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-27, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4072. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-26, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4073. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-58, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4074. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-53, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4075. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-49, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4076. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-67, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4077. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-21, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4078. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-57, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4079. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-48, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4080. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-52, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4081. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-38, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4082. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-0B, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4083. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report submitted in accordance with section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4084. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report submitted in accordance with Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4085. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorizations in the People's Republic of China [Docket No.: 130927853-3853-01] (RIN: 0694-AF99) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4086. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report in accordance with section 1028(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4087. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to 10 U.S.C. section 2432; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4088. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding Cooperative Threat Reduction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4089. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report submitted in accordance with section 8110(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4090. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report submitted in accordance with section 1308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4091. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-104; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4092. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-131; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4093. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-141; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4094. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-101; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4095. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 12-007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4096. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 12-023; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4097. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 12-019; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4098. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-126; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4099. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-079; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4100. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-089; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4101. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-105; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4102. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-092; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4103. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-067; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4104. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting an addendum to a certification, transmittal number: DDTC 13-099; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4105. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4106. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a waiver under section 7046(c)(1)(B) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4107. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting decisions pursuant to the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4108. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4109. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination pursuant to 22 U.S.C. Section 5963; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4110. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 102(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4111. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Accelerated Payments to Small Business Subcontractors [FAC 2005-71; FAR Case 2012-031; Item I; Docket No. 2012-0031, Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AM37) received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4112. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees received December 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4113. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minimum Internal Control Standards (RIN: 3141-AA27) received December 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4114. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tribal Background Investigations and Licensing (RIN: 3141-AA15) received December 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4115. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tribal Background Investigations and Licensing (RIN: 3141-AA15) received December 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4116. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Appeal Proceedings Before the Commission (RIN: 3414-AA47) received December 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4117. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Self-Regulation of Class II Gaming (RIN: 3141-AA44) received December 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4118. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minimum Technical Standards for Class II Gaming Systems and Equipment (RIN: 3141-AA27) received December 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4119. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations, Areas of the National park System, Curecanti National Recreation Area, Snowmobiles and Off-Road Motor Vehicles [NPS-CURE-13810] (RIN: 1024-AD76) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4120. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Land Acquisitions: Appeals of Land Acquisition Decisions [K00103 12/13 A3A10; 134D0102DR-DS5A300000 DR.5A311.IA000113, Docket ID: BIA-2013-0005] (RIN: 1076-AF15) received December 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4121. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System, New River Gorge National River, Bicycling [NPS-NERI-14336; PPNENERIP0,PPMPRLE1Z.Y00000] (RIN: 1024-AD95) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4122. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Compliance and Enforcement received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4123. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2014 Atlantic Shark Commercial Fishing Seasons [Docket No.: 130402317-3966-02] (RIN: 0648-XC611) received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4124. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC971) received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4125. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2013 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean; Correction [Docket No.: 110620342-1659-03] (RIN: 0648-XC922) received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4126. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 121009528-2729-02] (RIN: 0648-XC932) received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4127. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2013 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gag [Docket No.: 120924488-3671-02] (RIN: 0648-XC966) received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4128. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Vessel Monitoring Systems [Docket No.: 130426413-3934-02] (RIN: 0648-BD24) received December 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4129. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4130. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Criteria for a Catastrophically Disabled Detemination for Purposes of Enrollment (RIN: 2900-A021) received December 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4131. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Specially Adapted Housing Eligibility for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Beneficiaries (RIN: 2900-A084) received December 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4132. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants to States for Construction or Acquisiton of State Homes (RIN: 2900-A060) received December 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4133. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Inclusion in Income of Section 9010 Fee Collected from Customers (Revenue ruling 2013-27) received December 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2319. A bill to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994; with an amendment (Rept. 113–287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2542. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–288, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 2542. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulator Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–288, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 2013 Economic Report of the President. (Rept. 113–289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 438. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; providing for proceeding during the period from December 14, 2013, through January 6, 2014; and for other purposes (Rept. 113–290). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MARINO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 3693. A bill to clarify the application of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 to premium rates for certain properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 3694. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 3695. A bill to provide a temporary extension of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 and amendments made by that Act, as previously extended and amended and with certain additional modifications and exceptions, to suspend permanent price support authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. CLARKE):

H.R. 3696. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements regarding cybersecurity and critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and 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. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 3697. A bill to increase access to adult education to provide for economic growth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3698. A bill to delay the enforcement of the Medicare two-midnight rule for short inpatient hospital stays until the implementation of a new Medicare payment methodology for short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 3699. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to protect the right of a claimant in a civil action before a Federal court to retain a structured settlement broker to negotiate the terms of payment of an award, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 3700. A bill to instruct the Secretary of the Treasury to use 25 percent of civil fines collected for violations of the Bank Secrecy Act to make grants to community financial institutions to improve compliance with the provisions of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 3701. A bill to make improvements to provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 relating to proprietary trading by banking entities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3702. A bill to delay the effective date of certain rules of the Environmental Protection Agency until a report is submitted and a law is enacted setting the rule's effective date; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3703. A bill to provide for the expedited approval of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Keystone XL pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3704. A bill to establish the Sedona-Red Rock National Scenic Area in the Coconino National Forest, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 3705. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish appropriateness requirements for certain advanced diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3706. A bill to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOK, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 3707. A bill to ensure the emergency protection of Iranian dissidents living in Camp Liberty/Hurriya and to provide for their admission as refugees to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. POMPEO):

H.R. 3708. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain small aircraft pilots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 3709. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3710. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of continuous glucose monitoring systems (CGMS) as durable medical equipment under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 3711. A bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H. Res. 437. A resolution electing certain Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H. Res. 439. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a Global Marshall Plan holds the potential to demonstrate the commitment of the United States to peace and prosperity through poverty reduction in the United States and abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 440. A resolution congratulating Pope Francis on his election and recognizing his inspirational statements and actions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 3695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ability to regulate interstate commerce and with foreign Nations pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 includes the power to regulate commodity prices, practices affecting them and the trading or donation of the commodities to impoverished nations. In addition, the Congress has the power to provide for the general Welfare of the United States under Article 1, Section 8, Clause lwhich includes the power to promote the development of Rural America through research and extension of credit.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3696.

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 make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 3697.

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 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 3698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 3699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 3700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 3708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which reads ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''To regulate commerce . . . among the several states . . .''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: ''To promote the progress of science . . . by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper. . .''

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 3711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 183: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 184: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 292: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 366: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 419: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 503: Mr. COBLE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 533: Mr. JONES and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 543: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 564: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 685: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 705: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 750: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 792: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 809: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1000: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1020: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1074: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1179: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1201: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1209: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1226: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1263: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1281: Mr. LANCE, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1339: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1349: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1351: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1354: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1428: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1518: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1528: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1563: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1588: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1629: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1666: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1701: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1726: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1763: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1795: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1814: Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1830: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1837: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1852: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1869: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1918: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1985: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2000: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2012: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2068: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2195: Mr. COHEN and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 2288: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2298: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2309: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2319: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2366: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 2368: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2376: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2415: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 2453: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2529: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2591: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2663: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2692: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2801: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2866: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. COTTON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WOMACK,

Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 2868: Mr. JONES and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2920: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2939: Mr. COHEN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2962: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 2974: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2988: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2996: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2997: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 3040: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3077: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DENT, and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 3132: Mr. BARTON, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 3172: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3179: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3310: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3318: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3323: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 3327: Mr. COHEN and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 3334: Mr. COHEN and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 3344: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 3361: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3370: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3384: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3401: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3431: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 3449: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3462: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 3472: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 3474: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3482: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 3494: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3529: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3530: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 3538: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 3590: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. COOK, Mr. COLE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3610: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 3637: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 3644: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 3650: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3657: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3660: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 3666: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3676: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 3685: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DENT, Mr. REED, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H. J. Res. 25: Mr. HONDA.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. STIVERS.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. COHEN.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 30: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 72: Mr. MORAN.

H. Res. 112: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 147: Mr. REED.

H. Res. 247: Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 254: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. TIERNEY.

H. Res. 281: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 417: Mr. WALZ, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Res. 418: Ms. BONAMICI.

H. Res. 424: Mr. KIND.

H. Res. 425: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. SANFORD.

H. Res. 431: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H. Res. 434: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOWDY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARINO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLLS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YODER, and Ms. PELOSI.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

Mr. Speaker, the provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agricultural in H.R. 3695 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 or rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.