United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2014 No. 3

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 7, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Reverend Cara Spaccarelli, Christ Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, You have blessed us with creation and made us fellow workers in bringing about Your kingdom.

So draw our hearts to You, so guide our minds, so fill our imaginations, that we may have insight into Your purposes for our country and wisdom and determination in providing for its future, that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in You, we may glorify You in our care for all Your people.

All this we ask in Your holy name.

Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2014.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I hereby resign as a member of the United States House of Representatives, effective immediately upon being sworn in as the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the position to which I have been nominated by the President of the United States and confirmed by the United States Senate.

Service in the House has been a high honor. Please convey to my colleagues my thanks for the courtesies they have extended to me and for the privilege I have enjoyed of serving with them.

Sincerely,

MELVIN L. WATT,
12th District of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK MCCRORY,
State of North Carolina, Mail Service Center,
Raleigh, NC.

DEAR GOVERNOR MCCRORY: I hereby resign as a member of the United States House of Representatives, effective immediately upon being sworn in as the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the position to which I have been nominated by the President of the United States and confirmed by the United States Senate.

Service in the House has been a high honor.

Sincerely,

MELVIN L. WATT,
12th District of North Carolina.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), the whole number of the House is 432.

COMMUNICATION FROM FIELD REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE TOM GRAVES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Travis Loudermilk, Field Representative, the Honorable TOM GRAVES, Member of Congress:

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

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the State of Georgia Superior Court, County of Walker, for witness testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

TRAVIS LOUDERMILK,
Field Representative.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will use the electronic system to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

Printed on recycled paper.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—316

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—115

Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Benishek
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Cantor
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
DesJarlais
Doyle
Duffy
Ellmers
Enyart
Fincher
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gibson
Gosar
Granger
Grayson
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Harris
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kingston
Kuster
LaMalfa
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meeks
Meng
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Tiberi
Titus
Van Hollen
Veasey
Wagner
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yoder

□ 1852

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 316 Members have recorded their presence.

A quorum is present.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1, I was in the Chamber trying to vote at the voting box when the Speaker gaveled down the vote. I was present. I would have voted "present."

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1, I was unavoidably detained for quorum vote. If I had been here, I would have voted "present."

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1, I was at a Steering and Policy Committee meeting with Leader PELOSI. Had I been present, I would have voted "present."

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1, had I been present, I would have voted "present."

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, because of flight cancellations due to extreme weather I was not present for tonight's rollcall vote No. 1. Had I been present, I would have voted "present."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1, I was unavoidably detained and had I been present, I would have been recorded as "present."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the proceedings of January 3, 2014, and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas 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.

RESIGNATION OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 1, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you of my intent to resign as Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) effective at the close of business on January 6, 2014.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve you and the U.S. House of Representatives. Over the course of my 28 years as a staff member, I have developed a deep respect and reverence for the institution and, in particular, the Members and staff whose dedication and commitment to service make it an exciting, vibrant, and interactive community.

Additionally, I want to thank Ed Cassidy of your staff for his leadership, direction and support as Director of House Operations. He has done a tremendous job instilling and fostering a culture of collaboration and coordination within and among the institutional entities that support the House.

Finally, I want to thank my colleagues in the Office of the CAO and all the other institutional offices whose non-partisan professionalism serve as a model of excellence for other legislative bodies.

I will work with my successor as needed to ensure a smooth transition.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. STRODEL.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 449

Resolved, That Ed Cassidy of the State of Connecticut, be, and is hereby, chosen Chief

Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Will Mr. Cassidy please take the well.

The Chair will now administer the oath of office to the Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. Cassidy appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, Mr. Cassidy.

PROVIDING FOR A COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 450

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of the House has assembled and that the House is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 450

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the Chair appoints the following Members to the committee to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of the House has assembled and that the House is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make:

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) and

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

TO INFORM THE SENATE THAT A QUORUM OF THE HOUSE HAS ASSEMBLED

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 451

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE HOUR OF MEETING OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 452

Resolved, That unless otherwise ordered, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be 2 p.m. on Mondays; noon on Tuesdays (or 2 p.m. if no legislative business was conducted on the preceding Monday); noon on Wednesdays and Thursdays; and 9 a.m. on all other days of the week.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 3, 2013, providing for morning-hour debate be extended for the remainder of the 113th Congress, except that House Resolution 452 shall supplant House Resolution 9; and the Speaker may dispense with morning-hour debate upon receipt of a notification described in clause 12(c) of rule I and notify Members accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1900

ROSALYN ''ROZ'' MARIE SHOEMAKER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, she was a little bitty tiny thing weighing barely over 5 pounds. Four days after Christmas, she was born at 4:25 a.m. Sunday morning, December 29, 2013, in Dallas, Texas. Two days later, on New Year's Eve, Rosalyn Marie Shoemaker came home with her adoptive parents, Kellee and Anthony, and 3-year-old sister, Olivia.

Roz, as she is already nicknamed, is a good sleeper, healthy eater, and a cuddler. Kellee, my daughter, and Anthony, her husband, are model God-fearing parents of strong character and have a compassion for children. Being parents is the hardest and most important role and job. Roz could have none better.

During Christmas, Christians honor the most important child ever born, but in our family, this past Christmas season, we know that unto us a special child was also born. Her name is Roz. My hope and prayer for Roz is that she grows in wisdom and stature and favor with the good Lord.

Roz is our 11th grandchild. Like her ten cousins, she too was born in Texas. Of course she was born in Texas, because that's the rule.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING LIVERMORE HIGH SCHOOL SCOREKEEPER PEDER ANDERSEN

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored today to recognize legendary Livermore High School scorekeeper Pete Andersen, who sadly passed away on Sunday, December 29. He was 91.

After emigrating from Denmark to the United States in 1922, Pete went to high school in Pleasanton and served in the U.S. Army during World War II. Upon returning home from the war, Pete began keeping score at Livermore High School's sporting events. Pete had an impressive 60-year, 3,513-game tenure and built a reputation for dedication, knowledge, and a passion for sports. It's because of his dedication to our community that Pete was inducted into the first class of the Livermore High School Sports Hall of Fame in 2009.

I would like to express my deepest condolences to Pete's wife, Margaret, his family, and friends. In talking about his sacrifice for 60 years to keep score for young athletes, he said: ''It was a nice place to go on a Friday night.'' Well, Friday nights in Livermore won't be the same without Pete.

Pete will be missed dearly. His life is truly an inspiration to athletes, coaches, students, and the East Bay sporting community.

THE SKILLS ACT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today the President called on Congress to take action to help put Americans back to work. Almost 9 months ago, the House passed H.R. 803, the SKILLS Act, with bipartisan support. The SKILLS Act, which I authored, would modernize the vast labyrinth of Federal workforce development programs, increasing access, eliminating waste, and promoting accountability. This bill is languishing in the Senate.

As we gavel in the second session of the 113th Congress, this House will maintain its focus on jobs. Our top priority is creating an environment conducive to economic growth and job creation. In last year's session, the House passed more than 30 pieces of legislation designed to decrease bureaucracy, increase opportunity, and restore vitality to our economy. Unfortunately, the majority of this legislation is being held up in the Senate. I join the President in calling for action on jobs, starting with Senate consideration of the SKILLS Act.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the second session of the 113th Congress, Americans all over this country are coming up with their New Year's resolutions for 2014. In Congress, I propose we make this the year we stop ignoring climate change.

Last year, CO_2 concentrations reached dangerous new heights in our atmosphere. We suffered through—and paid for—record-breaking extreme weather events, and we received dire new projections from international scientific organizations on the threats posed by climate change.

What did the Republican-led House do? It continued its anti-environment voting record, voting 109 times in 2013 to weaken environmental protections. This behavior is reckless and irresponsible.

Despite the gridlock in Congress, the Obama administration has been making progress. Under the President's leadership, the Nation has doubled the production of renewable energy like wind and solar, vehicles are more fuel efficient, and toxic air pollution for power plants has been cut dramatically.

Let's work with the President this year to build off of these successes so that, on December 31, we can look with pride that we finally took action on climate change.

OBAMACARE INCREASES HEALTHCARE SPENDING

(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, yesterday, the White House claimed ObamaCare is partially responsible for helping to slow the growth rate in health care spending. Health care spending did grow at a record slow pace in 2012. Unfortunately, according to NPR:

> The Federal officials who compiled the report disagree with the Obama administration about why.

That's right. The annual report from the actuaries for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services disagrees with the White House.

NPR disagrees as well:

> One thing that did not lead to slower growth, according to the report's authors, was the Affordable Care Act.

''It's the recession, not ObamaCare, that is slowing health spending,'' writes the National Journal.

Mr. Speaker, hospital costs are increasing. Out-of-pocket costs continue to increase, and any reduction in the rate of growth isn't due to the Affordable Care Act.

A closer look at the numbers shows us that this law has made matters worse. A closer look at the numbers tells us more about what the White House would rather not discuss. A closer look tells us that the American people deserve better.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, right now, 1.3 million Americans are asking the question, why? Why is there a debate about my ability to pay for rent or mortgage or food or the necessities of taking care of my family? Why, having worked for many, many years, am I now being denied an unemployment insurance benefit that was utilized for the last 5 years and first voted on and brought forward by the Congress that supported President Bush in extending unemployment benefits?

Why is there not an understanding of what it is like to receive a letter in the mail to indicate that you will get no more benefits, even though you are actively looking for work and even though there are three people looking for every job? Why does this House of Representatives not understand that we can pass a 3-month emergency relief for these individuals and debate for the rest of the year how do we get a pay-for or an offset for funding it after 3 months?

Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency. People are on a lifeline, and we are killing it. It is time to pass unemployment insurance benefits now for the American people.

APPRECIATING JOHN CHAPLA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, the Armed Forces community lost a great friend and ally. Retired Army Lieutenant Colonel John Chapla was truly a Virginia gentleman of the Virginia Military Institute tradition. After serving our Nation in uniform for over 25 years, John continued his passion for public service as a professional staff member on the House Armed Services Committee, eventually becoming the lead staff member for the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

John possessed vast and remarkable wisdom of the military. He always sought to advocate for our brave men and women, their families, and our veterans. I had the privilege of working alongside him for 4 years as he coordinated the annual National Defense Authorization Act. Because of John's efforts, our wounded warriors, military families, and victims of sexual assault have substantial protections. There is no doubt that our country is a much safer place because of John Chapla's hard work and dedication.

My thoughts and prayers are with John's wife, Lee, his two daughters, and three granddaughters during this difficult time. He will be forever appreciated.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago, 1.3 million Americans lost their emergency extension of unemployment benefits.

Today, this afternoon at the White House, one of those individuals, Ms. Katherine Hackett from Moosup, Connecticut, shared her story with our country. She has two sons serving in the military. She was laid off through no fault of her own. She has been actively seeking employment, and yet she still needs help.

Yet this House left before Christmas without taking up an unemployment extension, which in every past recession, any unemployment rate above 5 percent required and resulted in automatic extensions. Yet this House went home.

Curt Edwards, from Norwich, Connecticut, who I spoke to yesterday, 20 years in the U.S. Army, Army Ranger, was laid off last April and is looking for work. His unemployment was cut off on December 28.

The majority leader issued his agenda for the month of January. There was not a word in that agenda about extending unemployment for 1.3 million Americans. Every economist tells us that's a mistake. These individuals need help. It is time for this House to focus on the immediate needs of the American people and extend unemployment insurance for 1.3 million Americans.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, January is National Slavery and Human Trafficking Prevention Month. It is a perfect time to highlight the terrible reality of sex trafficking that is happening in our communities. It is also an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to take steps to combat this growing problem that now puts 300,000 children at risk in the United States—many of whom are 12- and 14-year-old girls.

I'm authoring several bipartisan bills to address sex trafficking. One gives law enforcement additional tools to turn the tide against sex trafficking and help the victims of these horrific crimes receive the support they need

and deserve. That's what these young girls are: victims. The second bill improves data systems that track missing children because better information will help us find better solutions.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to end sex trafficking, and there's bipartisan support for action.

□ 1915

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER ROBERT DECKARD

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this first day of our 2014 session to pay tribute to a husband, a father, a son, and a San Antonian.

Bobby Deckard was a San Antonio police officer who died on Friday, December 20. He had come in on his day off to substitute for a colleague. He was shot in the line of duty. He was only 31 years of age.

This past Saturday, San Antonio and its citizens came together to honor Bobby's life and bid him a final farewell. Thousands of people lined the streets, and thousands of police officers from throughout the country were present as police helicopters flew in formation above the burial service, in remembrance of someone who spent 7 years of his life helping the citizens of San Antonio.

During the ceremony, San Antonio Police Chief William McManus instructed police dispatchers to retire Bobby's badge number, 0582, and every officer throughout the city heard the retirement of that badge number.

In a November email, ironically, Bobby Deckard had aspired to join the honor guard, the honor guard that, in fact, escorted his flag-draped coffin. In an email to his supervisor, he wrote that was the highest position of honor inside the department. That tells us so much about him, so much about him even as we mourn his loss. He had a positive outlook and a great personality. His humor could win anybody over.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I ask that we all take a moment to remember Bobby Deckard, police officer from San Antonio, Texas, whose name will now be added to the National Law Enforcement Memorial, the only memorial in Washington that has never been completed.

SUPPORT FAIRNESS TO VETERANS ACT

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 2906, the Fairness to Veterans Act, because I believe if anyone deserves a leg up in America, it is those who have served on our behalf.

The Fairness to Veterans Act is straightforward. It says that if any business receives a contracting preference, then a veteran-owned small business should receive that very same preference. I call this bill Fairness to Veterans because I believe it is only fair that if we are going to be singling out certain businesses to receive special consideration for government contracts, then that same benefit should be extended to veteran-owned small businesses.

More than 250,000 servicemembers are transitioning each year from military to civilian life; 2.4 million veterans own a small business of their own. Overall, one in four veterans say they want to start a business. This bipartisan bill makes sure that we are tapping into the most highly skilled workforce in history and utilizing their unique skills to get our economy moving again.

Mr. Speaker, whether my colleagues believe there should be contracting preferences or not is not at the heart of this legislation. The question here is: Do Members believe that veterans deserve to be on a level playing field with anyone when bidding for government contracts? I believe the answer to that question is a resounding ''yes.'' I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2906.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, it is cold outside, and for too many Americans who have been unemployed for too long because this Congress has failed to act, it is now a little bit harder for those Americans who are actively seeking work to get the emergency unemployment benefits that they need so that they can keep their homes warm for them and their families as they continue to seek employment.

For the 1.3 million Americans that we left behind by failing to extend emergency unemployment benefits before we left, this is the week when the check stops. This is the week when it becomes more difficult for them to keep a roof over their heads, to keep a warm environment for their families as they continue to seek employment.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to move forward and make sure that those benefits are continued. It is the right thing to do. It is time for this Congress to act.

CONGRATULATING FLORIDA STATE SEMINOLES

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate this year's BCS national champions, the Florida State Seminoles.

In one of the greatest championship games of the BCS era, head coach Jimbo Fisher and Heisman Trophy winner Jameis Winston led the Seminoles to a thrilling, come-from-behind victory last night over the Auburn Tigers, to a 34–31 victory. With 1 minute and 11 seconds left, the Seminoles drove 80 yards to score the game-winning touchdown, thereby capping an undefeated season.

As the Representative of Florida's Second Congressional District, I could not be more proud. As the Bowl Championship Series comes to a close, the Florida State faithful can forever take pride in knowing that the last BCS title will forever reside in Tallahassee, Florida.

On behalf of the people of north and northwest Florida and Florida's Second Congressional District, I extend my congratulations to the coaches and players who helped us provide a wonderful year for the fans and such an exciting season.

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have an additional 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that request.

Mr. UPTON. In the gentleman's remaining time, I would just say congratulations to Florida State. We from Michigan would love to see a unanimous consent that perhaps the Seminoles could play the Spartans for a national championship, and see that occur in the next couple of months. But, congratulations. It was a great game. It kept us up watching it.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I thank the gentleman very much for those sentiments and that offer. We will contact the coaches and see what we can do.

Mr. UPTON. We will be ready.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Go Noles.

VISITING NORTH KOREA IS TERRIBLE IDEA

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Dennis S. Rodman of NBA fame has announced that he and 10 or so other basketball players are going to North Korea, he said, to visit his friend, the notorious butcher and dictator, Kim Jong Un of North Korea.

Bringing American basketball to North Korea, a rogue state which has nuclear weapons, which starves its own people and imprisons them and throws them in jail, bringing American basketball there and sitting down with a dictator like Mr. Kim would be the equivalent of taking Adolf Hitler to lunch. This is really a terrible thing, a terrible idea, and it makes us gloss over the terrible suffering of the North Korean people and just ignore it and say, Well, we are going to play basketball and we are going to make this guy look legitimate.

In a rambling discussion today on one of the networks, Rodman said that

he didn't even care that an American, Mr. Kenneth Bae, was imprisoned in North Korea. At the very least we would hope that this American who is imprisoned for no reason by this brutal dictator would be released.

We should not be clinking glasses or playing basketball with this dictator. We should be demanding that an American citizen who committed no crime be released.

CONGRATULATING RIVERSIDE PHARMACY ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize a business in my district that celebrated its 60th anniversary this week.

Riverside Pharmacy is an example of a small business that has survived the economic downturn, changing health care landscape, and often unfair playing field to continue serving the people of northeast Georgia.

Local pharmacies, such as Riverside, play a vital role in America's neighborhoods. They provide unparalleled guidance, assistance, and resources for families, including my own.

Joann Adams and Charlie Johnson first opened Riverside on January 6, 1954. Now owned by Scottie Barton and Stephen Gee, Riverside Pharmacy has served generations of Georgians, helping to guide them through the often difficult health care decisions.

Although the world we live in looks far removed from the 1950s, the focus of Riverside Pharmacy has remained on the patient. I am pleased to offer my heartfelt congratulations to Riverside on their 60th anniversary. We are so lucky to have them providing care to families in northeast Georgia. The challenges facing independent community pharmacies are great. But the important role they play in our towns and States are even greater still.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN AND THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–86)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the ''Act''), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO) Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the ''Agreement''). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of Taiwan with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–1), as amended, is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with the authorities on Taiwan based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. The proposed Agreement has an indefinite term from the date of its entry-into-force, unless terminated by either party on 1 year's written notice. The proposed Agreement permits the transfer of information, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. The Agreement also specifies cooperation shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement and applicable legal obligations, including, as appropriate, treaties, international agreements, domestic laws, regulations, and/or licensing requirements (such as those imposed by the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 110 and the Department of Energy in accordance with 10 CFR 810). It does not permit transfers of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology and facilities, or major critical components of such facilities. The proposed Agreement also prohibits the possession of sensitive nuclear facilities and any engagement in activities involving sensitive nuclear technology in the territory of the authorities represented by TECRO. In the event of termination of the proposed Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls continue with respect to material, equipment, and components subject to the proposed Agreement.

Over the last two decades, the authorities on Taiwan have established a reliable record on nonproliferation and on commitments to nonproliferation. While the political status of the authorities on Taiwan prevents them from formally acceding to multilateral nonproliferation treaties or agreements, the authorities on Taiwan have voluntarily assumed commitments to adhere to the provisions of multilateral treaties and initiatives. The Republic of China ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1970 and ratified the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (the ''Biological Weapons Convention'' or ''BWC'') in 1972. The authorities on Taiwan have stated that they will continue to abide by the obligations of the NPT (i.e., those of a non-nuclear-weapon state) and the BWC, and the United States regards them as bound by both treaties. The authorities on Taiwan follow International Atomic Energy Agency standards and directives in their nuclear program, work closely with U.S. civilian nuclear authorities, and have established relationships with mainland Chinese civilian authorities with respect to nuclear safety. A more detailed discussion of the domestic civil nuclear activities and nuclear nonproliferation policies and practices of the authorities on Taiwan, including their nuclear export policies and practices, is provided in the NPAS and in a classified annex to the NPAS submitted separately. As noted above, an addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the authorities on Taiwan with respect to nuclear-related matters is being submitted to you separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge the Congress to give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 7, 2014*.

□ 1930

A GREAT DEAL OF NEWS TO REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCALLISTER). 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, a great deal of news has come out. So many things have happened since we recessed in December. Some things did not get the attention they should have.

This is an article from the Daily Caller, December 18, entitled: ''Senate Democrats Block Amendment to Restore Veteran Benefits by Closing Illegal Immigrant Welfare Loophole.''

Mr. Speaker, it would seem by anyone's standard of morality that when someone promises something in order to encourage or get someone else to expose themselves to death, to brutal treatment, and that person does so—they join the military, go through rigorous training, spend a career 20 years or more defending the United States of America, following orders—that it would be morally reprehensible for anyone, or in this case any government, to pull back on the promises that were made to those who served relying on those promises.

In courts, that doctrine would be called ''promissory estoppel.'' Promises are made to induce someone else to act, the other does act in reliance on those promises to the actor's detriment, then in a court system a civilian would be required under the doctrine of promissory estoppel to provide what was promised.

But the United States Government is not subject to such claims in court so it must rely upon Congress to have the moral compass and the conscience to keep our promises to those who have served enough years, long enough to retire. When I push for such benefits and the keeping of our word to our veterans, it is not something that enures to my benefit. I served in the Army, but only for 4 years. I did not reach the 20-year mark or more that would have entitled me to the promises that were made.

But I know so many who had the chance to go back and make more money in the civilian sector and not give up their right of freedom of assembly and had to assemble at 5 in the morning, as we often did, or doing forced marches, as we did, or doing so many things that were not fun or pleasant, but doing so because it was proper training to be in the United States military. We owe those who have served to keep our promises.

When George Washington resigned as commander of the revolutionary military, it was an incredible act that constantly comes up both here and abroad when people both here and around the world look for an example of true selfless service to one's country. And how George Washington could serve as commander of the revolutionary military, the revolution is won, and he did what no one in the history of the world has ever done: won the revolution as commander of the military and then resign and in effect that I have done all you asked and now I am going home.

That was brought up to me in the Maldive Islands some time back that I was told was a relatively new democracy who were always worried about a military coup because we never had a proper example like George Washington, we never had a George Washington to set the proper example, and has had a military coup since, I was told. Not only did George Washington resign, but at the end of his resignation—and this was something that was said to all 13 Governors—he had a prayer for the country. Part of that prayer was that we would never fail to remember, basically honoring those who have served.

Then apparently on December 18, the United States Senate voted against restoring the benefits that were taken away from veterans because they didn't want to close a loophole in the law that allows for people who come here illegally to get welfare. Because if that loophole had been closed, then people who come illegally would not be able to get welfare, and the money saved by closing that loophole would be enough to fund our promises that have been broken to our veterans under the brand-new budget.

I hope very soon that we will have a chance to fix that in the House. It is the right thing to do. How else will we have the moral authority in Congress to do anything else? We can't keep our promises in answer to the prayer that George Washington had that we would never forget those, that we would help those who have served in the field, our military. That is a travesty.

On December 19, the next day, there was an article in the Washington Times: ''Homeland Security Helps Smuggle Illegal Immigrant Children into the United States.'' It goes on to discuss a 10-page order by Judge Andrew S. Hanen. And Judge Hanen, it says, said the case was the fourth such case he had seen over the last month. And in each instance, Customs and Border Protection agents have helped to locate and deliver the children to their illegal immigrant parents.

Now, Republicans believe in the sanctity of marriage and the sanctity and importance of families in America. When someone chooses to violate United States law and enter the United States illegally without proper documentation, no matter how noble the cause is believed to be to help family—obviously that is a noble cause—but if it is done illegally, without documentation, it is an incredible disservice and affects so unfairly those who have stood in line, paid money after money, done everything the right way to gain entrance into the United States legally.

There is one person to whom I spoke last Thursday that he was married to a woman that he tried for so long to get legally into the United States and finally got her into the country legally. It is so grossly unfair to the millions of people who have come into this country as immigrants legally. We are a Nation of immigrants. As my friend STEVE KING says, there is really not a nation in the world, perhaps, that is not a nation of immigrants. But the United States certainly is.

One of the big reasons we have been able to become the most free—until ObamaCare perhaps—but the most free Nation in the world with the least government dictation and intervention in our private lives, and been the most blessed country, I believe, even more so than Solomon's Israel, is because we were a Nation of laws, as the Founders described it, a Nation where no one was perceived to be above the law.

I even paid a parking ticket because people perceived that I had violated a law and a National Park policeman who did not know the law, was ignorant of the law, decided to give it. It was easier to pay the $25 than it was to help teach the National Park policeman the law on parking in Washington, D.C. Nobody is above the law. Nobody is supposed to be above the law.

There are verses throughout the Old Testament and New Testament. So many of the first hundred years of this Nation's existence had scriptures quoted from the Old Testament and New Testament as a basis, or reason, that particular legislation should be passed.

Well, one thing is clear in the Old Testament and New Testament: that showing partiality, showing favoritism, to anyone—as Leviticus talks about—whether it is to the very poor or the very wealthy, either way it is not right; it is wrong.

If we are going to ever attain again moral authority as a Congress, we have to make sure the law is applied fairly across the board. When someone chooses to violate our laws by coming into the country, then we have a President who took an oath to see that the laws of the United States are carried out and properly executed. That means everyone who answers to the President of the United States, including the Department of Homeland Security, including Customs and Border enforcement, all of DHS, should be following

the law and pushing others to follow the law and seeing that the law is followed.

But yet we see apparently case after case, shockingly, that Homeland Security is getting involved in the human trafficking business carrying children around the country, seeking them out.

□ 1945

How about we get the parent together with the child in a country where they are lawfully allowed to be?

How about being a good neighbor to Mexico? Instead of providing weapons to drug cartels, which have killed hundreds of our neighbors in Mexico, how about standing up against the drug cartels—not supplying them weapons, not seeing that drug deals are done, which may help one cartel over another, but actually being a good neighbor so that Mexico becomes the country where people want to stay and work?

I have talked to so many Mexicans who really want to live in Mexico, but they have trouble finding jobs. There is so much corruption in a country where a police chief or a law enforcement officer or someone trying to do the right thing or trying to stand up against the drug cartel can end up with his head on a pike. That is our neighbor. Why are we not helping our neighbor stop the killing in massive numbers of our neighbor Mexicans? Instead, we have the Department of Homeland Security, as found by the Federal courts, to continually be helping people violate our own laws.

I want families together, but the law needs to be followed. That is why you have judges, like I was, who have their hearts broken when they have to enforce laws that they don't always believe in, but it is because the laws are duly passed and signed into law by the executive branch, because we took an oath to enforce the law and to follow the law.

Then it was shocking to read this story in TheBlaze from December 27. The headline: ''ATF Agent Sends Shock Waves Across Internet with Explosive Allegations About 'Fast and Furious' and Brian Terry's Death.''

On down in the article, it says:

> After the Terry slaying—in talking about Brian Terry, the Federal agent who was killed—and an attempted cover-up within the Justice Department, Dodson—in talking about this ATF agent—provided evidence and testimony to Congress. His revelations, later verified by an Office of the Inspector General's report, ignited a national scandal over Fast and Furious that resulted in a congressional contempt citation against Attorney General Eric Holder and the replacement of top ATF and Justice Department officials.
>
> In his book, Dodson uses cautious language to characterize his account of circumstances surrounding Terry's death, saying the information is based on firsthand knowledge, personal opinion and press reports. He asserts that the DEA had information about and may have orchestrated a large drug shipment through Peck Canyon that December night.

He was talking about the night Brian Terry was killed.

> He alleges that DEA agents shared that intelligence with FBI counterparts, who advised criminal informants from another cartel that the load would be ''theirs for the taking.''
>
> Dodson laid out a strategy in which Federal law enforcement agencies, like the FBI, allow criminal activity in order to increase the clout of FBI informants embedded within cartel organizations. ''If they can get these guys (informants) in a position so they're closer to the tier 1 or tier 2 guy (in the cartel), they'll do it . . . ''

Further down, the article says:

> ''Essentially, the United States Government is involved in cartel-building,'' Dodson said.
>
> The claims sound eerily familiar to allegations brought forward by high-ranking Sinaloa Cartel operative Jesus Vicente Zambada-Niebla, who is currently facing trial in Chicago on Federal drug charges.

Further down, it says:

> ''(They) were given carte blanche to continue to smuggle tons of illicit drugs into Chicago and the rest of the United States, and were also protected by the United States Government from arrest and prosecution in return for providing information against rival cartels which helped Mexican and United States authorities capture or kill thousands of rival cartel members,'' the defense motion in the case reads.

It is incredible what is going on, and it is only appropriate that, if Congress is to continue funding these agencies and these departments, we should have—and do have—the right to know what they are doing with our money. That should also mean getting to the bottom of Fast and Furious. There should be a select committee to get to the bottom of what happened in Fast and Furious. Eventually, there should be mainstream media components that actually do their job for a change, which is so important to keeping a free nation, by actually going after the administration they have put in place and demanding answers to the questions of what happened with Fast and Furious.

We owe our friends to the south, our Mexican neighbors, answers to what happened. It is outrageous for a government to treat a neighbor like this. There is no reason that the country of Mexico should not be one of the top 10 economies in the world. Mexico should be one of the top 10 economies in the world. They have the natural resources. They have got people willing to work and who are doing phenomenal work as we have seen even in this country. They have a beautiful country, but they need to be rid of the drug cartels. They need to be a nation of laws.

This eerily brings us back to the demand that some who come into this country illegally make now: we want you to quit being a nation of laws, ignore the law and say that we are legally here, though we came illegally. Ironically, if we do that, we are no longer a nation of laws, which would make us like the nation of Mexico, where graft and corruption in so many places is the rule of the day, where cronyism is the rule in so many places, where they don't have the freedom that we have here from the fear of drug cartels.

I have mentioned a Washington Times story. Unfortunately, there was one in the Washington Times today, entitled: ''Is Islam a religion of peace or a religion of war?'' written by Rahat Husain. In this, Mr. Husain shows that he is either one of the laziest reporters in the world or that he is one of the biggest liars.

I quote from the article:

> Of course, those who seek to vilify more than 1.6 billion Muslims in the world do so with a serious disregard for logic or morality. In 2010, Congresswoman Debbie Riddle and Congressman Louie Gohmert put a theory into the public discourse, that there was such a thing as a ''terror baby.''

I have never used that term to describe anybody. So, from Mr. Husain, Mr. Speaker, that is an outrageous, abominable lie.

Now, it is quite possible he could have gotten that from so many of the media sources that do what they do so well. I go back to a sign that used to be above a blacksmith's shop. It was a recreation of an old blacksmith's shop just south of Fort Benning in a quaint, old village. The sign above the blacksmith's door said: ''All types of bending and twisting done here.'' So what happens is that some in the mainstream, so-called, take a point that I make, twist it into something I didn't say, create this straw dog that they can beat up over and over and over and run that use up so much on the Internet that, if you click on my name, you will see this term, though I have never used it, and the point I made was a valid point.

This article says:

> Despite the moral depravity of referring to infants as terrorists—

which I never did. Mr. Husain is a liar—

> Congressman Gohmert defended the notion and got into a shouting match with CNN's Anderson Cooper, insisting on the validity of his idea.

Mr. Husain's writing does not deserve to be considered as serious literature if he is either that lazy or that significant of a liar. All he would have to do is research. Hopefully, he did that research, which would mean he is clearly one of the largest liars around. Now, if either Anderson Cooper or Mr. Husain or others would do a little homework—it doesn't take that much—they would find that something called ''birthright tourism'' is big around the world. It is significant.

As I pointed out to Anderson Cooper, there had been an article shortly before that about a Chinese tourist agency that, for a certain amount of money, would get you a tourist visa into the United States when you were pregnant. They would help you get your baby born and then get you an American passport before you left. Then I saw, right after that, an article where there was a Muslim-owned hotel in New York that was hurt because they said they

were the first ones to come up with this idea of having, in their case, basically, Muslim pregnant women come to the United States, have a baby, and then they would help you get the American passport when you returned to your country.

The point that I was making—and it is still a legitimate point—is that there are people who hate the United States, who come into this country, who have a child. Children are a gift from God. They are—that is why abortion is so wrong—and the responsibility that comes with having a child: to train them up in a wholesome environment as best you can, not to hate people. Yet we have children who leave this country with an American passport and go back to the country where their parents are citizens, and they are then raised to hate America.

Some may remember that, in 2011, a man named Anwar al-Awlaki, an American citizen, was killed by a drone in Yemen. Anwar al-Awlaki had been here on Capitol Hill numerous times. He had friends at the White House. He had friends in this administration. He had been on Capitol Hill, leading Muslim staff members in Muslim prayer. Why? How could he do it? Because he was an American citizen. How was Anwar al-Awlaki an American citizen? His parents came here on a visa to go to college.

□ 2000

He was born, returned to Yemen, was raised to hate America, raised to hate our Western democracy, and as an adult became a terrorist who incited others to terrorism against the United States.

Perhaps some have heard of a guy named Al-Amoudi. Actually, I had the paperwork, held it up for the Director of the FBI, Director Mueller, and he was not aware at all that the Boston mosque that the Boston bombers attended, were started—we had the paper on the Boston society that did that. Al-Amoudi was the founder.

Al-Amoudi was a friend and an adviser in the Clinton administration, but during the Bush administration, he was arrested at Dulles Airport and later pled guilty and was sentenced to 23 years in prison for supporting terrorism.

It might be worth noting for someone in Homeland Security or the State Department that Al-Amoudi, convicted and now imprisoned for supporting terrorism, while his wife was here on a visa, they had a child, who is an American citizen.

A man named Morsi was President of Egypt until he began to disregard the constitution of Egypt, to the extent that people rose up in Egypt in numbers greater than anywhere in the history of the world and demanded his ouster. As the Coptic Christian Pope has said, this wasn't a coup; this was the Egyptian people rising up as never before, reportedly, over twice the numbers that President Morsi claims voted for him to make him President.

It appeared he was doing as Chavez had done. It appeared he was doing, as one Egyptian told me, as the President who was elected in the Gaza Strip had done. Once he had an election, he pulled all the power to himself, and they didn't need elections after that. There would never be anybody defeat him, like Chavez did in Venezuela. They could see it happening. As one Egyptian told me in Egypt within the last few weeks, if the Egyptian people had waited another year to try to remove Morsi from office, they would have been unable, because he would have pulled that much power unto himself.

So I think accolades should go out to the Egyptian people for rising up and demanding democracy, demanding the fruition of a true Arab Spring, and for people who are ignorant or promoting lies, like Mr. Husain, if you would do some checking, you would find that I have moderate Muslim friends around the world. Anyone—Muslim, secularist, any persuasion, race, creed, color, or religion, if they believe in freedom, they are brothers in liberty. Something I think it would do well for this administration to learn at some point before it is too late is, we should be able to work with the enemy of our enemy.

Moderate Muslims in Afghanistan do not want radical Islamists leading and in charge of Afghanistan again. There is a simple answer to the problem of us leaving Afghanistan, which will soon become Taliban-run again, and this administration is bungling—even though the bungling began in the last administration, in fairness it did—but the final bungling will be by this administration if we don't take action to prevent those who fought for this country from believing their loved ones died in vain. I don't believe they did. They fought for liberty. But I have heard from too many family members who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan who have said, Don't let our loved ones have died in vain.

The Taliban were defeated in a matter of months in Afghanistan, and we did it with less than 500 embedded special ops and intelligence. We gave air support and provided some weapons, and they defeated the Taliban.

The former vice president under Karzai in the first administration, former Vice President Masood, a friend of mine—a Muslim—rushed out of his home to embrace me when I got there not too long ago, because he knew I was his friend. I don't want him to live under radical Islam. He doesn't want to live under radical Islam.

This friend said, Look, if you could just help us get an amendment to our constitution. I said, What are you talking about? He said, Under our constitution that you apparently rubberstamped, in essence, a strong centralized government was created in a country that has been and is and will be for the foreseeable future very tribal, very regional. We tried to make it into a strong centralized government when what the people wanted was a federalist system where the states, where the regions had some self autonomy like we are supposed to have in this country.

He said, If we could elect our own governors. It is a shock to so many that the constitution that we thought was okay under the Bush administration allows the President of Afghanistan to appoint the regional governors, to appoint the mayors, to appoint the chiefs of police. He appoints the top-level teachers. He appoints a slate of the legislators for a part of the legislature. He has powerful abilities to manipulate the purse strings.

What we created in Afghanistan—or helped them create—was a formula for disaster and corruption. How could you give one man that much authority to appoint and not expect corruption, when you get to appoint all the governors. As my friend, former Vice President Masood told me there at his home, if we could have an amendment that allowed us to elect our governors, allowed us to elect our mayors, allowed us to elect—or select, at least—our own chiefs of police, then our regions would be strong enough to prevent the Taliban from taking back over the whole country, and we could rally together, as we did before, to overrun them and run them out of the country.

I said, What makes you think that the United States could help push an amendment through your own constitution? That needs to happen here in Afghanistan, I said. He pointed out, Do you have any idea how much our federal government budget is? I had to admit I didn't know. He said, around $12.5 billion of your dollars. He said, Do you know how much Afghanistan provides of our $12.5 billion or so budget? I didn't know. About $1.5 billion.

Other moderate Muslims there were all in agreement, You need to help us with this. He said that most of the rest of that $11 billion comes from the United States. You have the leverage to help us get an amendment to our constitution.

Instead of trying to work out some messed up Status of Forces Agreement, as we have seen this administration try to do in Iraq, to no avail, instead of doing that, why don't we start pushing Karzai and say, you help get an amendment in there so you don't get to appoint everybody who is anybody in this country. We will let each state or each region elect their own governor. Let's get that amendment in there. Otherwise, we are going to cut every dime of support off. That might have some sway.

We have the ability, we have the leverage, and we have, for a little bit longer, before we totally lose it, some moral authority to seek that on behalf of our moderate Muslim friends in Afghanistan who don't want to be killed because they fought with us and for us in defeating the Taliban before we became occupiers, before we gave them a centralized government that the

Taliban can easily take over when we leave.

We owe them that, and we owe ourselves that, because if we can empower the enemy of the Taliban to continue to keep the Taliban at bay in Afghanistan, we have done a great thing. We have helped our country, and we have helped our moderate Muslim friends in Afghanistan who do not want to live under Taliban tyranny again, and they don't want to die and be killed because they helped us and then we abandoned them. We owe them that.

I hope Mr. Husain that is writing this garbage for The Washington Times will do a little research. He will also find out, if he did so, that President Morsi, the Muslim brother who was elected President, reportedly—some say it was a fraudulent election, or election results—but anyway, he was made President and then began to abuse the constitutional powers and tighten the reins around him.

I was told by friends who love Israel that this is really exciting because Morsi is really our friend. He is really cleaning up the Sinai. After Morsi was removed, we found out the Sinai has been incredibly militarized by Morsi. What would you expect of a man who had said that Jews are descendants of apes and pigs? That is not a friend of Israel.

Yet you have the Egyptian Government now taking action to demilitarize, to fight the radical Islamists in the Sinai that pose a threat to the Suez Canal, that pose a threat to our friend, Israel, and they are actually trying to take action. What did this administration do? They had promised 10 Apache helicopters to the Morsi presidency, to that regime.

When the people of Egypt rose up in true democratic form and demanded and got the ouster of a man trying to become a tyrant, this administration wanted Morsi put back in place, and even sent a couple of Republican senators over there to ask for Morsi to be released from prison. They didn't even know, as General el-Sisi finally admitted to me in the presence of our Ambassador, that, yes, they had evidence that Morsi was trying to have a contract to have General el-Sisi killed. Murdered. Trying to higher a contract killer. That was just one of the many problems that Morsi created.

President Morsi said he backed off his membership, his participation in the Muslim Brotherhood. Right. There is video of him having orders dictated, delivered to him, on what he should do by the supreme leader there.

What happened when Morsi was removed? The Muslim Brotherhood went berserk.

□ 2015

They began burning churches by the dozens, killing Christians, persecuting Jews and Christians like never before, persecuting moderate Muslims.

I am so proud of the people of Egypt. They want a democracy. A man named Amr Moussa was appointed as chairman of the Constitutional Convention. Incredibly diverse groups there, incredibly diverse interests; yet they all agreed on this to start out, under Moussa's leadership, that unless 75 percent of all of those delegates to the Constitutional Convention agreed on a provision, it wouldn't be there.

As Chairman Moussa pointed out to me personally, he said, you know, we learned from your Constitution. Basically, he said, you know, our prior constitution, under Morsi, had no provision for impeachment. There was no way to lawfully remove him under that constitution, which was the way Morsi wanted it.

In their new constitution, they have provisions for impeachment. And this Constitutional Convention was led by moderate Muslim friends like Amr Moussa. And it was endorsed by the Sheikh of al-Azhar, a very well-respected Muslim leader, and has been endorsed by so many Muslim leaders.

They don't want radical Islam in charge. Moderate Muslims can be and are our friends.

And instead, this administration canceled the order for the 10 Apaches, or at least suspended it. And what is Egypt doing with the Apaches they already have?

They are fighting radical Islamists in the Sinai, and they are making sure ships get through the Suez Canal. Well, that should be a worthy endeavor, worthy of this administration not condemning a true democracy-in-the-making in Egypt, but trying to help them keep the Suez Canal open, trying to help them demilitarize the radical Islamists controlling the Sinai, as a threat to the Suez, to Egypt and to our friends, Israel and Jordan, and others.

If that Constitutional Convention is approved, which will be voted on in Egypt January 14 and 15, article 64 is a provision for freedom, stating that freedom of belief is absolute. You have an absolute freedom to believe in whatever religious beliefs you care to believe in without the government's harm.

What we are seeing here is really, if it works out, the people approve it, is the beginning of what we saw in Turkey with Ataturk so many decades ago, when he overran radical Islam and Turkey bloomed and became a great nation under his leadership and under those who followed what he set forth.

Article 93 of the new Egyptian Constitution commits that Egypt is obligated to observe all human rights that Egypt has ever endorsed and in all treaties to which it has agreed.

Article 235 was shocking to me. In their new constitution, the moderate Muslims of Egypt, who want a democracy, they felt so badly about the radical Islamists that make up the Muslim Brotherhood burning so many churches, persecuting, killing so many Christians, that article 235 requires that the first parliament pass a law to deal with the churches that were burned to ensure that Egypt rebuilds those churches for them.

What a statement to the world about the freedom they want to see take place. That is why it was so moving to people that told me about being there firsthand during those, the revolutionary masses, as they came forward by the millions, holding hands, figuratively and literally, Christians, moderate Muslims, secularists, Jews, saying we don't want radical Islam.

It is high time this administration began helping the enemy of our enemy, instead of trying to help our enemy.

As General al-Sisi asked me, are you and the United States still with us in the war against terror?

He and others commented to the effect that United States leaders do not seem to believe we are still having to fight terrorists anymore. They are fighting them in this new government.

Now, to be sure, they have got a long, tough road ahead because they are already where this nation is heading, with a massive welfare state, where so many of the citizens are getting giveaways from the government, where they have tried this idea of redistribution of the wealth and it has led to many more and more richer people, and much, much poor people, just as we have seen in this Nation in the last 5 years, and it needs to stop.

Another thing that needs to stop was reported in Breitbart, written by Frances Martel: ''State Department Whistleblower Has E-Mail Hacked.'' The story talks about the whistleblower who helped expose misconduct by Hillary Clinton's security detail had his Gmail account hacked and key evidence against State Department officials deleted, according to an exclusive New York Post report.

Diplomatic Security Service Criminal Investigator Richard Higbie had exposed earlier this year that the State Department allegedly covered up reports alleging improprieties by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's security detail in which they had engaged with prostitutes abroad. Those reports would have also exposed the Belgian Ambassador's alleged attempts to solicit. And it goes on.

But the article says the Gmail hack deleted 4 years' worth of messages, according to Schulman, including significant damning evidence against high-ranking officials in the State Department. It also included messages with evidence sent to Members of Congress and their offices investigating the story. Higbie has called for the FBI to investigate the hacking, and continues to have unanswered questions about other strange occurrences since he began to expose the covered-up investigation.

The article goes on, and that goes hand-in-hand with another story that was reported in the past 6 months or so of a whistleblower having her and her husband's home burglarized, and they ended up taking all of that reporter's files that she had used to expose

wrongdoing, misconduct, within the very department that raided her home and took her records and won't give them back.

At the same time, this administration continues to send people to the nation of Israel, the Jewish State, the home where people could come by the millions after 6 million were killed in the Holocaust of World War II.

We have the nerve to send people over to the leaders of Israel and tell them they have got to give away more land, when every time they have given away land, whether it was northern Israel, that is now southern Lebanon, or whether it is the Gaza Strip, anything they have given away ends up being used as a staging area from which to attack it; and those to whom the land is given use our money we provide for books to teach their children to hate Jews, to hate Israelis, and to hate the United States.

As I have said for years, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free. We could make our word good to our veterans if we just quit paying the people that hate us. Let them hate us for free. Maybe they would learn to like us and come ask to work with us and find out we are actually pretty decent people if we quit paying them to hate us.

The Palestinians, was reported, January 1 in this Jerusalem Post article, said Palestinians reiterate plans to reject any framework accord presented by the U.S. And yet we send over a Secretary of State, well-meaning, and others, to demand Israel give up more land to people that say they will reject it, but give us more land from which we can attack you.

I think about the verses in Jeremiah, where the prophecy is there that there will be grapes grown in the mountains of Samaria, that some are saying doesn't belong to Israel. Well it used to; 1,600 years before a man named Mohammed was born, King David was ruling in that region.

But over the years, over the decades and centuries, people have said, look, that area, those mountains of Samaria will not grow grapes. That is ridiculous. And yet in the past couple of years, I have tasted those grapes. The vineyards are beautiful. They are Israeli, Jewish vineyards in the mountains of Samaria, just as Jeremiah prophesied would happen, that God would make it happen.

And we send a Secretary of State over saying, you have got to give away what you believe God providentially provided to you. We, the United States, know more than any god you believe in. Give it away.

It has been prophesied. I would hate to go against prophecy.

And yet this article from the Telegraph, Iran Nuclear Deal, Saudi Arabia warns it will strike out on its own. As STEVE KING, MICHELLE BACHMANN and I, ROBERT PITTENGER, traveled to some of the countries in the Middle East, as others of us traveled around the Middle East back in September, it is incredible, but this administration, with what it is doing in Iran, the rest of the Middle East believes is going to allow Iran to have nukes and Saudi Arabia and our other allies and our enemies all want nukes, and nuclear proliferation will become just a rule of thumb, which is why I think this article appeared January 2 in the Washington Times, showing a comment that makes sense now, but ''Anti-Communist Icon Decries Obama: U.S. No Longer Leads the World.''

This was from Lech Walesa, and he had great hopes for the United States. He obviously had great hopes for this administration.

He said whatever hope in the world existed that Obama would reclaim moral leadership for America when elected in 2008 is gone, and instead the President has failed to bring that dream to fruition, he told CNN.

We have to do everything we can to recreate, to reclaim America's role, and it seems that Obama would manage that, but he didn't accomplish that. America did not regain its leadership status. We're just lucky there were no bigger conflicts in the world, because if it had had bigger conflicts, then the world would be helpless.

The trouble is, 2014 will be a year in which there are bigger conflicts, bigger issues. It is time we did the moral thing by our military veterans. It is time we did the moral thing by stopping the spending of children and grandchildren and great grandchildren's money. And it is time we did the moral thing by our friends and quit helping our friends' enemies hurt our friends.

□ 2030

We need to regain, as Lech Walesa said, the moral authority we once had. That can be done, and we need to seize the day and do it.

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

JOBS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is good to return from our 3 weeks back in our districts. I suspect that most of us spent time talking to our constituents, observing the good and the bad and the cold and the wet—not in California, where we have been in the midst of a drought—but working, as we should, back in our districts and also spending some time with our families along the way. For me, it was one of those periods of time where we were reaching out, trying to gain an understanding of the challenges that face our constituents.

As I returned here today, I realized that in 1964, Mr. Speaker, right below you on the podium where one of our key assistants is now standing, a fellow by the name of Lyndon Baines Johnson gave a speech—here is a picture of him—on January 8, 1964, speaking to a joint session of Congress. I think it was his first speech after becoming President, following the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. There he stood. And among the things he told America was that it was time for a war, a war on poverty, and he urged the United States to take on the troubling and continuing issue of poverty in the United States.

I remember that speech. I was in college at the time. I remember him standing there, and I remember that challenge, following shortly upon the challenge that President Kennedy had given us to ask not what our country could do for us but, rather, what we could do for our country.

So those two things came together, and they have been with me these many, many years, together with one other very famous and very important challenge. And this was from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is etched into the marble in his memorial here in Washington, D.C. President Roosevelt said:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

That ethical moral position was taken up by Lyndon Baines Johnson when he declared the war on poverty 50 years ago—50 years ago—at a time when seniors in the United States, 47 percent of them, were impoverished.

I remember well during those years when my father took me to the county hospital to visit a neighbor, the poverty, the ward, the odor, the hopelessness.

So what did America do? What did America do to face this challenge? Well, Social Security was already in place, one of the fundamental pillars to deal with poverty among seniors. In this Chamber, in the Senate Chamber, the men and women who then represented the American people put forward an extraordinary effort to deal with poverty in the United States. And one of those major second pillars to address poverty was the establishment of the Medicare program for seniors. Men and women over 65 years of age were guaranteed that, if they lived to 65 in the days and years following, they would have a health insurance program, which was an incredible step forward.

Many other things were done. Programs were put in place for jobs, job programs across this Nation, in Appalachia, in the Central Valley of California, and all across this Nation. There was an outpouring of sympathy, an outpouring of the basic morality of this country took place.

In 1967, 29 percent of the children in this country were in poverty. In 2012, it was 19 percent, one out of five. That is

far too high. It is a challenge for our generation.

How did they bring it down from 29 percent to 19 percent? They did it with government programs of many kinds—Head Start, food stamp programs, programs dealing with earned income tax credits, which, by the way, was added during the Nixon period. All of those things together reduced the poverty. Today, take away those government support programs for children and we would have 30 percent of the children in the United States living in poverty.

I would just like to remind my Republican colleagues that what they have attempted to do this year in their budgets, in their appropriation proposals, is to reduce those programs that 30 percent of the children of the United States—nearly one out of three—depend upon to stay out of poverty. That is not a good idea.

If this is one of our moral compasses, adding to the abundance of those who have much or providing for those who have too little, if that is a moral compass, how are we doing? Well, let's look at it. Let's look at how we are doing.

One of the things that FDR said from the four freedoms: the freedom from want. As a result of the Great Recession in 2010 and beyond, 46.2 million Americans live below the poverty level, the highest number in 52 years. Food lines in America today are as they were in the 1930s. Men and women are lining up at the various food programs to get food. That is America today.

How about the children? How about the children today, those one in five? Well, let's see. If FDR says the test is not how well the wealthy are doing but, rather, how the poor are doing, in 2012, the wealthiest Americans took home the biggest share of income—the biggest share of income, in 2012—ever recorded in America's history. One out of every four children in America go to bed at night not knowing where their next meal comes from.

In my own area, Sacramento, California, as reported by the Sacramento Bee, the capital's newspaper, the bottom 20 percent of the region's people lost 27 percent of their income between 2007 and the beginning of 2013. The bottom 20 percent earned less than $23,000 a year, yet they lost 27 percent of their income. The next 20 percent, those making $43,000 down to $23,000 lost 22 percent of their income. The next 20 percent—we are now up to 60 percent—those making between $43,000 and $71,000 in annual income, lost 15 percent of their income. This is America today in my area, where the bottom 60 percent have not moved forward but, rather, have moved backwards. Oh, but if you are in the top 20 percent, these folks here, they took in 50 percent of all of the income generated and earned in the Sacramento region. The bottom 20 percent took in 3 percent.

So Franklin Delano Roosevelt, how are we doing with our moral compass? How are we doing? Are we adding to those who have little or are we adding to those who have much?

It is clear that, not just in the Sacramento, California, region but across this Nation, those who have much are doing extraordinarily well while those who have little are falling further and further behind. Hmm.

Fifty years ago today, President Lyndon Baines Johnson stood right there and he declared a war on poverty. And where are we today? We are not winning that war at all. But there are solutions. There are ways in which we can deal with this, and one of them is to put a stop to this kind of situation.

This is a photo taken outside of a workshop that I conducted in Fairfield, California, for the unemployed. It is a jobs workshop. In a town of less than 100,000, 1,000 people showed up seeking a job. Unemployment is very real, and unemployment is a specific cause for the statistics that indicate growing poverty in America.

These folks want a job. But yet on December 28, 1.2 million Americans—some of them here in this line—lost their unemployment insurance. So are they wealthier having lost an average of $265 a week on a long-term unemployment insurance check or are they poorer? What are they going to do? Of every one of these people, 2.9 of them are looking for the one job that exists. So one out of three will find a job, maybe.

The long-term unemployed have an even greater challenge, and we will talk about that tonight. We have an enormous challenge here in America. We have got to put people back to work.

In Solano County, where Fairfield is, 2,640 of the folks that stood outside searching for a job in early December—by the way, the temperature there was not below zero, but it was below freezing—they were standing in the cold, below freezing temperatures for more than an hour to get in just to have a chance to talk to the 50 or some employers that were there.

By the way, 50 veterans did get an opportunity to get a job that day. 2,640 long-term unemployed lost their unemployment insurance, and they don't have a job today. So what of them?

Colusa County, which I also represent, is one of the poorest counties in America and is also one of the wealthiest counties for those at the top. A population of 21,244 people lost their unemployment insurance.

□ 2045

The stories are in the faces of these people desperate to go to work. We're going to talk today a little bit about that with my colleagues.

A second way in which we can deal with this poverty issue is to deal with the minimum wage. Yesterday, I had a meeting of my agricultural advisory committee. I have a very big agricultural district, $3 billion farm gate. One of the farmers, a conservative fellow, came up to me, and he talked to me about food stamps. He said, hey, listen. I know you're working on the farm bill, and I know this issue of farm subsidies is very much in play, but I'm telling you where I'm coming from. You can reduce the subsidies, but make sure people have food. Make sure that the SNAP program, the food program, is in place. I'll trade the subsidies so people have food. He said—and this was the interesting part, because I had not heard it from a conservative before—he said, and raise the minimum wage. Raise the minimum wage.

Interesting. Today, the Federal minimum wage is $7.25. If you were to use equal dollars, take out the inflation, $7.25 equates to a minimum wage in 1978—this is Ronald Reagan period, 1978—of $10.60. So in equal dollars in 1978 the minimum wage was $10.60. Today, it is $7.25. So you wonder why, why is it that in America today we have food lines? Why is it in America today that one out of four children goes to bed hungry worried about where their next meal is going to come from? Why in America after 50 years with LBJ standing right there and declaring a war on poverty, that we are where we are today?

Does minimum wage have something to do with it? Oh, yes. Does unemployment have something to do with it? Oh, yes—and it's going to be worse tomorrow, as it was on December 29, January 1, January 5, 6, today the 7th and tomorrow the 8th, when 1.2 million people don't have that unemployment check and unemployment insurance is gone. By the way, it will get worse unless this Congress acts on the unemployment insurance. The statistics are there—right there. By the end of this year, unless Congress acts to put people back to work—and we can, and we will talk about that tonight—unless Congress acts to extend the unemployment insurance, 4.9 million Americans will lose their unemployment insurance, and this will be the face of America: hungry children. This will be the face of America: hungry adults and families without jobs.

This is America. This is the place where we can solve problems. We have it within our capability as a nation and as an economy to put people back to work. We can do it if we have the will to do it. It's up to us to look into the faces of poverty in America, to look at the children of America, and say, we can address this issue.

We can put people back to work. We can do it now by rebuilding America's infrastructure. We can pay for the unemployment insurance by not spending nearly $90 billion this year in Afghanistan for the most corrupt government on the face of the Earth, $6.8 billion needed to keep Americans with food, shelter, and clothing. We can take it out of the pocket of Mr. Karzai and his cronies and still meet the challenges that my colleague spoke about earlier this evening.

We're making choices here. We can build our infrastructure. We can pay for the unemployment insurance. We can educate our children. For those

long-term unemployed that need a re-education, need to have that job skill, we can do it. When we do it, this economy will grow. The taxes will flow into the governments of the United States, including the Federal Government. The deficits will shrink. You leave that long-term unemployment as high as it is today, and we have put an anchor out the back of the great economic ship of the United States, and we will not be able to move forward in a way that addresses this issue, this fundamental, moral issue of America. Are we providing enough for those who have too little? Today, we are not, but we can.

Joining me tonight are two of my colleagues. From the east coast is PAUL TONKO. You and I have spent many hours here on the floor discussing these issues. Joining me is our new colleague from the State of Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD). I'd like you to start. I know you had an experience this last week in your district when you met with people that were unemployed. Please share with us your view of this issue from the State of Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you. First, I'd like to extend my appreciation to my colleague, Mr. GARAMENDI from California, for laying out the case for economic mobility. I'm glad that we're beginning to have this discussion at the beginning of this second session of the 113th Congress because it's the discussion that the American people desperately need this Congress to focus on, and you touched on it. Are we providing enough for the people who have too little? Are we focused on those who are in the middle class and are striving to be part of the middle class?

I'm from Nevada. Nevada is currently tied with Rhode Island for the highest unemployment in the Nation at 9 percent. This is not something that we're proud of. We like boasting about being the entertainment capital of the world and the fact that we have some of the most magnificent natural resources. Unfortunately, the prolonged recession has hit our State and the people of Nevada to our core, and it's because, in large part, our economy was a growth economy. For nearly 20 years, year over year, we had double-digit growth, and people were moving to the great State of Nevada to help us build and to grow. During the recession, that changed. So, now, thousands, over 100,000, Nevadans are unemployed and have been, primarily from the construction, engineering, and architecture sectors of our economy.

Thousands of Nevadans have spent more than a year now doing what many of us here in Congress maybe haven't had the perspective of experiencing. So my question to my colleagues tonight is, have you ever been unemployed? Do you know what it feels like to have to go to a work center or to spend your days full-time looking for work? Do you know what it means to submit resume after resume, never to get a call back, not knowing if it's your skills or some other issue as to why you're not getting that interview?

Well, thousands of Nevadans have the full-time job right now of looking for work, and I recently held a meeting at a local work center, Workforce Connections, and met with constituents who are affected by this prolonged recession and the discussion that we're having here tonight about the need to have a priority and a focus on creating jobs in America again.

They've been affected by the downturn in the economy, and they've been affected by the expiration of unemployment benefits, many of them. I promised that when I came back to Congress today that I would share the story of several of these constituents because too often we talk in this Chamber as if there aren't people behind the numbers.

There are 1.3 million Americans, our neighbors, who are without unemployment insurance. Think about that term—insurance, of the unemployment insurance program, who are relying on this Congress to do its job so that our neighbors, our friends, and some of our family who are unemployed cannot be left out and without.

So I just want to share the story of several of these constituents because I want to put a perspective on who we're talking about. One of the constituents, her name is Pauline. She's worked in a warehouse customer service position. She has a degree in bookkeeping. Unfortunately, after more than 20 years in serving as an accountant, her skills are outdated, and so as she has looked for current jobs, she hasn't been able to land one. She was laid off because technology devalued her position, and there was no longer a need for her services. She currently lives at a home with her husband and two adult offspring, who are also looking for work. One of her daughters just got hired, actually yesterday, as a teacher. She was very proud of that. So do you know what she is doing after 20 years? She has enrolled in a training program to update her skills in QuickBooks so that she can add that certification to her resume, because that's one of the things that the employers that she's applying for say that they want her to have, this certification. She's using the unemployment insurance as a bridge while she's in training to allow her and her family to meet their basic obligations to keep a roof over their head, to provide food on the table and to keep the lights on. Those are the basics that are being funded because of unemployment insurance.

Then there is Alfordeen. She was laid off from the medical industry after more than 20 years as an administration person. She handled all of the admissions for this local medical company in southern Nevada. She is currently looking to obtain her certification for her to meet the minimum requirements for current positions in her field. She is also a cancer survivor. She found out she had cancer after she lost her job, the job that provided her health benefits. She was thankful because of the Affordable Care Act she now can get insurance again that she lost because she lost her job. After more than 20 years of caring for people in the health care industry, she is now relying on unemployment insurance as a bridge so that she can meet her obligations while going to school so that she can get back into the career that she loves, helping other people.

Teresa also was laid off from the medical industry. She is in need of updated skills and certification in order to find gainful employment. One of the things that struck me about the stories, listening to Teresa, Alfordeen, and Pauline, is they all expressed the same concern that because they've been in the workforce for 20—one was in the workforce for 30 years—that they feel that they're not being given an equal shot now in competing for jobs when they go to apply, that they feel like because of their age, maybe, that they're being looked over for possible positions.

I think that's a real issue that this Congress needs to confront. I know that there is legislation by people like Representative SCHAKOWSKY and others who want to bring this issue to this body, and I ask the Speaker to allow that legislation to be considered.

□ 2100

There is James, who worked also as a customer service representative and who is enrolled in a training program to become a medical biller because he knows that is a demand occupation right now and there are a ton of openings. Again, he needs to have a certification in order to get the job.

Then there is Susan, who is currently unemployed, and her unemployment funds stopped 3 weeks ago. She is a single mother who is caring for her daughter and receives no child support. She has no family to rely upon, and she is not eligible nor seeking welfare.

All of the Nevadans that I have met with have had their unemployment insurance lapse, and they are scrambling to make ends meet. No one, none of them, wants to live on unemployment insurance forever. In fact, they all said to a person that they wanted to go to work. Some of them were in training, and they were using unemployment as a bridge. Others go to the Workforce Connections office on a regular basis every week looking for jobs to apply for. None of them are lazy, Mr. Speaker.

When unemployment insurance expires, it doesn't just mean those struggling to find work won't be able to put food on the table or pay the rent; it means money that is pumped into our local economy will also be lost, and that is a serious drag on the economy. So if you don't want to listen to me talk about the people who are affected behind the 1.3 million who are losing their unemployment insurance, the 20,000 Nevadans, then maybe you will

care that this is a drag on our economy, and you will do the right thing by extending the unemployment insurance.

Overall, failing to renew the emergency unemployment compensation program will cost the economy 200,000 jobs this year, according to the Congressional Budget Office, including 3,000 jobs in my home State of Nevada. The expiration of Federal unemployment insurance at the end of last week is already taking more than $400 million out of pockets of American job seekers nationwide and in local and State economies. In Nevada, the total economic benefit lost during the first week of the insurance expiring was $5.4 million. For every $1 spent on unemployment insurance, it grows the economy by $1.52, according to Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics. So there are some 17,600 unemployed workers in Nevada who have lost their unemployment benefits because this Congress failed to do its job in December when we had an opportunity to do it.

I urged the Speaker, along with 170 of my colleagues, to not adjourn, to not go on recess until we completed the work of extending the unemployment insurance, but that request was not acted upon. So we are here, and as my colleagues have said, there are things, there are solutions that we can do to extend the unemployment insurance.

If you want to offset it, if you want to have pay-fors, I would like to offer a couple of suggestions on how to pay for it. In order to offset funding for unemployment insurance, Congress could close a number of corporate tax loopholes, such as eliminating tax incentives for companies to move jobs overseas. Why is it that we continue to incentivize major corporations, based on U.S. tax policy, for shipping jobs overseas when we have Americans who are desperate for work right here? Why should big CEOs get corporate bonuses at the end of the year for sending our jobs to other countries when the people in our own neighborhoods could be performing that work?

The United States loses an estimated $150 billion annually to tax-avoidance schemes involving tax havens. Many of our largest and most-profitable corporations paid absolutely no Federal taxes at all in 2011. So Congress could also find revenue by placing caps on commodity payments or eliminating or reducing subsidies to mega-farms in the farm bill that is currently being negotiated. So for whatever reason, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that it is the constituents I talked about, who get $300 or $400 a week, who are the problem with the Federal budget, that they are the reason that we have a Federal deficit, then I would urge you to consider these pay-fors. Let us end the corporate tax subsidies. Let us end the policies that ship our jobs overseas, and let's start investing in America and Americans again. There are reasonable solutions, but that means we have to come together to get it done. We can't let rigid ideology trump the practical need to help those in need.

I thank my colleagues, Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. TONKO, for being here tonight, and I am hopeful that the Senate, under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and my U.S. Senator, Republican DEAN HELLER, who is a cosponsor on the unemployment insurance bill, extend it for 3 months. They are working in the Senate to reach an agreement. I hope that the Speaker and my colleagues in the House will take it up and vote on it so that none of our neighbors go without unemployment insurance to provide for themselves or their families.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HORSFORD, thank you very much for bringing to us the message from Nevada, the message of compassion and the message of hope and the challenge that we face. This House is fortunate, as are the constituents that have elected you, to have your voice heard on the floor and heard across America.

Now, over the last 3 years, my colleague from New York and I have talked about jobs, talked about making it in America, and talked about this problem of unemployment. So joining me now is PAUL TONKO from the great State of New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for leading us in this discussion for an hour of focus on solutions that are possible out there, within our grasp, easily within our grasp. As you and the gentleman from Nevada (Representative HORSFORD) have highlighted with a very, very strong context placed in terms of the human impact here, and the great compassion with which you spoke, I couldn't help but think that we are challenged in this given moment by a very daunting series of questions, most notably: Do we reject our history, or do we respect our history?

Our history, replete with success stories, perhaps in some of our darkest, deepest, painful hours, should inspire and direct and challenge us, guide us in a way that enables us to embrace the progressive voices of the past and use that in an instructive measure to move forward with the socially correct thing to be done so as to respond to those needs of the many, the bulk of the middle-income community that beacons us to be there and to be there in such a measure. Do we respect that history? Representative GARAMENDI shared the words of President Franklin Roosevelt. Are we willing to add to those who have plenty? We were challenged by President Johnson in his message addressing the war on poverty.

Today, as all of these statistics were exchanged by my two colleagues, I couldn't help but recall the fact that we are reaching some of the greatest measures of productivity in our business community, in our industrial settings today. Where is the sharing of success? Where is the sharing with the middle-income community, the workers who have produced that sort of productivity? So let me understand this. The growth of the top 1 percent, the top income strata of our society, has been exponentially strong, all while we have seen a diminishing of the growth, the potential growth of our middle-income community or a flat-lining, all while we have been most productive in our industry and business settings. Where is the economic justice? Where is the sharing that allows for us to enhance that purchasing power of the middle-income community? That is the economic engine of this Nation.

So as we are faced with these given statistics, as we are challenged with these economic times in the post-recession recovery, the moral compass should guide us, if not our history, replete with success stories. Do we respect our history or do we reject our history?

I would suggest those progressive voices of the past that led us through our darkest hours envisioned an outcome that strengthened everyone in the equation, not playing toward favorites, because, in my opinion, catering to a small percentage of the population is a dangerous outcome for them. In order to succeed, in order to continue to grow and survive, you need to have that strong purchasing power.

We know, we know from statistics, we know from past history that we should be guided by those economic reforms that enable social and economic justice to take hold. I look at the impact in New York State: 127,000 people affected when I look at the 20th Congressional District. In all of the statistics, the numbers swell from 127,000 to another series of 133,000 that will be affected. As it has been stated earlier tonight, some economic consequences of $400 million and 200,000 jobs lost. Are we willing to endure that simply by our lack of professionalism here? The willingness to walk past those who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed. Three people pursue every one available job, and that statistic also is accompanied by the requirement that you must actively pursue employment. It is part of the program.

I was visited today, Representative GARAMENDI, by Vice President BIDEN in the 20th Congressional District. He and our governor, Governor Andrew Cuomo, and our State leadership, Shelly Silver, speaker of the Assembly with whom I had the pleasure of serving, who has been a great leader for New York, as has the Governor, and the Senate majority leader, Dean Skelos, all of whom have shown an interest in infrastructure, all gathered today in New York in the 20th Congressional District, specifically at Albany, our State capital. It was about Superstorm Sandy and the impacts of storms Irene and Lee that in 2011, for Irene and Lee, and in 2012 with Superstorm Sandy devastated various regions of New York State. Yes, we need to rebuild, but you need to do it

intelligently and with an order of academics, and certainly with a strategic planning that accompanies all of that effort that is effective, efficient, smart government. The Vice President spoke to the wisdom of investing in infrastructure because commerce requires it.

Across this great Nation, talk to the midland of America. Without the appropriate infrastructure, they can't send forth their agricultural produced products or their manufactured goods. They cannot ship forward, and so commerce is crippled by our lack of investment in infrastructure.

□ 2115

And so with great sensitivity the Vice President spoke, spoke to the infrastructure needs of New York and that we will utilize these efforts with the guidance of New York State, with the Governor and the legislature, to make certain that it is not merely replacing infrastructure damaged by the ravaging of Mother Nature, but rather restructuring and reorganizing how we respond to that.

Much of our energy infrastructure, our water-sewer treatment infrastructure, our manufacturing infrastructure, are along water's edge, either intercoastal systems or the coastal system itself. We extended our land into the coastal system and now Mother Nature is saying, whoa, push back.

But that urgency that came with those storms has us now struggling with infrastructure investment. Is that what we require in order to invest in infrastructure? So we need to go forward and make certain that these down payments on the future strength of this Nation are made and made sensibly and made in an order of investment, not spending but investing, where reasonable expectation, justified expectation, of a return on those hard-earned tax dollars is there. We will see that with the infrastructure improvement. So much can be done.

I will close with this—not close with this, but——

Mr. GARAMENDI. Take a break.

Mr. TONKO. Take a break, as they say.

You can't have it both ways. You can't deny all these legislative bills that are advanced to the Congress or initiated by Members of the House that would speak to job growth. The President has sent forward on behalf of the administration a number of bills that would grow our economy, grow the climate to enhance job growth.

You can't reject that agenda and then not reauthorize the unemployment insurance benefit package. If you are going to do that, if you are not going to reauthorize, then you need to do the jobs packages that have been sent here. But to do both, to reject the job packages—the legislation that would grow that climate—and also reject the reauthorization of unemployment insurance, reject minimum wage, reject the SNAP programs, that is harsh. That is not being guided by a moral compass, and that is not America at her best.

So I would implore with my colleagues on this floor this evening, with Representative GARAMENDI, Representative HORSFORD, I would implore the leadership of this House to pursue that agenda that provides for job creation and that speaks to economic justice and that responds with insensitive measure to those who are unemployed through no fault of their own who are actively searching for employment.

We need those job-training programs. We need the assistance programs, so as to maintain the economic comeback from the recession.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very, very much. We have got about 10 or 12 minutes here. Let's do kind of one of those back and forth real fast.

I am going to go through a bunch of placards here very, very quickly. This is part of our job agenda. It is called the Make It In America agenda. They are trade policies, and we are going to be dealing with a major one of that.

Mr. HORSFORD talked about tax policy, critically important; energy policy, which we have not come to tonight; labor issues; we have definitely talked about the minimum wage, critically important; equal dollars. Minimum wage in 1978, Ronald Reagan, was $10.60. Same purchasing power today at $7.25. Education. We talked a little bit about the education—not a little bit, Mr. HORSFORD. You talked a great deal about the education, reeducation programs. Research, which we haven't covered today. And, of course, the infrastructure issues.

And by the way—you are using American taxpayer dollars for all of these things—we ought to be buying American-made products. So we will make it in America using American taxpayer dollars.

We talked a lot about infrastructure. Every dollar you invest, $1.57, pumped into the economy, jobs created. Mr. HORSFORD, you talked about the unemployment in the building trades, very important. Most people can go back to work, and this can go immediately.

Oh, by the way, August of this year, unless we fund and expand the transportation programs in the United States, there will be no more new bids for transportation programs. This issue is before the Congress today.

This one, this is what happens when you don't invest in infrastructure. This is the Interstate 5 bridge in Washington just near the Canadian border. You talk about commerce, it came to a halt. This bridge collapsed. More than a couple of thousand bridges in the United States are in similar jeopardy and could collapse. Major infrastructure needs to be done.

This is my district. I have 1,100 miles of levees, floods. We have a Resource Development Act bill in conference—I am fortunate enough to be on that conference committee—and this is what we must do. We must improve our levees, we must deal with Superstorm Sandys, and we must make sure that we are protecting our citizens.

Once again, how do we pay for it? Why are we giving the Karzai government $3 billion not knowing how they are going to spend it? I will tell you where you can spend $3 billion. You make sure our levees are sound and up to date.

Mr. HORSFORD, would you like to join us and we will do the quick minutes here.

Mr. HORSFORD. I want to just accentuate—thank you for yielding time—the need for infrastructure. In my home State of Nevada, as you indicate, the lifeline of our primary industry, the gaming and tourism industry, is largely dependent upon a strong infrastructure for people being able to get to our State to be able to enjoy our entertainment.

We have legislation before this Congress that would do just that by helping to build a new interstate between Phoenix and Las Vegas, the two major metropolitan communities in the intermountain west that don't have a major interstate between them that would help create a corridor between Mexico and Canada and provide the type of trade and commerce that would grow our economy. Those are the types of investments that we desperately need, as well as an investment in our veterans.

A third of my population in the Fourth Congressional District of Nevada are veterans, people who have served our country with distinction and honor and now have come back home and cannot find work. It is why we need to reauthorize the Veterans' Employment and Training Act, help to provide entrepreneurial and small business funding for veteran-owned businesses so that they can compete and participate in the Make It In America agenda that Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. TONKO and other leaders in this body have worked so hard to bring forward.

So I urge the House Republican leadership, we are serious about solutions for the American people. I didn't come here to be a ''no'' vote or a ''yes'' vote for every piece of legislation. I came here to work with my colleagues to find solutions to complex problems.

One of the biggest problems that we face is that not enough of our friends and neighbors can find work. The way to address that is to make it in America and to support our agenda.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am delighted that you came here. I think the people of America as they come to know you over the years that you will serve here in Congress will share that delight, your wisdom, your ability to articulate key issues. Thank you so very much for joining us tonight.

Continuing our lightning round, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

Quickly, the infrastructure issues are heavy duty. It is not just traditional

roads and bridges. It is airports and rails and subway systems, it is mass and public transit, but it is also communications, it is also the energy grid.

We have a system that was designed for regional activity with monopolies, and now we are transmitting electrons, wheeling electrons from region to region, State to State, nation to nation. So upgrades are essential. An infrastructure bank bill could assist in great ways to make that all happen.

Today, again with the visit of Vice President BIDEN to the 20th Congressional District of New York, specifically to Albany, the history of the Erie Canal was addressed. In the early 1800s, a huge effort was made, a difficult task, to sell an idea in very difficult times. But it was again in those difficult times that we had our shining moment, and what we did was create out of a small town a huge port. We developed a New York City that we know today as a robust area, metropolitan area. And the corresponding result: a necklace of communities dubbed ''mill towns'' that became the epicenters of invention and innovation that allowed for a manufacturing boom to take hold. While we addressed quality of life to people, not just in New York, not just in this country, we inspired a westward movement, and we affected the quality of life of people around the world.

Often-times—often-times—that growth, that innovation came from blue collar workers who gave it their all and who suggested to management, here is a new idea, here is something we can produce in addition to our ongoing ordinary business.

So what that strikes in my mind is the need to invest in R&D, research dollars that translate into jobs, taking that innovation, that intellectual capacity of this Nation, taking all of that brain power we develop through education and higher ed investment and putting it to work and allowing us to grow our energy independence by innovation, by producing energy supplies here as American power and delivering in more effective, efficient ways where there isn't line laws, where perhaps there is grid system activity that is localized close to the source that requires that electricity. Many, many things that we can respond to if we open ourselves to the innovation, the reform that is essential, and if we attach to that tax reform policy that is so long overdue.

It has been a pleasure to join with my colleagues here this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, somehow I knew from previous experience here on the floor that you were going to mention the Erie Canal.

Mr. TONKO. The Vice President mentioned it too.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And he did too.

So actually, before the Erie Canal it was George Washington that laid out an economic growth agenda for the United States. He asked Alexander Hamilton to prepare a policy on manufacturing, or manufactures as they called it there. Part of it was the development of a canal system, in other words, the infrastructure the ports, the canals, and the roads. In fact, the Constitution says there should be post roads in the United States.

Much to talk about. Make it in America. Use our tax dollars to buy American-made products in these areas: trade, taxes, energy, education, and research.

Oh, by the way, 2 years ago, the President of the United States stood right there in his State of the Union and said, here is an American jobs program. Do you know what he talked about? Every one of these issues.

If this Congress had acted, trains, locomotives, 100 percent American built in Sacramento, California, and a new contract coming up for even more of these state-of-the-art locomotives.

Mr. HORSFORD, end the lightning round, and then we will turn this back to the Speaker.

Mr. HORSFORD. I just want to conclude by ending where you started, which is on creating economic mobility for all Americans.

When we talk about innovation, job creation, growing the economy, we are talking about growing an economy that works for all Americans, for people who are in the middle class, most importantly, because they are the engines of our economy, but also those who are striving to be part of the middle class.

That is why assistance for unemployment insurance and extending unemployment insurance is so important. It is why providing nutrition assistance programs for families when they are in need is important, because they are creators in moving people out of poverty and into the middle class; and it is what we are focused on when we talk about making it in America.

We are not saying make it in America for the top 1 percent of the wealthiest, the elite. We are focused on those who are the engines, who are the backbone, who have made America great. We can do big things if we work together as a body to do that.

□ 2130

I know that is what my colleagues are aspiring to do. I am proud to join you here tonight, and I will continue to work with you and with anybody from either party who is focused on growing our economy and on creating true economic mobility for all Americans.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HORSFORD, thank you so very, very much.

Mr. TONKO, thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present a true American agenda.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HECK of Nevada (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of mandatory military duty.

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today through January 16 on account of surgical recovery.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the remainder of January on account of medical reasons.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family medical emergency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1614. To require Certificates of Citizenship and other Federal documents to reflect name and date of birth determinations made by a State court and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 8, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ROBERT KAREM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 31 AND NOV. 9, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Robert Story Karem	10/31	11/2	Lebanon		425.40						425.40

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ROBERT KAREM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 31 AND NOV. 9, 2013—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	11/2	11/5	Turkey		2,040.00						2,040.00
	11/5	11/7	Egypt		571.60						571.60
	11/7	11/9	France		1,092.75						1,092.75
Total transportation	10/31	11/9					6,731.90				6,731.90
Committee total											10,861.65

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT STORY KAREM, Dec. 9, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MEXICO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 20 AND NOV. 24, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael McCaul	11/21	11/24	Mexico		724.00		1,079.00				1,803.00
Hon. Gene Green	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		891.00				1,615.00
Hon. Sean Duffy	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		971.00				1,695.00
Hon. Joe Barton	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		807.00				1,531.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		854.00				1,578.00
Hon. Henry Cuellar	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		1,414.00				2,138.00
Hon. Pete Gallego	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		907.00				1,631.00
Hon. Richard Hudson	11/21	11/24	Mexico		724.00		1,649.00				2,373.00
Hon. Beto O'Rourke	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		844.00				1,568.00
Greg Hill	11/21	11/24	Mexico		724.00						724.00
Janice Robinson	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		794.00				1,518.00
Leah Campos	11/20	11/23	Mexico		1,086.00		794.00				1,880.00
Rev. Patrick Conroy	11/21	11/23	Mexico		724.00		844.00				1,568.00
Peter Quilter	11/21	11/24	Mexico		724.00		879.00				1,603.00
Charlotte Sellmyer	11/21	11/24	Mexico		724.00		863.00				1,587.00
Committee total					11,222.00		13,590.00				24,812.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Dec. 9, 2013.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4383. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Citizen Petition Submission; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA 2013-S-0610] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4384. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution by Permits for New Construction or Modification; Permits for Specific Designated Facilities [EPA-R06-OAR-2006-0593; FRL-9905-07-Region 6] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4385. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Request for Delegation of Authority for Prevention of Accidental Release, North Dakota Department of Agriculture [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0330, FRL-9904-88-Region 8] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4386. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4387. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report for FY 2013 of the Department's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4388. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting waiver of requirement to certify conditions under Section 203(e) of the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4389. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4390. A letter from the U.S. House of Representatives, Clerk, transmitting List of reports created by the Clerk, pursuant to Rule II, clause 2(b), of the Rules of the House; (H. Doc. No. 113–85); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

4391. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act Usage of the Act's Antitrust Laws Exemption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4392. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Applicable Federal Rates — January 2014 received January 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4393. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — FFI Agreement for Participating FFI and Reporting Model 2 FFI (Rev. Proc. 2014-13) received January 3, 2014, 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. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 724. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles (Rept. 113–320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3527. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HALL, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS,

Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RADEL, Mr. REED, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3811. A bill to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 3812. A bill to repeal sections 1341 and 1342 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3813. A bill to provide a three-month extension for the emergency unemployment compensation program, retroactive to its expiration, and to offset the costs of such extension; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Agriculture, 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. HUDSON:

H.R. 3814. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to require the de minimis quantity of swap dealing needed to qualify for exemption from designation as a swap dealer to be changed by a vote of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 3815. A bill to repeal the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3816. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate Congressional review of newly-passed District laws; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 449. A resolution electing the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 450. A resolution providing for a committee to notify the President of the assembly of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 451. A resolution to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 452. A resolution providing for the hour of meeting of the House; considered and agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. POLIS introduced a bill (H.R. 3817) for the relief of Jeanette Vizguerra-Ramirez; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 3811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states that Congress shall have the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states . . .''

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 3812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution

This states that ''Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 3814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, as this legislation regulates commerce with foreign nations, between the states, and with Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 3815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the General Welfare Clause) and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 3817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Submitted January 3, 2014]

H.R. 508: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 875: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2288: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2591: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 3370: Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. REED, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.Res. 109: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

[Submitted January 7, 2014]

H.R. 7: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 24: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 139: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 164: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 274: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 337: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 411: Mr. RUNYAN AND MR. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 460: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 495: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 498: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 503: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 515: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 562: Mr. TAKANO and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 564: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 645: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 669: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 673: Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 685: Mr. CRAMER and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 721: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 724: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 808: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 831: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 962: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 997: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1000: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1010: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1024: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 1091: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 1179: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1243: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1281: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1303: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1318: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1339: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1428: Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1518: Mr. DAINES, Mr. REED, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 1563: Mr. MESSER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 1588: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1638: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 1726: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1748: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1761: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1775: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1795: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1838: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1843: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1852: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1869: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1875: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1910: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2037: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2053: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 2066: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2073: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2080: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2123: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2199: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2283: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2300: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 2330: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2453: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2493: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 2500: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 2510: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2529: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2536: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KIND, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 2553: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2662: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSKAM, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2663: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2691: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2726: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 2727: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2753: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2807: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2822: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2847: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2856: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2866: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 2909: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2959: Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2996: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3043: Mr. REED.
H.R. 3090: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3118: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3172: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3179: Mr. CALVERT and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3211: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3243: Mr. KIND and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3279: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3306: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3335: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JONES, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3361: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 3362: Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3390: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3404: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3413: Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 3429: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3461: Mr. ENYART and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 3465: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3471: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 3484: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 3485: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 3488: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. CHU, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 3489: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 3490: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 3493: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3499: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3516: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3527: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3531: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3532: Ms. NORTON and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3541: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 3573: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 3578: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 3590: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3593: Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 3600: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3633: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 3663: Mr. MULLIN and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3666: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3693: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3698: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 3708: Mr. UPTON and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 3712: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 3714: Mr. ENYART and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3728: Mr. COBLE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3731: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3732: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 3745: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 3747: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3774: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3778: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3789: Mr. LATTA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 3790: Mr. LATTA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3793: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3804: Mr. JONES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3807: Mr. TIBERI.
H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Res. 34: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Res. 147: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 187: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 190: Mrs. BEATTY.
H. Res. 281: Ms. MATSUI.
H. Res. 284: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 412: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 418: Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 431: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 440: Mr. GRIMM, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2014 No. 3

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Out of the depths we lift our hearts to You, O God, waiting for Your providence to prevail more than they who watch for sunrise. Guide our Senators to find hope in Your presence as they trust the unstoppable cycle of seed time and harvest. Lord, give our lawmakers such reverence for You that they will stand for right although the heavens fall. May they delight in any work they do for You and tire of any rest that is apart from You. Create in them clean hearts, which no unworthy purpose may tempt aside. May they wait for the power of Your Spirit, working through their faith, to do more than they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 265, S. 1845, the unemployment insurance extension.

I ask unanimous consent that the leader time that I use and that of Senator MCCONNELL not count against the half hour that the proponents and opponents of this legislation have to speak, 15 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. The vote will drag a little bit but not very much. My remarks are fairly short.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for weekly caucus meetings.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. REID. Over the last 45 months America's private sector has done OK—not great but done pretty well. Eight million jobs have been created. The stock market is booming and even the housing market is starting to show signs of life.

A number of States were hit so hard with the decline of the housing market. Nevada was hit the hardest, and California, Florida, Michigan—a number of States—were hit very hard. But even in those States the housing market is turning around a little bit—not enough but turning around. It is clear that the economy is picking up steam—not enough steam but picking up steam.

But for far too many Americans these bright headlines that I have just announced touting good economic news don't match the darker reality of their lives. They sit at the kitchen table—if they are lucky to have a kitchen table—and they are juggling their bills.

It was brought to my attention on the way to work this morning about how hard it is for so many people. On Constitution Avenue, as we were waiting for a light, I could see off to the left a news camera and a reporter trying to wake up somebody who had been spending the night on the pavement—not on the grates where the heat comes up. They kept pushing and pushing. I could see they were talking to him. He or she didn't come out of that bundle of material on that sidewalk.

I don't know if this man is one of the long-term unemployed. I don't know. But there are lots of people who are in desperate shape. They may not be sleeping on a sidewalk on Constitution Avenue 14 blocks from the White House, but there are people in America who are desperate for help.

There are 1.3 million people who have already lost their unemployment insurance benefits. This is not good for the country. We are told by economists that for every $1 we spend on unemployment benefits it gets $1.50 back to us just like that. So we have to start understanding that we have a country where not everyone is benefiting from what is going on with these headlines I just reported.

Over the last 30 years the income and wealth of the top 1 percent has increased 300 percent. The middle class dropped almost 10 percent. Think about it, 300 percent; the middle class about a 10-percent drop.

I haven't even mentioned the poor. They have been hit harder than anyone else. When I say this, it is true. The rich are getting a lot richer and the poor are getting poorer. The middle class is being squeezed.

I have nothing against people of wealth. It is great we live in a country where people can make a lot of money, but we have to understand there are people who are really hurting. For those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own—and millions of them have struggled for months to find new work—a booming stock market of increasing corporate profits is of little comfort to them.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Fortunately, Americans looking for work have been able to rely on unemployment insurance to get them through the tough times. But for 1.3 million people, no deal; 20,000 are veterans returning from wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

At the end of last year, only a few days ago, Congress failed to extend unemployment emergency insurance for Americans who have been looking for work for more than 6 months. We have never in the history of our country had long-term unemployment such as today—never in the history of our Republic. Yet we are turning 1.3 million people away. Are they going to be the next ones sleeping on some street—wherever they come from—trying to stay warm?

For many Americans these benefits make the difference between being able to live a decent life—not a good life, a decent life—and going hungry or becoming homeless.

Let us go back to 2012. In 2012 unemployment insurance helped 2.5 million people, including 600,000 children, from going into the rolls of poverty. We don't have all the results from last year. These families live in red States, blue States, Republicans, Democrats, or Independents. We shouldn't turn our backs on them.

In the past, we have worked together. Did we complain when President Bush came to us? Unemployment was nowhere near where it is now. There were enough long-term unemployed, and we automatically together extended those benefits. Not today. We are not doing it because we can't get the Republicans to help us. We have reached out the hand to hardworking Americans struggling to get by.

I would hope we can get a few Republicans to join DEAN HELLER of Nevada, a conservative Senator. Join with DEAN HELLER, a junior Senator from Nevada, and help get this legislation passed.

In the latest round of emergency assistance, George Bush was the person who signed that bill. At the time the unemployment rate was about 5.5 percent. Today in Nevada and Rhode Island—the State of Senator JACK REED, who will speak—it is about 9 percent.

The long-term unemployment rate today is more than double what it was at the time that we let emergency job assistance expire. Senator HELLER understands. I am troubled that most of Senator HELLER's Republican colleagues, according to what we are hearing in the press, callously turned their backs on the long-term unemployed.

I am saddened. I hope that we can get them to move over and help us to help these people who need it so very much. Failing to restore emergency assistance would not only be a crushing blow to the long-term unemployed, it would be a blow to our economy.

Americans use their unemployment benefits to buy food and fuel at local gas stations, to pay their landlords or to purchase for a child a winter coat. That is why for every dollar we spend on unemployment benefits, I repeat, the economy grows by $1.50. This investment in our fellow Americans is one of the most effective ways to spark and sustain an economic recovery.

Last night the senior Senator from Texas, a Republican, asked that we delay this vote until today. I was pleased to do that. He called this a serious issue, and he is very correct. The senior Senator from Texas is correct. This is a serious issue. It is as serious to people outside Nevada as it is to those people from Nevada who have been out of work for so long. People from Nevada have written and called my office, calling and begging for a little more time.

For every job that is available, there are three that are unemployed in America. We Democrats stand united in support of this extension. Republicans need to take this seriously as well as we.

I hope Republicans remember that during hard times, that during times of high unemployment—regardless of who is in the White House or who led this Chamber—Congress is always willing to put politics aside and put American families first.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I indicated to the majority leader I was going to ask unanimous consent, which I am prepared to do at this point. I have to admit, I am a little surprised at the fervor with which the majority is dedicated to reviving the expired emergency unemployment benefits after they ignored the issue all of last year. I am sure there are many on my side who would like to see these additional weeks of benefits extended if—as the Speaker of the House indicated he supported—we could find a way to extend them without actually adding to the national debt.

To that end I would like to propose that we be allowed—my side be allowed—to offer an amendment to pay for these benefits by lifting the burden of ObamaCare's individual mandate for 1 year and take care of our veterans who were harmed by the recently agreed-to budget deal while we are in the same amendment, and once that is disposed of we can have an actual debate on this issue and an amendment process in the Senate, which hasn't happened very often in recent times.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 1845, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill and that my amendment with Senator HATCH be the first amendment in order and that there be up to 1 hour of debate on the amendment divided in the usual form; that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate then proceed to a vote in relation to that amendment. I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of that amendment, it be in order for the majority leader or his designee to offer an amendment and it be in order for the leaders or their designees to continue to offer amendments in alternating fashion, which used to be the way we did business around here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object—and I appreciate how candid my Republican counterpart is and I say that seriously—I do speak with some, or I try, though I am not real good at speaking with a lot of fervor, as everyone knows—but I feel very strongly about this issue. For people who are unemployed and can't find a job, it is a tough deal. I have, fortunately, always had a job. I can't say the same for my family, especially my dad. So I do speak with as much fervor as I am capable on this issue.

The reason I mention I am glad my friend is being so candid is—listen to this—no one can in any way dispute my facts. For every $1 spent, we get $1.50 back. That doesn't add to the deficit. So as I see this picture from the consent request, I am seeing that we are going to take away ObamaCare, which 9 million new people have and are signing up at the rate of thousands every day. We are going to take away their benefits, in some form or fashion, and we are going to trump the bipartisan agreement we have with MIKULSKI and ROGERS. They are coming up with an omnibus bill. I know my friend has already stated he initially was against the budget deal, but I would bet that is addressed in this deal MIKULSKI and ROGERS will come up with—this helping of veterans.

So this is a guise to obstruct, as has been happening during the 5 years President Obama has been President of the United States, and I object with as much fervor as I can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the past several days, we have seen a number of stories about how Democrats plan to spend the year gearing up for the November elections by making an issue out of economic hardships faced by Americans; in other words, instead of working on reforms that would actually help people overcome the challenges so many of them

face in this economy, Democrats plan to exploit those folks for political gain. It is pretty amazing when you think about it.

We are now in the sixth year—the sixth year—of the Obama administration. We all know the stock market has been doing great, so the richest among us are doing fine. But what about the poor? What about working-class folks? What about folks who work in industries liberals don't approve of, such as coal? How many of these Americans have been doing well during the Obama economy?

Record numbers of them are having a perfectly terrible time. One indicator is the growth of the Food Stamp Program. Consider this: Since the President took office, the number of Americans who have signed up for food stamps has literally skyrocketed—skyrocketed. It is up almost half. Nearly 4 out of 10 unemployed Americans are trapped—literally trapped—in long-term unemployment. What is worse, the poorest Americans are the ones who have often had the hardest time recovering in this economy.

Yes, the President took office in the midst of an economic crisis. No one disputes that. But for many Americans, a terrible situation seems to have only gotten worse over the course of this administration. For the President to turn around and try to blame his political opponents for the suffering we have seen out there takes a pretty good amount of nerve. It also assumes a collective case of national amnesia. It would take a collective case of national amnesia to reach those conclusions because, remember, these are the same folks who gave us the stimulus, who gave us tax increases, who gave us ObamaCare, and all of it was done in the name of helping the little guy, in the name of greater equality.

What has it given us? It has given us this mess we have in our country: record numbers of long-term unemployed, record numbers on food stamps, people losing their health care plans, others seeing the premiums shoot up when they can least afford it, and now another call, one more call, for a government fix.

Washington Democrats have shown almost no interest for 5 years in working together on ways to create the kind of good, stable, high-paying jobs people want and need. This is a real disservice, first and foremost, to those who are struggling the most out there—from the college graduate who suddenly finds herself wondering why she has huge student loan debts but no prospects of work to the 50-year-old dad who has worked his whole adult life but suddenly can't find a job that meets either his needs or his potential. Yet this administration's proposed solution is just to slap another bandaid from Washington on it and call it a day.

Yes, we should work on solutions to support those who are out of work through no fault of their own, but there is literally no excuse to pass unemployment insurance legislation without also finding ways to create good, stable, high-paying jobs and also trying to find the money to pay for it. So what I am saying is, let us support meaningful job creation measures and let us find a way to pay for these UI benefits so we are not adding to an already completely unsustainable debt.

Unfortunately, the administration seems almost totally disinterested in solutions that don't put government in the lead, and it seems nearly incapable of working with those who don't share that belief. That, in many ways, is precisely why we are in the situation we are in—because it is only when one believes government is the answer to all of our problems that we talk about unemployment insurance instead of job creation and the minimum wage instead of helping people reach their maximum potential.

It is time to get away from ''temporary government programs'' and give the American people the tools they need to drive an economy that truly works for them and for their families. We could start with one of the real bright spots in our economy; that is, energy, a field that is poised to help our economy create literally millions of jobs, if only the administration would get out of the way.

Another area in which we should be able to work together is health care. By almost any metric—affordability, accessibility, even the ratio of cancellations to enrollments—this law has imposed more pain and more distress than many had ever thought possible. Centrists, moderates, conservatives, just about any sensible person outside the congressional Democratic leadership in Washington has long understood this. But now even the left is starting to come to grips with the painfully obvious fact that the law it fell in love with can't possibly work.

Last week one of the great pooh-bahs of the left admitted that ''ObamaCare is awful,'' calling it ''the dirty little secret many liberals have avoided saying out loud.'' I don't agree with that man on much else, including his broader ideas on health care, but it is good to hear a grandee of the left at least admit this isn't working.

His words point to a larger truth, that the President's amen chorus had ample opportunity to speak truth to power when it mattered and that most—most—chose to remain silent. For that the law's apologists have left the American people to pay the price.

Let me read part of a letter I recently received from Jennifer Bell, a constituent of mine in Hopkinsville. This is what she said:

> I have less coverage than I did before. I didn't get to keep my policy that I was happy with. Every dollar I have to pay more is a dollar taken from my family. I never thought that in America we would be forced to purchase something we cannot afford. We worked hard to get where we are. Now we are being forced to pay more in order to pay for somebody else's insurance. How is that fair?

I hear you, Jennifer. Everyone on this side of the aisle hears those concerns.

Here is something else. Many Kentuckians are finding ObamaCare is about more than just higher premiums and cuts to Medicare. It is also about a lack of access to doctors and hospitals. One of the most leftwing papers in my State recently ran a big story about how many ObamaCare coverage networks exclude—exclude—so many of the hospitals my constituents want to use.

A few weeks ago, the majority leader basically said criticisms of ObamaCare amounted to jokes. He might like to think this is all some joke, but the constituents who have been writing me about the consequences of this failed law don't see it that way.

I know this must weigh heavily on our Democratic colleagues. I know they can't see so many Americans hurting because of decisions they made and feel absolutely nothing.

Let me say this to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is a new year and a time for new beginnings. If you are ready to work with us, we are here. Together we can start over on health care. Together we can give the American people the kind of health care reform they deserve—reform that can lower costs and improve the quality of care.

But as with solving the problems of joblessness and unemployment, it is something we can only do together.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1845, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 265, S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on the side supporting the pending motion, there is 15 minutes under the unanimous consent agreement and a similar amount of time on the other side. If all time is used, I would notify Members our rollcall vote will be about 11 o'clock.

I ask unanimous consent that on our side, supporting the motion, I be allowed 5 minutes, Senator REED of Rhode Island 5 minutes, and Senator KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the Republican leader today. Here is what he said.

If we are going to give 1.3 million Americans unemployment insurance which has now expired, we have to pay for it. Then he suggested how he would pay for it. He would pay for it by attacking ObamaCare. That is no surprise. But the provision he would attack is the individual mandate—the mandate that people buy health insurance. Well, what is the impact of that? The mandate that people have the responsibility to buy health insurance is necessary if we are going to protect Americans from being discriminated against who have preexisting conditions in their families. Follow me now. In order to make sure a parent with a child who has asthma or a child who has diabetes can still buy health insurance, we needed to expand the insurance pool. We expanded the insurance pool by saying to everyone across America: You have the responsibility to buy health insurance.

So what Senator MCCONNELL, on behalf of Senate Republicans, is suggesting is this: If we are going to give 1.3 million Americans unemployment insurance, we have to say to everyone living in America we can no longer keep our promise that health insurance will not discriminate against your family because of a preexisting condition. Wow. What a tradeoff, 1.3 million people get unemployment benefits over 300 million Americans lose the protection of discrimination in their health insurance because of a preexisting condition in their families. That is the Republican logic: Help the unemployed but at the expense of 300 million American families and their health insurance protection.

It is interesting to note that we have had a dramatic increase in people living in the Commonwealth of Kentucky—represented by Senator MCCONNELL—when it comes to the Affordable Care Act. Governor Beshear, a Democrat, is promoting affordable care in Kentucky and has one of the most successful efforts under way across America. Yet every day the Senators from Kentucky both come to the floor and criticize the very program that is so popular in their State.

The second point I want to make is this: All we are asking for this morning is a vote to start the debate on unemployment insurance benefits. We are asking 5 Republicans to join 55 Democrats to let us debate whether we extend unemployment benefits across America. It is that simple. At about 11:00 that vote will take place.

This used to be a bipartisan issue.

The Presiding Officer of New Jersey is the newest Member of the Senate, and I welcome him again.

There was a time when Republican Presidents thought unemployment compensation was a pretty good idea. Why? Because families with breadwinners who are out of work need to feed their children, need to feed themselves. Senator MCCONNELL criticizes this program as a temporary government handout. Let me tell you, if you don't have food on the table, you need a temporary helping hand so you can put food on the table so you are strong enough tomorrow to look for jobs again. That is what it is all about, and they don't get it. They say we should be talking about creating jobs. What about creating some food in the bellies of children? What about paying the utility bill or the rent or keeping the lights on or keeping the place that you live warm enough while you are out looking for a job? That is part of the reality facing people across America. There were 81,867 individuals in my home State of Illinois who lost their benefits between Christmas and New Year. They have written me letters.

Ryan, a 35-year-old man with two children from Antioch, IL, writes to me about how difficult it is for him to keep his family together as he continues day after weary day looking for a job. What I hear from the Republican leader is: Well, isn't it a shame that Ryan doesn't have a job? But we can't let government come in and provide the solution.

Well, historically government has stepped up when the private sector cannot or will not. In this case, we know it is absolutely essential.

What we need to have is five Republicans to at least give us a chance this morning at 11 to move forward on the debate on unemployment insurance. This is basic and it is humane. It used to be bipartisan before the tea party takeover of the Republican Party. I hope there are enough moderates left on the Republican side to join us to make this a bipartisan issue again. Helping people keep their families together, the lights on, the heat in their homes, and food on the table while they are looking for a job is not a government giveaway. For goodness sake, it defines who we are as a nation. If we can't stand and help these people looking for work, then it is a sad commentary on who we are, where we are, and our principles.

Finally, this notion of thrashing out at ObamaCare every time there is an issue coming up on the floor has reached its extreme today, when the Republican leader would eliminate the protection against discrimination for preexisting conditions for 300 million Americans in order to provide unemployment benefits for 1.3 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, could the Presiding Officer instruct me when I reach the 4-minute mark?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise with my colleagues to support this motion to bring this legislation to the floor to begin a debate.

There were 1.3 million Americans who were pushed off an economic cliff on December 28 when their extended unemployment benefits ended. They are searching for work. They have to search for work. They are in a market where there are typically two or three applicants for one job.

Yesterday I read a story from the Washington Post that talked about the opening of a new dairy plant in Maryland. They were expecting a lot of interest in the 36 jobs: 1,600 applicants. I would wager that many of those applicants never thought in their lives, after being a vice president of sales in a company or a sophisticated manager of the financial aspects of a company, that they would be applying for work in a dairy. Some of them might even be on extended benefits, and that is the only thing keeping them whole. And they are looking for work, 1,600 applicants for 36 jobs.

This is not unique to Maryland. It is in my home State of Rhode Island. It is in States all across this country, Nevada, Tennessee, Arizona, States with unemployment numbers above the national average of 7 percent. In my case, it is 9 percent. We have to help these families. And as Senator DURBIN pointed out, we have done this on a bipartisan basis until very recently.

This is a smart economic program. This program, according to CBO, will create 200,000 jobs next year if we extend it. Those are 200,000 jobs we are going to give away. And the minority leader was talking about how we have to do more to create jobs around here. Well, if we don't pass this measure, CBO has told us we are going to forfeit 200,000 jobs. So from an economic basis in this country, this is smart. But from a human basis, this helps people who have worked—and the only way you qualify for this program is if you worked and then you are let go through no fault of your own. So we have to do that.

Colleagues on the other side are talking about: Well, we have to pay for these benefits. This is a selective sort of notion, because, frankly, the last time we extended these benefits in January of 2013, it was not offset and the vote was 89–8. It included tax provisions and other provisions, but we extended these benefits, unpaid for, 89–8. Yet now we have to pay for these benefits.

What Senator HELLER and I have done is said: Listen, we need to help these people now. Let's do a 90-day extension, provide retroactive relief, and help these 1.3 million—and it will grow, because several million more people will lose their benefits this year. Let's do it, and then let's sit down and work on this program.

But let me also remind my colleagues, we have made significant changes to the unemployment insurance program. In early 2012, we had a conference report between the House and the Senate which made changes in unemployment insurance. We reduced the total time from 99 weeks to 73 weeks. We created the work-sharing

program, a very innovative program which allows people to collect for part of the week but also stay employed the rest of the week. It is a program which has helped companies all across the country, small companies in particular. We have given States more flexibility on job training. We have given States more flexibility in oversight of their programs. We have made changes. We are willing to listen to thoughtful proposals again. But we can't do it on the backs of 1.3 million Americans who have lost the only benefit they have.

If we really want to talk about job training, if we want to talk about cooperation, why haven't we been able to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act since 1998? We have not made the changes in workforce training that affect this whole country—not just the unemployed but those young people who are trying to move out of high school and junior college into the workforce. We haven't done it. Why? Well, from 1998 until 2007, we had a Republican Congress. Since 2007, we have been struggling very mightily with an economic crisis. And we have made progress.

But if we want to start cooperating, let's bring the Workforce Investment Act to the floor. It has passed the committee on a bipartisan basis. Let's bring it to the floor. Let's help people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island under that time to yield for the following question.

I don't know if the Senator was on the floor when the Republican leader said he wanted to pay for the cost of these unemployment benefits by eliminating the individual mandate under the Affordable Care Act—which is the key element in protecting families who have children with preexisting conditions—cancer survivors, children with diabetes, children with asthma. As I understood the Republican leader, he believes that the best way to take care of people who are unemployed and can't feed their children is to deny the protections of the Affordable Care Act for those families who have children with preexisting conditions. Would the Senator from Rhode Island comment on whether that is a good trade for either side?

Mr. REED. I think it is a terrible trade. It is not just about families with children, it is about many of these working adults who, if they have a preexisting condition, lose their coverage. It is not just a question of children. That I think is very sensitive. Without the Affordable Care Act, if you get sick, you can't get coverage. The only way you can get coverage if you are middle-aged is if you are healthy and you don't need it. When you needed it, the insurance companies took it away—before the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. DURBIN. If I might ask another question to the Senator from Rhode Island from the time allotted on our side, I listened carefully to the speech given by the Republican leader this morning.

I see my colleague from New York here, so I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friends from Illinois and Rhode Island.

How much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute 30 seconds.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I see what is going on here. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know the power of this issue but don't really want to vote for it, and so they are putting impossible logjams in the path.

Who would believe that on this side of the aisle we would delay an important part of the ACA which would hurt—as my colleagues from Illinois and Rhode Island brought out—parents who have kids with cancer? We are not going to do that, and we are not going to do it on the fly.

So what I would say to my colleagues is if you believe in unemployment benefits and extending them, pass them clean and simple. Don't play games. Don't put obstacles in their path that you know would be insurmountable. Get it done.

I make one other point. The bottom line is very simple: People want to work. People who have lost their jobs after working decades for a company are knocking on doors every day. They are going online. They are desperate to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. This idea that unemployment benefits encourage them not to work is balderdash.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. I yield back all time on the Republican side.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 265, S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Martin Heinrich, Thomas R. Carper, Charles E. Schumer, Dianne Feinstein, Patty Murray, Bernard Sanders, Angus S. King, Jr., Al Franken, Tom Harkin, Jeff Merkley, Elizabeth Warren, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara Boxer, Richard Blumenthal, Sherrod Brown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would have voted ''nay.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 2 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Ayotte	Hagan	Murphy
Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Portman
Blumenthal	Heller	Pryor
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Brown	Kaine	Rockefeller
Cantwell	King	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Carper	Landrieu	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Coats	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—37

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—3

Begich	Hatch	Thune

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 37. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not an order to reconsider; it is a separate cloture motion.

Mr. REID. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am so pleased that six Republicans—six out of all the Republicans—joined with us—every Democrat present—to reach that magic 60 votes we needed to proceed to consider the unemployment compensation bill.

I think it is so important to recognize that Federal unemployment programs have been extended no less than 28 times since 1958—15 times under Republican Presidents and 13 times under Democratic Presidents. So this is nothing new—this is nothing new—and the fact that it has been made such a big deal is incomprehensible given the circumstances of us recovering from the greatest recession since the Great Depression, with a very special number, a very large number. The fact is we have a long-term unemployment rate that is very high, way higher than normal.

The fact is, since we have extended Federal unemployment benefits so many times it should not be a problem, it is shocking it is a problem. In November 2008, unemployment insurance was extended with bipartisan support without an offset, which seems to be the excuse the Republicans have for not voting with us.

What is very interesting about that is these are the same Republicans who voted to go to war twice and put those wars on the credit card—never paid for them. These are the same Republicans who voted for tax cuts to billionaires and multimillionaires and never paid for it. Yet still, when it comes to the middle class, oh, they cannot possibly extend unemployment benefits without paying for it. If anyone knows anything about economics, they should know that when we are trying to stimulate jobs and stimulate the economy—not depress jobs and lose jobs—we do not contract spending.

We have already dealt with deficits, and we continue to deal with deficits. I want to show the progress we have made under President Obama. This is something we never hear from the Republicans. They would make us feel deficits are raging, as they were under George W. Bush.

When President Obama took over, he inherited a $1.4 trillion deficit from George Bush. George Bush inherited surpluses from Bill Clinton. It took him—and I am exaggerating—15 minutes to change it: two wars on a credit card, no problem, no offsets; tax cuts to billionaires, no problem, no offsets—and the deficits soared to $1.4 trillion.

When President Obama came in, he not only had to deal with raging deficits, he had to deal with the worst recession since the Great Depression, and all we hear from the Republican side is: This President did not do enough here, did not do enough there. Nothing is enough.

We are now in a situation where this deficit has been cut in half—cut in half—down to $560 billion, and we want to see it disappear, just as we did when Bill Clinton was President and the Democrats passed a budget that balanced and set in motion a surplus, which was destroyed when George W. Bush was President. Let's be clear on the history. There are facts. There are stubborn things. They are real. These are the facts.

Now we come to a place where we want to extend long-term unemployment benefits for those who got deeply hurt in this great recession, and we hear that we have to offset it, which goes against the economic experts who say it is important that we stimulate this economy and keep these jobs rolling.

Remember, in the President George W. Bush recession, we had a similar extended benefit. It was not offset. It was extended twice in 2003 with strong bipartisan support and no offset. So why is it when a Republican is President the Republicans say: OK, let's help the unemployed without an offset, without spending cuts. But when a Democrat is President, oh no, we could not do it?

Honestly, it just is so political on its face. Democrats have been consistent. Whether a Republican is President or a Democrat is President, we want to help the middle class. We want to help the unemployed. That is the difference between the parties. I say God bless those six Republicans who joined with us today so we can do our job and help the long-term unemployed.

The long-term unemployment rate is 2.6 percent—the long-term unemployment rate, twice as high as it was at any other time that these extended unemployment benefits were allowed to expire. Let me say that again, how urgent this is. The long-term unemployment rate—that means people who have been out of work for a long time, 6 months or more, is 2.6 percent, twice as high as it was at any other time in our history where we have extended unemployment benefits.

There are almost three unemployed people for every job opening nationwide. Let me repeat. There are almost three unemployed people for every job opening nationwide. We need to understand, while some of our Republican colleagues are blaming the unemployed and saying it is a disservice to give them unemployment compensation, that these folks are actively looking for jobs. That is part of the deal.

First of all, this is insurance. Second of all, they are looking for work. Third of all, they are stuck in the situation where it is not their fault. A Christmas present was given by the Republicans to the 1.3 million unemployed. That Christmas present was: Sorry, you are not getting your unemployment benefits. We left here without being able to deal with it.

But today we have a chance, a chance to do the right thing. In California, my State alone, there are 222,000 people who have lost their extended unemployment benefits. An additional 1.9 million people are projected to lose their benefits over the next 6 months if unemployment insurance is not extended.

What are these grandiose amounts of money that people get when they are long-term unemployed: $300 a week, on average—$300 a week, on average. So for our colleagues to say that people want to be purposefully unemployed to collect $300 a week, could I tell you, try living on $300 a week. If you are lucky, you can keep a roof over your head but you have to be pretty lucky. If you are lucky, you can get maybe a little bit of nutrition. That $300 a week is a lifeline. They can put some groceries on the table, pay their rent, and cover the expenses they have in looking for a job.

This keeps American families afloat at a critical time. I want to give you a few stories from my home State of the real face of long-term unemployment and why we have to vote to extend these benefits. One woman wrote:

> I am 58 years old and am receiving unemployment benefits for the first time in my life. I am currently receiving my first federal extension. I was laid off because the nonprofit I was working for lost a major portion of its state funding.
>
> Getting unemployment benefits is not preventing me from looking for work. In fact, people getting extended unemployment benefits are required to prove they're looking for work. I spend hours every week filling out applications and posting my resume without result.
>
> Tell me, how am I, and thousands like me supposed to pay my rent and eat? I agree that Washington should ''focus on job creation'' but that should be in addition to, not instead of, extending benefits. I beg you,—

She writes to me—

> Please extend unemployment benefits. Thank you.

Another Californian wrote from Los Angeles:

> After working 27 years for one employer, the bad economy finally led to my layoff and my first time ever on unemployment.

Remember, this person worked 27 years for one employer.

> I was told that because of the bad economy, I would get up to 63 weeks with the Federal Extension. Now I'm being told without further action from Congress and the President, my benefits end at the end of the year even though that leaves me 3 months short. After paying into the system for 32 years, this is the only time I have ever asked for anything back and this is how I'm treated.

There are other stories. Kaitlyn of Twentynine Palms, 24 years old, lost her $450-a-week benefit when the Federal extension expired. She is a Marine Corps veteran, the mother of two young kids. She has been searching for work. The family cannot move because her husband, a veteran of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars must remain near the combat center until he is discharged from the Marines.

The loss of her benefits will cut deeply into the couple's income. Smith said, ''The family is already skimping on basics, including heat.''

Including heat.

''I have to keep the house at 55 degrees even though I have two little girls, ages 2½ and 1½.''

Keeping the house at 55 degrees. That is a story which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on New Year's Eve.

Laura Walker, a 63-year-old paralegal has been looking for work since January when she was laid off from a California law firm. She counted on her benefits that have now run out.

Not all of us have savings and a lot of us have to take care of family because of what happened in the economy, said Walker, of Santa Clarita, who said she has applied for at least three jobs a week and shares an apartment with her unemployed son, his wife and two children. It's going to put my family and me out on the streets.

That appeared in Bloomberg News on December 31.

We have a story of a software engineer who lives in San Diego County. She is one of 18,000 San Diego County residents to lose their payments. She says her $450 weekly unemployment payment goes to food, dental insurance, and other living necessities. She has tried zealously to find work. She has volunteered. She has attended meetings. She has cold called. She has written letters. She has joined the Project Management Institute of San Diego. She said:

I haven't been sitting here watching soap operas. I would go to work tomorrow, or today. I really am tired of this.

That story appeared in the San Diego Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that several additional stories be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cindy Snow, of Beaumont, CA, lost her job as a social worker in April when the San Bernardino school system terminated the child-care program where she worked. Her husband, employed in the construction industry, has been without a job since 2009. They have been relying on assistance from the California Housing Finance Agency to cover a $1,424-a-month payment on their home.

When she loses her unemployment benefits, she said, the family will no longer qualify for the housing assistance. ''Why are they using us as pawns? They're playing games with people's lives,'' Snow said, referring to politicians in Washington.

—Bloomberg News, 12/30/13

Steven Swanson of Madera Ranchos, CA, worked for 33 years in wholesale, mostly in beverage sales, before losing his job in 2011. Since then, he estimates that he's submitted resumes for more than 500 positions and in the last six months filled out more than 200 job applications—all to no avail.

''I want a job, I want to work,'' said Swanson whose daughter and son-in-law live with him and pay rent to help him keep up the mortgage on the house he owns. ''As a taxpayer, I paid into the system for a lot of years. For them to just shut it off and say, 'These people need to get weaned off and get a job'—well, yeah, I need to get a job. But for them to suggest that I just go get welfare or go get food stamps—that's why I'm frustrated with the Republican Party. They just don't get it.''

—Fresno Bee, 1/2/14

Mrs. BOXER. So here you have the facts. I will just recap them. We have a situation where the long-term unemployment rate—those looking for work and out of work for more than 6 months is higher than it has ever been, 2.6 percent.

We have a situation where we are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression. Even though President Obama has done an amazing job on job creation, creating 8 million private sector jobs in his time—8 million private sector jobs under President Obama. We lost more than 600 million private sector jobs by the end of 8 years under George W. Bush. But we still have a problem. How many private sector jobs were lost in the recession? More than 8 million. So we need to restore those jobs.

So this is not the time—when you go for a job and there are three applicants for one job—to tell people they are cut off from unemployment.

Here is the issue. In a State that has a really good economy with a very low unemployment rate, less than about 5 percent, the full extension does not go forward. It only goes forward to States that have a high unemployment rate. So it is targeted. It is not going to States where there is a boom going on or a really strong economy. It goes to States that have a tough unemployment rate, and have all these people coming for one job opening.

In some States it is five to one. Remember, the average is almost three to one, three people for every job. In some States they are doing better. Maybe there is just two people for every job. But there are three nationally. In some States it is way higher. So we are just saying at this particular point in time: Let's extend this for a 3-month period. Do it without offsets, because when you offset you cut something else and you constrict the economy at a time when you should be expanding it. Two-thirds of the time we have never paid for unemployment extensions. Under George W. Bush, who started the current program, we never did—at least in the beginning we did not.

We care about jobs in this country. Everybody does. If we extend unemployment insurance, we would prevent the loss of 240,000 jobs. You say: Why? That is because when folks get their checks, what do they do with it? They go down to the store, and they spend it buying food for their families. They do not hold back. They pay their rent. The landlord gets that check and spends that check. So it is an immediate boon to the economy and an immediate fact that we can definitely prove that jobs are not lost because economic activity in those communities goes down.

We are talking, in my State, of 46,000 jobs that will be lost if we do not correct this problem. The Congressional Budget Office has said another year-long extension, if we do this and do it for a year—this particular bill is only a few months extension—if we did it for a year, we would add two-tenths of 1 percent to our gross domestic product.

Extending unemployment insurance is one of the most cost effective ways to grow the economy and create jobs. In the end, that reduces the deficit. So all of this talk to cut this and cut that to pay for this, it is counterproductive because you will pull back on gross domestic product growth, and there will be less revenue coming into the government.

So I do not see how this extension of unemployment is anything but a win-win. It is an obvious win-win. If you took the politics out of it, you would do the right thing, Republicans, because you have done it in the past. When Republicans were President, you did it without an offset. You did not hold up a bill. You passed it. You stimulated the economy. You create more jobs. The deficit then goes down even faster than it is going down. Look at how it is coming down.

There is no reason why we have to cut something that then depresses spending over here, while doing unemployment over here. It does not make sense. I was an economics major a long time ago. So I am not saying that I am up to date on the latest theories. But one thing we know makes sense: When you are trying to create jobs, when you are trying to get out of a recession, you do not turn to austerity, especially since we have wrapped our arms around this deficit. It has been hard to do. But who would have thought we could have done it. We did it.

So we do not have to say now that, while we give an unemployment extension on the one hand, we are going to cut something on the other hand and lose those jobs over there. It does not make sense. Then you put those people on unemployment. It really does not make sense.

Would I vote to give a little higher tax rate to the billionaires? I just watched a documentary called ''Park Avenue.'' This is what they said. I have not fact-checked it, so we have to fact check this. But this is what the documentary said: Approximately 400 or 500 families are worth more than 150 million Americans—net worth. That is what they said. We are going to fact-check it this afternoon. If I am wrong, I will correct the RECORD.

That is what the movie said: 450, 500 families have more net worth than half the population of America.

That is the income inequality.

So would I pay for this by putting a little tax on the billionaires? Oh, yes, I would. But I don't wish to start cutting programs: education, housing, health care, whatever they come up with, which then means people would be laid off.

We can do this. We are not afraid to cut spending. We are not afraid to reduce the deficit. We did it under Bill Clinton. We got a surplus, and we are doing it under Barack Obama.

I defy any Republican to show me how this shapes up in a bad way with the Bush record, which was taking surpluses that George Bush inherited and turning it into massive deficits and literally no job creation. It was 1.1 million jobs created, compared to cutting

the deficit in half after President Barack Obama inherited the worst recession since the Great Depression, creating 8 million new jobs in the private sector alone and reducing the deficit by half.

We know what we are doing, despite what they say, and it is OK, because at the end of the day the facts are the facts. I didn't make up this chart. This is a chart that comes from the Congressional Budget Office. These are their numbers.

The stories I have told and that I have put in the RECORD are poignant. There are people out there who are at their wit's end holding their lives together, keeping their homes at 55 degrees when they have little children in them, not knowing if they can pay the rent, not knowing if they can go to the grocery store, not knowing if they will be homeless, not knowing what the future holds.

The least we can do, the least we can do in this Chamber is stand and fight for them.

What are we here for anyway? Are we here for the Koch brothers? I hope not. The billionaires are doing just fine. This country is a great country. It is a great country because everyone can dream to go to the top. But if we lose the middle class and we are not there with the safety net when they fall, we will lose everything and this country will not resemble the America I grew up in and that I knew. I had nothing and my husband had nothing. He lost his father when he was only a young boy. His mother was a school crossing guard and raised three boys.

In this country, my husband went to college, to law school, and started his own law firm, his own small business. That is what America is.

But when we were in trouble when we were young, we knew we had the hope and the dream. It was real. It wasn't unreachable. It was reachable because there was a safety net, and part of that safety net is unemployment insurance. Part of that safety net is extending it for the long-term unemployed.

I am going to close with a couple of facts about health care because I am so tired of the ''bad news bears'' coming out here every day whining about ObamaCare. I wish to tell everyone some of the good news about health care because we don't hear it enough.

Across this country, over 2.1 million Americans have enrolled through the exchanges in private health insurance—2.1. It is pretty amazing, and I wish to state some more facts.

In California, I wish to tell you what is happening. We have our own exchange, Covered California, coveredCA.com. What has happened so far we don't hear around the beltway. All we hear is: ObamaCare is bad. ObamaCare is bad.

I wish to tell some stories of what is truly happening and these facts will catch up as well, such as 400,000 Californians now have coverage through the California exchange, private coverage.

We have more than 200,000 Californians on Medi-Cal, which is California's Medicaid Program.

A truly great number is more than 1 million California families—not people, families, so we are talking about probably a few million people—have begun the process of applying for coverage.

Across the country, I can state—and we know we have had our bumps in the road—today we are resolving some of those bumps. We had about 2 percent of the people who wound up in a problem where they couldn't get the insurance they wanted. President Obama fixed that problem.

Now we have that 2-percent problem down to way less than .2 percent, very few families. Let's get that clear. Will there be more bumps? Yes. Will we fix them, yes. Are we still worried about the few thousand families who need our help? Yes. We will fix it.

I don't shy away from this. If we have a problem, we fix it. Somebody point out to me any business that doesn't have a few problems in the rollout, and I will say that is pretty amazing.

We had problems with the rollout. It was bad. We are fixing it, and the proof is in the pudding. Today, 9 million Americans have new secure health insurance; 2.1 million, on that other chart, have received it through all the different exchanges, 2.1 million; 3.9 million have enrolled in Medicaid; and 3 million young adults can now stay on their parents' plans. There were bumps in the road, we fixed them, and we will continue to do so, but this is a good story.

I wish to read from some constituents who have written to me about the Affordable Care Act. These are real people speaking, not politicians, not I—them.

Mary Natwick of Monrovia signed up for a platinum plan for her family of three through the Covered California Web site. Even though she makes too much to qualify for a subsidy and even though she purchased the highest level plan, she is saving $1,000 a month on her premiums and she has a lower deductible.

Mary wrote:

> Needless to say, we are thrilled beyond belief. Please accept our gratitude, and pass on our thanks to all who voted for this bill.

This is a constituent who likes ObamaCare and she thanks the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MERKLEY.

David Specter of Ventura and his wife are young retirees, 62 and 58. Their old premiums cost $882 a month. Now because David and his wife qualify for subsidized premiums on the Covered California exchange, they will pay a total of $434 a month with lower deductibles. That is $400 a month in savings. Calculate what that means in 1 year, $400 a month. They can spend it in the neighborhood, in the movies, at a restaurant, in the grocery store, on a vacation, gifts for their grandkids.

David wrote:

> Thank you so much for supporting the Affordable Care Act. It may not be perfect, but it sure makes a big difference for us.

I think that sums it up for me. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, may not be perfect, but it sure is making a difference for Americans—so far 9 million strong, and it will be way more than that.

Maya Walls of San Diego was diagnosed with breast cancer at 27 years of age. Since that diagnosis 20 years ago, she has either kept working to maintain insurance or paid very high COBRA premiums in between her jobs to keep her coverage and to avoid preexisting condition exclusions. That is because, as we know, until ObamaCare became the law of the land, insurers could walk out on people once they got sick.

Two years ago, Maya lost her job. In September she held her breath and went without coverage. On October 1, she found out she finally qualified for California's new expanded Medicaid Program, which she had never qualified for before.

She wrote:

> Please do not give an inch on the ACA. This is the first time I have taken a deep breath in 20 years. Thank you.

I see we have a new Presiding Officer, and I wish to retell this story.

This is a story of one of my constituents who was diagnosed with breast cancer at 27 years of age. Since that diagnosis she was so scared she would lose her insurance because of her preexisting condition that she kept paying very high COBRA premiums. When she finally ran out of options, she lost her insurance and just found out she qualifies for the new expanded Medicaid.

She wrote:

> Please do not give an inch on the ACA. This is the first time I have taken a deep breath in 20 years.

I say to the American people—I hope a few will hear my voice—nothing in life is perfect. No bill is perfect. No business is perfect. No one is perfect; no individual, no President, no Senator for sure. But we see a problem, and we do our best to step up to the plate.

If things go wrong, as it did with the rollout, we get mad about it, but we fix it, and we don't go back to the problems we had before of kids being kicked off their parents' insurance and having no insurance, of people being told: Sorry. You have asthma or you have cancer or you have high blood pressure. We can't help you.

Those days are over. Being a woman was a preexisting condition. Having been a victim of sexual assault was a preexisting condition. If someone was in an abusive relationship, they said: You are just too high of a risk, and they walked away.

There were lifetime caps on our policies. There were annual caps on our policies, gender discrimination, preexisting condition discrimination, all of that.

I am going to say anyone who wants to repeal ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act will go back to those days.

I will never forget reading a New American Foundation study that said,

if we hadn't changed health care in this country, we were getting to a place where premiums would have risen to about 50 percent of our incomes, on average, for at least half of American households. At that point, who is going to be able to afford insurance?

I met people who were praying on their hands and knees to turn 65. As we get older we say: Oh, my God. I want to stay young.

People were saying: Let me get to my 65th birthday so I can get Medicare because I have no insurance.

That is what I heard from my constituents.

What I hear may not be perfect, but it is saving their lives: Fix what is a problem, Senator. You can.

I thank the President for acting to make sure the people who got those cancellation notices—it was about 2 percent of all Americans—were able to stay on similar insurance for an extended period of time.

Yes, we will fix what the problems are, but we will also rejoice when we get letters such as I am getting from all over my State. I ask unanimous consent to have three additional stories printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

John Nunnemacher is a 43-year-old freelance graphic artist from San Jose and the last time he had health insurance was 15 years ago, when his employer paid for his coverage. But as of January 1, John is covered by a plan he can finally afford. He told the San Jose Mercury News, ''I hoped this day would come. I worried that it wouldn't. And I'm very glad that it finally has.''

Amy Torregrossa, 27, is from San Francisco. She has been without insurance since July, when coverage through her partner's company ended because he changed jobs. She has a congenital heart defect and a history of high blood pressure. She no longer runs, she said, because ''if I twist my ankle or get hit by a car. . .any doctor visit is so expensive.'' She signed up on Covered California for a silver plan costing $310 a month. She made sure her cardiologist was in the insurer's network and plans to schedule a checkup for early next year.

Michel Stong, 57, is a self-employed product designer. For many years, she could not afford any insurance at all because of a false-positive test for lupus, which incorrectly flagged her as someone with a pre-existing condition. For the past 15 years, she could afford only catastrophic insurance. Now, thanks to a tax credit, she will pay $55 a month with no deductible and a $3 copay for doctor visits. ''It just blows my mind that I can get health insurance for this price! I can finally afford checkups, tests, and age-related visits.''

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we will tell those stories and we will counteract the stories we hear.

In closing, I wish to say—because I know the Senator from Oregon has been waiting patiently—the reason I took to the floor to talk about health care is to make the point that it is the middle class and the working poor who are truly being helped—that is so important in this time of income inequality—and make the point that we make sure we extend the unemployment compensation to the long-term unemployed as they, through no fault of their own, are trying to keep their house and home together, which is so critical.

I thank my six Republican colleagues who showed courage, stepped up, and allowed us to get on this bill. I hope we pass it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I wish to make a few very brief comments, and the first is this: In the budget agreement that was hammered out right before we left for the holidays, a provision was inserted by Congressman RYAN that changed the COLA details for our veterans. This provision is outrageous. It is changing the retirement deal in the middle of a person's service or, for many of our veterans, even after they have retired—between the time they have retired and the time they reach age 62. In the coming days of this week, I hope this body can come together and reverse this provision which unfairly changes the terms of retirement for our veterans. Our veterans stood up for us as a nation when they were overseas, and we must stand up for them here at home.

Secondly, I would like to express hope for the bipartisan spirit that led to an agreement to debate the bill regarding restoring emergency unemployment. I had eight townhalls over the weekend, and I can tell you that it strikes people as fundamentally unfair that States with high unemployment, such as my home State of Oregon—that these weeks of emergency unemployment, which was a deal hammered out in a bipartisan fashion under a Republican President, President Bush, should be set asunder.

Indeed, on December 28, 18,000 Oregon families got a lump of coal in their stockings, and in the course of this coming year another 58,000 Oregon families will be thrown out in the cold, if you will, due to the failure to reauthorize this program. Indeed, the failure to reauthorize it not only affects directly those families who need a longer bridge to the next job because of the high unemployment levels, but it also affects the economy, destroying an estimated 4,000 jobs. Our citizens want to see us create jobs, not destroy jobs.

So I hope the bipartisan spirit that led to our agreeing to debate restoring the emergency unemployment program will lead to our actually reauthorizing the emergency unemployment program.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, this new year represents an opportunity for us to refocus and plan for our year ahead. Unfortunately, for millions of Americans their focus will be on trying to stay afloat over the next year while they search for work. All of us here know there is no more important issue for middle-class families across America right now than jobs and the economy. This is what they want their elected officials to be focused on, and it is exactly what I think we ought to be working on every day.

By reaching a bipartisan agreement last month, we did a number of things to work toward that goal. First of all and importantly, we showed the American people that Members of Congress can work together, that we can listen to each other, and that we can get into a room and talk frankly without trying to hurt each other politically. Second, by breaking through that partisanship, we finally ended that seemingly never-ending cycle of lurching from crisis to crisis. Third, we showed that ''compromise'' isn't a dirty word and that there is a big coalition that is ready to make some sacrifices politically to get things done. Finally and importantly, for our efforts to continue to grow our economy, we gave American families and businesses the certainty they need to grow.

Of course, there is much more to do. As much as we are heartened by the headlines that predict a strong economy this year, we understand just how fragile our recovery still is, with millions of Americans still out of work.

Now is the time to redouble our efforts, not shrink from the challenges we face, because the truth is that all the economic predictions in the world mean nothing if we don't continue to support policies that help our middle class. That work absolutely starts with extending unemployment benefits for the millions of Americans who have been losing their benefits since December 28.

Because unemployment assistance goes right back into the economies of communities large and small, nonpartisan economists have found it is one of the most effective ways to build a recovery that lasts. Those same economists have said that failure to continue these benefits will cost us over 200,000 jobs. And renewing these benefits is simply the right thing to do at a time when millions of American families continue to teeter on the brink in States where unemployment remains stubbornly high.

I have come to the Senate floor today with the hope that we can continue with the bipartisan momentum we saw with today's cloture vote and that we have seen over the last few weeks and take a final vote to provide a lifeline for millions of Americans. This should be an easy issue. It would be simply wrong to cut off the support while our economy continues to struggle and so many workers are really having difficulty finding work. Right now, in fact, there are three unemployed workers for every single job opening. If every opening were filled tomorrow, we would still have more than 7 million American workers across the country without a job to even apply for. More

than one-third of all unemployed workers have been out of a job for 6 months or longer—above historic averages and higher than in past recoveries.

Millions of Americans are unemployed today not because they do not want to work, not because they do not have valuable skills, but simply because they found themselves in an economy that isn't creating jobs as quickly as needed. These unemployed workers are desperate to get back on the job, and unemployment benefits make all the difference for them and their families while they scour the want ads, pound the pavement, and send out resume after resume.

I have received story after story from workers and families across my home State of Washington about what unemployment benefits have meant to them and what losing them would mean for their future. These men and women can't afford to have the rug pulled out from under them and are now struggling with each day that passes.

One of these stories came from a woman named Carol from Puyallup in my home State. She is a nurse. She was laid off from her job. She decided that in order to make ends meet she would start her own legal nurse consulting business, so she enrolled in classes to help her hone her entrepreneurial skills. While taking those classes, Carol relied on her unemployment benefits to get by. Then, not only were her benefits slashed significantly due to sequestration, but Carol just found out she was one of the 25,000 people in Washington State whose benefits were completely cut off on December 28.

As a leader in the classroom, Carol has spoken to many other soon-to-be business owners who are suffering. In the face of unexpected job loss, they now feel as if they are being punished for deciding to chart a new course in their lives. They are creating work for themselves and potentially others but now have to decide whether they can continue following that dream without the critical support unemployment benefits provide them.

Carol is not alone. I heard from a woman who was laid off from her job at a plant in Keyport, WA, early last year. She told me:

> Living in Kitsap County, we are geographically isolated, and finding work with so many qualified applicants right now is much more difficult. This year, I have applied for over 200 jobs and in spite of a stellar resume, have only gotten four phone interviews. I have lowered my standards throughout the year and applied for jobs far below my pay grade to no avail . . . my husband and I have had to claim bankruptcy . . . and I truly worry about losing my home and displacing my children.

Madam President, that is what people are facing today.

Finally, there is Traci, a woman from Everett. She is a former executive assistant with 20 years of experience. After taking time off from work to care for her dying mother and a daughter who was suffering from bipolar disorder and drug addiction, Traci found herself without a job. Shortly after her mother passed, Traci fell ill, making it difficult for her to look for work.

While Traci was receiving unemployment benefits, they were barely enough to cover the care her daughter required. Traci told me that she now can't afford food and has lost over 50 pounds. She even asked that I send her a video of the speech I am making right here as she won't be able to tune in today because she had to get rid of her television in the process of finding savings. Like so many others, Traci is searching high and low for that one break, and she told me, ''I just need time for someone to give me a chance.''

For Traci, unemployment benefits are not the solution. A job is what she wants. But they provide her with some critical support while she takes care of her family and tries to find that work.

Those are just a few of the stories I have heard, but there are a lot like them. Millions of people across America, including an almost additional 28,000 in my State, stand to lose the benefits they count on if Congress doesn't act soon. These workers are not looking for a handout. They do not want to be a burden. But they need support while they work to get back on their feet and back on the job.

In this struggling economy, renewing these benefits is truly crucial. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has said that renewing unemployment benefits is one of the most effective policy tools we have to boost the economy and get money in the pockets of consumers. So I am really hopeful the Senate will act quickly, without political games, because failure to do so wouldn't just be devastating for the families who count on this, it would also hurt many small businesses and communities to have the billions of dollars pulled away from consumers who spend it every month on food and rent and clothing.

Last month's budget deal provided us with a glimmer of bipartisan hope coming into this new year. However, we have to continue working together to focus on improving the economy for middle-class Americans. We cannot afford to allow this lifeline to be cut off.

The stories I shared today, like so many others, are heartbreaking, but they also show the fierce determination exhibited by so many who are out of work in the struggle to get back on their feet. They are the stories of people who are applying for work far below their own qualifications, going back to school to earn the skills needed to change careers or waking up every day to scour for jobs in their communities that all too often lack opportunity. I believe it is Congress that needs to match their determination and grit. We took an important first step today, and I know unemployed workers I have heard from are watching. Today's vote is a glimmer of hope for them. We can't let it fade. We need to move on and pass this extension quickly, and the House needs to follow suit.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1845.

FARM BILL CONFERENCE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I congratulate Senator REID, who I know worked extraordinarily hard to get the votes for this.

I read something someone wrote in the press, saying they are afraid that Senator REID didn't talk about these issues enough yesterday on the floor. I would point out that you can either talk or do. I thought he spoke quite well, but he basically spent the time lining up the votes and won. A lot of people talk about what they want to do. Senator REID usually gets it accomplished. As one who has served here longer than anybody else in this body, I would rather see people get things done, and he did.

Speaking of things to get done in this new year, the farm bill remains as one of the Nation's top legislative priorities. Yet it has languished in Congress's in-box. As the Senate begins this new session, it is a relief—at last—to be able to say that there are new glimmers of hope that Congress is nearing the point of being able to complete work on a farm bill.

We passed this farm bill twice in the Senate. I compliment the chair of the Agriculture Committee, Senator STABENOW. She brought together Democrats and Republicans, many of us who served at one time or another as either chair or ranking member or both on that committee, and said: Why don't we just do it the old-fashioned way? Instead of just talking about it, why don't we actually sit down, write it, and bring something to the floor that can pass? We did, and it passed twice. While over in the House, the bill languished for quite some time before they decided to move forward.

Chairwoman STABENOW and Chairman LUCAS from the House worked throughout the holiday break. My own staff, Adrienne Wojciechowski and Rebekah Weber, have worked very hard with them to produce a bipartisan, comprehensive bill that addresses the needs of farmers, families, communities, and taxpayers.

A farm bill is a dynamic element of our agriculture economy, and of our overall national economy. A farm bill touches every family, in ways large and small. It has now been more than 460 days since the last farm bill expired. That is well over a year ago. Since then, American farmers have

struggled to make long-term planting decisions, and more than 20 programs—such as those affecting organic certification cost-sharing, beginning farmers, relief from livestock disasters, renewable energy, and rural small businesses—all have been stranded without funding. Rural small businesses are a major part of my State and the Presiding Officer's State. But every State has some rural area that is extremely important.

This farm bill limbo is part of a string of artificial made-by-Congress dilemmas. Farm bill limbo hurts not only farmers, but their communities, and our economy. It hampers efforts to help those who are struggling the most in our communities, with food security for their families. It holds us back from making greater gains toward energy security.

Last month, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives proposed a short farm bill extension. Short extensions are nothing new here on Capitol Hill. Most of us know them by the term ''kicking the can down the road.'' They patch things over from one crisis to the next. But just as a temporary extension to fund government offers neither certainty nor meaningful change, a short extension of the farm bill would not provide farmers the certainty they need to plan, or funding for stranded programs. Farming is a business, and saddling farmers with this needless uncertainty makes their difficult work even more difficult. Even worse, the proposed House extension would prolong direct payment subsidies for another year, senselessly costing taxpayers untold millions of dollars. At this point, the only acceptable path forward is to deliver a full, five-year, comprehensive farm bill by the end of January. Moving forward on the farm bill not only will avoid the so-called ''dairy cliff,'' but it also will help families put food on the table, improve conservation efforts, support regional farming, and put an end to wasteful subsidies.

This farm bill marks the seventh time that I have served as a member of a Farm Bill Conference Committee. I know how difficult it is to bring complex, five-year bills to the floor and ultimately to final passage after a conference. I don't in any way diminish the difficulty in that. I know; I have been there, and I have done that.

While there have been many significant changes in agricultural policy since the 1981 farm bill, which I had the privilege to write, one thing has remained the same: No farm bill is easy, and no farm bill is perfect. But to finalize a farm bill, the Senate and House must work together to reach bipartisan agreement. It means, whether you are a Republican or Democrat, forget the symbolism and start dealing with the substance. Stop rhetoric and go to reality.

The conference committee is making steady progress, and Chairwoman STABENOW and Chairman LUCAS deserve credit, and our appreciation, for working closely together to bridge the wide differences between our two bills. The cuts it includes will not go unnoticed, as we have already seen spending reductions from the sequester, followed by the end of the Recovery Act nutrition benefits. We can talk here on the floor. We are all going to collect our paycheck every month. But we sometimes forget these cuts and policy changes affect real people in real ways. So we have to continue to do the best we can.

Speaking as a Vermonter, I would note that every farm bill is important to Vermont, just as every farm bill is important to every State represented in this body. Farm bills make real differences in our quality of life, and the fact that Congress every 5 years or so would renew and pass a farm bill was once something Americans could take for granted. This is the first time we have not been able to do so.

The delays have been unfortunate, and they have been needless. But I am increasingly hopeful that this recent dark chapter is coming to a close. Farmers and families around the Nation are looking to us to pass forward-looking, fiscally responsible, and regionally sensitive food and farm policy—and the two have to be together, both the food and the farm policy. Farmers have to be able to plan, but families have to know, when their children go to school, they are going to be fed. Every teacher will tell you that a hungry child doesn't learn. If children aren't learning, what are we doing for the next generation? That is our responsibility.

Now is the time, without further delay, to enact a farm bill that will strengthen the Nation and support the economy. I know we are up to this challenge. We have done it twice already in this body, forging a bipartisan coalition. I am hoping the other body, notwithstanding some of the Republicans who tried to block it, will come forward and speak, not just for a small part of one political party, but speak for all Americans.

Before I yield, I ask unanimous consent that all the time during the recess count postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1845.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last month the President of the United States gave a speech on what has come to be known by the code words ''income inequality,'' which means different things to different people. He also talked about a very important aspect of that, and that is upward income mobility. In other words, we want to make sure that somebody who goes to work in a restaurant bussing tables can work their way up the income and education ladder to where they can actually own their own restaurant and create jobs and opportunities for other people. The President called it ''the defining challenge of our time.''

Well, the timing, coming as it has, one might be forgiven from wondering whether the President and his allies want to change the subject from ObamaCare. We know that the rollout of ObamaCare has been an unmitigated disaster, and, frankly, there is more to come. We can certainly understand why the President might want to change the subject. But while he is changing the subject, Republicans should embrace the challenge of discussing this: What are the policies that have resulted in income inequality and insufficient upward mobility when it comes to jobs in America?

Of course, the President, you might predict, has talked about his proposed solutions, which are creating more government programs and more spending, including up to $6 billion of money that we have to borrow from China and our other creditors just to extend the unemployment insurance program by 3 months. My question is: What happens after that 3 months? I don't want to be rash, but I will make a prediction that the Democrats will say: We need another 3 months. After that, they will say: We need another 3 months. Before you know it, unemployment insurance has been extended beyond the half-year mark, which is the basic program, to another full year beyond that at a cost of $25 billion.

Just to put all of this in context, the Federal Government spent $250 billion for extended unemployment insurance benefits since 2008. Of course, the President did not mention some of the primary causes for income inequality and the loss of upward mobility because he is responsible for a lot of that, along with his allies. He failed to mention that under his administration America has suffered the longest period of high unemployment since the Great Depression, and he failed to mention his signature health care law. I mentioned that a moment ago. He is trying to pivot to another subject, but inevitably we find ourselves coming back to ObamaCare and its negative impact on job creation and the 40-hour workweek.

We know that ObamaCare has done a number of things in the short period of time since it began the rollout, which was October 1st. Millions of people have lost their existing insurance coverage. In fact, more people have lost their insurance coverage than have

signed up for ObamaCare or even Medicaid. Then there is the issue of skyrocketing insurance premiums. So I thought the idea was: How do we make health care more affordable? In fact, instead of making health care better and more affordable, it has become less affordable.

We are not just talking about the insurance premiums, we are talking about deductibles. We have all heard the stories of people signing up on the ObamaCare exchanges only to find out: Yeah, they have health insurance, but you know what, the first $5,000 per person is the deductible, which effectively means—for all practical purposes—that person is self-insured. That is a deal breaker for many hard-working middle-class Americans.

We know, of course, that even organized labor has complained about the fact that ObamaCare has turned full-time work into part-time work. Why is that? For employers who put their employees on a 30-hour workweek, they are not required, under the law, to pay for health care benefits. But if you have a full-time worker, you are required to pay for health care benefits. So what is happening is that many employers are cutting people back from 40 hours to 30 hours with a commensurate loss of income.

Recently, I was in Tyler, TX, sitting around a table at a restaurant when one gentleman who owns a restaurant said that because of ObamaCare one of the single moms who works in his restaurant lost her 40-hour workweek job. He had to cut her down to 30 hours. So she had to get two 30-hour jobs in order to get by. In other words, she now has to work 60 hours instead of working 40 hours, and obviously she is worried about the lack of time she has with her children in addition to having lost her full-time job.

The President has also failed to mention a number of other items which have contributed to income inequality and the loss of upward mobility, such as the medical device tax that is a feature of ObamaCare. In Texas we have a number of medical device companies that came to see me after the ObamaCare legislation passed.

They said: We have a duty to our shareholders not to spend their money inefficiently, and so our only alternative is to expand our existing facility in Costa Rica rather than in Texas. So the jobs that would have been created in Texas effectively moved to Costa Rica because of the medical device tax. So much for job creation and reducing income inequality and enhancing upward mobility.

The President also declined to talk about his refusal to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. Of course, this is a pipeline that would start in Canada and end up in Port Arthur, TX, in an area we call the Golden Triangle. We happen to have a lot of refineries there that can refine that oil into gasoline, jet fuel, and other products for Americans consumers.

The President promised the country he would make a decision by the end of 2013. I may have missed something during the holidays, but I don't recall the President making any announcement whatsoever on the Keystone XL Pipeline. Not only would it produce thousands of good well-paying jobs, it would also produce a dependable supply of energy from a friendly country—the nation of Canada.

What else did the President fail to mention in his income inequality and upward mobility speech? He failed to mention how the impact of his regulatory policies are piling hundreds of billions of dollars of additional costs on small businesses.

For example, the small banks in Texas have told me that they have hired new people, but the people they hired are the people who help us comply with the Dodd-Frank regulations. This bill—just to remind everybody—was filed to address the abuses on Wall Street that led to the subprime loan crisis and collapse in 2008. As we now know, while Wall Street was the target of Dodd-Frank and these regulations, Main Street is the collateral damage. Yes, people are being hired but not for the purpose of loaning more money and helping small businesses start and grow their businesses but, rather, just to comply with new government regulations.

What else did the President fail to mention in his discussion about the lack of jobs and upward mobility? He failed to mention his proposed greenhouse gas rules, which will kill jobs and drive up energy costs.

He failed to mention that during the so-called Obama economic recovery—the President has now been President for 5 years. He can't blame this on George Bush anymore. But during the so-called Obama economic recovery, real median household income has fallen more than $2,500. At the same time that real household median income has fallen by $2,500, households are finding that their health care insurance costs have gone up by $2,500, for a net loss of $5,000 for most hard-working American families.

The President has failed to acknowledge—in his discussion of slow economic growth—high unemployment. He has failed to mention that the economic recovery following the 2008 recession has been the weakest U.S. recovery since World War II.

Economists ordinarily say that after a recession there will be sort of a V-shaped recovery—once you hit the bottom, you come out of it very quickly and the economy grows fast. Under the Obama recovery, that has been flatlined to anemic growth, which is not fast enough or strong enough to hire more American workers.

Indeed, we have the lowest percentage of Americans actually in the workforce in the last 30 years. What that means is that even though the unemployment rate is roughly 7 percent—that is on a national basis—millions of people have simply dropped out of looking for a job because they see the prospects for finding work so dim.

The President also failed to mention that his 2009 stimulus package—at that time you may remember that Speaker PELOSI said: Our goal is to make timely, targeted, and temporary investments in government spending to help stimulate the economy and help bring down the unemployment rate.

The President later joked and said—we found out it wasn't a funny joke—that "shovel ready" didn't actually mean it was shovel ready, which was absolutely true. He failed to add that his 2009 stimulus package added more than $1 trillion to the national debt, which now stands at $17.3 trillion. That is equivalent to more than $54,000 worth of debt for every man, woman, and child living in America today.

I don't think anyone in their right mind believes we can continue down this same path of racking up more and more debt by borrowing more and more money without having some negative consequences at some point in the future. One thing we do know will occur is that the present generation that is racking up all of this debt will probably not be around to have to pay it back, but the next generation and beyond will.

If the President wants to have an honest debate about income inequality, he needs to be honest about his own record, and he needs to talk about it in a holistic context.

A few months ago, the New York Times reported that the trend of rising inequality "appears to have accelerated during the Obama administration." Indeed, according to one measure of the income gap, inequality has increased about four times faster under President Obama than it did under President George W. Bush.

Here is the reality: If we want to reduce income inequality, we need to boost economic growth. That is the debate we should be having and which this side of the aisle embraces—not how we can pay more government benefits to people who can't find work or artificially fix the price of wages. We need to figure a way to benefit the entire country by growing the economy.

Largely—at least where I come from—people say there are three things that the Federal Government can do to help grow the economy: Get out of the way, get off our back, and get your hand out of our pocket. Those are three things the Federal Government could do which would help the economy grow, create more opportunity, and deal with this issue of income equality in an effective sort of way.

So we need to boost economic growth. That is the debate we should be having—how do we create more jobs, or actually how do we allow the private sector to create more jobs? We tried having the government spend borrowed money to create more jobs, and that did not turn out so well. So now we need to figure a way to get out of the

way so the private-sector economy can create the jobs that will put Americans back to work and deal with this issue of income inequality once and for all.

As we saw last night, instead of trying to actually solve the problem, sometimes I am tempted to think that the majority leader and his allies really want a political issue rather than a solution to the problem, because we saw last night the majority leader was ready to have a vote with 17 Senators missing because of the storms around the country. We know people could not get back because of cold weather and storms and flight cancellations and the like, and I predict if we had had the vote last night, the cloture vote that we had today would have failed, and that would have fit very nicely into the majority leader's and the President's desire to change the subject from ObamaCare to Republicans blocking this unemployment compensation bill.

It did not turn out that way because we had the vote here this morning. We embrace the opportunity to talk about our progrowth alternatives, which will actually make life better for the American people, not worse, as the policies of this administration have over the last 5 years.

Basically, we know that the demand is this: to extend long-term unemployment benefits beyond the half year, which is the basic program, another 3 months, and to put the entire $6.5 billion tab on our national credit card. But I ask you, What is going to happen after 3 months? Will the President and his allies be back asking for another 3 months and another $6.5 billion in deficit spending that will be added to the debt? I think so. How about in 9 months? If we extend it for two 3-month periods, we will be here for another one that will extend it to 9 months and beyond, ad infinitum—$25 billion in added deficit and debt spending—unless we solve the root of the problem.

Republicans would prefer that we offset any real extension with spending cuts that would make it revenue neutral. We would also like to reform the unemployment insurance program so it delivers better results to the unemployed.

For example, if there is one thing that most people who are unemployed need it is the opportunity for job skills training. We ought to make sure things such as Pell grants are available for people during that 26-week period of time they are on unemployment, that they can go to a community college in their own town and learn new job skills, and so they do not have to be stuck in the same old position. They could learn new job skills, which will open a whole new world of opportunity for them when it comes to jobs.

Before I conclude, I want to mention a few numbers that help put the Obama economy in perspective. According to the Joint Economic Committee, the economy grew during the first 4 years of the Reagan administration by 22.3 percent—22.3 percent. During the first 4 years of the Obama administration, it was about 9 percent—less than half. Why is that? Why is it that the economy grew during the first 4 years of the Reagan administration by 22 percent; in the first 4 years of the Obama administration by about 9.2 percent?

As I pointed out, there are some good reasons why this recovery has been anemic and so slow and why so many people are still struggling to find work. If the Obama recovery had been as strong as the Reagan recovery, we would have millions more private-sector jobs. Isn't that what we want? The recipients of unemployment insurance compensation do not want to receive a government check. What they want is the dignity and the self-confidence and the opportunity to provide for their family that comes with a good job. That is what is missing in this whole equation and this transparent political exercise to play gotcha at their expense.

We know it was President Reagan's economic strategies, combined with permanent, broad-based tax cuts and sensible regulatory policies that helped grow the economy. By contrast, President Obama's strategy is to combine massive tax increases—including the payroll tax, a year ago January—with a regulatory bonanza. We do not have to speculate about what the impacts of President Obama's policies are. We are living with them today.

So I would say to President Obama, if you really want to reduce income inequality and promote upward mobility, we want to have that conversation. Let's get back to the policies, though, that have worked so well in the past, not those which have failed us and the American people during the last 5 years. Let's put a stop to regulations that do not pass a cost-benefit test. Let's do what we need to expand domestic energy production and create jobs.

Do you know where the two lowest unemployment rates in the country are? Bismarck, ND, and Midland, TX, and that is because of the shale energy renaissance that has created jobs. If you can pass a commercial driver's license test, you can get a job driving a truck with a high school degree in both of those places and earn between $75,000 and $100,000 a year; the lowest unemployment in the country but this administration's policies have made it harder and harder for those jobs to be created, along with the Keystone Pipeline and the jobs that would create.

We need also to reform our Tax Code to encourage more investment. We need to reward earned success so that small businesses can be started, so existing small businesses can expand. All of the President's policies, including, of course, most notably, ObamaCare, have made that harder. We need to do what we can, as I said, to expand domestic energy production and create jobs. We need to reform unemployment insurance to get more people back into the workforce by making sure they have the job training they need to learn employable skills.

Then, of course, the subject that will not go away—notwithstanding the President's most earnest desire—that is, we need to dismantle ObamaCare before it does any more harm to our health care system and our broader economy. We need to replace it with more affordable coverage that lets consumers keep the doctor they trust—a promise that ObamaCare made, but a promise that has been broken, as too many people already know.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CORNYN. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I was just walking through the Chamber and I had the opportunity to visit with some of my colleagues in the back, and I heard what my colleague from Texas was saying, and I just want to add a couple things, if I could. One is to say he is absolutely right in terms of the underlying problem here, which is a weak economy, and really a historically weak economy. Never coming out of a recession have we had a recovery this weak.

The Senator made that point well—that typically we go into a recession in sort of a V formation. We go in and then come back out with a relatively strong recovery from a relatively deep recession. That certainly happened in 1981, where at this point in Ronald Reagan's recovery we had created over 8 million new jobs. Unfortunately, we are not creating the new jobs that we created in these other recoveries. As a result, we do have these problems with folks who are both unemployed and long-term unemployed.

I think it is important to note that we now have historic levels of long-term unemployment, people who have been out of work for more than a half year, more than 26 weeks—the highest levels ever. So something is not working. It is different this time. I think what is not working is that some of our basic structural institutions—such as our tax system, our regulatory system, the regulations that have come from ObamaCare, and so on—are adding more and more burdens to the economy.

The historic debt and deficits the Senator talked about are also adding to our economic woes. It is hurting the economy today, and it is certainly unfair, I would say even immoral to put that burden on future generations. Some of the young people who are here today are going to get left holding the bag for the $17 trillion national debt we now have—$145,000 for every family in Texas or Ohio.

So the Senator makes the right points. We have to get this economy moving. There are some very specific policy proposals the Senator has outlined that we ought to turn to. The President has talked about tax reform, he has talked about regulatory relief,

but he has not delivered. If we do not get at those issues, we are not going to ultimately solve the problem.

But here we find ourselves within a few hours of having voted to proceed on a debate on whether we do extend unemployment insurance for people for the next 3 months beyond the normal unemployment insurance that would be out there. Most States provide about 6 months of unemployment insurance, about 26 weeks; some States a little more, some States a little less. What we are talking about is how much do you add at the Federal level as emergency unemployment benefits? I did vote, along with some of my other colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to proceed to this debate. As the Senator said earlier—I heard him—perhaps that was not what the majority leader was hoping for because maybe he wanted more of a political issue. But I did so because I took to heart what was said on the other side of the aisle about the fact that we are going to now have a debate.

I think this debate breaks down into a couple things. One is, how do you deal with paying for this? Because, as we indicated, this economy is not going to grow until we deal with these historic levels of debt and deficit.

How ironic would it be if we were saying: We are going to help those who are unemployed by making it harder to get the economy moving—by not doing anything with regard to the debt and deficit, in fact, adding to it.

So what I am going to be filing is an amendment. It is a very simple amendment that says let's pay for this extension for 3 months. I just heard my colleague from Texas saying he would support that. Others, I hope, on both sides will support this. The specific idea that we have is let's take the proposal out of the President's budget that says if you are on Social Security disability and, therefore, not working, you, of course, should not be getting unemployment insurance. It is in the President's budget. I would also say trade adjustment assistance, of course, should not be available to you because you are not working by definition.

So it is basically tightening up some of the provisions in current law to make them work better. That provides the funding to be able to say: OK, let's go ahead and extend unemployment insurance, but only for a few months while we do sit down and work on these bigger problems that the Senator from Texas has taken a lead on and talked about today. I hope that is where we will end up, that we will actually pay for this rather than adding to the burden and making the economy even weaker by adding to our deficit.

Second, I think we need to have an honest discussion, even in the next couple of days here, as to how to make the unemployment system itself work better. Unemployment insurance, as has been noted, is not connecting people to jobs. That is the reason we have these historic levels of long-term unemployment.

The Senator mentioned the Pell grants, for instance, being available to people who are on unemployment insurance. That is incredibly important, but also having our worker retraining programs at the Federal level work better for those folks who are uninsured. I think we should engage in that topic now—not only on how do we pay for this, but how do we actually make the unemployment insurance system work for the people who are unemployed?

The Federal Government spends over $15 billion a year in worker retraining programs—47 programs spread over 9 different departments and agencies. Often the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. The GAO, which looks at these issues—the General Accountability Office—has said there is duplication in most of these programs, and only a handful—four or five—are seeing the kind of performance measures you would want to have in a Federal program.

So there is a great opportunity here on a bipartisan basis for us to get those worker retraining programs working better and into the hands of the people who really need the retraining to match skills with jobs. In Ohio—and I am sure the same is true in Texas—we have a lot of jobs going wanting right now. We have about 100,000 jobs available. We have about 400,000 people out of work. How do you connect those? A big part of that is providing the skills to those workers to be able to access those jobs that are available that do require a higher skill—maybe it is advanced manufacturing, maybe it is biotechnology.

The Federal Government is not providing that help right now. Those worker retraining skills that are needed are not being provided. So I do think there is an opportunity here for us to pay for this, to be sure we are not adding to the debt and deficit, at a time when the economy is too weak already, and, second, to provide the skills workers need—Pell grants and so on—to actually give people some hope and give people some additional tools to be able to access this economy and these jobs that are available and get this economy moving again.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CORNYN. Before the distinguished Senator from Ohio leaves the floor, I did not know he was coming down, but I am delighted he did. Not only is he an expert and former Director of the Office of Management and Budget, distinguished Member of the House, now the Senate, and a great new addition since 2010, he understands these issues, particularly the fiscal issues, better than most of us.

But the Senator makes a very important point. I am worried, based on what the majority leader did last night, that they preferred to have a ''gotcha'' moment, have the bill fail at the very outset, rather than have a fulsome debate and a realistic discussion about what the alternatives are to basically permanently paying people not to work, through virtually a permanent extension of unemployment.

More than most people, the Senator from Ohio, when he came to this Chamber, said what we need is a jobs program. So he advocated among those in our Republican conference. He said: We need a positive program for how do we facilitate the economy, the private sector, creating those jobs. Of course, he described the amendment that he intends to offer on this bill, not only to pay for this 3-month extension, which would be a welcome measure, but also to reform the unemployment system so that people can learn skills that actually match them with the jobs that do exist.

I would add, while the Senator is on the floor, that as he knows, there are a lot of other good ideas that will be offered this week by this side of the aisle, but it is entirely dependent upon the majority leader allowing that sort of fulsome debate and those ideas to come to the floor and be available for a vote, things such as the Forty Hours Is Full Time Act that Senator COLLINS has promoted, the medical device tax which I talked about, the repeal sponsored—the chief sponsor, Senator HATCH of Utah.

Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming has got one that would repeal the health insurance tax from ObamaCare, which is a direct passthrough to consumers. Senator PAUL, Senator MCCONNELL have their economic freedom zones idea to help blighted areas where unemployment is high, and to create a way for the private sector to be incentivized to come in and start jobs and to create opportunity.

We have got regulatory reform bills and proposals. We have got the Keystone XL Pipeline idea. I know Senator LEE and Senator RUBIO have both recently come up with some very visionary ideas about how do we fight the war on poverty in a realistic sort of way. But my point is that whether we are going to get into that debate and give a full and fair consideration of all of these ideas about how to solve this problem depends on the majority leader allowing amendments to be offered and voted on.

I would ask the Senator from Ohio what his expectation is in that regard, and what the consequences would be if the majority leader decides to deny any amendments and basically shut down this process?

Mr. PORTMAN. I appreciate the Senator yielding. I would say that having listened to some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak earlier today prior to the vote about what their intentions were, including one of the authors of the legislation, and one of the leaders in the Senate, it seems to me they are interested in a debate. They encouraged those from the Republican side to vote yes on the motion to proceed, with the understanding that there would be the opportunity then to at least discuss these issues

and to therefore offer amendments and to have what the Senate typically has had over the years, which is the opportunity for some give-and-take, and the opportunity to have voices heard, people representing both the States on the Democratic side and the Republican side of the aisle. So I am hopeful we will have that debate. That is my expectation.

I plan to file an amendment to pay for the unemployment insurance extension, and I know a lot of support will come from both sides of the aisle for that. I also hope to be able to offer other amendments that have to do with growing the economy in a more direct way. The Senator mentioned regulatory reform, for instance.

We have bipartisan proposals on this side of the aisle that are intended to take the unemployment situation and deal with it in a broader context of reducing the burdens on small businesses, for instance. When you try to get a permit, for instance, from the Federal Government right now, sometimes with an energy project, sometimes there are as many as 34 different permits you have to obtain. That is one reason we are not seeing investment in some of the energy projects we would like to see. It is a great potential for our economy right now. We can make the potential even greater and achieve it if we can do something on the regulatory reform side. So these are all issues that ought to be part of the broader discussion as to how to increase economic growth and therefore to increase jobs and opportunity for people who find themselves unemployed and are looking for those job skills and are looking for the jobs that are open.

I look forward to that debate over the next few days. That is certainly my expectation. I hope that Members on both sides would come down to the well and offer their amendments, have them voted up or down in the great tradition of the Senate.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Senator for responding to that question.

I would point out, in conclusion, that this bill extends unemployment benefits for 3 months at a cost of $6.5 billion, right now which is unpaid for. But if the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is adopted, there is the solution to that problem, along with reform of the job training components of our current unemployment compensation system.

But if we are unable to have this broader debate, we will find ourselves right back here in 3 more months because none of the underlying problems, of which high unemployment and low growth are symptoms, will have been addressed. So what I hope—and I would love to be optimistic about the majority leader's willingness to allow those amendments and allow those votes and have that fulsome debate. If he does not, then we have had a 3-month patch and we will be right back here with the same problems confronting us, with the underlying symptoms of an anemic economy, with slow economic growth and high unemployment.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. I rise today on behalf of over 37,000 unemployed Nebraskans and nearly 21 million Americans who are searching for work. The vast majority of these men and women are jobless through no fault of their own. They are the real-life casualties of failed Washington policies. They are our friends, our neighbors, and in many cases they are our family members. They are decent people, and they are desperate to regain the dignity of a full day of labor.

We have had 5 years of economic fits and starts—glimmers of hope dashed by the harsh reality of persistent economic headwinds. But the weak job reports and the Pollyanna claims of recovery don't tell the full story. Our real unemployment rate or the total percentage of unemployed and underemployed workers tops 13 percent, significantly higher than the 7 percent reported by the Department of Labor in November. That is nearly 21 million people out of work. At the same time our labor force participation rate is at 63 percent, a near 35-year low.

The greatness of a nation cannot endure without work for its people. It is not only about putting food on the table. It is about the ability of families to buy a home, to save for their kids' college education, and to retire with a modest nest egg. It is about hard-working moms and dads in need of the simple assurance that their government isn't going to pass laws that intentionally make life harder for them.

I am interested in promoting thoughtful economic policies that increase employment opportunities and make life a little bit easier for our people. But instead of a laser focus on job creation, politicians in Washington seem to pivot from issue to issue, frantically chasing the topic du jour. Jobless Americans aren't interested in who is to blame; they are interested in who is going to fix this mess and how.

Congress has returned to Washington for a new year, a new chance to take on daunting challenges, such as joblessness in America. We have all been informed by the media and the so-called wise men of Washington that 2014 will be a year in which very little is accomplished. The pundits point to election-year politicking, and some Members are fretting about taking those very tough votes. There is no will for action, they say. There is no chance for any kind of compromise, they claim.

The 21 million Americans without jobs are counting on us to do our job. They expect and they demand that we do better. Promoting policies to create jobs is not election-year rhetoric; it is the duty of the people's government.

The best way to support the unemployed is not to just extend the benefits; we need to grow the economy, and we need to provide paychecks for families.

Lately, there has been a lot of talk about income inequality or the need to bridge the gap between rich and poor. Some argue that deficit spending is the way to go, while others insist on increasing the minimum wage.

Arthur Brooks, the president of the American Enterprise Institute, offers a different take on how to best conquer the income divide. In a July 31, 2013, opinion piece published in the Wall Street Journal, Brooks notes:

> Again and again, the president offers a higher minimum wage as a solution. Yet as the overwhelming majority of economists have argued for decades, the minimum wage actually harms the poorest and most marginalized workers—those with the most tenuous grip on their jobs.
>
> In January, a study from the National Bureau of Economic Research surveyed the most recent studies and concluded: ''The evidence still shows that minimum wages pose a tradeoff of higher wages for some, against job losses for others.''

Brooks continues:

> The story for strivers and entrepreneurs is no better. Scott Shane of Case Western Reserve University has shown that business formation fell by 17.3% between 2007 and 2009. Launching a business is never a walk in the park, especially given the explosion of red tape at all levels of government.
>
> While it is still possible for the educated and comfortable, government bureaucracy can crush entrepreneurship entirely for those at the bottom of the income scale.
>
> As a pro-poor rule of thumb, I suggest this: If you want to start a landscaping business, all you should need is a lawn mower, not an accountant and a lawyer to help you hack through all the red tape before setting up shop.

I think Brooks is right.

Regulatory overreach is also holding back American business. Regulations can be helpful. They ensure the health and safety of Americans. However, overregulation places unnecessary burdens on small business owners, and it does stifle economic growth. A homebuilder in Nebraska once told me that he was fined $7,000 for leaning a ladder against a wall.

There is solid legislation out there to address the rampant redtape. Here are a few examples.

The Regulatory Responsibility for our Economy Act of 2013 is a bill that was introduced by Senator PAT ROBERTS that I am cosponsoring. It requires the executive branch to repeal duplicative and onerous rules currently hindering our Nation's job creators. It also requires Federal agencies to modify, streamline, or repeal significant regulatory actions that are unnecessary or overly burdensome. The legislation ensures that regulations put forth by the administration account for their economic impact on American businesses. It ensures stakeholder input and promotes innovation.

These simple commonsense policies are a good start toward relieving business owners of some of the unnecessary challenges they face in these already difficult economic times. I believe and I know many Nebraskans believe that executive agencies should be held accountable for the rules they put in place which directly affect our economic growth and our job creation.

Another key way we can spur economic growth is through broad-based tax reform. Our current tax system is arcane and riddled with loopholes for special interests from the eighties. It is time that we simplify our Tax Code so that we can encourage progrowth behavior.

Whenever I travel in my State and I meet with Nebraska's business owners, both large and small, I hear the same message over and over: We need more certainty. We need more certainty.

They need more certainty in the Tax Code, they need more certainty in health care, and they need more certainty in the regulatory environment. A business cannot grow today if it cannot adequately predict its needs for tomorrow.

This is especially true for small business owners, who are responsible for 64 percent of all net new private sector jobs. Jobs will come when these entrepreneurs have confidence that the bureaucrats are going to get off their backs. Jobs won't come from just another DC Government program.

I believe we must shift the focus of economic growth from government-driven regulation to private sector innovation. The great government-controlled experiment has failed us yet again, so it is time for a change of course.

There is no shortage of good ideas out there. My colleagues and I have introduced dozens of bills to directly address job creation by repealing specific regulations, preventing new burdensome mandates, and encouraging a fairer tax system. But so far we haven't had any form of meaningful debate. Why? Why can't we debate in this body in a meaningful way? I believe it is because we are restricted in this Senate by what we can actually vote on. It is a radical form of control, and we are tired of it. Rather than allowing an open amendment process, the majority leader has locked this place down. We hear constant calls to end obstruction, but if we are being honest, we would all acknowledge that the primary obstruction here is in the broken, nonexistent amendment process.

My friend and colleague Senator COBURN recently noted in the Wall Street Journal:

> Mr. Reid had already used Senate rules to cut off debate and prevent the minority from offering amendments 78 times—more than all other Senate majority leaders combined.

Why?

It appears designed to advance a partisan political agenda—show votes in an election year. In other words, let's airdrop bills on the floor and prevent any form of modification or improvement. That seems to be routine business around here these days, and it is shameful.

It is my hope that in this new year all thoughtful ideas will get a vote. It is my hope that in this new year we will actually get a chance to amend bills. That is the only way we can actually pass legislation to improve the lives of the American people.

I look forward to putting forth my own proposals to fulfill my duty to the people of Nebraska to get our friends and our neighbors back to work. Rather than focusing on issues that divide us, I hope my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, will come together to support policies that promote opportunities for all.

Show votes might make for good election-year politics, but make no mistake—they are bad policy. And unfortunately it is ''we the people'' who pay the steep price for politics over policy.

I am excited for another year here in the Senate where I can represent my friends and neighbors, Nebraskans from back home, and I look forward to helping put Americans back to work in the year ahead. Our citizens send us here to do a job and they are counting on us, so let's not let them down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, the Chair and I earlier today were part of a historic majority—a very bipartisan majority—that voted 60 to 37 to extend unemployment insurance for millions of Americans across this country who are struggling to make ends meet, to keep their families together, to keep a roof over their heads—basic essentials not only to continue living but to continue searching for work. These Americans are not without a work ethic. In fact, they are devastated by being out of work for so long with such destructive results for their sense of self-worth and their family.

This measure is limited in its scope and significance. It is only a procedural vote on a temporary measure for 3 months, and only a partial solution to the grave and pressing issue of putting Americans back to work, restoring employment for Americans who want to work and keep their families together, but it is profoundly important.

I want to thank my colleagues, Senators REED of Rhode Island and HELLER of Nevada, as well as all of our colleagues who voted for it, and even many of my colleagues who may have voted against it but were torn and, hopefully, will vote for it on final passage. I urge all my colleagues to get this job done so we can send it to the House of Representatives and make sure it is approved there.

What is significant about this measure is in fact it was bipartisan. It was overwhelming. It shows Congress is listening; that it is heeding the calls for action from those 4 million Americans, including over 60,000 of them in my home State of Connecticut, who need this measure so they can continue seeking work, hopefully successfully.

It is a temporary fix, but it is a measure with profound significance for those men and women who courageously are facing the searing facts of life during long-term joblessness. One of those individuals, in fact, from Connecticut, very courageously appeared with the President earlier today. Katherine Hackett of Moodus, CT, is the parent of two sons in the military, who herself is struggling to keep the heat on and put food on her table. She described her situation in introducing President Obama when he spoke about this problem earlier today. I am proud she is at the forefront of this fight, and I am proud to be fighting with her so that Americans have the benefit of unemployment insurance when they are unemployed for longer than the 26 weeks that is recognized under the statute.

This story is one of numbers. We can't deny the statistics. The great recession may have ended for a lot of Americans, but it continues for the unemployed, the jobless, particularly long-term jobless. Those numbers have become almost mind-numbing, but they are very significant. According to a report recently released by the Joint Economic Committee, 3 years after the recession ending in 1991, long-term unemployment was at 1.3 percent. Three years after the recession ending in 2001, long-term unemployment was also at 1.3 percent. Today, long-term unemployment is double those numbers, at 2.6 percent.

Here we are, 4 years after the supposed end of the recession in 2009 with double the percentage of long-term unemployed that we had in previous recessions. Our economy simply is not growing fast enough or creating enough jobs to end that persistently high rate of long-term unemployment. About 4 million Americans, more than one-third of unemployed Americans, have been looking for work for 6 months or more.

In my home State of Connecticut, long-term unemployment has become even more prevalent among those who have lost their jobs. In fact, 43.6 percent, or almost half of Connecticut's overall unemployed population, are long-term unemployed. That means over 60,000 people.

But those numbers are less convincing and compelling than the human stories. I was proud and moved to sit with a number of my fellow Connecticut citizens—hard-working, dedicated people of all ages, some of whom have spent lifetimes working for a single employer only to find themselves rejected and released. Many of them told me they expected to find work right away, within a couple of weeks, and here they are—more than 6 months later, many of them—still struggling to find work and working to improve

their skills so they can match the job opportunities that may exist.

Rosa Dicker, who has been out of work for almost a year, is a former health insurance project manager who also has experience with health care reform implementation in Massachusetts, our neighboring State. Rosa has sent out 500 job applications in the past year. I almost misstated that figure. I thought it was 50. It is 500 job applications in the past year. And she has been granted how many interviews? She has interviewed three times.

Nyrsa Cruz, an experienced social worker with a master's degree, has also been unemployed since early 2013. Despite hours and hours she has devoted to countless job applications, she has been unable to find work.

Michael Kubica, unemployed after years of experience in the insurance and publishing industries, went back to school to pursue an MBA. Yet despite his educational experience, despite his degrees, despite his dedication, he has been unable to secure more than temporary holiday season work.

Anyone who suggests the long-term unemployed are somehow content or have decided to stay out of work or have abandoned the search ought to talk to people in their own communities—people such as Rosa, Nyrsa, or Michael, who have struggled and worked to find suitable jobs. They are driven, passionate, and absolutely dedicated.

One woman I met, Erin London, described it this way:

> My whole family is impacted. My son asks, ''Am I going to be able to go to college?'' I don't know how to answer. I don't want him to know I am scared.

Imagine yourself as a parent thinking—and we have all thought it—I don't want him or her to know I am scared.

Another Connecticut woman, Alicia Nesbitt, was proud to be working and to have worked continuously since the age of 16, until she was unemployed. Now she depends on food stamps and heating assistance.

These stories are powerful and compelling, even more so than the numbers and statistics, shocking as they are. I hope we will heed those human stories when we come back tomorrow and the next day to vote on this bill.

In the long term we need measures such as targeted tax credits and skills training so people can be matched with jobs and so they can prepare for the jobs of the future. Pathways Back to Work is a bill I have introduced that supports creation of new jobs as well as training for the ones that exist. I have introduced it with my colleagues Senators MURPHY and GILLIBRAND, and I think it would do a great deal to address the fundamental underlying challenges that are keeping unemployed people from reconnecting with the world of work. But these measures are for next week or the week after. Right now, the urgency of this week is passing a measure that is fundamentally important to keep people moving forward, searching for work, and to keep our economy moving forward.

Those folks who receive unemployment insurance use it to buy clothes or food or a car that drives the economy, provides for the kinds of consumer demand we need to enable our economy to continue moving forward. So we are helping these folks avoid the precipice of poverty and homelessness, which makes their job search even more difficult, but we are also helping our economy. All of us who want job creation and economic progress want it to be our Nation's priority and success.

I am proud to stand and join Senators REED and HELLER, and thank also our majority leader Senator REID for their leadership, because our most urgent task is to move our economy forward, provide these unemployment benefits as soon as possible, and then look toward more permanent measures—skills training, the Pathways Back to Work Act, veterans programs that will enable all Americans to enjoy more equally the benefits of the greatest nation in the history of the world.

The challenge of our growing inequality is also our growing inequity. This measure is a start—a temporary, limited start—in the right direction toward making America fulfill its great promise for the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today, and as I do so, Washington has an incredible opportunity for a new beginning—a beginning that would begin by listening to the American people and what the American people want, and not just what Washington and the Democrats in this body think is best for all the American people.

According to a new Associated Press poll, most Americans say health care reform is the top issue they want the government to work on this year—the top issue they want government to work on this year. Fifty-two percent of people have said that is what they are asking us to work on.

People have seen—and I heard about this all around Wyoming over the Christmas holiday—the complete failure of the health care law's big rollout last year. They saw President Obama and they saw Washington Democrats break one promise after another. As a matter of fact, one of the President's promises was designated ''the lie of the year.'' The American people have lost faith this administration can ever get health care reform right.

It wasn't just a bad Web site. The President said: Well, the Web site was bad. He said: The health care law is more than a Web site.

In spite of what the Obama administration has said, it wasn't all fixed last year because the Web site is just the tip of the iceberg. And huge Web site failures? Absolutely. I heard it everywhere I went around Wyoming, and I actually even heard it brought up when I was in Afghanistan visiting the troops on New Year's Day.

So it is not just the Web site, with the higher premiums, canceled coverage, can't keep your doctor, fraud and identity theft, higher copays and higher deductibles; the Web site continues to be just the tip of the iceberg.

Beyond all of those things we have been talking about coming down the line and hitting the American people, we have also seen even more problems surface already this year.

Here is a headline from the Wall Street Journal, January 3: ''Consumers Hit Snags as Health Law Kicks In.'' The snags? We can imagine what they are. People have been going to the doctor, going to the pharmacy looking for help, and even though they signed up for insurance in the new exchange, it turns out they can't be found. They are not in the system.

So Web site failures? Absolutely. Insurance companies aren't sure who is signed up with them. People aren't sure if they are covered. Doctors aren't sure who is covered.

Doctors, as a result of their training, their compassion, their care for human beings, are trying their best to help their patients. They have been fighting a losing battle against the exchanges and all of the problems with the new Washington-mandated health insurance. One Chicago doctor tried for 2 hours to verify the new insurance for a patient who was scheduled for surgery. The office manager finally gave up. The doctor went ahead with the surgery without what should have been a routine approval from the insurance company.

Here is another problem some people are going to have to deal with this year. The Associated Press ran an article headlined ''Adding a baby to health plan is not easy.'' Every day, babies are born and need to be included in the family's health plan. For common life changes such as having a baby, you would normally just call your insurance company and they would take care of it from there. Not under this law. If you have to buy your insurance through one of the new health care exchanges, it is not that simple. According to the article, ''the HealthCare.gov website can't handle new baby updates, along with a list of other life changes including marriage and divorce, a death in the family, a new job or a change in income, even moving to a different community.'' Yet the Obama administration and the Secretary of Health and Human Services says the Web site is fixed. It can't handle a baby being born, marriage, divorce, moving, change in income. It can't handle any of those things, and they claim it is fixed.

Here is another problem that has turned up. Washington Democrats said the law would lead to fewer people visiting emergency rooms—I heard it right here on this floor: fewer people getting their care in emergency

rooms—and that would reduce expenses. The reality is very different. The New York Times, Friday morning, January 3: ''Emergency Visits Seen Increasing With Health Law. Doubt Cast on Savings.'' But Democrats on this floor said that emergency visits would decrease and that it would save money. That is not what the New York Times says. They said, ''Oregon Medicaid Test at Hospitals Found Rise of 40 Percent.'' The Wall Street Journal, in the same issue, talks about how the Medicaid expansion drives up emergency room visits. The Washington Post said, ''Study: Expanding Medicaid Doesn't Reduce ER trips. It increases them.''

Democrats don't want to talk about all these problems. They don't want to talk about all of the reform bills which Republicans passed in the House last year but which never got a vote in the Senate in spite of our efforts to try to get votes on those bills. Democrats hope people believe what they are saying, accept their claims that the Web site is working fine and that all the law's problems have been fixed. The American people see through this. They know that what has been done to them by this administration is not right.

It is time for Washington Democrats to play it straight with the American people and to make a new beginning on health care reform. I am not talking about more fake fixes like the one we saw right before Christmas. That was the Obama administration quietly announcing that people whose insurance had been canceled because of the law could apply for a hardship exemption to avoid the individual mandate.

Well, the newer numbers have come out. There are now more than 5 million health insurance cancellations in 35 States. And we don't even know how many were canceled in Texas, Ohio, Virginia, South Carolina, Missouri, and Wisconsin. We don't know those numbers yet. So we know that a minimum of 5 million people have received cancellation notices and the anxiety that comes with that, as well as the anger. When people tried to replace the plans they lost, many found that their premiums would skyrocket and their deductibles would be higher than ever.

I find it interesting that Democrats I have talked to said: Well, January 1 has come, so the numbers aren't going to go up anymore. That is just not true. I was just in my office and got off the phone with a friend in Douglas, WY. He is a pharmacist and provides health insurance for employees. He has fewer than 50 employees, so it is not mandatory under the law that he do so, but he does it anyway and he has done it for years. But Gary is in a situation where he has now received a letter of cancellation of his own insurance policy, and it was dated January 1. This is not something from last year; this is something dated January 1, 2014. It is a letter from the Madison National Life Insurance Company to Gary Shatto at Shatto's Frontier Drug in Douglas, WY.

''Important Notice.'' Can you imagine getting this letter and opening it? ''Important Notice'' in bold print. ''This Affects Your Insurance Contract Rights. Please Read Carefully.'' That would get your attention.

This notice is to inform your company that Madison National Life Insurance Company . . . will be exiting the employer small group major medical insurance market in Wyoming effective June 30, 2014 at midnight.

Exiting June 30, 2014, at midnight.

So what this tells us is these numbers are going to go up because, at 3,000, the numbers in Wyoming are such that we know more people are going to get cancellation notices. And this isn't just for Gary; this is for everybody who works there.

They ''will be exiting the employer small group major medical insurance market in Wyoming effective June 30, 2014 at midnight. This decision was prompted by the increased regulation since the federal government's passage of its recent federal health care reform, commonly referred to as the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (''PPACA'').

''The increased regulation will make it difficult for Madison National to continue to operate and compete meaningfully in Wyoming's small group major medical market. As such, your referenced insurance coverage will terminate at midnight on June 30, 2014.''

This is what people are going to continue to deal with, letters like this continuing to go out, a new round of letters going out January 1.

The President of the United States needs to be honest with the American people about the significant damage his health care law is doing to families all across the country. And as the employer mandate—which the President has delayed for a year—kicks in this year, we are going to see more and more letters like this and more and more people dumped, losing their insurance, in spite of the President's claim that ''if you like your coverage, you can keep your coverage.'' No wonder the folks who look into these things have labeled it the ''lie of the year.''

The White House continues to try to do this little bandaid approach. Now they say they are going to let some Americans buy catastrophic coverage. That is an idea I proposed to the President at the White House health care roundtable back in February of 2010. After 25 years of practicing medicine, I know that for some people catastrophic coverage is the right option. For many people it is, and it encourages patients to be smart consumers of medical services. But at our meeting 4 years ago President Obama said that these plans were suitable only for the wealthy, that they weren't good ideas. He said that letting people be smarter consumers wouldn't help. Now he has changed his mind.

Don't expect him to admit that Republicans were right all along. The President said: Well, the Republicans have no ideas. If they have some ideas, they can bring them to him. There were a number of different bills and proposals by Republicans. The President seems to want to ignore that just as much as he wants to ignore the problems and the misery his health care law has caused for so many people all around the country.

Instead of trying to patch this terrible health care law together with chicken wire and duct tape, it is time for Democrats in Washington to admit that this entire law is failing the American people because it absolutely hurts so many American families. Then we can move on to talking about real reforms to give people access to quality, affordable health care. That is the year's top priority of the American people, and it needs to be our top priority in the Senate.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act. That would be S. 1845. This is legislation that will continue to be a critical safety net for workers who have fallen on tough times through no fault of their own. Just a few short hours ago, as you know, the Senate sent a strong message by voting to move forward on this vital legislation to restore unemployment insurance for the more than 1 million Americans whose benefits expired on December 28.

I wish to thank Senator JACK REED and Senator HELLER for their bipartisan leadership on this issue. This is a very important step in providing economic security for the millions of Americans who lost their unemployment benefits at the end of the year or who will lose them this year if Congress does not act.

By helping people to stay on their feet after an unexpected job loss, unemployment insurance has kept millions of Americans out of poverty. Rather than removing the safety net these people rely on, we should be focused on policies that help the long-term unemployed get back to work, including the help that will allow them to pay their rent and fill their gas tanks while they are searching for jobs.

Yesterday I released the Joint Economic Committee report making the economic case for extending the Federal support for our unemployment insurance, designed to keep long-term unemployed Americans above water as they search for work. Approximately 1.3 million workers, as we know, lost their unemployment benefits on December 28. Barring Congressional action, benefits will expire for an additional 3.6 million over the next year. In

my home State of Minnesota, roughly 8,500 people lost benefits at the end of last year and about 65,000 Minnesotans will lose benefits by the end of December of 2014.

These are people who may have had a plant close in their town. Maybe their position was eliminated and no one is hiring. Either way, these are people who have been paying into the system for their working lives and we need to see them through to their next job.

This is especially important at a time of stubbornly high long-term unemployment. For most Americans, State-funded unemployment insurance lasts 26 weeks. Yet the average unemployment spell lasts 10 weeks longer. In 2008, as our country went into the worst downturn since the Great Depression, Congress authorized Federal support for extended unemployment benefits for those who were out of work for more than 26 weeks. For people struggling to find work during those dark days, the extension was a lifeline. For the millions of Americans still searching for work as our economy recovers, it is a critical safety net.

Our economy, as we know, has come a long way since the downturn began, with the national unemployment rate now lower than it has been in 5 years. In my home State of Minnesota we are doing even better. The unemployment rate is more than two points below the national average. We are proud of that for our businesses. We are proud of that for our workers.

But there is a problem that remains. While the overall workforce is growing stronger every day, we are still facing significant challenges with long-term unemployment. At 2.6 percent, that is people long-term unemployed more than 6 months, it is more than twice what it was when Congress last allowed Federal unemployment insurance to expire after the recessions of 1990–1991 and 2001. In fact, in our report we have a graph that shows that literally this unemployment rate we are facing now for the long-term unemployed is twice what it has been in any other year when we faced a decision in Congress and decided in fact to terminate those benefits.

Literally, that long-term unemployment rate is now twice what it was in those other years. That is why there is so much concern about stopping the benefits at this point.

In Minnesota, our long-term unemployment rate is 1.4 percent, much better than it is in many States in the country, but too many Minnesota communities are still hurting, with unemployment rates reaching as high as 9.5 percent in Clearwater County in Minnesota.

Given the numbers, Federal support for unemployment insurance is more important than ever for the long-term unemployed. Extending this critical safety net is fair. American families, struggling against long-term unemployment, are working hard to find a job, to put food on the table, to pay their bills. They are not exactly the ones who have seen the upturn from the stock market that many people have seen in the last years. They are not the ones who have seen their stocks rise. They don't have stocks. They are just trying to put food on the table for their families. They are not faceless, nameless charity cases. They are our neighbors, they are our family members, and they are our friends. In fact, nearly one out of every five Americans has either received or is living with someone who has received Federal unemployment benefits since 2008. That is 69 million people. Almost 24 million long-term unemployed workers have directly benefited and another 45 million Americans, including nearly 17 million children, are living with someone who is receiving unemployment insurance.

These benefits help carry families through long unemployment spells, pay the mortgage, rent, utilities. While the average unemployment insurance benefit of $300 per week only replaces about one-third of an individual's average weekly wage, unemployment insurance benefits have kept 11 million Americans out of poverty; 2.5 million in 2012 alone. That is 2.5 million Americans kept out of poverty because of this program.

In 13 States, over 40 percent of those who are unemployed have been out of work for more than 26 weeks and have exhausted their State-funded benefits. Nationally nearly 38 percent of unemployed workers are long-term unemployed. These are the workers, the 4.9 million Americans who will lose their unemployment insurance if we fail to pass this bill. These benefits help them to keep looking for work, support their children and families, and contribute to the economy.

The longer a person is unemployed, the more difficult it is for that person to find a job. Skills atrophy and professional networks dry up. But you can't go on a job interview if you cannot even fill up your car with gas, so we also need to make sure the long-term unemployed are not left high and dry after State-funded unemployment benefits run out.

Addressing long-term unemployment is a problem that calls for an all-of-the-above solution. We need to do more to support American workers.

This is the right thing to do. We also know it is better for the economy. The CBO has found that each dollar of unemployment insurance increases the GDP by as much as $1.90, and extending the Federal unemployment benefits through 2014 would boost GDP by a .2 percentage point and increase employment by 200,000 jobs. Failing to extend Federal unemployment benefits will cost the economy 240,000 jobs, according to the Council of Economic Advisors. Those are the numbers with which we are dealing.

We also know if we look at the suggestions of the debt commission—something that I think is a very important body of work and has some very good ideas in it—their idea is trying to get about $4 trillion in debt reduction. We are something above $2.6 trillion of the way there with more to do, but the point is there are ways to get there. One of my favorite ways is to pass the immigration bill. CBO has found that in the second 10 years that will actually save $700 billion on the debt by making people pay taxes, by bringing them out of the shadows so they pay fines. That is what we are dealing with.

If we want to look at ways to reduce our debt, I don't think we should be doing it on the backs of the most vulnerable, those kids, those people who are long-term unemployed who still have not been able to find a job. In many States it is still a very difficult economy. Especially for the long-term unemployed, this is the right thing to do. We shouldn't leave these Americans in the lurch. We need to restore this critical safety net and focus on getting Americans back to work.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about an amendment I will seek to offer on the pending bill, amendment No. 2603.

We all sympathize with those who are struggling to find work in a difficult economy, and I want to see people get back to work. Certainly a short-term extension for those who are relying on unemployment insurance—if it is paid for—will allow a transition for those who are out of work. What we need to do most in this Chamber is to give them an opportunity to get a good-paying job. The focus in this Chamber, most of all, needs to be on enacting progrowth policy that will encourage both small and large businesses to thrive and grow in our economy and create jobs.

I have voted today to begin debate on the legislation to provide a temporary extension of unemployment insurance. I voted to begin this debate because I believe both sides of the aisle can find a way to grant this temporary extension to those who are struggling to find work in this difficult economy while making sure we don't add to the $17 trillion of debt that also threatens our country and our economy.

I continue to believe that any temporary extension in a long-term unemployment benefit should be paid for in a responsible manner. So I have submitted an amendment, Ayotte amendment No. 2603. I think it is an amendment that makes a ton of sense.

Let me tell you what this amendment does. This amendment pays for

the 3-month extension of unemployment insurance. It fixes the unfair cut to the military cost of living that was just enacted in the budget I voted against. I felt this was unfair to those who have served in our military and were singled out for cuts to their retirement benefits, unlike anyone else, and it included, by the way, those who were retired because they had a medical retirement. In other words, those who many of us—I know the Presiding Officer has visited Walter Reed, as have I; those who have lost arms, legs—they have received a medical retirement, and their cost of living was cut under this budget as well.

So my amendment not only would pay for this temporary unemployment insurance for those who are struggling to find work, to give them a transition to get them back to work, but it would also pay to fix and reverse this unfair cut in military retirement benefits—many who, by the way, have served multiple tours for our country and have sacrificed a tremendous amount because they moved around, because they served both in Iraq and Afghanistan, on behalf of our country.

It would also give approximately $7 billion toward reducing our deficit.

The way I pay for this is to fix an egregious problem in our Tax Code. It is a problem that was identified by the Treasury IG. It is, frankly, egregious. This is a problem in our Tax Code that has allowed illegal immigrants to claim a refundable tax credit for children who should not be entitled to it—children that do not even live in the United States of America or may not even exist. Why? Because when someone claims this refundable tax credit, they do not have to include a Social Security number on their return. A Treasury IG report identified this problem.

This amendment—a simple fix that would require a Social Security number for anyone who is claiming the additional child tax credit on their tax return—is estimated to save approximately $20 billion over the next 10 years. So paying for reversing the cost-of-living increase for those who have sacrificed so much for our country, paying for a temporary unemployment insurance extension for those who are struggling to find work, and reducing our deficit by approximately $7 billion over 10 years—all three of those things are done by fixing an egregious problem in our Tax Code.

The audit of the Treasury IG in 2011 reported that individuals who are not authorized to work in the United States of America received $4.2 billion by claiming this additional child tax credit. The audit found that the payment of Federal funds through this tax benefit appears to provide an additional incentive for aliens to enter, reside, and work in the United States without authorization, which contradicts Federal law and policy to remove such incentives.

The audit was based upon an analysis of tax returns filed by persons with individual taxpayer identification numbers which are issued to individuals who are required to have a taxpayer ID number for tax purposes but are not eligible for a Social Security number because they are not authorized to work in the United States of America.

Again, this saves approximately $20 billion over the next 10 years.

Let me tell you how egregious this is. Here are some of the reports about this problem in our Tax Code. It is fraud. This is fraud we are going to fix here. This is good government. We should fix this now, regardless. This $20 billion is money that should not be going out the door over 10 years.

Here are some examples from Indiana. In fact, I just saw walk into the Chamber one of my colleagues from Indiana, Senator COATS. In Indiana, a local television station found that an undocumented worker who was interviewed at his home in southern Indiana by a reporter admitted his address was used this year to file tax returns by four other undocumented workers who do not even live there. Those four workers claimed 20 children who live in one residence, and, as a result, the IRS sent the illegal immigrants tax refunds totaling over $29,000.

The local station has found many undocumented workers are claiming tax credits for children who live in Mexico. Many children who do not even live in this country are being used by those committing fraud on the IRS to claim this tax credit.

In Indiana, a tax preparer who acted as a whistleblower to an Indiana news station said: ''We've seen sometimes 10 or 12 dependents—most times nieces and nephews—on these tax forms. The more you put on there, the more you get back.'' The whistleblower had thousands of examples.

Another example from the whistleblower: ''We've got an over $10,000 refund for nine nieces and nephews,'' he said, pointing to the words ''niece'' and ''nephew'' listed on the tax form nine separate times. ''We're getting an $11,000 refund on this tax return.'' ''There are seven nieces and nephews,'' he said, pointing to another set of documents. ''I can bring out stacks and stacks. It's just so easy, it's ridiculous.''

In North Carolina, investigators uncovered more than 1,000 tax returns linked to eight addresses in that state last May, with refunds worth more than $5 million. Investigators tied at least 17 tax returns, totaling more than $62,000 in refunds, to a Charlotte, NC, apartment one woman leased. At another apartment nearby, investigators discovered 153 returns, valued at over $700,000 in refunds.

Another address in the same apartment complex had 236 returns worth $1.1 million in refunds.

At another Charlotte apartment complex, investigators traced 398 returns to two apartments, totaling more than $1.9 million in additional child tax credits, with no guarantee that the children even existed or lived in the United States of America.

Another North Carolina woman owned a tax preparation business. A search of that business and her home turned up more returns, dozens of uncashed U.S. Treasury checks, a FedEx box containing dozens of foreign birth certificates, and a notary public stamp and signature stamp listing her as a notary. That fraud case by the IRS totaled over $5 million.

In Tennessee, a search warrant prepared by the IRS claims that a Murfreesboro, TN, tax company encouraged undocumented workers to lie on their tax returns by claiming children who live in Mexico as dependents. The IRS says that the Tennessee tax preparer has filed 6,000 tax returns over the last 3 years and although his clients only paid $3.3 million in taxes, they were able to claim more than $17 million in refunds. The refunds left the United States on the hook for $14 million.

So here is the question in this Chamber. The question is, Should we fix egregious fraud in our Tax Code, where we have people, who are not entitled to work in this country, claiming tax refunds for children, some of whom have not been determined to exist, some of whom do not even live in our country? Should we fix that in our Tax Code? Isn't that good government?

And if we fix it, we can use the pay-for, the $20 billion that the Joint Tax Committee has estimated to save over the next 10 years, to do the following: to provide for a 3 month temporary extension of unemployment insurance to those Americans who are struggling for work right now; to fix the unfair cut to our military retirees, including those who have gotten a medical retirement, those who are our wounded warriors who have been injured, many of them serving in Afghanistan and Iraq; and return $7 billion to the Treasury.

So here is the choice. Only in Washington would this be the choice: We can fix the egregious problem with the Tax Code, where there is all kinds of fraud and save billions of dollars; we can fix it for those who have sacrificed the most—the unfair cuts to their cost-of-living increase—those who have served our country admirably, and our wounded warriors; and return money to reduce the deficit or what? We can be denied a vote. I hope I will get a vote on this amendment. It is pretty outrageous if I am not granted a vote on this amendment to prevent tax fraud that needs to be fixed on behalf of the taxpayers in this country.

If I cannot get a vote to take that $20 billion to help struggling workers and to fix the unfair cuts to those who have sacrificed the most and taken the bullets for this country and also to help fix our deficit—only in Washington would that be a tough choice for anyone. How do you vote against doing that?

I really hope the majority leader will allow a vote on this commonsense

amendment that will allow us to help struggling workers without adding to the $17 trillion debt, that will allow us to say to our men and women who have sacrificed the most: We are not going to continue to target you with these unfair cuts to your cost of living, when no one else has sacrificed under this budget agreement like that—and particularly our wounded warriors—and to say to the American public: We are going to fix fraud in our Tax Code, and also take some money and apply it to the deficit.

It makes so much sense that only in Washington would I even be asking the question on the Senate floor: Will I get a vote on this commonsense amendment that allows us to do important things for the Nation and fixes egregious fraud in our Tax Code, putting taxpayer dollars to uses that they should be put to.

I end with the hope that I will get a vote on this commonsense amendment and that my colleagues will support this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would like to discuss today's vote, as others who have come down here.

First of all, it is important to understand that this was a vote on whether to start debate. I was one of those who joined several of my colleagues saying: Yes, this ought to be debated. It was not a vote to pass or not pass the legislation. That will come.

But the frustration that so many of us have had over this past year in particular of not being able to participate in the process of legislating boiled over at the end of the year and ended with a change in the rules in the way the Senate has operated for more than 200 years and stuffed the desires of the minority to be able to participate in certain areas regarding nominations. Now there is some talk about doing the same for legislation.

That frustration has led many of us to try to rethink: How can we get back to what is called regular order—the way the Senate has always operated in the past, the way it operated when I came here in my first tranche in the Senate.

I started in the House of Representatives back in 1980. I was part of a minority for four straight terms. There are majority rules. If one is in the minority, they do not have a whole lot of authority. Maybe at that time we held the White House under Ronald Reagan. He had the ability to go above a Congress which did not support him but went to the American people, and through their efforts many changed their minds in the majority party and supported the policies of President Reagan.

When I came to the Senate in 1989, I was asked: What is the difference between the House and the Senate? You are in the minority in the Senate. You were in the minority in the House. I said: The difference is like going to legislative heaven from a place a lot lower than that in the House, because any Senator, majority or minority, had the opportunity to offer an amendment, to offer an alternative, to offer a statute, to participate in the effort to pass better legislation.

Any Senator had that in the minority. The majority leader, then-Senator George Mitchell, the Democratic leader, honored that. It was honored throughout my term in the Senate. I was then gone for 12 years and came back. I thought I was coming back to that same process, only to find that, no, the whole process has been changed.

We do not have the rights we once had. We do not have the opportunities we had. I came here to represent the people of Indiana and their wishes. Yet now I am in a position where I do not even have a chance to offer an amendment. I do not have even have a chance to offer an alternative or a substitute saying: Look. This may be a legitimate issue. I cannot support what is being handed to us take it or leave it. It deserves debate. It deserves alternatives. It deserves to give us an opportunity to try to convince our colleagues that a majority of us can work together to pass legislation.

That is the kind of legislation that works, as opposed to some of the legislation we are dealing with now that has been enacted simply by one-party rule. I think looking back on the Affordable Care Act, so-called ObamaCare, those who supported it wish now that it did have bipartisan support, that it was worked out, that some of the alternatives that were presented by Republicans were debated and perhaps supported. Maybe we would be in a different position now.

It is not right to characterize a vote on a procedural motion to say let's go forward and open this for debate, the opportunity to have amendments. That is why I voted for it. Unemployment insurance is a legitimate issue, policy issue to debate. I cannot support the proposal that was brought before us. But I can support going forward to discuss that proposal, to look at the alternative, to offer my own amendments and see if our thoughts, our ideas prevail.

I am hoping that is what will happen. That is up to the majority leader Senator REID. Mr. President, 2013 did not offer us very many—in fact, very few—opportunities to do that. We ended up on a very sour note in 2013. It was good we had that break and we are back, the second day of a new session of Congress. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle reflected over this period of time on how we can return the Senate to its original intent, how we can get back to so-called regular order, so we can have legitimate debate on the floor, we can go back and forth with our colleagues.

I think if we amend this, it will be a better bill. We do not think that bill is the one that ought to address this problem, but here is a substitute. Let's debate it. Then let's have a vote. Some of us will win and some of us will lose. But every one of us will have the opportunity to have their voice heard, their amendment voted on, their alternative evaluated, and perhaps work in a bipartisan way to come up with something constructive.

So that was the purpose for leaving most of my party and voting for the motion to proceed, to go forward. Here we are. Now we have a chance to debate it. Senator AYOTTE was on the floor speaking before me, Senator PORTMAN, Senator CORNYN, all proposing ways in which we can offset the cost.

We all know we are adding to our debt and deficit on a daily basis. We have not come to grips with that. Yet the future consequences for this country, our economy, our children, our grandchildren, future generations is something we are all going to be ashamed of if we do not try to impose some discipline. How do we do that?

We made many efforts going all the way back to Simpson-Bowles. All of the major efforts, we were unable get the President's support for any of those, even though he commissioned the Simpson-Bowles group, which was bipartisan. But nevertheless, we have not yet to this point been able to get that large effort in place that will put us on the path to fiscal health.

But one thing we can do is when we have programs—new programs, an extension of programs such as this—come before us, we can say: Let's, one, reform this so we achieve what we want to achieve, and, No. 2, let's make sure we do not add more taxpayer dollars to our deficit spending and our debt. Let's offset it with something.

For those who say we cannot cut a penny more, for goodness' sake, the organizations—the Federal organizations, the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Research Service, on and on, GAO and others, have proposed numerous ways of billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars in savings for programs that are deemed wasteful and fraudulent.

Senator AYOTTE just mentioned specific examples, some in my State, of abuses of the system. There are concerns about abuse of the unemployment insurance, people seeing this not as a help to getting a job and getting back into the workforce but seeing this as yet another entitlement benefit they can receive without putting the effort in to get meaningful employment.

We have the responsibility to bring forward measures that I think give people a connection between unemployment and their ability to get employed. That has been suggested by Senator PORTMAN and others here. Senator CORNYN also talked about that. So whether it is an offset in order to pay for this so we do not go further in debt and use taxpayer money for excess

spending, when we know over here is waste and fraud and abuse in programs that have been deemed dysfunctional, unnecessary, the Federal Government never should have been involved in this process in the first place, why not take those programs that have been recommended to us by nonpartisan agencies of the Federal Government?

Senator COBURN has spent his career down here pointing out excessive, outrageous, egregious waste that has gone on and a misuse of taxpayer dollars. That is not how to run a government. My State has had to face this. They have faced up to it. We made the tough decisions. Of course, there have been interest groups supporting every possible item we spend money on. But we separated the necessary, the efficient, the effective from the unnecessary, ineffective.

We now have been rated as the most taxpayer conscious friendly State in the Nation. Our per capita tax impact on Hoosiers in Indiana is the lowest of any State in the Nation. We have an efficient, effective government that has a AAA credit rating, that has been deemed business friendly, taxpayer friendly, residential friendly, family friendly. It is a good place to live because we are not wasting taxpayer dollars. People are tired of spending money on what does not work.

I have gotten way off my intended statement. But I guess I am expressing my frustrations over the inability to participate in the process that can bring about better use of the taxpayers' dollars and more effective government. I think I speak for a lot of people on both sides of the aisle, that the way to do this is simply not to freeze out debate, not to freeze out amendments, not to freeze out the opportunity to offer alternatives. By moving through this motion to proceed, I am hoping this is a step forward to returning to a process in which we are able to do what I just suggested.

This decision is going to be up to the majority leader. If he wants honest debate, if he wants the American people and all of us in this Chamber to know—to examine alternatives, if he wants to be conscientious about spending taxpayer dollars, allow us the opportunity to offer some offsets.

Senator AYOTTE had a specific and I think very compelling offset. If we took a fraction of the money that we would save, we can cover the cost of this extension, if that is where we think we should go. I think major reforms need to be made to this program, and we ought to be emphasizing getting people back to work rather than how to keep extending unemployment. But the two go somewhat hand in hand.

There are people in Indiana and other places who have made every possible effort to get a job and have come up short. We need to be sensitive to the plight of those people, but we do not need to be sensitive to those who have taken advantage of this program and are abusing this program who simply say: I do not have to work because the government will send me a check; when I add up all of my benefits, I am doing as well as I could if I worked. That is not the kind of policy we ought to be advocating or enabling in the Senate.

As I said, there are numerous alternatives or ways in which we can find a way to pay for this, if we can also put the reforms in place that mean we ought to go forward with this particular program. Let me suggest three. My colleagues have suggested others also, which I support. Any one of these could work. This program is scored at about a cost of six point something billion dollars.

This is a program, a policy, which requires taxpayers, in order to claim refundable portions of the child tax credit, it would require them to provide a Social Security number. I mean, this is so elementary, it is unbelievable to discover that a government agency has said: This is not in place. In other words, if you want to qualify for a refundable child tax credit, you have to verify who you are by giving them your Social Security number, so they can check to see if this is legitimate or not legitimate.

Senator AYOTTE laid out a situation where people were claiming 10, 15, 20 exemptions for children who did not even live in the United States, who were not even citizens. I was embarrassed that one of examples came from my State. But I think it is true of all States. But the savings to put a good bit of common sense into a program is scored not by DAN COATS, not by a Republican Senator but by a government agency. It is scored at $27 billion.

So here is a program that wants to spend $6.6 billion. Republicans say: First of all, we have problems with the program. I may or may not support extending this. But if it does get extended, surely we do not want to dump more money, more future debt, onto our children and grandchildren. So let's take this $27 billion, or a fraction of that $27 billion, and pay for this.

Let me offer another option: a delay for 1 year of the individual employer mandates under ObamaCare, the legislation I introduced in the Senate. If the President has delayed the mandates for businesses, should not he offer the same delay to families and individuals as a simple issue of fairness? What is the score—$30 billion.

A third option: Prohibit those who are eligible for unemployment insurance from claiming Social Security disability benefits. Under the law, one must be able to work to qualify for unemployment benefits.

Yet some people claiming unemployment benefits are also claiming Social Security disability benefits. We can't make some of this stuff up. Savings: roughly $6 billion, maybe more, that, if we want to support this bill, would be a pay-for. So whether it is a pay-for or whether it is the necessary policy changes to make the program more effective—including, and I would suggest, a number of efforts that have been proposed by my colleagues in terms of better connecting the unemployed with those who are seeking, with the employers.

I can't tell you how many employers I have talked to in Indiana who have said: I have jobs.

I have talked to others, but the bottom line is this. There are people out there who look at what I have to offer. It is not the greatest, but it is a job. It covers benefits, and it is a step forward for them.

But they say: It doesn't match what I am getting from the government, so I think I will take a pass.

This is not America and not the principles that made America the kind of country it is. We should not be enablers in that regard through legislation that we pass.

I hope that we can have a full and open debate on this bill and move to policies that will grow and create jobs, and that we will adopt a practice of paying for new spending with offsets from known waste, fraud, and abuse that has been documented by government agencies.

Can't we at least do that? Can't we at least agree, in the future interest of our country, both fiscally, domestically, on a number of issues, for all of the reasons that I have articulated or tried to articulate, this makes sense?

Breaking with some of the past ways I have given my vote, I have said I am going to vote for the motion to proceed, and I going to challenge the majority leader to look at this and say let's run this place differently in 2014 than it was in 2013. Let's not be afraid of debate. Let's not be afraid of amendments. Let's let the yeas be yeas and the nays be nays. Let's give everybody an opportunity to state their case, to offer an alternative, and to be recognized. As a Member of the Senate, and the way this Senate was designed to be and traditionally for over 200 years it has been, let's move back to that.

What happens next is now up to the majority leader. The ball is in his court.

Had we not passed the motion to proceed with the support of Republican help, then we wouldn't have given the majority leader the need to make a decision.

What kind of a Senate do we want in 2014? A Senate that is doing what the American people want us to do, representing the people of our State with their interests, representing our beliefs about how government should be run, how it should be funded, having an open and honest debate, not afraid to take votes, trying to construct good policy for the future of this country? We can't do that if this body is run by one person saying: My way or the highway. You are in the minority. Tough break.

This is a chance for the majority leader. Let's give us the opportunity and return this back to the Senate it was once and always has been until lately. It is up to the majority leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. I am here today with some good news. This week the government will fix something that was broken. I know that some people wish to deny that is possible, but hear me out.

Five years ago, during the 2008 financial crisis, we witnessed firsthand that the market for home mortgages was badly broken. The fundamental problem was that many lenders issued mortgages without any concern about whether the borrower would be able to repay those mortgages in the long run. Why would they do that? They did it because they could immediately sell the mortgage to another financial institution. If the borrower couldn't pay, that would turn out to be somebody else's problem.

We all know what happened next. Millions of these dangerous mortgages were bundled together, sliced, diced, slapped with AAA ratings, and then sold to retirement funds, local governments, and investors all over the country. When borrowers couldn't make their monthly payments, those bundles of mortgages began collapsing, and the effects were felt in every corner of the economy.

This Friday, that basic business model will change, thanks to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's new mortgage rules. When these rules go into effect, lenders will be able to issue a mortgage only after they determine that the borrower has the ability to repay it.

Lenders will no longer be able to make loans they know will blow up and then feed those dangerous loans into the financial system. Because of the consumer agency's new rules, families will be safer. Pension funds and other investors will be safer. Our whole economy will be safer—not completely safe, but with a new cop on the beat, it will be safer.

The new rules will fix other problems as well. Before the crisis, some mortgage brokers who were supposed to be helping consumers find the best mortgage were actually taking money from lenders to steer those consumers into higher-cost loans. The CFPB's new rules will prohibit this sort of under-the-table dealing and protect consumers from being tricked by people they think they can trust.

The rules will also address many of the mortgage servicing problems that emerged during the crisis. After mortgages were sold off, bundled, and cut up into pieces for various investors, too many borrowers were unable to track down clear information about their accounts. Some of the companies responsible for servicing their loans took days or even weeks to give them credit for their payments.

When borrowers fell behind, these servicers often began foreclosure proceedings without giving people full information about the options they had to modify their loans. The consumer agency's new rules will help clean up the mortgage servicing industry so more families can keep up with their payments and stay in their homes.

CFPB Director Rich Cordray and his hardworking and incredibly talented staff have worked for a long time to put these new rules together, and its rules will reshape the mortgage market for the better. They will give people a better chance to buy homes and a better chance to keep those homes. They will force mortgage lenders and servicers to compete by offering better rates and customer service, not by tricking and trapping people. These rules will help markets work better, and they will reduce the risk that the economy will crash again.

Our work is not done. The march toward financial reform has been too slow, and the chances of another crisis, while dialed back in some areas, remain unacceptably high in others. Even today, the too-big-to-fail banks that nearly crashed the global economy in 2008 are nearly 40 percent bigger than they were back then.

Yes, we have more work to do on dangerous banking practices, but this week marks an important milestone. Six years ago, I noted that it was impossible to buy a toaster with a one-in-five chance of bursting into flames and burning your house down, but it was possible to take out a mortgage that had the same one-in-five chance of putting a family out on the street.

The point was that consumers had the Consumer Products Safety Commission to keep people safe from dangerous toasters, and they needed the same kind of agency to keep people safe from dangerous and deceptive financial products.

In the years since, we have built that agency. It has already returned nearly $1 billion to consumers who were cheated, and it has helped tens of thousands of consumers resolve complaints against financial institutions. Now, this Friday, that agency will put in place some commonsense rules that will make a real difference for millions of families who own—or someday hope to own—their own home.

The consumer bureau's new mortgage rules show, once again, that government can fix problems. Sure, we have to work hard. We have to fight against those who benefit from the broken system, and we have to stick with it even when the odds are against us. But when we do those things, real change is possible in this country. We are seeing that up close this week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, last night here in the Senate we confirmed Janet Yellen to be the next Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I firmly opposed her confirmation. In 2010 I also voted against Dr. Yellen's nomination to serve as Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve. I want to explain.

At that time I stated my deep concerns about Dr. Yellen's Keynesian bias toward inflation as a member of the Federal Open Market Committee and her poor record of bank regulation as president of the San Francisco Federal Reserve. Those concerns have not faded; rather, they are magnified in light of the importance of the position to which Dr. Yellen has now been confirmed, and that is the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve.

It is not just that the Chairman of the Fed is perhaps the most powerful individual in the global economy; it is that the institution itself is in utterly uncharted waters. I believe we need a Federal Reserve Chairman with the record and resolve to navigate our economy through this incredibly delicate situation. In my judgment, I thought Dr. Yellen was not that person.

The Federal Reserve's balance sheet currently stands at $4 trillion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the balance sheet as of January 1 of this year.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

8. CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF CONDITION OF ALL FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

[Millions of dollars]

Assets, liabilities, and capital	Eliminations from consolidation	Wednesday Jan 1, 2014	Change since	
			Wednesday Dec 25, 2013	Wednesday Jan 2, 2013
Assets:				
Gold certificate account		11,037	0	0
Special drawing rights certificate account		5,200	0	0
Coin		1,955	−8	−148
Securities, unamortized premiums and discounts, repurchase agreements, and loans		3,952,587	−7,327	+1,113,092
Securities held outright (1)		3,756,159	−6,835	+1,086,566
U.S. Treasury securities		2,208,775	−54	+542,657

8. CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF CONDITION OF ALL FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS—Continued

[Millions of dollars]

Assets, liabilities, and capital	Eliminations from consolidation	Wednesday Jan 1, 2014	Change since Wednesday Dec 25, 2013	Change since Wednesday Jan 2, 2013
Bills (2)		0	0	0
Notes and bonds, nominal (2)		2,103,871	−1	+523,399
Notes and bonds, inflation-indexed (2)		91,379	0	+16,639
Inflation compensation (3)		13,525	−53	+2,619
Federal agency debt securities (2)		57,221	0	−19,562
Mortgage-backed securities (4)		1,490,162	−6,781	+563,471
Unamortized premiums on securities held outright (5)		208,610	−492	+37,730
Unamortized discounts on securities held outright (5)		−12,352	+20	−10,788
Repurchase agreements (6)		0	0	0
Loans		171	−21	−416
Net portfolio holdings of Maiden Lane LLC (7)		1,541	0	+128
Net portfolio holdings of Maiden Lane II LLC (8)		63	0	+2
Net portfolio holdings of Maiden Lane III LLC (9)		22	0	0
Net portfolio holdings of TALF LLC (10)		109	0	−747
Items in process of collection	(0)	165	+4	−22
Bank premises		2,289	−1	−42
Central bank liquidity swaps (11)		272	−1	−8,617
Foreign currency denominated assets (12)		23,821	+35	−1,181
Other assets (13)		24,579	−1,637	+3,987
Total assets	(0)	4,023,640	−8,935	+1,106,451

Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding. Footnotes appear at the end of the table.

Liabilities:				
Federal Reserve notes, net of F.R. Bank holdings		1,197,920	+2,719	+71,059
Reverse repurchase agreements (14)		315,924	+164,667	+212,653
Deposits	(0)	2,445,620	−174,717	+822,821
Term deposits held by depository institutions		0	0	0
Other deposits held by depository institutions		2,249,070	−201,663	+740,398
U.S. Treasury, General Account		162,399	+68,506	+77,941
Foreign official		7,970	−10	+1,660
Other	(0)	26,181	−41,550	+2,822
Deferred availability cash items	(0)	1,127	−87	−66
Other liabilities and accrued dividends (15)		8,035	−1,514	−311
Total liabilities	(0)	3,968,627	−8,930	+1,106,158
Capital accounts:				
Capital paid in		27,507	−2	+147
Surplus		27,507	−2	+147
Other capital accounts		0	0	0
Total capital		55,014	−4	+294

Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Mr. SHELBY. A recent Bloomberg analysis contains figures that help us put this staggering number—$4 trillion—into perspective.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that Bloomberg article.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Bloomberg, Dec. 17, 2013]

FED'S $4 TRILLION IN ASSETS DRAW LAWMAKERS' SCRUTINY

(By Jeff Kearns)

The Federal Reserve's balance sheet is poised to exceed $4 trillion, prompting warnings its record easing is inflating asset-price bubbles and drawing renewed lawmaker scrutiny just as Janet Yellen prepares to take charge.

The Fed's assets rose to a record $3.99 trillion on Dec. 11, up from $2.82 trillion in September 2012, when it embarked on a third round of bond buying. Policy makers meet today and tomorrow to decide whether to start curtailing the $85 billion monthly pace of purchases.

Among Fed officials, ''there's discomfort in the sense that the portfolio could grow almost without limit,'' former Fed Vice Chairman Donald Kohn said last week during a panel discussion in Washington. Kohn said there was ''discomfort in the potential financial stability effects'' and added: ''There's some legitimacy in those discomforts.''

Fed Governor Jeremy Stein has said some credit markets, such as corporate debt, show signs of excessive risk-taking, while not posing a threat to financial stability. Representative Jeb Hensarling, chairman of the House committee that oversees the Fed, last week said he plans ''the most rigorous examination and oversight of the Federal Reserve in its history.''

While any effort to rewrite the law establishing Fed powers lacks support from Democrats who control the Senate, the scrutiny is undesirable for central bankers who believe ''independence is priceless,'' said Laura Rosner, a U.S. economist at BNP Paribas SA in New York.

NOT WELCOME

THE FED APPROACHES A TAPER ON TIPTOE

''It's not a welcome development that a lot more time and focus is spent on answering questions'' from Congress, said Rosner, a former researcher at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Lawmakers may also use the size of the balance sheet to ''draw attention to concerns they have about the Fed's responsibilities and growing role in financial regulation.''

Chairman Ben S. Bernanke, whose second four-year term ends next month, has quadrupled Fed assets since 2008 with bond purchases intended to lower long-term borrowing costs and reduce unemployment. Vice Chairman Yellen, who may win Senate confirmation this week to replace Bernanke, has been a supporter of the policy.

The Fed has said it will keep buying bonds until the outlook for the labor market has ''improved substantially.'' Thirty-four percent of economists surveyed by Bloomberg Dec. 6 predicted the Fed will start reducing purchases this month, while 26 percent forecast January and 40 percent said March.

ASSETS HELD

The Fed's balance sheet exceeds the gross domestic product of Germany, the world's fourth-largest economy. It's enough to cover all U.S. federal government spending for more than a year. It could pay off all student and auto loans in the country with $2 trillion to spare, Fed data show. The central bank's assets are set to exceed the $4.1 trillion held by BlackRock Inc. (BLK), the world's largest asset manager.

The third round of quantitative easing probably will total $1.54 trillion before it ends, bringing the balance sheet to $4.3 6 trillion, according to economists in the survey.

''This is a stimulus of the first order. It's just unprecedented,'' Alabama Republican Senator Richard Shelby said in an interview last week. ''The Fed is an independent body, but we can point out what they're doing.''

Jeffrey Lacker, president of the Richmond Fed and a critic of the Fed's bond buying, said in a Dec. 9 speech he expects the Fed policy makers to discuss reducing purchases at this week's meeting. Adding to the balance sheet ''increases the risks'' associated with exiting stimulus, he said.

'REAL RISK'

Shelby, a five-term senator and past chairman of the Banking Committee sees ''a real risk'' the balance sheet will ignite inflation. So far, there's little sign that's happening: a measure of prices watched by the Fed rose 0.7 percent in October from a year earlier, below the central bank's 2 percent target and the least in four years.

At 22 percent of the $16.9 trillion U.S. economy, the balance sheet is surpassed by those of other major central banks as a percentage of gross domestic product, according to third-quarter data compiled by Haver Analytics in New York. In the euro zone, the figure is 24 percent, and in Japan, it's about 44 percent.

That doesn't mollify Republican critics. When Yellen started to make global comparisons at her Senate confirmation hearing last month, Shelby interrupted her.

''I'm asking about the Federal Reserve of the United States of America,'' he said.

WARNING SIGNS

Yellen is set to take over amid warnings that assets from leveraged loans to farmland are showing signs of froth.

The Fed and other U.S. banking regulators have said they want to crack down on underwriting standards in the market for high-risk, high-yield loans.

Non-bank lenders such as mutual funds, hedge funds and pools of collateralized loan obligations, bought $630 billion of the loans this year, surpassing the 2007 peak of $581.5 billion, according to data compiled by Bloomberg.

Sales of high-yield, high-risk bonds, rated below Baa3 by Moody's Investors Service and lower than BBB- at Standard & Poor's, soared to an annual record of $373.2 billion this year, data compiled by Bloomberg show. That compares with $149.2 billion in 2006, the year before the start of the credit crisis.

The extra yield investors demand to hold speculative-grade bonds rather than government debt reached 411 basis points, or 4.11 percentage points, last week, the least since October 2007, according to Bank of America Merrill Lynch index data. Spreads ended the week at 412 basis points.

RECORD LOANS

Sales of institutional loans have also reached an annual record, soaring 71 percent from 2012 to $627.1 billion, according to data compiled by Bloomberg.

Potential losses on the Fed's investments are also cause for concern and ''something we will be watching,'' Representative John Campbell, a California Republican who leads the House Financial Services subcommittee on monetary policy and trade, said in February.

The Fed sent a record $88.4 billion to the Treasury in 2012 and $75.4 billion in 2011, up from $31.7 billion in 2008. Most of the income was from interest on assets bought under the quantitative easing program.

The risk for the Fed is that rising interest rates reduce the value of its bond holdings, potentially causing losses if the central bank had to sell the securities back into the open market.

''Losses are dangerous for the Fed from a political perspective because they would be a risk to its independence,'' said Roberto Perli, a partner at Cornerstone Macro LP in Washington.

DEFICIT SPENDING

Campbell and Hensarling also say the Fed's purchases of government debt are encouraging deficit spending by allowing the government to borrow cheaply. The yield on the 10-year Treasury note has averaged 2.31 percent this year, compared with a 6.61 percent mean over the past half century.

''The Fed's additional extraordinary purchases of Treasury bonds have supported the Obama administration's trillion-dollar deficits,'' Hensarling said at a Dec. 12 hearing.

Yellen says bond purchases have put Americans back to work. Asset purchases helped the private sector add 7.8 million workers since 2010 and boosted home prices and auto sales, Yellen said in her confirmation hearing, adding that the progress will let the central bank get back to more normal monetary policy.

JOBLESS RATE

The jobless rate has fallen to 7 percent from a 26-year high of 10 percent in October 2009. Since then, the economy has regained most of the jobs it lost during the 18-month recession ended in June 2009.

''The balance sheet is growing because that's how the Federal Reserve thinks it's going to accomplish the mandates that Congress gave to it'' for full employment and price stability, Kohn, now a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution's Hutchins Center on Fiscal and Monetary Policy in Washington, said in an interview last week.

Still, policy makers haven't spurred the growth they expected. Officials forecast 2013 growth of 2 percent to 2.3 percent in September, down from a 2.3 percent to 2.8 percent estimate in March.

''QE turned out to be a safety net, a floor, a way to catch the economy to keep it from crashing,'' said Steve Blitz, chief economist at ITG Investment Research Inc. in New York. ''A safety net to catch a falling economy is not the same thing that can springboard the economy to a higher rate of growth.''

Mr. SHELBY. The article contains the following three comparisons that I found more than interesting. Four trillion dollars is equivalent to 24 percent of the U.S. GDP. That is greater than the GDP of the world's fourth largest country—Germany. Think about it. Four trillion dollars is twice the amount of all student and auto debt in this country. Yes, $4 trillion far surpasses even the amount of money the Federal Government spends in an entire year.

This brings me to my next point. Many hold the misconception in this country that China is the world's largest owner of U.S. debt. That is not true. In fact, the Federal Reserve's balance sheet shows the Federal Reserve itself is by far the largest holder of U.S. Treasury bonds. With $2.2 trillion in Treasury debt, the Fed holds nearly $900 billion more than China does, if you can think in those terms. The Fed holds more in Treasury bonds than do China and most of the eurozone combined.

The rate of acceleration with which the Federal Reserve is purchasing Treasuries should be alarming to all Americans. On the day of President Obama's first inauguration, the Federal Reserve held $475 billion in Treasuries. Today it holds $2.2 trillion in Treasuries. That represents a 363-percent increase in the past 5 years.

It is no coincidence that President Obama has greatly accelerated our national debt over that same period of time. There is a connection. When he took office, the national debt stood at a large $10.6 trillion. That is a lot of money. Today it stands at $17.3 trillion—5 years later. I believe the Federal Reserve is aiding and abetting the failed policies and the reckless spending of the Obama administration.

But the Fed's binge on Treasuries alone doesn't tell the full story of its exploding balance sheet. The Federal Reserve's portfolio is also loaded with nearly $1.5 trillion of mortgage-backed securities. I have long been concerned that this aggressive and extraordinary purchasing program is artificially propping up home prices, and this is especially pertinent since an overheated housing market greatly contributed to the financial crisis that caused this situation in the first place.

Taken altogether, the Federal Reserve has added more than $3 trillion to its balance sheet since early 2008, just before the investment bank Bear Stearns failed and the Federal Reserve stepped in.

I realize that sometimes it is easy to become lost in all of these huge figures I have been sharing. I brought a simple chart that illustrates the magnitude of the Federal Reserve's actions. It shows here the size of the Federal Reserve's balance sheet by decade, from its creation in 1913, 100 years ago, to present day. As we can see, it took 95 years for the Federal Reserve's balance sheet to reach $1 trillion. But look at the incredible spike in just a few years since, in the red here. Here we are today, just 5 years later, at $4 trillion and growing.

Let's call this what it is: a backdoor stimulus program through monetary policy. Very complicated, yes, but very important. It dwarfs even the fiscal stimulus package President Obama rammed through Congress during his first days in office about 5 years ago. President Obama's fiscal stimulus package totaled $787 billion—a lot of money—and I have just described the Fed's monetary stimulus package as nearly four times larger and growing.

This highly unconventional monetary policy poses huge risks to our economy—namely, inflation in the future and a devaluation of our currency. I realize that current inflation expectations are relatively low and anchored. However, again we are in completely uncharted territory. Should inflation expectations become unglued, prices could increase uncontrollably. There is simply no playbook that I am aware of on how to deal with such a situation successfully.

Yes, I also understand that the Fed has recently announced it will modestly scale back its so-called quantitative easing program. The Fed will still purchase tens of billions of dollars of securities each month.

Make no mistake—the Fed's balance sheet will continue to expand rapidly. How long will this continue? We don't know. How large will the Fed's balance sheet ultimately grow? We don't know. Will the Fed be able to contain inflation if it does begin to rise? Again, we don't know. And when will the Federal Reserve actually begin to unwind the balance sheet—which will be tricky? Again, we don't know. How exactly does the Federal Reserve plan to unwind the balance sheet? Again, we don't know, and I don't believe they know.

I raise these points because I met with Dr. Yellen in my office and attended her confirmation hearing in the Banking Committee. I received no meaningful answers to any of those questions, only the usual platitudes that so often mark such meetings.

If I may, I will now turn briefly to the subject of bank regulation, which is very important in this country—a primary and critical function of the Federal Reserve.

I have been a member of the Banking Committee since I first came to the Senate in 1987. I served on the committee through many difficult times in the financial markets, including the savings and loan crisis and the 2008 financial crisis. In all of my experience, I have never seen a financial institution fail that was well managed, well capitalized, and well regulated. The

fact is that so many financial institutions failed in 2008 and 2009 in no small part because the Federal Reserve failed spectacularly in its role as their regulator. I think that is a given.

As President of the San Francisco Fed from 2004 to 2010, Dr. Yellen presided over a regional housing bubble and failed to restrain the excesses in the market. Yet, despite this record of failure, she now runs the most powerful bank regulatory institution in the world—the Federal Reserve. I guess failure begets promotion in President Obama's view. We have seen it time and again.

This is all the more important considering that the Fed gained even greater power under the Dodd-Frank financial regulation law despite the fact that the Federal Reserve's own failures contributed to the need for financial reform in the first place.

In light of Dr. Yellen's weak touch as a bank regulator and her strong inclination to print more and more money, I firmly opposed her nomination. Only time will tell, but I believe a vote in the affirmative is one many of my colleagues will come to regret.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I presume we are in a quorum call. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am back today for the 54th time to urge my colleagues to wake up to what carbon pollution is doing to the Earth's climate and oceans. We see the facts all around us, but can't seem to penetrate the politics of Congress.

We, in this body, are willfully ignoring changes we have never seen before, changes that threaten our planet and its rich array of plant and animal life, our homes, farms, and factories, and our very health and well being.

Carbon-driven climate change can be seen in warming surface temperatures and shifting seasons, but perhaps nowhere is carbon pollution doing more harm than in our oceans. The year 2013 brought ample new evidence of these changes in our oceans.

People often talk about climate change as if it were a theory. Here is what we know. We know that the oceans are warming. That is not a theory; that is a measurement. It is done with thermometers. It is not complicated. Sea level, we know, is rising; that is another measurement. It is very simple. We could do it with a yardstick. Oceans are becoming more acidic. Every American with an aquarium measures acidity with litmus paper. Again, it is simple measurement and proven facts.

If we put those proven facts into context, let's look at geologic context. According to an article published in 2012 in the journal Science, our current rate of carbon dioxide emissions—mainly from burning fossil fuels—is enough to cause the most severe changes to the chemistry of our oceans in 300 million years, and 300 million years ago is before the dinosaurs.

We know the oceans are warming. The oceans have absorbed more than 90 percent of the excess heat in the atmosphere between 1971 and 2010, according to a 2013 report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Here is where the heat goes: 93.4 percent goes into the ocean. The rest we are seeing, 2.3 percent, goes into the atmosphere. Our oceans are really taking the brunt of the added heat.

We also know that sea level is rising. We know this. It is driven not only by melting glaciers carrying water into the seas and raising their level, but also by ocean water expanding. As water warms, it expands. The principle of thermal expansion is known in every science class in this country.

At the Newport tide gauge in Rhode Island, sea level is up almost 10 inches since the 1930s. So that means that storms driving the sea against Rhode Island's coast have 10 more inches of sea to throw against our homes and infrastructure.

Recent satellite measurements from the University of Colorado Sea Level Research Group show 3.2 millimeters of sea level rise per year from 1993 to 2013. Between 1901 and 2010, that rate was estimated at 1.7 millimeters per year. So the rate of increase has nearly doubled, and that means sea level rise is very likely speeding up. That is all stuff we measure. That is not theory.

The IPCC report also projects—conservatively, in my view—that sea level will likely rise one-half to one full meter by the year 2100 if we do nothing to dial back carbon pollution. Obviously, the other estimates are for far more extreme sea level rise.

We know the oceans are becoming more acidic. Oceans not only absorb 90 percent of the heat that has come from climate change, they are absorbing about 30 percent of the carbon itself. The carbon itself goes to the surface of the ocean, and it is absorbed there. Roughly 600 gigatons worth of carbon have been pumped into our oceans as a result. As all that carbon dissolves into the oceans, what happens? Ocean water becomes more acidic. It is a chemistry experiment you can duplicate in any simple lab. Indeed, if you do the measurement, we have gotten about 26 percent more acidic—the seas have—since the Industrial Revolution. That was reported, again, last year by the International Programme on the State of the Ocean.

The rate of change in ocean acidity—we can see it is speeding up—is already faster than at any time measured in the past 50 million years according to research published in the journal Nature Geoscience. Yet we sleep walk here in Congress, narcotized by polluter money.

Ocean acidification and warming are fundamentally altering our undersea environment—what Pope Francis in his recent exhortation called the ''ocean wonder world.'' These changes, among other things, have made the world's coral reefs extremely vulnerable to decay and bleaching. Areas such as the Great Barrier Reef—one of the great global wonders of the world off the coast of Australia—has already experienced large-scale bleaching.

As a boy, I used to scuba dive in the Andaman Sea. If you go back now—30 years later—it is heavily bleached. These are pictures that were taken in 2002 by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, and they clearly show a once lush and vibrant reef now gone and barren.

Worsening this bleaching would be particularly hard on countries whose people depend on the bounty of the reef for their protein, sustenance, and economy. Remember, the reefs are the ocean's nurseries, and they support food and economic stability as well as pretty tropical fish.

New research also suggests that even the most remote depths of the ocean will suffer the consequences of climate change. A study published in the journal Global Change Biology looked at various climate models to predicate changes in food supply throughout the world's oceans. The models predict that the changes to our ocean could lead to a worldwide drop in sea floor dwelling life by the year 2100.

The North Atlantic—off our shores in Massachusetts and in Rhode Island—may lose more than one-third of all deep-sea marine life. These drastic changes from our carbon pollution are daunting ones—particularly for our ocean State of Rhode Island. Our way of life in Rhode Island, like the Presiding Officer's in Massachusetts, has always been closely tied to the sea. Yet here in Congress we ignore all of that and continue perilously sleepwalking through history.

The Obama administration has at last put forward a Climate Action Plan, the cornerstone of which will be EPA regulations to limit greenhouse gas emissions from new and existing powerplants. Our 50 worst powerplants—in terms of emission—put out more carbon pollution than the entire country of Canada and the entire country of Korea. So solving that problem is vitally important.

The plan also directs executive branch agencies to take concrete steps to safeguard the American people and our interest in the world against the harmful effects of excessively high temperatures, melting ice, ocean acidification, and sea level rise.

These are important steps, but they must ultimately be backed up by congressional action. EPA regulations and executive orders will never have the same economy-wide effect as a congressionally approved carbon fee, for instance.

The sweeping changes taking place in our oceans make adapting to these changes particularly important along our coastlines. Warmer waters and higher seas load the dice for more damaging storms. Our coastal counties in this country harbor 39 percent of the country's population and account for 41 percent of our GDP.

Let's look at our ports, for example. According to a 2009 National Ocean Economics Program report: ''Three-quarters of all United States trade passes through estuary ports.'' No wonder, then, that the American Association of Port Authorities is taking climate change seriously—working to reduce carbon pollution and stave off its effects, rather than waiting for Congress to awaken from our slumber.

American ports are switching trucks and cranes from diesel to electric and installing onshore power supply to ships, thus reducing emissions from the port and from idling vessels. Likewise, the International Association of Ports and Harbors has launched the World Ports Climate Initiative to reduce the CO_2 output from port-related activities.

In my State, the Rhode Island Climate Change Commission reported:

> Inundaton of the state's ports and railroads may reduce interstate access, affecting economic viability and potentially limiting imports and exports. Sea level rise may also reduce navigational clearances for the State's bridges, additionally limiting access.

These changes will be particularly harmful for the Port of Providence, which today brings hundreds of millions of dollars to the region.

We need strong Federal action to reduce the carbon emissions that are threatening our coastal communities. We must also take firm Federal action to adapt ourselves, and our States and our coastal communities, to the changes that we can no longer avoid because of what we have already pumped into the atmosphere and the harm we have already done.

This is a real threat. It is embarrassing, and it is wrong for Congress and the Senate to continue to ignore it. Somebody who knew something about looming threats was Sir Winston Churchill. He gave this advice:

> One ought never to turn one's back on a threatened danger and try to run away from it. If you do that, you will double the danger. But if you meet it promptly and without flinching, you will reduce the danger by half.

That is good advice. What's embarrassing and wrong is that not only are we failing to meet it promptly—and flinching—but that failure and that flinching is the result of special interest influence in this body.

We face uncommon challenges and they demand uncommon resolve. America has not overcome past crises by pretending they did not exist; that state of play is preposterous for us to embark from. We actually have clear scientific understanding of the problem. The doubt is passed, the jury is in, and the verdict has been delivered. Yet we lack the will of leadership to forge a solution. Another great leader who knew something of leadership in times of crisis was President Lincoln. He understood that the greatest challenges require clear vision and brave thinking. When faced with a crisis, President Lincoln said:

> The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

It is past time to disenthrall ourselves of the corrupt thrall of polluting special interests. It is time, at last, to wake up and get to work on the job we have before us.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I want to share in some remarks Senator AYOTTE had relative to the amendment she submitted that would pay for the unemployment insurance extension and veteran pensions benefits. I will just say her pay-for is an issue that I have had some experience with. I offered several years ago an amendment to fix the same problem, and I was disappointed when the majority leader, Senator REID, objected to that amendment.

Senator AYOTTE's amendment would pay for the jobless benefits of unemployed Americans and restore veterans' pensions by cutting off fraudulent tax payments to illegal aliens. This is a very simple concept. There is a clear abuse going on here that needs to be fixed, and it should have been fixed a long time ago.

The amendment contains an offset of $20 billion—$20 billion—by closing this loophole and ending this abuse of American tax dollars. Remember, the veterans' retirement benefit reductions in their retirement plans that were voted on recently in this body—part of the Ryan-Murray budget agreement—only saved $6 billion over 10 years by altering the retirement benefits of veterans. So this amendment—closing the tax loophole—would save $20 billion over 10 years.

In 2011—this is when the matter first came to my attention by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration. Each Department has an inspector general. The inspectors general are part of the Obama administration, but they take pride in their independence, and they are by and large a very valuable part of the American Government.

So this Treasury Inspector General made this statement in a report:

> Millions of people are seeking this tax credit who, we believe, are not entitled to it. We have made recommendations to the IRS as to how they could address this, and they have not taken sufficient action in our view to solve the problem.

A clear statement by the Inspector General of the U.S. Treasury Department that there were problems with this policy, and they could be fixed, and the Internal Revenue Service was failing to take steps to fix the problem.

One press report that highlighted the abuses occurring within this program reported that an illegal alien admitted that his address was used to file tax returns by four other illegal workers. All were in the country working illegally, and they filed tax returns. Did they file the tax returns to pay taxes? No. They filed the tax returns to get a tax credit back from the government, a check from the government. They claimed 20 dependents living inside their residence, and the Internal Revenue Service sent the illegal tax filers $30,000—direct checks from the U.S. Government, from the U.S. Department of Treasury, went to them. They filed a return, they said they had all these children, and they were given $30,000.

According to the report, none of those dependents lived in the United States or had even visited the United States. The illegal alien in the story justified the enormous tax fraud by saying: ''If the opportunity is there and they can give it to me, why not take advantage of it?''

Well, this is an interesting development. Let's go along a little further. As the Treasury Inspector General himself said: ''The payment of Federal funds through this tax benefit appears to provide an additional incentive for aliens to enter, reside, and work in the United States without authorization, which contradicts Federal law and policy to remove such incentives.''

So the inspector general took the obvious position that it is the government's position that people who enter the country illegally ought not to receive tax credit checks from Uncle Sam and that this policy not only encouraged that, it encouraged more people to come to America to claim benefits, as this person who entered the country illegally said: If they can give it to me, why not take advantage of it?

Now one of the things I have learned as I have traveled the world is, a lot of people have an exaggerated opinion of the wealth and power of the United States. You meet good people in underdeveloped countries, and they say: Why doesn't the United States do this, that, and the other—as if we had unlimited power, unlimited money, and unlimited ability to solve the problems they face at any given time.

So a lot of people, maybe, when they come to the country do not realize we are a nation of limited resources and we cannot be wasting money, we cannot be having people enter our country contrary to the law, undocumented, working, taking jobs that Americans need, and then sending them big checks—$30,000 for children who do not even exist or certainly have never been in the United States.

How do they do it? They use an ITIN, an individual tax identification number. They do not have Social Security numbers. They have a tax ID number. Why? That is a tax number that the Treasury Department came up with to

allow noncitizens who do not have Social Security numbers to pay taxes to Uncle Sam. That is what it was supposed to be used for. These clever individuals have figured out a way—they do not qualify for a Social Security number, so they get an ITIN number, and then they immediately start filing a tax return, claiming benefits, tax credits for children they may not even have or are not in the country, and they are not entitled to it. It is billions of dollars. According to the best estimates we have, if this loophole were closed—that the Treasury Department themselves has identified—it would save $20 billion over 10 years. Well, that is a lot of money.

In fact, in 2011, they claimed—and I do not know why it is not more—that illegal aliens received a staggering $4.2 billion in refundable tax credits in 2010. So in 2010, they received illegally $4.2 billion under this program. Can you imagine that? That is more than the budget of the State of Alabama—the general fund budget of the State. This was in 2010, and it has been growing substantially. It is probably more than that now.

So the legislation Senator AYOTTE proposes would fix this problem, and it is time we fixed it. I cannot imagine why anyone would oppose it. The House has passed legislation already that would fix this problem and it died in the Senate. Senator REID refused to bring it up. He obstructed its passage. It should have long since been passed.

So I pose a question to my colleagues: Which would you rather do? Would you cut the retirement benefits of men and women who served this country for 20 years or more in the U.S. military, being deployed in harm's way, placing their lives at risk—even those who are disabled as a result of service in the U.S. military in combat zones; they have their retirement cut too—would you choose to cut their pay to save $6 billion, when you could cut out a totally unjustified claim of tax credits of $20 billion? Is it political correctness run amok that we are dealing with here? Why can't we fix this? So I think this is something that needs to be fixed. It is past due to be fixed.

Senator AYOTTE is correct to raise it as a legitimate pay-for for unemployment compensation and veterans' retirement, and I salute her for it. It is something I pushed for, and I offered a very similar amendment when the Murray-Ryan bill moved through the Senate. I think it is something we need to work on.

We are not talking about as much as we should now the chatter has receded a little bit—but our deficit situation is still very grim. We now have a current debt of $17 trillion. That is unprecedented in the history of the United States. It has doubled in recent years. They are the kind of deficits we have never seen before, and it is something we have to address.

Mr. J.T. Young, in the Washington Times, a former member of the Department of Treasury, I believe, in the Bush administration, and a former staffer on the Budget Committee, wrote that what we are seeing in our budgeting is a tip of the iceberg. The interest payments we are making now—some $250 billion a year on the $17 trillion we owe—is a tip of the iceberg. Because if interest rates return to their 40-year average, we are going to see a dramatic increase in interest payments on that debt.

When we say we have $17 trillion, we are talking about money the U.S. Government has borrowed so it could spend. That borrowed money comes from a source. Much of the source of that money are foreign nations. The largest creditor is China. They loan us money, and we pay them interest every year.

Right now interest rates are low, unusually low, exceedingly low according to historic averages, and most people expect they are not going to stay low. The bond market is already slipping because people expect interest rates to go up, making their bonds less valuable. All the experts—virtually all—expect we will have a rising interest rates in the year to come.

Our Congressional Budget Office analyzes the debt of the United States and our whole fiscal policy—taxing and spending and income and outgo and has calculated that 10 years from today, under their baseline budget plan, with interest rates increasing, and the increased deficits—the deficits every year that we will have that will add to the $17 trillion—in 10 years we will be paying interest, each year, of over $800 billion.

Mr. YOUNG refers to that as a ''third entitlement.'' Actually, under these figures, it looks as though that interest payment will exceed Social Security's payment and Medicare's payment and the Defense Department. Not together, but each. This is a stunning danger that we face. So it is not mean-spirited to say that before we pass an unemployment compensation extension beyond our historic levels that we need to ask: Will we just borrow all the money, or will we look around this government and find places to save money such as the child tax credit going to people without Social Security numbers illegally in the country? What should we do?

The challenge we face is how to confront the rising debt. Every year, every month , virtually, some other issue rises before the Senate. It sounds persuasive and it is something we want to do, sometimes it is something we really need to do. Certainly Americans are hurting today. There is no doubt about that. There are a lot of reasons for it. We need to work to reverse those trends. Middle America, poor America are not doing well financially.

One reason is, there are millions of people in the country illegally taking jobs, pulling down wages and reducing the employment prospects of American citizens. There is no doubt about that. President Obama proposed, and this Senate voted by a sizable majority, to double the amount of guest workers who come into America. Meanwhile, they come before the Senate and say: We need another $7 billion in unemployment benefits because we have too much unemployment in America. How can that possibly resonate logically with the American people? We should control immigration in America. We are a very generous nation of immigrants. We support immigration. One million people enter our country every year legally. We have guest workers who come every year.

The immigration bill that was before us, that was voted on by this body, would have not ended the illegality it would reduce it only by 40 percent or so, according to the Congressional Budget Office. But it would have doubled the legal flow of guest workers to America. What a stunning number, at a time of high unemployment, low wages, and the lowest workplace participation rate this country has seen since the 1970s.

Americans are having a hard time finding work. So we have our colleagues, our Senate majority, who voted for that immigration bill, ranting to the Senate, demanding now that we extend unemployment insurance, demanding that we raise the minimum wage. Well, I would like to see the wages of Americans go up, all of them. I would like to see people make $15, $18, $25, $30 an hour. We need more of that kind of growth and prosperity in America. But I am not comfortable with the Federal Government setting wages and price controls in this country. It has never worked effectively.

We should do things that make sense. We should create economic policies that create prosperity. We should not import large increases in labor in America when we have huge numbers of people here that are unemployed. That is just common sense.

I want to share with our colleagues some thoughts about where we are with regard to the unemployment insurance extension legislation that is now before us. Since 2009, the Senate has required that any extension of unemployment insurance benefits be paid for because we agreed that we need to reduce the amount of money we are borrowing. We are spending considerably more than we take in. We are going to have to raise the debt ceiling again next month so we can borrow even more money. So all of the money my colleagues want to spend on extending unemployment insurance, unless some savings are found elsewhere in the government, will be borrowed. The legislation that is before us now borrows every cent of it. Every cent of the $7 billion that is proposed will be borrowed.

We are $17 trillion in debt, much owed to foreign creditors. It does not seem wise to do this. This is the wrong thing. In the past, Congress has paid for unemployment insurance extensions. This is unprecedented, an

extranormal unemployment insurance extension. The current amount is always out there, but because the unemployment rate has been high, we have extended it up to 99 weeks. We paid for this in 2009. We paid for it in 2011, and we paid for it in 2012.

So clearly the Senate's policy approach has been consistent in recent years to pay for this. Many remember our former colleague, Jim Bunning, that Hall of Fame baseball pitcher, who stood right back here and objected to this one time before, I think it was in 2009, all alone and he insisted that it be paid for, and eventually he prevailed. It caused quite a stir. He stopped the train until there was an agreement to pay for this.

According to a report yesterday in National Journal, some Senators want to rush this bill through now and will worry about paying for it later. They will promise to pay for it later. This ''spend now, pay later'' policy is how we racked up $17 trillion in debt. It is smoke and mirrors. If you do not in this Congress agree to pay for something before it is spent, it is not going to be paid for later. We have got debt in the hundreds of billions of dollars every year and we are certainly not going to go back and pay for more, pay down the money we spent the year before. We have got to deal with the year we are in. If we do that, it would be helpful. This is how we go broke.

But what I want to say is, fundamentally, the spending provided for in this extension of unemployment insurance violates the spirit of the Budget Control Act of 2011. It spends money above what we agreed to spend. It should not be done. We need to know, every one of us, that by voting for this bill, you are voting to violate the promise you made to the American people in August of 2011 that we would limit the growth in spending, not cut spending, but limit the growth in spending, that we would raise the debt ceiling $2.1 trillion so that money could be borrowed and be spent, but we would reduce, over 10 years, the growth in spending enough to offset that increase. That was the bargain that was made.

More importantly, this legislation violates the budget agreement that was passed into law, the Murray-Ryan bill that was signed by President Obama just before Christmas—just a few weeks ago. The ink is barely dry on that agreement and my colleagues now are proposing to bust it completely. This has become too common. This is too much how we operate here. Some of our Members take umbrage at the fact that millions of Americans are unhappy with us in Washington. People complain about how we are doing our jobs. They say the Tea Party people are angry and therefore they are evil people. Well, why should they not be angry with us? We promised not to spend over a certain amount of money and we have repeatedly voted to do that since 2011.

We voted in December to contain spending and maintain spending levels. Now, in January, as soon as the year began, we have a proposal to add $7 billion to the debt above what we agreed to spend. So I think the American people have a right to be hot with us. We need to vote some people out of here. If we do not change the spending habit, this country is going to be facing a fiscal catastrophe as independent observers have warned us for years.

Next month, the President is going to ask Republicans for our help in passing a bill that raises the debt ceiling. We have already hit the debt ceiling again. So he will be asking for us to raise it again, because we need to borrow more money because we haven't cut spending. We are spending more money than comes in. We are spending that every year. The President wants to keep spending and not reduce spending. So he is asking us to raise the debt ceiling to let him borrow even more than the $17 trillion we have. They are going to threaten, cajole, and try to scare Americans with horror stories of imminent financial collapse if we do not agree to raise the debt ceiling. We know that is coming. Hopefully we will reach an agreement that will raise the debt ceiling but get some real reforms in this government and bring down the rate of growth in spending in this country.

But how can we talk about promise to contain spending in the future when we have got a bill before us right now that blatantly violates the Budget Act? All we are doing is spending more money, borrowing more money, and raising the debt ceiling even faster than otherwise would be the case. This is the wrong direction for America. We need to be reducing our deficit, not voting to increase deficits. This is simple and plain. We need to be reducing deficits.

We need to be working every day, as the American people have told us, to bring our spending under control. Wasteful Washington spending is threatening America. The Federal Government already taxes too much, spends too much, borrows too much, regulates too much. It is time for us to live within our means, to balance our budget. That includes finding offsets and spending savings to pay for any extension of unemployment insurance or really any other proposal for new spending.

This Congress has not been doing that. I would note that in the New York Times recently, Jonathan Weisman wrote this:

> The drive to extend unemployment insurance has put both parties into awkward political positions. Mr. Reid opened the second session of the 113th Congress Monday by declaring: 'The rich keep getting richer. The poor keep getting poorer, and the middle class are under siege.' It was hardly an endorsement for an economy entering its sixth year under President Obama's watch.

Gene Sperling, the President's economic advisor, just said this recently. ''Three people are looking for every one job open.''

So what are we to do about this? What do we say about this? I would say, colleagues, that while hopefully we can help unemployed Americans today with some sort of a benefit that we will pay for in a financially sound manner, hopefully we will see wages rise. We need to see wages rise, in my opinion, because I think the middle class is under siege. I think poor people are getting hammered in this current economy.

But I will ask this question: Who has been setting the agenda economically for America for the last 5 years? Has not President Obama taxed more? Hasn't he regulated more? Has he not spent more? Hasn't he borrowed more? Hasn't ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, hammered American businesses and caused them to lay off workers and hire people part time rather than full time?

Actually two-thirds of the people hired in 2013 were hired part time. This is not healthy. Things are not going well. The model that is planned that we are seeing overall is not working.

How much longer will it take for people to recognize that? The promises were made. If we just send out more checks, if we pass more stimulus bills, if we spend more money, if we do all these things, somehow this will create growth and prosperity in America. But all this time, we have been increasing the debt dramatically, trillion-plus-dollar deficits for 4 years. We have never seen anything like this in American history.

The debt itself is a detriment and a depressant to economic growth in America. It causes fear and concern throughout the entire American populace and the world, unease about the future of the United States with these kinds of debts.

The point I would make is let's do some things that fix the disease, and the disease is an excessive government domination of the economy that is suppressing growth and prosperity, suppressing wages, and government actions that create more unemployment and part-time employment than is necessary and should be happening. That is the problem we need to be addressing. The symptoms of that are being addressed when we deal with unemployment insurance or mandatory wage rates.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for the opportunity to share these thoughts. I really do believe Senator AYOTTE's proposal to deal with the waste and fraudulent abuse of tax money through the improper use of the ITIN—the individual tax identification number—is very real. It is very effective, would save billions of dollars, and would help us pay for some of the things we would like to do. That is what we should be doing, not adding more debt to the people of America.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. I come to the floor this evening to express my hope that the bipartisan effort that brought this 3-month bill to the floor can be sustained as we go forward so that we can swiftly help the 1.3 million long-term unemployed workers who were cut off from these benefits on December 28. As many of my colleagues have discovered from going back to their home States, in many cases these folks are desperate. This benefit was the difference between things we take for granted—having a car to be able to get to a job, having a cell phone so they can get a message saying they have a job interview, paying for heat in the cold weather, putting groceries on the table. For many people, this is truly an emergency.

That is why working with Senator HELLER, whom I applaud for his vision, collaboration, and for his sense in terms of the difficulties of his constituents and, nationally, many people, and for his effort—he did a superb job. What we sensed was we needed to provide relief immediately. Longer term, there are issues to address, and my colleagues have been on the floor discussing these issues, but immediately we have 1.3 million Americans, and every day many more who need help go off the rolls.

I hope we can move very expeditiously and provide at least this short-term aid. Then, of course, we have very significant issues going forward for the entire-year extension, which I hope ultimately we can resolve.

In addition to Senator HELLER, I wish to thank all of my colleagues. Particularly, I thank Senators COLLINS, MURKOWSKI, PORTMAN, AYOTTE, and COATS for their support, along with all of our Members of the Democratic caucus who came together.

Now we have the challenge of providing this relief and then thinking creatively, constructively, and collaboratively about how we provide this relief at least through the full year. I hope we can extend the program for the next 90 days immediately and quickly, but that other issue is certainly before us.

I understand also that my colleagues have raised issues about the structure of the program, about whether this spending—even the short-term spending—should be offset. Again, I go back to the point that we have 1.3 million Americans—and growing each day—who are looking for immediate help, not thoughtful, careful, long-term deliberation. That was the logic behind moving to a 90-day extension, getting it done, and then going forward and dealing with inherently more difficult issues for a full-year program.

We already understand that short-term lapse from the 28th until today has already had dramatic impacts on families. This is what I think my colleagues have heard, seen, and read about when they have gone home. Men and women who worked for decades, never thinking they would ever use their unemployment benefits, which they have earned since they started working, are now suddenly facing a weakened job market where there are nearly three people for every one job, where there are issues of skill training for the new jobs that are emerging. These are very difficult challenges.

I think what finally led us to at least this point of moving forward was the perception that this program is not subject to some arcane abuse by people in the system; this is for working men and women who, through no fault of their own, lost their jobs, who are desperately looking for jobs, and they are our neighbors and our constituents—many of whom we thought and they thought would never be in this predicament. They have families, elderly parents, and young children. They have responsibilities.

They have something else too, which I think we sometimes don't give enough credit for: They want to work. They have spent a life, many of them, working to a position of responsibility where they are using all of their talents. The idea that they are just going to give that up for the only available job, which might be working at a counter at a fast-food restaurant—that is a challenge not only to your pocketbook, but that is a challenge to your person, to who you are—we have to recognize that also.

These benefits are usually helpful to people in so many different capacities.

As I said, we are trying to deal with a situation where people have been let go through no fault of their own. If someone quits, they don't qualify. If they are fired, they don't qualify. Many of these people are unemployed as a result of the new economy—information technology that makes their job something that can be done away with; mergers, acquisitions, and downsizing that caused the bottom line of a corporation to grow, but they are out of a job. We have to deal with it, and we have to deal with it as we have done so many times before by providing these long-term unemployment benefits.

We also have to do it because it is good for our economy. The CBO estimates that if we do not renew UI for the full year 2014, we will lose 200,000 jobs because the weekly benefits, which are rather modest—$300 to $350 a week—go almost immediately from the recipient into the economy. It is the reason some grocery stores can keep two or three extra people on, because the demand is still there. It is the reason some service stations can keep the extra mechanic on, because the demand is still there. If we shut down that demand, we will have 200,000 more people—ironically—who will qualify, at least initially, for State unemployment benefits.

This is about our economy.

I would like to draw our attention to the report our colleague Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR did as the vice chair of the Joint Economic Committee. It was very thoughtfully done. It is not a surprise given that it was authored in large part by Senator KLOBUCHAR. This report touches on these important issues and notes that ''unemployment insurance (UI) has kept more than 11 million people out of poverty since 2008—including 1.8 million adults and 620,000 children in 2012 alone. People of all demographic and socio-economic backgrounds have been helped by unemployment insurance following a job loss.''

This cuts across the whole spectrum. Again, how does someone get to qualify? They have to work. I would suspect that every one of my colleagues would say this country should be all about work, rewarding work, and if someone loses a job through no fault of their own, give them a chance to get back in the workforce.

The reality of this economic downturn has been so pervasive that it has affected virtually every American. And so unemployment insurance has been a key part of the recovery. We all know that economists who have looked at this program suggest there is anywhere from a $1.50 to $1.60 benefit for every $1 we put in the economy. Economically, for the national economy as a whole, this is a very powerful tool to keep economic growth, expansion, and demand moving forward. That is exactly what we need to keep the economy growing.

Indeed, one of the aspects of this recession and one of the aspects highlighted very insightfully by the report from the Joint Economic Committee is the long-term rate of unemployment. This might be a new structural phenomenon in our economy, but definitely something is happening out there.

I will go back to when I was a kid. Someone is on the third shift because they are the junior person. The recession comes and guess who gets laid off. The third shift. The second shift, the middle people, and the first shift, the most senior people, typically weren't touched. The economy came back, and that third shift got rehired, but those workers with 10, 15 years' experience were pretty safe.

Now that is not the case. Now we are seeing first, second, and third shift gone. Now we are seeing, well, this is a great opportunity, with interest rates at in some cases 1 percent—at least for the major financial institutions—to replace a lot of workers with a lot of machines. Let's do that. Let's get value. Let's downsize. Let's make sure we invest in capital. This is the phenomenon we are seeing, and it is causing some of this significant increase in long-term unemployment.

In the JEC report, they note:

The current long-term unemployment rate of 2.6 percent is twice as high as it was when Congress allowed emergency federal UI programs to expire after the 1990–91 and 2001 recessions.

Let me say that in my terms. Previously, we have never taken away these benefits when long-term unemployment has been so high, and these benefits are not directly responsible for long-term unemployment. The 26 weeks of the State benefit programs is for people who lose work and find it relatively quickly. This program, the one we are debating today, is specifically designed for those people who are having a difficult time finding work over a long period of time.

We are now at twice as high a level of unemployment as we were in previous recessions when we ended these benefits, which would suggest this is not the time to end these benefits.

Let me continue from the JEC report:

> While employment prospects have improved for many jobless Americans (the national unemployment rate is 7.0 percent—the lowest rate in five years), finding work is challenging for the long-term unemployed. More than one-third of unemployed workers (roughly 4 million Americans) have been searching for work for more than 26 weeks, when state-funded UI benefits typically run out, and 2.8 million unemployed people have been searching for work for more than one year.

This is a phenomenon we have to deal with. This program we are discussing today is specifically designed for those long-term unemployed. So if there is one program that is responsive to one of the most salient aspects of this current recession, it is the long-term UI program because long-term unemployment seems to be the most difficult issue to resolve, even as our overall employment numbers continue to grow—not fast enough, but they are growing.

I want to also dispel the belief of some of my colleagues that these benefits only flow to one or two distinct constituencies. That this is a targeted program that provides some benefits, but it doesn't apply across the board. That is not the case. This is about every American from virtually every type of education, income, and ethnic background.

As the JEC report documents:

> The 23.9 million Americans who have directly benefited from the EUC program since 2008 include people of all demographic and socioeconomic backgrounds . . . [I]n 2012, more than 60 percent of the recipients were between the ages of 25 and 54.

Let me stop. There is a stereotype out there that a lot of these folks are 18 year olds who had a job for a while but decided they would rather go skiing in Utah or snorkeling in the Caribbean, and what better way to do that than just essentially sort of perform so that when the layoffs come you get one—but so what, I am not going to look for work; I'm going to just go. Sixty percent of these people are 25 years old to 54 years old. They are starting the prime or are in the prime of their work career. They have responsibility. They typically have families. They have, probably, if they are in their 50s, been working for 30 years.

So this notion this is just a convenient time to take a vacation subsidized by the government is erroneous.

Let me continue from the report:

> The remaining recipients were about evenly split between those younger than 25 and those 55 and older.

Again, the 55 and older—and this is very close to home—for these people it is a desperate struggle because they are caught right in the middle. They have a 75-year-old or 80-year-old mother or father; they have 30-year-old children and some younger who are going to school or they need the help. They have been working for 30-plus years. They have reached positions of responsibility in their firm and now, suddenly, for the first time—many is the case—they are without a job. That is not just economic, as I suggested. That also goes deeply to who they are, their value, and how they can help their family if they can't work. What is the effect on the family? How do they come home every day from looking for work without a job and not have it affect the family? This is the reality we are dealing with.

That is why, frankly, I have been pleading to at least get this program restored for 90 days. That will give us the time—not on the backs of the unemployed—but give us the time to do the work for a longer extension.

Now let me continue:

> More than half the recipients in 2012 were white, while 22 percent were black, and 19 percent were Hispanic. The vast majority (85 percent) lived in households with more than one adult, and 43 percent lived in households with at least one child.

So these are not single transients who move around and are used to being unemployed and could work if they wanted to. These are people with real family responsibilities.

> People of all levels of education have received EUC benefits. The majority of recipients in 2012 had earned a high school diploma, and almost one-fifth held a 4-year college degree.

These are people that have skills. They have at least got the credentials, which, again, 20 or 30 years ago put you into the workplace and probably kept you there, if you were diligent.

So I hope my colleagues take time to review this report. It is extremely useful. It shatters some stereotypes and reinforces the point this is about helping working Americans who need help.

I think the facts are clearly on the side of continuing this program, and I think the reality is they need the help now. If we can get them that help, then we will have the time to deliberate the very serious questions that my colleagues have raised; and they have raised them constructively and raised them sincerely about the long-term approach of this program. But to continue to trade legislative ideas on the floor while millions of Americans either are losing their benefits or are seeing the end come within days, weeks or months is not the right response.

So I urge my colleagues to move forward through these procedural hurdles. Let's get this bill done as Senator HELLER and I have proposed it. Let's get it done, and then we have another huge challenge because we want, frankly, and I think the sentiment is across the board—if we are going to do this, let us at least continue it through the year 2014.

We are beginning to sense some positive economic shifts. We hope those materialize. We hope they come forward to the point where the unemployment rate, which has fallen—I heard the President today say when he took over we were losing 800,000 jobs a month. It was rocketing up into the stratosphere in some states, 12 percent, 14 percent. In Rhode Island it is still 9 percent. We have seen some progress—not enough in my State, in Nevada, and other States. But we have seen progress, and we hope that progress continues.

Indeed, one of the other aspects of this program, if we pass these benefits—and the economists have pointed it out, particularly if we pass them on an emergency basis—it will add more fuel to our economy, not less. It will add more demand. It will, in fact, increase growth at a time when everyone is on the floor talking about the fact that we just have to grow more jobs. Of course we do. But this program is, in a way, the proverbial two-fer. You help people who need help, and you help the economy grow faster—200,000 jobs at least.

So I really do think we should move forward as quickly as we can to get this Reed-Heller bill completed, and then we have a lot of careful, thoughtful, collaborative effort to engage in. Because if we want to go forward for a full year, which we do, we have other significant issues—not just the size of the program, but other issues as were brought up by my colleagues, and brought up very fairly, very constructively, and very thoughtfully.

So Madam President, my message is: No. 1, I thank my colleagues for giving us the chance to seriously debate this bill, and I urge them to pass it quickly, and then we will set ourselves up for another serious, thoughtful and constructive debate. That is my wish.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING PHIL EVERLY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to bid farewell to a Kentucky son who became half of one of the most enduring and influential acts of country and rock and roll music. Phil Everly, of the hit-making duo the Everly Brothers, passed away this weekend at the age of 74.

Phil and his older brother Don brought their trademark close harmony singing, modeled in the Appalachian country and bluegrass music tradition, to rock and roll beginning in the late 1950s. With songs including ''Bye Bye Love,'' ''Wake Up Little Susie,'' and ''All I Have to Do Is Dream,'' they consistently scored hits at the top of the charts.

The Everly Brothers are famous the world over and influenced musicians such as the Beatles, the Beach Boys, Bob Dylan, Simon and Garfunkel, and many others. But they were especially beloved in their family's home State of Kentucky, and particularly in Central City, in Muhlenberg County, western Kentucky, which was the site of the Everly Brothers' Labor Day Homecoming Music Festival every year.

This festival included many famous country and rock and roll music stars from the Everly Brothers themselves to Chet Atkins, Keith Urban, Billy Ray Cyrus, and Tammy Wynette. Money raised went to local charities.

Phil and Don Everly's musical career was the result of a lifetime spent singing. Phil and Don were born the sons of a Kentucky coal miner turned country musician, Ike Everly, and his wife Margaret. The family moved to pursue musical opportunities and ended up playing live country music on the radio in Shenandoah, IA. The whole family was spotlighted, from Mom and Dad Everly to Little Donnie and 6-year-old ''Baby Boy Phil.'' Don and Phil spent their summers in their parents' home of Muhlenberg County.

As teenagers the Everly Brothers started their own careers, first as songwriters, then as performers. In 1957 they scored a No. 1 hit with ''Bye Bye Love.'' In their trademark style, Phil sang the high harmony notes while Don sang baritone, their voices intertwining in a way that sounded easy but was difficult to duplicate.

They continued to have best-selling songs for several years, including 12 Billboard top 10 hits, and released the landmark country-rock album ''Roots'' in 1968 that included snippets of their old family radio show. The Beatles have said that the vocal harmonies from their first No. 1 hit, ''Please Please Me'' of 1963, were modeled after the Everly Brothers' 1960 hit song ''Cathy's Clown.'' Phil was the author of one of the duo's best loved songs, ''When Will I Be Loved?,'' which was a top 10 hit for Linda Ronstadt in 1975.

While older brother Don was born in Kentucky, younger brother Phil was actually born in Chicago on January 19, 1939. Nearly 50 years later, in 1988, the mayor of Central City gave Phil Everly an honorary Kentucky birth certificate. ''I really appreciate you making me a full-blown Kentuckian,'' Phil said as he received it. ''I've been lying for a lot of years.''

The Everly Brothers' Labor Day Homecoming Music Festival began in 1988 as a way for the Everly Brothers to show their gratitude to their hometown fans. In 2010, the Central City Tourism Commission opened the Muhlenberg County Music Museum, which showcases a complete collection of Don and Phil's albums and features a 1950s-style jukebox that plays their biggest hits.

Sadly, just before Phil's death, local western Kentucky fans of the Everly Brothers were planning a celebration of what would have been Phil's 75th birthday on January 19. Instead, the Central City Tourism Commission will host a memorial service at the museum on that day to celebrate Phil's life and music. Phil is survived by many family members and beloved friends, including his brother Don.

I know my colleagues will join me in expressing gratitude and appreciation for the wonderful music that Phil, along with his brother Don, provided the world. The music of the Everly Brothers continues to provide joy to people to this day. Kentucky is honored to have played such a role in the shaping of this extraordinary musical family.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CALIFORNIA CASUALTIES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to eight servicemembers from California or based in California who have died while serving our country in Operation Enduring Freedom since I last entered names into the record on July 10, 2013. This brings to 410 the number of servicemembers either from California or based in California who have been killed while serving our country in Afghanistan. This represents 18 percent of all U.S. deaths in Afghanistan:

LCpl Benjamin W. Tuttle, 19, of Gentry, AR, died July 14, 2013, at the Landstuhl Regional Medical Center following a medical evacuation from the aircraft carrier the USS *Nimitz*, CVN 68, during a scheduled port visit in the 5th Fleet Area of Responsibility. Lance Corporal Tuttle was assigned to Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 323, Marine Aircraft Group 11, 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

SPC Nicholas B. Burley, 22, of Red Bluff, CA, died July 30, 2013, in Pul-E-Alam, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained when enemy forces attacked his unit with indirect fire. Specialist Burley was assigned to the 6th Squadron, 8th Cavalry Regiment, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division, Fort Stewart, GA.

SPC Kenneth Clifford Alvarez, 23, of Santa Maria, CA, died August 23, 2013, in Haft Asiab, Afghanistan, from wounds suffered when enemy forces attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device during combat operations. Specialist Alvarez was assigned to 2nd Engineer Battalion, 36th Engineer Brigade, White Sands Missile Range, NM.

SSG Robert E. Thomas Jr., 24, of Fontana, CA, died September 13, 2013, at Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, of wounds suffered during a non-combat related incident on April 21, 2013, in Maiwand, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Thomas was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 36th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, Fort Bliss, TX.

LCDR Landon L. Jones, 35, of Lompoc, CA, died September 22, 2013, as a result of an MH–60S Knighthawk helicopter crash while operating in the central Red Sea. Lieutenant Commander Jones was assigned to Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron Six at Naval Air Station North Island, San Diego, CA.

CWO Jonathon S. Gibson, 32, of Aurora, OR, died September 22, 2013, as a result of an MH–60S Knighthawk helicopter crash while operating in the central Red Sea. Chief Warrant Officer Gibson was assigned to Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron Six at Naval Air Station North Island, San Diego, CA.

CPT Jennifer M. Moreno, 25, of San Diego, CA, died October 6, 2013, in Zhari District, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained when enemy forces attacked her unit with an improvised explosive device. Captain Moreno was assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA.

LCpl Matthew R. Rodriguez, 19, of Fairhaven, MA, died December 11, 2013, while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Lance Corporal Rodriguez was assigned to 1st Combat Engineer Battalion, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

YELLEN NOMINATION

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, yesterday, the Senate voted to confirm Janet Yellen to be Chairman of the Federal Reserve. Regrettably, I was not in Washington and was not present for the vote. Had I been here, I would have voted no on this nomination. While Ms. Yellen may be well-qualified for this position, I do not support her nomination due to her support of monetary policies such as quantitative easing, QE, that have distorted the markets and artificially stimulated the economy. With interest rates at record lows, economic growth continues to be anemic and unemployment rates are higher than normal. During her confirmation hearing, Ms. Yellen admitted that there are ''costs and risks'' associated with the QE program but still signaled support. QE has done little more than increase uncertainty in our economy and opened the door for high interest rates in the future. The Federal Reserve must stop this ill-conceived,

wholly irresponsible approach and Congress and the administration must enact fiscally responsible policies that strengthen the middle class by creating jobs, growing the economy and cutting the red tape that continues to hamper the private sector.

BUDGET ACT SECTION 114(c)

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, to discuss section 114(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to replace sequestration.

Before I turn to Senator PORTMAN for his questions, I would like to note that the Senate has relied on reserve funds for nearly 30 years to help it carry out its priorities as part of the annual budget process. In fact, during debate on the 2014 budget resolution, the Senate considered or filed over 300 reserve funds. These included multiple amendments from Members of both parties to create new reserve funds. This particular reserve fund, section 114(c), was included and voted on as part of both the Senate Budget Committee-reported resolution and the Senate-passed budget resolution.

I would now like to turn to my colleague for his questions.

Mr. PORTMAN. I would like to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the opportunity to engage in this colloquy with her. As I understand it, the intent of the reserve fund under section 114(c) is to be available to adjust certain budgetary levels for deficit-neutral legislation that would replace sequestration. Do I have that correct?

Mrs. MURRAY. Yes, the bipartisan budget agreement reached between the House and Senate replaces some of the sequester cuts that otherwise would occur in 2014 and 2015. By avoiding sequestration and reaching agreement on bipartisan funding levels for 2014 and 2015, this agreement will provide relief to our families, servicemembers, and the economy. Sequestration, however, continues to remain in place, unmodified, for fiscal years 2016 through 2021. Assuming legislation met the necessary requirements specified in section 114(c), this reserve fund would be available to further address the harmful effects of sequestration.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the chairman for her response. There is a concern that the reserve fund in section 114(c) could deprive the minority of an opportunity to require 60 votes for legislation that would modify the statutory limits on discretionary spending and pay for some or all of that cost with new revenue. Is that concern accurate?

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his question. No, that concern is not accurate. While a useful tool to help the Senate carry out its priorities under the budget process, a reserve fund is limited in what it allows me to do, in my capacity as chairman of the Budget Committee. In general, for legislation that meets the required criteria, reserve funds allow me to revise the levels adopted in a budget resolution and enforced in the Senate, such as committee allocations and the budgetary aggregates.

A reserve fund, however, does not have any impact on the standing rules of the Senate, including the cloture process and the need for 60 votes to end debate. Nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that process.

A reserve fund also does not waive budget points of order. I can use a reserve fund to revise the committee allocations and budgetary aggregates, such that legislation that meets the criteria of the reserve fund, including deficit neutrality, can be brought into compliance with the allocations and aggregates. But, it does not allow me to waive budget points of order that still may lie against the legislation following the reserve fund adjustment. Budget points of order generally can only be waived by unanimous consent or with 60 votes. Nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

Further, the Senator from Ohio proposed the specific hypothetical example of legislation that would increase the statutory limits on discretionary spending and offset some or all of those costs with new revenue. Recognizing this is a hypothetical scenario, I believe in that situation the legislation would be subject to a 60-vote point of order for violating section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act, which creates a point of order against legislation dealing with matters within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee that has not been reported out of the Budget Committee. Ultimately, the Parliamentarian of the Senate determines whether points of order under section 306 lie against legislation, but legislation to alter the statutory limits in discretionary spending has historically been within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee. A reserve fund would have no impact on a section 306 point of order and nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

In addition, legislation increasing the statutory caps on discretionary spending above the existing levels, as the Senator from Ohio outlines in his question, would also violate section 312(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of legislation that would exceed any of the statutory limits on discretionary spending. The reserve fund in 114(c), like other reserve funds, deals only with Senate enforcement and would have no impact on that point of order. Again, nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that.

Finally, I would suggest to my colleague that legislation originating in the Senate rather than in the House of Representatives that raises revenue would likely be subject to a ''blue slip'' and returned back to the Senate by the House of Representatives. Again, nothing in the Bipartisan Budget Act would change that process.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Chairman for her answer. I understand that we were discussing a hypothetical example. I thank her for engaging with me in this colloquy.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last night, due to airline flight delays in South Dakota and Minneapolis, I missed the roll call vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 452, Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 4 years. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted no.

Madam President, last night, due to airline flight delays in South Dakota and Minneapolis, I missed the roll call cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1845. Had I been present for this vote, I would have voted no.

U.S. CADET NURSE CORPS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the women of the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps. Approximately 125,000 American women served as Corps members during World War II, providing comfort and care at hospitals across the country, including in New Hampshire. Most of the former Corps members are now in their eighties, and it is incumbent upon us to ensure that the lessons of their service are remembered for the benefit of future generations.

In March of 1943, Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton of Ohio, a strong believer in the power of nurses in the healing process, introduced legislation to ensure that the supply of nurses in the United States would be large enough to meet the increasing demands of the war effort, especially as large numbers of experienced nurses left the country to serve overseas. The Bolton Act promised a free nursing education in exchange for a commitment to serve in the Cadet Nurse Corps for the duration of the war.

Driven by the immediate need for more nurses, Corps members worked overtime to finish their studies within a compressed study schedule and began to perform nursing duties even before they had formally graduated. This on-the-job training ensured that civilians and recovering servicemembers continued to receive necessary medical care even as much of the medical community was focused on the war front.

Members of the U.S. Cadet Nurse Corps took an oath to dedicate themselves to the triumph of life over death at a time when this perpetual struggle took on previously unseen dimensions. Like many of the American soldiers fighting overseas, these women were predominantly young, recent high school graduates who, when confronted with the call to serve their country,

answered unhesitatingly and in large numbers.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in thanking all former Cadet Nurse Corps members for their service to the country and for their the selfless commitment to the nursing profession.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN (AIT) AND THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES (TECRO) CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—PM 26

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the ''Act''), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO) Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the ''Agreement''). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of Taiwan with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–1), as amended, is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with the authorities on Taiwan based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. The proposed Agreement has an indefinite term from the date of its entry-into-force, unless terminated by either party on 1 year's written notice. The proposed Agreement permits the transfer of information, material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. The Agreement also specifies cooperation shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement and applicable legal obligations, including, as appropriate, treaties, international agreements, domestic laws, regulations, and/or licensing requirements (such as those imposed by the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 110 and the Department of Energy in accordance with 10 CFR 810). It does not permit transfers of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology and facilities, or major critical components of such facilities. The proposed Agreement also prohibits the possession of sensitive nuclear facilities and any engagement in activities involving sensitive nuclear technology in the territory of the authorities represented by TECRO. In the event of termination of the proposed Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls continue with respect to material, equipment, and components subject to the proposed Agreement.

Over the last two decades, the authorities on Taiwan have established a reliable record on nonproliferation and on commitments to nonproliferation. While the political status of the authorities on Taiwan prevents them from formally acceding to multilateral nonproliferation treaties or agreements, the authorities on Taiwan have voluntarily assumed commitments to adhere to the provisions of multilateral treaties and initiatives. The Republic of China ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1970 and ratified the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (the ''Biological Weapons Convention'' or ''BWC'') in 1972. The authorities on Taiwan have stated that they will continue to abide by the obligations of the NPT (i.e., those of a non-nuclear-weapon state) and the BWC, and the United States regards them as bound by both treaties. The authorities on Taiwan follow International Atomic Energy Agency standards and directives in their nuclear program, work closely with U.S. civilian nuclear authorities, and have established relationships with mainland Chinese civilian authorities with respect to nuclear safety. A more detailed discussion of the domestic civil nuclear activities and nuclear nonproliferation policies and practices of the authorities on Taiwan, including their nuclear export policies and practices, is provided in the NPAS and in a classified annex to the NPAS submitted separately. As noted above, an addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the authorities on Taiwan with respect to nuclear-related matters is being submitted to you separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge the Congress to give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 7, 2014.*

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the new markets tax credit and provide designated allocations for areas impacted by a decline in manufacturing; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ALEXANDER,

Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 329. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of the biennial USA Science & Engineering Festival in Washington, DC and designating April 21 through April 27, 2014, as ''National Science and Technology Week''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes.

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 249

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 249, a bill to provide for the expansion of affordable refinancing of mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation.

S. 267

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 267, a bill to prevent, deter, and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing through port State measures.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 269, a bill to establish uniform administrative and enforcement authorities for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes, and for other purposes.

S. 270

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 270, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to establish a United States Ambassador at Large for Arctic Affairs.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 653, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to ensure that individuals do not simultaneously receive unemployment compensation and disability insurance benefits.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1204, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1460

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1460, a bill to create two additional judge positions on the court established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and modify the procedures for the appointment of judges to that court, and for other purposes.

S. 1467

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1467, a bill to establish the Office of the Special Advocate to provide advocacy in cases before courts established by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and for other purposes.

S. 1468

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1468, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to establish a renewable electricity standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1610

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1610, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1696

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1696, a bill to protect a women's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services.

S. 1709

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1709, a bill to require the Committee on Technology of the National Science and Technology Council to develop and update a national manufacturing competitiveness strategic plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1737, a

bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. 1778

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1778, a bill to require the Attorney General to report on State law penalties for certain child abusers, and for other purposes.

S. 1796

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1796, a bill to increase the participation of women, girls, and underrepresented minorities in STEM fields, to encourage and support students from all economic backgrounds to pursue STEM career opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 1798

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1798, a bill to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not counted as full-time employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1802

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1802, a bill to provide equal treatment for utility special entities using utility operations-related swaps, and for other purposes.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1810, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1846

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1846, a bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1869

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1869, a bill to repeal section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, relating to an annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62, and to provide an offset.

S. 1894

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1894, a bill to provide for the repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act if it is determined that the Act has resulted in increasing the number of uninsured individuals.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 329—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE BIENNIAL USA SCIENCE & ENGINEERING FESTIVAL IN WASHINGTON, DC AND DESIGNATING APRIL 21 THROUGH APRIL 27, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY WEEK''

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. AYOTTE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 329

Whereas science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (referred to in this preamble as ''STEM'') are essential to the future global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas advances in technology have resulted in significant improvement in the daily lives of individuals in the United States;

Whereas scientific discoveries are critical to curing diseases, solving global challenges, and an increased understanding of the world;

Whereas the future global economy will require a workforce that is educated in science and engineering specialties;

Whereas educating a new generation of individuals in the United States in STEM is crucial to ensure continued economic growth;

Whereas increasing the interest of the next generation of students in the United States, particularly young women and underrepresented minorities, in STEM is necessary to maintain the global competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas science and engineering festivals have attracted millions of participants and inspired a national effort to promote science and engineering;

Whereas thousands of universities, museums, science centers, STEM professional societies, educational societies, government agencies and laboratories, community organizations, elementary and secondary schools, volunteers, corporate and private sponsors, and nonprofit organizations have come together to organize the USA Science & Engineering Festival in Washington, DC in April 2014;

Whereas the USA Science & Engineering Festival will reinvigorate the interest of young people in the United States in STEM and highlight the important contributions of science and engineering to the competitiveness of the United States through exhibits on topics that include human spaceflight, medicine, engineering, biotechnology, physics, and astronomy; and

Whereas scientific research is essential to the competitiveness of the United States, and events like the USA Science & Engineering Festival promote the importance of scientific research and development to the future of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the goals and ideals of the USA Science & Engineering Festival to promote scholarship in science and an interest in scientific research and development, as the cornerstones of innovation and competition in the United States;

(2) supports festivals, such as the USA Science & Engineering Festival, that focus on the importance of science and engineering to the daily lives of individuals in the United States through exhibits on topics that include human spaceflight, medicine, engineering, biotechnology, physics, and astronomy;

(3) congratulates all individuals and organizations whose efforts will make possible the USA Science & Engineering Festival, highlighting the accomplishments of the United States in science and engineering;

(4) encourages families and children to participate in the activities and exhibits of the USA Science & Engineering Festival that will occur in Washington, DC, and across the United States as satellite events of the festival; and

(5) designates April 21 through April 27, 2014, as ''National Science and Technology Week''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2603. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2604. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2605. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2606. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KING, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2607. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. KING, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2608. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2609. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2610. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2611. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2612. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2603. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer's Social Security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the Social Security number of either spouse is included on such return.

''(C) LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the extent the tentative minimum tax (as defined in section 55(b)(1)(A)) exceeds the credit allowed under section 32.''.

(2) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct Social Security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN'' after ''IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT'' in the heading thereof.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2604. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. TRANSPARENCY OF COVERAGE DETERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives and the Financial Clerk of the Senate shall make publically available the determinations of each member of the House of Representatives and each Senator, as the case may be, regarding the designation of their respective congressional staff (including leadership and committee staff) as ''official'' for purposes of requiring such staff to enroll in health insurance coverage provided through an Exchange as required under section 1312(d)(1)(D) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18032(d)(1)(D)), and the regulations relating to such section.

(b) FAILURE TO SUBMIT.—The failure by any member of the House of Representatives or Senator to designate any of their respective staff, whether committee or leadership staff, as ''official'' (as described in subsection (a)), shall be noted in the determination made publically available under subsection (a) along with a statement that such failure permits the staff involved to remain in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program.

(c) PRIVACY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit the release of any individually identifiable information concerning any individual, including any health plan selected by an individual.

SA 2605. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 7. STATE CONTROL OF ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION ON ALL AVAILABLE FEDERAL LAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AVAILABLE FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''available Federal land'' means any Federal land that, as of May 31, 2013—

(A) is located within the boundaries of a State;

(B) is not held by the United States in trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe;

(C) is not a unit of the National Park System;

(D) is not a unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(E) is not a Congressionally designated wilderness area.

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

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) a State; and

(B) the District of Columbia.

(b) STATE PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State—

(A) may establish a program covering the leasing and permitting processes, regulatory requirements, and any other provisions by which the State would exercise its rights to develop all forms of energy resources on available Federal land in the State; and

(B) as a condition of certification under subsection (c)(2) shall submit a declaration to the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Energy that a program under subparagraph (A) has been established or amended.

(2) AMENDMENT OF PROGRAMS.—A State may amend a program developed and certified under this section at any time.

(3) CERTIFICATION OF AMENDED PROGRAMS.—Any program amended under paragraph (2) shall be certified under subsection (c)(2).

(c) LEASING, PERMITTING, AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) SATISFACTION OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Each program certified under this section shall be considered to satisfy all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations), including—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

(2) FEDERAL CERTIFICATION AND TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.—Upon submission of a declaration by a State under subsection (b)(1)(B)(i)—

(A) the program under subsection (b)(1)(A) shall be certified; and

(B) the State shall receive all rights from the Federal Government to develop all forms of energy resources covered by the program.

(3) ISSUANCE OF PERMITS AND LEASES.—If a State elects to issue a permit or lease for the development of any form of energy resource on any available Federal land within the borders of the State in accordance with a program certified under paragraph (2), the permit or lease shall be considered to meet all applicable requirements of Federal law (including regulations).

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Activities carried out in accordance with this section shall not be subject to judicial review.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.—Activities carried out in accordance with this section shall not be subject to subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'').

SA 2606. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KING, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 7. ENDING UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO JOBLESS MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used to make payments of unemployment compensation (including such compensation under the Federal-State Extended Compensation Act of 1970 and the emergency unemployment compensation program under title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008) to an individual whose adjusted gross income in the preceding year was equal to or greater than $1,000,000.

(b) COMPLIANCE.—Unemployment Insurance applications shall include a form or procedure for an individual applicant to certify the individual's adjusted gross income was not equal to or greater than $1,000,000 in the preceding year.

(c) AUDITS.—The certifications required by subsection (b) shall be auditable by the U.S. Department of Labor or the U.S. Government Accountability Office.

(d) STATUS OF APPLICANTS.—It is the duty of the states to verify the residency, employment, legal, and income status of applicants for Unemployment Insurance and no Federal funds may be expended for purposes of determining an individual's eligibility under this Act.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2607. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. KING, and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 7. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 224 the following new section:

''PROHIBITION ON PAYMENT OF BENEFITS BASED ON RECEIPT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

''SEC. 224A. (a) If for any month prior to the month in which an individual attains retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))—

''(1) such individual is entitled to benefits under section 223, and

''(2) such individual is entitled for such month to unemployment compensation,

the total of the individual's benefits under section 223 for such month and of any benefits under subsections (b) through (h) of section 202 for such month based on the individual's wages and self-employment income shall be reduced to zero.

''(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of any Federal agency shall provide such information within its possession as the Commissioner may require for purposes of making a timely determination under this section for reduction of benefits payable under this title, or verifying other information necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section.

''(2) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with States, political subdivisions, and other organizations that administer unemployment compensation, in order to obtain such information as the Commissioner may require to carry out the provisions of this section.

''(3) Any determination by the Commissioner pursuant to this section shall be subject to the requirements described in section 205(b)(1), including provision of reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

''(c) For purposes of this section, the term 'unemployment compensation' has the meaning given that term in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to benefits payable for months beginning after 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2608. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—PATHWAYS BACK TO WORK

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Pathways Back to Work Act of 2013''.

SEC. 202. ESTABLISHMENT OF PATHWAYS BACK TO WORK FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States an account, which shall be known as the Pathways Back to Work Fund (referred to in this title as ''the Fund''), consisting of such amounts as are paid to the Fund under subsection (b).

(b) PAYMENT INTO THE FUND.—Out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated $12,500,000,000, which shall be paid to the Fund, to be used by the Secretary of Labor to carry out this title.

(c) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—The amounts appropriated under this title shall be available for obligation by the Secretary of Labor through December 31, 2014, and shall be available for expenditure by recipients of grants and subgrants under this title through September 30, 2015.

SEC. 203. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Using the amounts available through the Fund under section 202(b), the Secretary of Labor shall, subject to subsection (b)—

(1) allot $8,000,000,000 in accordance with section 204 to provide subsidized employment to unemployed, low-income adults;

(2) allot $2,500,000,000 in accordance with section 205 to provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities to low-income youth; and

(3) use $2,000,000,000 in accordance with section 206 to award grants on a competitive basis to local entities to carry out work-based training and other work-related and educational strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness to unemployed, low-income adults and low-income youth to provide the skills and assistance needed to obtain employment.

(b) RESERVATION.—The Secretary of Labor may reserve not more than 1 percent of the amounts available through the Fund under each of paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) to pay for the costs of technical assistance, evaluations, and Federal administration of this title.

SEC. 204. SUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT FOR UNEMPLOYED, LOW-INCOME ADULTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ALLOTMENTS.—From the funds available under section 203(a)(1), the Secretary of Labor shall make an allotment or provide assistance under subsection (b) to each State that has a State plan approved under subsection (c) and to each outlying area and recipient under section 166(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911(c)) that meets the requirements of this section, for the purpose of providing subsidized employment opportunities to unemployed, low-income adults.

(2) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of Labor, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall issue guidance regarding the implementation of this section. Such guidance shall, consistent with this section, include procedures for the submission and approval of State and local plans and the allotment and allocation of funds, including reallotment and reallocation of such funds, that promote the expeditious and effective implementation of the activities authorized under this section.

(b) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) RESERVATIONS FOR OUTLYING AREAS AND TRIBES.—Of the funds described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Labor shall reserve—

(A) not more than ¼ of 1 percent to provide assistance to outlying areas to provide subsidized employment to unemployed, low-income adults; and

(B) 1.5 percent to provide assistance to recipients under section 166(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911(c)) to provide subsidized employment to unemployed, low-income adults.

(2) STATES.—After determining the amounts to be reserved under section 203(b) and paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall allot the remainder of the funds described in subsection (a)(1) among the States by allotting—

(A) one-third on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals in areas of substantial unemployment in each State, compared to the total number of unemployed individuals in areas of substantial unemployment in all States;

(B) one-third on the basis of the relative excess number of unemployed individuals in each State, compared to the total excess number of unemployed individuals in all States; and

(C) one-third on the basis of the relative number of disadvantaged adults and youth in each State, compared to the total number of disadvantaged adults and youth in all States.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of the formula described in paragraph (2)—

(A) AREA OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT.—The term ''area of substantial unemployment'' means any contiguous area that has a population of at least 10,000, and that has an average rate of unemployment of at least 6.5 percent for the most recent 12 months, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

(B) DISADVANTAGED ADULT OR YOUTH.—The term ''disadvantaged adult or youth'' means an individual who is age 16 or older who received an income, or is a member of a family that received a total family income, that, in relation to family size, does not exceed the higher of—

(i) the poverty line; or

(ii) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level.

(C) EXCESS NUMBER.—The term ''excess number'' means, used with respect to unemployed individuals in a State, the higher of—

(i) the number that represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in the State; or

(ii) the number that represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in areas of substantial unemployment in such State.

(4) REALLOTMENT.—If the Governor of a State does not submit a State plan by the date specified in subsection (c)(2)(B), or a State does not receive approval of a State plan, the amount the State would have been eligible to receive pursuant to the formula under paragraph (2) shall be transferred within the Fund and added to the amounts available for competitive grants under section 203(a)(3).

(c) STATE PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For a State to be eligible to receive an allotment of funds under subsection (b), the Governor of the State shall submit to the Secretary of Labor a State plan in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require. At a minimum, such plan shall include—

(A) a description of the strategies and activities to be carried out by the State, in coordination with employers in the State, to provide subsidized employment opportunities to unemployed, low-income adults, including strategies relating to the level and duration of subsidies consistent with subsection (e)(2);

(B) a description of the requirements the State will apply relating to the eligibility of unemployed, low-income adults, consistent with section 208, for subsidized employment opportunities, which requirements may include criteria to target assistance to particular categories of such adults, such as individuals with disabilities or individuals who have exhausted all rights to unemployment compensation;

(C) a description of how the funds allotted to provide subsidized employment opportunities will be administered in the State and (if administered by entities described in subsection (d)(1)(A)) in local workforce investment areas, in accordance with subsection (d);

(D) a description of the performance outcomes to be achieved by the State through the activities carried out under this section and the processes the State will use to track the performance, consistent with guidance provided by the Secretary of Labor regarding

such outcomes and processes and with section 207(b);

(E) a description of the coordination of activities to be carried out with the funds provided under this section, with activities under title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (referred to in this title as the ''TANF program''; 42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and other appropriate Federal and State programs that may assist unemployed, low-income adults in obtaining and retaining employment;

(F) a description of the timelines for implementation of the activities described in subparagraph (A), and the number of unemployed, low-income adults expected to be placed in subsidized employment by calendar quarter;

(G) assurances that the State will report such information relating to fiscal, performance, and other matters as the Secretary of Labor may require and as the Secretary determines is necessary to effectively monitor the activities carried out under this section; and

(H) assurances that the State will ensure compliance with the requirements, restrictions, labor standards, and other provisions described in section 207(a).

(2) SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF STATE PLAN.—

(A) SUBMISSION WITH OTHER PLANS.—The State plan described in paragraph (1) may be submitted in conjunction with the State plan modification or other request for funds by the State required under section 205, and may be submitted as a modification to a State plan that has been approved under section 112 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2822).

(B) SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL.—

(i) SUBMISSION.—The Governor shall submit the State plan described in paragraph (1) to the Secretary of Labor not later than 75 days after the date of enactment of this title and the Secretary shall make a determination regarding the approval or disapproval of such plan not later than 45 days after the submission of such plan. If the plan is disapproved, the Secretary may provide a reasonable period of time in which the plan may be amended and resubmitted for approval.

(ii) APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall approve a State plan that the Secretary determines is consistent with the requirements of this section and reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out the objectives of this section. If the plan is approved, the Secretary shall allot funds to the State under subsection (b) within 30 days after such approval.

(3) MODIFICATIONS TO STATE PLAN.—The Governor may submit a modification to a State plan under this subsection, consistent with the requirements of this section.

(d) ADMINISTRATION WITHIN THE STATE.—

(1) OPTION.—The State may administer the funds for activities under this section through—

(A) the State and local entities responsible for the administration of the formula program of workforce investment activities for adults under subtitle B of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq.);

(B) the State agency or agencies responsible for the administration of the TANF program; or

(C) a combination of the entities and agency or agencies described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(2) WITHIN-STATE ALLOCATIONS.—

(A) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—The Governor may reserve not more than 5 percent of the funds made available through the allotment under subsection (b)(2), for administration and technical assistance, and shall allocate the remainder, in accordance with the option elected under paragraph (1)—

(i) among local workforce investment areas within the State in accordance with subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b)(2), except that for purposes of such allocation references in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (b) to a State shall be deemed to be references to a local workforce investment area and references to all States shall be deemed to be references to all local workforce investment areas in the State involved; or

(ii) through entities responsible for the administration of the TANF program in local areas, in such manner as the State agency or agencies responsible for the administration of the TANF program may determine to be appropriate.

(B) LOCAL PLANS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In a case in which the responsibility for the administration of the activities described in subsection (e) is to be carried out by the entities described in paragraph (1)(A), in order to receive an allocation for a local workforce investment area under subparagraph (A)(i), a local workforce investment board, in partnership with the chief elected official for the local workforce investment area, shall submit to the Governor, not later than 30 days after the submission of the State plan, a local plan for the use of such funds under this section. Such local plan may be submitted as a modification to a local plan approved under section 118 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2833).

(ii) CONTENTS.—The local plan described in clause (i) shall contain the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of subsection (c)(1), as applied to the local workforce investment area.

(iii) APPROVAL.—The Governor shall approve or disapprove the local plan submitted under clause (i) not later than a date (referred to in this clause as the ''final determination date'') that is the later of the 30th day after the submission of the local plan or the 30th day after the approval of the State plan. The Governor shall approve the local plan unless the Governor determines that the plan is inconsistent with the requirements of this section or is not reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out the objectives of this section. If the Governor has not made a determination by the final determination date, the plan shall be considered to be approved. If the plan is disapproved, the Governor may provide a reasonable period of time in which the plan may be amended and resubmitted for approval. If the plan is approved, the Governor shall allocate funds to the local workforce investment area involved under subparagraph (A)(i) within 30 days after such approval.

(C) REALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREAS.—In a case described in subparagraph (B)(i), if a local workforce investment board and chief elected official do not submit a local plan by the date specified in subparagraph (B)(i), or the Governor disapproves a local plan, the amount the local workforce investment area would have been eligible to receive pursuant to the formula under subparagraph (A)(i) shall be allocated to local workforce investment areas that receive approval of their local plans under subparagraph (B). Each such local workforce investment area shall receive a share of the total amount available for reallocation under this subparagraph, in accordance with the area's share of the total amount allocated under subparagraph (A)(i) to such local workforce investment areas.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The funds made available under this section shall be used to provide subsidized employment for unemployed, low-income adults. The entities or agencies described in subsection (d)(1) may use a variety of strategies in recruiting employers and identifying appropriate employment opportunities, but shall give priority to providing employment opportunities likely to lead to unsubsidized employment in emerging or in-demand occupations in the area served through the grant involved. Funds made available under this section may be used to provide support services, such as transportation and child care, that are necessary to enable such adults to participate in subsidized employment opportunities.

(2) LEVEL OF SUBSIDY AND DURATION.—The entities or agencies described in subsection (d)(1) may determine the percentage of the wages and costs of employing a participant for which an employer may receive a subsidy with the funds made available under this section, and the duration of such subsidy, in accordance with guidance issued by the Secretary of Labor in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The entities or agencies may establish criteria for determining such percentage or duration, using appropriate factors such as the size of the employer and type of employment.

(3) LIMITATION.—Not more than 10 percent of the funds allocated to a local workforce investment area under subsection (d)(2)(A)(i) may be used for the costs of administration of this section.

(f) COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Labor shall administer this section in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure the effective implementation of this section.

SEC. 205. SUMMER EMPLOYMENT AND YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOW-INCOME AND DISCONNECTED YOUTH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From the funds available under section 203(a)(2), the Secretary of Labor shall make an allotment or provide assistance under subsection (c) to each State that has a modification to a State plan approved under section 112 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2822) (referred to in this section as a ''State plan modification'') (or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b)) approved under subsection (d) and to each outlying area and recipient under section 166(c) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911(c)) (referred to in this section as a ''Native American grantee'') that meets the requirements of this section, for the purpose of providing summer employment and year-round employment opportunities to low-income youth.

(b) GUIDANCE AND APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 20 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of Labor shall issue guidance regarding the implementation of this section.

(2) PROCEDURES.—Such guidance shall, consistent with this section, include procedures for—

(A) submission and approval for State plan modifications, for such other forms of requests for funds by the State as may be identified in such guidance, for modifications to local plans approved under section 118 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2833) (referred to individually in this section as a ''local plan modification''), or for such other forms of requests for funds by local workforce investment areas as may be identified in such guidance, that promote the expeditious and effective implementation of the activities authorized under this section; and

(B) the allotment and allocation of funds, including reallotment and reallocation of such funds, that promote such implementation.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—Except as otherwise provided in the guidance described in paragraph (1) and in this section and other provisions of this title, the funds provided for activities under this section shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of subtitles B and E of title I of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2811 et seq., 2931 et seq.) relating to youth activities.

(c) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) RESERVATIONS FOR OUTLYING AREAS AND TRIBES.—Of the funds described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Labor shall reserve—

(A) not more than ¼ of 1 percent to provide assistance to outlying areas to provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities to low-income youth; and

(B) 1.5 percent to provide assistance to Native American grantees to provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities to low-income youth.

(2) STATES.—After determining the amounts to be reserved under section 203(b) and paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall allot the remainder of the funds described in subsection (a) among the States in accordance with the subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 204(b)(2).

(3) REALLOTMENT.—If the Governor of a State does not submit a State plan modification or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b) by the date specified in subsection (d)(2)(B), or a State does not receive approval of such State plan modification or request, the amount the State would have been eligible to receive pursuant to the formula under paragraph (2) shall be transferred within the Fund and added to the amounts available for competitive grants under section 203(a)(3).

(d) STATE PLAN MODIFICATION OR REQUEST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For a State to be eligible to receive an allotment of funds under subsection (c), the Governor of the State shall submit to the Secretary of Labor a State plan modification, or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b), in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require. At a minimum, such State plan modification or request shall include—

(A) a description of the strategies and activities to be carried out to provide summer employment opportunities and year-round employment opportunities, including linkages to training and educational activities, consistent with subsection (f);

(B) a description of the requirements the States will apply relating to the eligibility of low-income youth, consistent with section 208, for summer employment opportunities and year-round employment opportunities, which requirements may include criteria to target assistance to particular categories of such low-income youth, such as youth with disabilities, consistent with subsection (f);

(C) a description of the performance outcomes to be achieved by the State through the activities carried out under this section and the processes the State will use to track the performance, consistent with guidance provided by the Secretary of Labor regarding such outcomes and processes and with section 207(b);

(D) a description of the timelines for implementation of the activities described in subparagraph (A), and the number of low-income youth expected to be placed in summer employment opportunities, and year-round employment opportunities, respectively, by calendar quarter;

(E) assurances that the State will report such information relating to fiscal, performance, and other matters as the Secretary of Labor may require and as the Secretary determines is necessary to effectively monitor the activities carried out under this section;

(F) assurances that the State will ensure compliance with the requirements, restrictions, labor standards, and other provisions described in section 207(a); and

(G) for any employment opportunity that will provide participants with an industry-recognized credential, a description of the credential.

(2) SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF STATE PLAN MODIFICATION OR REQUEST.—

(A) SUBMISSION.—The Governor shall submit the State plan modification or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b) to the Secretary of Labor not later than 30 days after the issuance of such guidance. The State plan modification or other State request for funds may be submitted in conjunction with the State plan required under section 204(c).

(B) APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall approve or disapprove the State plan modification or request submitted under subparagraph (A) within 30 days after submission. The Secretary of Labor shall approve the modification or request unless the Secretary determines that the modification or request is inconsistent with the requirements of this section. If the Secretary has not made a determination within that 30-day period, the modification or request shall be considered to be approved. If the modification or request is disapproved, the Secretary may provide a reasonable period of time in which the modification or request may be amended and resubmitted for approval. If the modification or request is approved, the Secretary shall allot funds to the State under subsection (c) within 30 days after such approval.

(3) MODIFICATIONS TO STATE PLAN MODIFICATION OR REQUEST.—The Governor may submit further modifications to a State plan modification or other State request for funds specified under subsection (b), consistent with the requirements of this section.

(e) WITHIN-STATE ALLOCATION AND ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds allotted to the State under subsection (c), the Governor—

(A) may reserve not more than 5 percent of the funds for administration and technical assistance; and

(B) shall allocate the remainder of the funds among local workforce investment areas within the State in accordance with subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 204(b)(2), except that for purposes of such allocation references in paragraph (2) or (3) of section 204(b) to a State shall be deemed to be references to a local workforce investment area and references to all States shall be deemed to be references to all local workforce investment areas in the State involved.

(2) LOCAL PLAN MODIFICATION OR REQUEST.—

(A) SUBMISSION.—In order to receive an allocation for a local workforce investment area under paragraph (1)(B), the local workforce investment board, in partnership with the chief elected official for the local workforce investment area, shall submit to the Governor, not later than 30 days after the submission by the State of the State plan modification or other State request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b), a local plan modification, or such other request for funds by local workforce investment areas as may be specified in guidance under subsection (b), describing the strategies and activities to be carried out under this section.

(B) APPROVAL.—The Governor shall approve or disapprove the local plan modification or other local request for funds submitted under subparagraph (A) within 30 days after submission. The Governor shall approve the modification or request unless the Governor determines that the modification or request is inconsistent with the requirements of this section. If the Governor has not made a determination within that 30-day period, the modification or request shall be considered to be approved. If the modification or request is disapproved, the Governor may provide a reasonable period of time in which the modification or request may be amended and resubmitted for approval. If the modification or request is approved, the Governor shall allocate funds to the local workforce investment area within 30 days after such approval.

(3) REALLOCATION.—If a local workforce investment board and chief elected official do not submit a local plan modification, or other local request for funds specified in guidance under subsection (b), by the date specified in paragraph (2)(A), or the Governor disapproves such a modification or request, the amount the local workforce investment area would have been eligible to receive pursuant to the formula under paragraph (1)(B) shall be allocated to local workforce investment areas that receive approval of their local plan modifications or local requests for funds under paragraph (2). Each such local workforce investment area shall receive a share of the total amount available for reallocation under this subparagraph, in accordance with the area's share of the total amount allocated under paragraph (1)(B) to such local workforce investment areas.

(f) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The funds made available under this section shall be used—

(A) to provide summer employment opportunities for low-income youth, with direct linkages to academic and occupational learning, and may be used to provide supportive services, such as transportation or child care, that are necessary to enable the youth to participate in the opportunities; and

(B) to provide year-round employment opportunities, which may be combined with other activities authorized under section 129 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2854), to low-income youth, giving priority to out-of-school youth who are—

(i) high school dropouts; or

(ii) recipients of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent but who are basic skills deficient, unemployed, or underemployed.

(2) PROGRAM PRIORITIES.—In administering the funds under this section, the local board and chief elected official shall give priority to—

(A) identifying employment opportunities that are—

(i) in emerging or in-demand occupations in the local workforce investment area; or

(ii) in the public or nonprofit sector and meet community needs; and

(B) linking participants in year-round employment opportunities to training and educational activities that will provide such participants with an industry-recognized credential.

(3) PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY.—For activities funded under this section, in lieu of meeting the requirements described in section 136 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2871), States and local workforce investment areas shall provide such reports as the Secretary of Labor may require regarding the performance outcomes described in section 207(b)(5).

(4) LIMITATION.—Not more than 10 percent of the funds allocated to a local workforce

investment area under subsection (e)(1)(B) may be used for the costs of administration of this section.

SEC. 206. WORK-RELATED AND EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES AND ACTIVITIES OF DEMONSTRATED EFFECTIVENESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From the funds available under section 203(a)(3), the Secretary of Labor shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to carry out work-related and educational strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity—

(1) shall include—

(A) a partnership involving a chief elected official, and the local workforce investment board, for the local workforce investment area involved (which may include a partnership with elected officials and workforce investment boards in the region and in the State); or

(B) an entity eligible to apply for a grant, contract, or agreement under section 166 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2911); and

(2) may include, in combination with a partnership or entity described in paragraph (1)—

(A) employers or employer associations;

(B) adult education providers or postsecondary educational institutions, including community colleges;

(C) community-based organizations;

(D) joint labor-management committees;

(E) work-related intermediaries; or

(F) other appropriate organizations.

(c) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall submit to the Secretary of Labor an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. At a minimum, the application shall—

(1) describe the strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness that the eligible entity will carry out to provide unemployed, low-income adults and low-income youth with skills that will lead to employment upon completion of participation related to such strategies and activities;

(2) describe the requirements that will apply relating to the eligibility of unemployed, low-income adults or low-income youth, consistent with section 208, for strategies and activities carried out under this section, which requirements may include criteria to target assistance to particular categories of such adults and youth, such as individuals with disabilities or individuals who have exhausted all rights to unemployment compensation;

(3) describe how the strategies and activities will address the needs of the target populations identified under paragraph (2) and the needs of employers in the local workforce investment area;

(4) describe the expected outcomes to be achieved by implementing the strategies and activities;

(5) provide evidence that the funds provided through the grant will be expended expeditiously and efficiently to implement the strategies and activities;

(6) describe how the strategies and activities will be coordinated with other Federal, State, and local programs providing employment, education, and supportive activities;

(7) provide evidence of employer commitment to participate with respect to the strategies and activities funded under this section, including identification of anticipated occupational and skill needs;

(8) provide assurances that the eligible entity will report such information relating to fiscal, performance, and other matters as the Secretary of Labor may require and as the Secretary determines is necessary to effectively monitor the strategies and activities carried out under this section;

(9) provide assurances that the eligible entity will ensure compliance with the requirements, restrictions, labor standards, and other provisions described in section 207(a); and

(10) for any activity leading to the acquisition of an industry-recognized credential, a description of the credential.

(d) PRIORITY IN AWARDS.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary of Labor shall give priority to applications submitted by eligible entities from areas of high poverty and high unemployment, as defined by the Secretary, such as Public Use Microdata Areas designated by the Bureau of the Census.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the funds made available through the grant to support strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness that are designed to provide unemployed, low-income adults or low-income youth with skills that will lead to employment as part of or upon completion of participation with respect to such strategies and activities. Such strategies and activities may include—

(1) on-the-job training, registered apprenticeship programs, or other programs that combine work with skills development;

(2) sector-based training programs that have been designed to meet the specific requirements of an employer or group of employers in that sector and for which employers are committed to hiring individuals upon successful completion of the training;

(3) training that supports an industry sector or an employer-based or labor-management committee industry partnership and that includes a significant work experience component;

(4) strategies and activities that lead to the acquisition of industry-recognized credentials in a field identified by the State or local workforce investment area as a growth sector or in-demand industry in which there are likely to be significant job opportunities in the short term;

(5) strategies and activities that provide connections to immediate work opportunities, including subsidized employment opportunities, or summer employment opportunities for youth, that include concurrent skills training and other supports;

(6) strategies and activities offered through career academies that provide students with the academic preparation and training, such as paid internships and concurrent enrollment in community colleges or other postsecondary institutions, needed to pursue a career pathway that leads to postsecondary credentials and in-demand jobs; and

(7) adult basic education and integrated basic education and training, for low-skilled adults, that are tied to employer workforce needs, hosted at community colleges or at other sites, to prepare individuals for jobs that are in demand in a local workforce investment area.

(f) COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Labor shall administer this section in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and other appropriate agency heads, to ensure the effective implementation of this section.

SEC. 207. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) LABOR STANDARDS AND PROTECTIONS.—Activities provided with funds made available under this title shall be subject to the requirements and restrictions, including the labor standards, described in section 181 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2931) and the nondiscrimination provisions of section 188 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2938), in addition to other applicable Federal laws.

(b) REPORTING.—The Secretary of Labor shall require the reporting of information relating to fiscal, performance, and other matters that the Secretary determines is necessary to effectively monitor the activities carried out with funds provided under this title. At a minimum, recipients of grants or subgrants under this title shall provide information relating to—

(1) the number of individuals participating in activities with funds provided under this title and the number of such individuals who have completed such participation;

(2) the expenditures of funds provided under this title;

(3) the number of jobs created pursuant to the activities carried out under this title;

(4) the demographic characteristics of individuals participating in activities under this title; and

(5) the performance outcomes for individuals participating in activities under this title, including—

(A) for adults participating in activities funded under section 204, performance on indicators consisting of—

(i) entry into unsubsidized employment;

(ii) retention in unsubsidized employment; and

(iii) earnings in unsubsidized employment;

(B) for low-income youth participating in summer employment activities under sections 205 and 206, performance on indicators consisting of—

(i) work readiness skill attainment, using an employer-validated checklist; and

(ii) placement in or return to secondary or postsecondary education or training, or entry into unsubsidized employment;

(C) for low-income youth participating in year-round employment activities under section 205 or in activities under section 206, performance on indicators consisting of—

(i) placement in or return to postsecondary education;

(ii) attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent;

(iii) attainment of an industry-recognized credential; and

(iv) entry into unsubsidized employment, retention, and earnings as described in subparagraph (A); and

(D) for unemployed, low-income adults participating in activities under section 206—

(i) entry into unsubsidized employment, retention, and earnings as described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) attainment of an industry-recognized credential.

(c) ACTIVITIES REQUIRED TO BE ADDITIONAL.—Funds provided under this title shall only be used for activities that are in addition to activities that would otherwise be available in the State or local workforce investment area in the absence of such funds.

(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Labor may establish such additional requirements as the Secretary determines may be necessary to ensure fiscal integrity, effective monitoring, and appropriate and prompt implementation of the activities under this title.

(e) REPORT OF INFORMATION AND EVALUATIONS TO CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC.—The Secretary of Labor shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress and make available to the public the information reported pursuant to subsection (b) and the evaluations of activities carried out with the funds reserved under section 203(b).

SEC. 208. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CHIEF ELECTED OFFICIAL.—The term ''chief elected official'' means the chief

elected executive officer of a unit of general local government in a local workforce investment area or, in the case in which such an area includes more than one unit of general local government, the individuals designated under an agreement described in section 117(c)(1)(B) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2832(c)(1)(B)).

(2) INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED CREDENTIAL.—The term ''industry-recognized credential'' means such a credential within the meaning of section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302).

(3) LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT AREA.—The term ''local workforce investment area'' means such area designated under section 116 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2831).

(4) LOCAL WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD.—The term ''local workforce investment board'' means such board established under section 117 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2832).

(5) LOW-INCOME YOUTH.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''low-income youth'' means an individual who is not younger than age 16 and not older than age 24 and is an individual described in subparagraph (B) or (C).

(B) ELIGIBLE YOUTH.—For purposes of this paragraph, an individual described in this subparagraph—

(i) meets the definition of a low-income individual provided in section 101(25) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801(25)), except that—

(I) States and local workforce investment areas, subject to approval in the applicable State and local plan modifications and requests for funds, may increase the income level specified in subparagraph (B)(i) of such section to an amount not in excess of 200 percent of the poverty line for purposes of determining eligibility for participation in activities under section 205; and

(II) eligible entities described in section 206(b), subject to approval in the applicable applications for funds, may make such an increase for purposes of determining eligibility for participation in activities under section 206; and

(ii) is in one or more of the categories specified in section 101(13)(C) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801(13)(C)).

(C) YOUTH ELIGIBLE FOR SCHOOL LUNCHES.—For purposes of this paragraph, an individual described in this subparagraph receives or is eligible to receive a free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

(6) OUTLYING AREA.—The term ''outlying area'' means the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Republic of Palau (except during any period for which the Secretary of Labor determines that a Compact of Free Association is in effect and provides for Federal assistance for education or training).

(7) POVERTY LINE.—The term ''poverty line'' means a poverty line as defined in section 673 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902), applicable to a family of the size involved.

(8) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(9) UNEMPLOYED, LOW-INCOME ADULT.—The term ''unemployed, low-income adult'' means an individual who—

(A) is age 18 or older;

(B) is without employment and is seeking assistance under this title to obtain employment; and

(C) meets the definition of a low-income individual specified in section 101(25) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801(25)), except that—

(i) States and local entities described in section 204(d)(1)(A), subject to approval in the applicable State plans and local plans described in subsection (c) or (d) of section 204, or a State agency or agencies described in section 204(d)(1)(B), subject to approval in the State plan described in section 204, may increase the income level specified in subparagraph (B)(i) of such section 101(25) to an amount not in excess of 200 percent of the poverty line for purposes of determining eligibility for participation in activities under section 204; and

(ii) eligible entities described in section 206(b), subject to approval in the applicable applications for funds, may make such an increase for purposes of determining eligibility for participation in activities under section 206.

SA 2609. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER REQUIRED TO CLAIM THE REFUNDABLE PORTION OF THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year unless the taxpayer includes the taxpayer's Social Security number on the return of tax for such taxable year.

''(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the requirement of subparagraph (A) shall be treated as met if the Social Security number of either spouse is included on such return.

''(C) LIMITATION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the extent the tentative minimum tax (as defined in section 55(b)(1)(A)) exceeds the credit allowed under section 32.''.

(b) OMISSION TREATED AS MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR.—Subparagraph (I) of section 6213(g)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(I) an omission of a correct Social Security number required under section 24(d)(5) (relating to refundable portion of child tax credit), or a correct TIN under section 24(e) (relating to child tax credit), to be included on a return,''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING CHILDREN'' after ''IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT'' in the heading thereof.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2610. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 7. DISQUALIFICATION ON RECEIPT OF DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS IN A MONTH FOR WHICH UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IS RECEIVED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 223(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 423(d)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C)(i) If for any month an individual is entitled to unemployment compensation, such individual shall be deemed to have engaged in substantial gainful activity for such month.

''(ii) For purposes of clause (i), the term 'unemployment compensation' means—

''(I) 'regular compensation', 'extended compensation', and 'additional compensation' (as such terms are defined by section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act (26 U.S.C. 3304 note)); and

''(II) trade adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).''.

(b) TRIAL WORK PERIOD.—Section 222(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 422(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6)(A) For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall be deemed to have rendered services in a month if the individual is entitled to unemployment compensation for such month.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'unemployment compensation' means—

''(i) 'regular compensation', 'extended compensation', and 'additional compensation' (as such terms are defined by section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act (26 U.S.C. 3304 note)); and

''(ii) trade adjustment assistance under title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.).''.

(c) DATA MATCHING.—The Commissioner of Social Security shall implement the amendments made by this section using appropriate electronic data.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to months after March 2014.

SA 2611. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DELAY IN APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' in clause (i) and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting ''2016''.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''2016''.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2016''.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SEC. ___. DELAY IN APPLICATION OF EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1513(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2014''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REPORTING BY EMPLOYERS.—Section 1514(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2014''.

(2) REPORTING BY INSURANCE PROVIDERS.—Section 1502(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to which they relate.

SA 2612. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 7. SUPPORTING NEW BUSINESSES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Startup Act 3.0''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Achieving economic recovery will require the formation and growth of new companies.

(2) Between 1980 and 2005, companies less than 5 years old accounted for nearly all net job creation in the United States.

(3) New firms in the United States create an average of 3,000,000 jobs per year.

(4) To get Americans back to work, entrepreneurs must be free to innovate, create new companies, and hire employees.

(c) CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR IMMIGRANTS WITH AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN A STEM FIELD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 216A the following:

''SEC. 216B. CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALIENS WITH AN ADVANCED DEGREE IN A STEM FIELD.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may adjust the status of not more than 50,000 aliens who have earned a master's degree or a doctorate degree at an institution of higher education in a STEM field to that of an alien conditionally admitted for permanent residence and authorize each alien granted such adjustment of status to remain in the United States—

''(1) for up to 1 year after the expiration of the alien's student visa under section 101(a)(15)(F)(i) if the alien is diligently searching for an opportunity to become actively engaged in a STEM field; and

''(2) indefinitely if the alien remains actively engaged in a STEM field.

''(b) APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Every alien applying for a conditional permanent resident status under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Homeland Security before the expiration of the alien's student visa in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

''(c) INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE.—An alien granted conditional permanent resident status under this section shall not be eligible, while in such status, for—

''(1) any unemployment compensation (as defined in section 85(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); or

''(2) any Federal means-tested public benefit (as that term is used in section 403 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613)).

''(d) EFFECT ON NATURALIZATION RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.—An alien granted conditional permanent resident status under this section shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence for purposes of meeting the 5-year residency requirement set forth in section 316(a)(1).

''(e) REMOVAL OF CONDITION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's conditional permanent resident status under this section on the date that is 5 years after the date such status was granted if the alien maintained his or her eligibility for such status during the entire 5-year period.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN A STEM FIELD.—The term 'actively engaged in a STEM field'—

''(A) means—

''(i) gainfully employed in a for-profit business or nonprofit organization in the United States in a STEM field;

''(ii) teaching 1 or more STEM field courses at an institution of higher education; or

''(iii) employed by a Federal, State, or local government entity; and

''(B) includes any period of up to 6 months during which the alien does not meet the requirement under subparagraph (A) if such period was immediately preceded by a 1-year period during which the alien met the requirement under subparagraph (A).

''(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

''(3) STEM FIELD.—The term 'STEM field' means any field of study or occupation included on the most recent STEM-Designated Degree Program List published in the Federal Register by the Department of Homeland Security (as described in section 214.2(f)(11)(i)(C)(2) of title 8, Code of Federal Regulations).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 216A the following:

''Sec. 216B. Conditional permanent resident status for aliens with an advanced degree in a STEM field.''.

(d) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress on the alien college graduates granted immigrant status under section 216B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (c).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report described in paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who have earned a master's degree, broken down by the number of such degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(B) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who have earned a doctorate degree, broken down by the number of such degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(C) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who have founded a business in the United States in a STEM field;

(D) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who are employed in the United States in a STEM field, broken down by employment sector (for profit, nonprofit, or government); and

(E) the number of aliens described in paragraph (1) who are employed by an institution of higher education.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ''institution of higher education'' and ''STEM field'' have the meaning given such terms in section 216B(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (c).

(e) IMMIGRANT ENTREPRENEURS.—

(1) QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.—

(A) ADMISSION AS IMMIGRANTS.—Chapter 1 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 210A. QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEURS.

''(a) ADMISSION AS IMMIGRANTS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in accordance with the provisions of this section and section 216A, may issue a conditional immigrant visa to not more than 75,000 qualified alien entrepreneurs.

''(b) APPLICATION FOR CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Every alien applying for a conditional immigrant visa under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary of Homeland Security in such form and manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

''(c) REVOCATION.—If, during the 4-year period beginning on the date that an alien is granted a visa under this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that such alien is no longer a qualified alien entrepreneur, the Secretary shall—

''(1) revoke such visa; and

''(2) notify the alien that the alien—

''(A) may voluntarily depart from the United States in accordance to section 240B; or

''(B) will be subject to removal proceedings under section 240 if the alien does not depart from the United States not later than 6 months after receiving such notification.

''(d) REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of the status of an alien issued an immigrant visa under this section on that date that is 4 years after the date on which such visa was issued if such visa was not revoked pursuant to subsection (c).

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.—The term 'full-time employee' means a United States citizen or legal permanent resident who is paid by the new business entity registered by a qualified alien entrepreneur at a rate that is comparable to the median income of employees in the region.

''(2) QUALIFIED ALIEN ENTREPRENEUR.—The term 'qualified alien entrepreneur' means an alien who—

''(A) at the time the alien applies for an immigrant visa under this section—

''(i) is lawfully present in the United States; and

''(ii)(I) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b); or

''(II) holds a nonimmigrant visa pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(F)(i);

''(B) during the 1-year period beginning on the date the alien is granted a visa under this section—

''(i) registers at least 1 new business entity in a State;

''(ii) employs, at such business entity in the United States, at least 2 full-time employees who are not relatives of the alien; and

''(iii) invests, or raises capital investment of, not less than $100,000 in such business entity; and

''(C) during the 3-year period beginning on the last day of the 1-year period described in paragraph (2), employs, at such business entity in the United States, an average of at least 5 full-time employees who are not relatives of the alien.''.

(B) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 210 the following:

''Sec. 210A. Qualified alien entrepreneurs.''.

(2) CONDITIONAL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Section 216A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1186b) is amended—

(A) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(B) in subsection (b)(1)(C), by striking ''203(b)(5),'' and inserting ''203(b)(5) or 210A, as appropriate,'';

(C) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''alien entrepreneur must'' each place such term appears and inserting ''alien entrepreneur shall'';

(D) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''or 210A, as appropriate.''; and

(E) in subsection (f)(1), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''or 210A.''.

(f) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress on the qualified alien entrepreneurs granted immigrant status under section 210A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by subsection (e).

(2) CONTENTS.—The report described in paragraph (1) shall include information regarding—

(A) the number of qualified alien entrepreneurs who have received immigrant status under section 210A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, listed by country of origin;

(B) the localities in which such qualified alien entrepreneurs have initially settled;

(C) whether such qualified alien entrepreneurs generally remain in the localities in which they initially settle;

(D) the types of commercial enterprises that such qualified alien entrepreneurs have established; and

(E) the types and number of jobs created by such qualified alien entrepreneurs.

(g) ELIMINATION OF THE PER-COUNTRY NUMERICAL LIMITATION FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED VISAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''AND EMPLOYMENT-BASED'';

(B) by striking ''(3), (4), and (5),'' and inserting ''(3) and (4),'';

(C) by striking ''subsections (a) and (b) of section 203'' and inserting ''section 203(a)'';

(D) by striking ''7'' and inserting ''15''; and

(E) by striking ''such subsections'' and inserting ''such section''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3), by striking ''both subsections (a) and (b) of section 203'' and inserting ''section 203(a)'';

(B) by striking subsection (a)(5); and

(C) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

''(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR COUNTRIES AT CEILING.—If it is determined that the total number of immigrant visas made available under section 203(a) to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area will exceed the numerical limitation specified in subsection (a)(2) in any fiscal year, in determining the allotment of immigrant visa numbers to natives under section 203(a), visa numbers with respect to natives of that state or area shall be allocated (to the extent practicable and otherwise consistent with this section and section 203) in a manner so that, except as provided in subsection (a)(4), the proportion of the visa numbers made available under each of paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 203(a) is equal to the ratio of the total number of visas made available under the respective paragraph to the total number of visas made available under section 203(a).''.

(3) COUNTRY-SPECIFIC OFFSET.—Section 2 of the Chinese Student Protection Act of 1992 (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''subsection (e))'' and inserting ''subsection (d))''; and

(B) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection—

(A) shall take effect as if enacted on September 30, 2012; and

(B) shall apply to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2013.

(h) TRANSITION RULES FOR EMPLOYMENT-BASED IMMIGRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection and notwithstanding title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.), the following rules shall apply:

(A) For fiscal year 2013, 15 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2011 under such paragraphs.

(B) For fiscal year 2014, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2012 under such paragraphs.

(C) For fiscal year 2015, 10 percent of the immigrant visas made available under each of such paragraphs shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of a foreign state or dependent area that was not one of the two states with the largest aggregate numbers of natives obtaining immigrant visas during fiscal year 2013 under such paragraphs.

(2) PER-COUNTRY LEVELS.—

(A) RESERVED VISAS.—With respect to the visas reserved under each of subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (1), the number of such visas made available to natives of any single foreign state or dependent area in the appropriate fiscal year may not exceed 25 percent (in the case of a single foreign state) or 2 percent (in the case of a dependent area) of the total number of such visas.

(B) UNRESERVED VISAS.—With respect to the immigrant visas made available under each of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) and not reserved under paragraph (1), for each of fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015, not more than 85 percent shall be allotted to immigrants who are natives of any single foreign state.

(3) SPECIAL RULE TO PREVENT UNUSED VISAS.—If, with respect to fiscal year 2013, 2014, or 2015, the operation of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection would prevent the total number of immigrant visas made available under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)) from being issued, such visas may be issued during the remainder of such fiscal year without regard to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

(4) RULES FOR CHARGEABILITY.—Section 202(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(b)) shall apply in determining the foreign state to which an alien is chargeable for purposes of this subsection.

(i) CAPITAL GAINS TAX EXEMPTION FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.—

(1) PERMANENT FULL EXCLUSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1202 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(a) EXCLUSION.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, gross income shall not include 100 percent of any gain from the sale or exchange of qualified small business stock held for more than 5 years.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) The heading for section 1202 of such Code is amended by striking ''**PARTIAL**''.

(ii) The item relating to section 1202 in the table of sections for part I of subchapter P of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking ''Partial exclusion'' and inserting ''Exclusion''.

(iii) Section 1223(13) of such Code is amended by striking ''1202(a)(2),''.

(2) REPEAL OF MINIMUM TAX PREFERENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 57 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraph (7).

(B) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subclause (II) of section 53(d)(1)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking '', (5), and (7)'' and inserting ''and (5)''.

(3) REPEAL OF 28 PERCENT CAPITAL GAINS RATE ON QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1(h)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(A) collectibles gain, over''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 1(h) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (7).

(ii)(I) Section 1(h) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraphs (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13) as paragraphs (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12), respectively.

(II) Sections 163(d)(4)(B), 854(b)(5), 857(c)(2)(D) of such Code are each amended by striking ''section 1(h)(11)(B)'' and inserting ''section 1(h)(10)(B)''.

(III) The following sections of such Code are each amended by striking ''section 1(h)(11)'' and inserting ''section 1(h)(10)'':

(aa) Section 301(f)(4).

(bb) Section 306(a)(1)(D).

(cc) Section 584(c).

(dd) Section 702(a)(5).

(ee) Section 854(a).

(ff) Section 854(b)(2).

(IV) The heading of section 857(c)(2) is amended by striking ''1(h)(11)'' and inserting ''1(h)(10)''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to stock acquired after December 31, 2013.

(j) RESEARCH CREDIT FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) TREATMENT OF CREDIT TO QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—At the election of a qualified small business, the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under

subsection (a) shall be treated as a credit allowed under section 3111(f) (and not under this section).

''(2) PAYROLL TAX CREDIT PORTION.—For purposes of this subsection, the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under subsection (a) for any taxable year is so much of such credit as does not exceed $250,000.

''(3) QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified small business' means, with respect to any taxable year—

''(i) a corporation, partnership, or S corporation if—

''(I) the gross receipts (as determined under subsection (c)(7)) of such entity for the taxable year is less than $5,000,000, and

''(II) such entity did not have gross receipts (as so determined) for any period preceding the 5-taxable-year period ending with such taxable year, and

''(ii) any person not described in subparagraph (A) if clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) applied to such person, determined—

''(I) by substituting 'person' for 'entity' each place it appears, and

''(II) in the case of an individual, by only taking into account the aggregate gross receipts received by such individual in carrying on trades or businesses of such individual.

''(B) LIMITATION.—Such term shall not include an organization which is exempt from taxation under section 501.

''(4) ELECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a partnership or S corporation, an election under this subsection shall be made at the entity level.

''(B) REVOCATION.—An election under this subsection may not be revoked without the consent of the Secretary.

''(C) LIMITATION.—A taxpayer may not make an election under this subsection if such taxpayer has made an election under this subsection for 5 or more preceding taxable years.

''(5) AGGREGATION RULES.—For purposes of determining the $250,000 limitation under paragraph (2) and determining gross receipts under paragraph (3), all members of the same controlled group of corporations (within the meaning of section 267(f)) and all persons under common control (within the meaning of section 52(b) but determined by treating an interest of more than 50 percent as a controlling interest) shall be treated as 1 person.

''(6) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including—

''(A) regulations to prevent the avoidance of the purposes of paragraph (3) through the use of successor companies or other means,

''(B) regulations to minimize compliance and recordkeeping burdens under this subsection for start-up companies, and

''(C) regulations for recapturing the benefit of credits determined under section 3111(f) in cases where there is a subsequent adjustment to the payroll tax credit portion of the credit determined under subsection (a), including requiring amended returns in the cases where there is such an adjustment.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 280C(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT.—For purposes of determining the amount of any credit under section 41(a) under this subsection, any election under section 41(i) shall be disregarded.''.

(2) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST FICA TAXES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) CREDIT FOR RESEARCH EXPENDITURES OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified small business which has made an election under section 41(i), there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by subsection (a) on wages paid with respect to the employment of all employees of the qualified small business for days in an applicable calendar quarter an amount equal to the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit determined under section 41(a).

''(2) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED CREDIT.—In any case in which the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit determined under section 41(a) exceeds the tax imposed under subsection (a) for an applicable calendar quarter—

''(A) the succeeding calendar quarter shall be treated as an applicable calendar quarter, and

''(B) the amount of credit allowed under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by the amount of credit allowed under such paragraph for all preceding applicable calendar quarters.

''(3) ALLOCATION OF CREDIT FOR CONTROLLED GROUPS, ETC.—In determining the amount of the credit under this subsection—

''(A) all persons treated as a single taxpayer under section 41 shall be treated as a single taxpayer under this section, and

''(B) the credit (if any) allowable by this section to each such member shall be its proportionate share of the qualified research expenses, basic research payments, and amounts paid or incurred to energy research consortiums, giving rise to the credit allowable under section 41.

''(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) APPLICABLE CALENDAR QUARTER.—The term 'applicable calendar quarter' means—

''(i) the first calendar quarter following the date on which the qualified small business files a return under section 6012 for the taxable year for which the payroll tax credit portion of the research credit under section 41(a) is determined, and

''(ii) any succeeding calendar quarter treated as an applicable calendar quarter under paragraph (2)(A).

''For purposes of determining the date on which a return is filed, rules similar to the rules of section 6513 shall apply.

''(B) OTHER TERMS.—Any term used in this subsection which is also used in section 41 shall have the meaning given such term under section 41.''.

(B) TRANSFERS TO FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401) amounts equal to the reduction in revenues to the Treasury by reason of the amendments made by paragraph (1). Amounts appropriated by the preceding sentence shall be transferred from the general fund at such times and in such manner as to replicate to the extent possible the transfers which would have occurred to such Trust Fund had such amendments not been enacted.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(k) ACCELERATED COMMERCIALIZATION OF TAXPAYER-FUNDED RESEARCH.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COUNCIL.—The term ''Council'' means the Advisory Council on Innovation and Entrepreneurship of the Department of Commerce established pursuant to section 25(c) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3720(c)).

(B) EXTRAMURAL BUDGET.—The term ''extramural budget'' means the sum of the total obligations minus amounts obligated for such activities by employees of the agency in or through Government-owned, Government-operated facilities, except that for the Department of Energy it shall not include amounts obligated for atomic energy defense programs solely for weapons activities or for naval reactor programs, and except that for the Agency for International Development it shall not include amounts obligated solely for general institutional support of international research centers or for grants to foreign countries.

(C) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(D) RESEARCH OR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The term ''research'' or ''research and development'' means any activity that is—

(i) a systematic, intensive study directed toward greater knowledge or understanding of the subject studied;

(ii) a systematic study directed specifically toward applying new knowledge to meet a recognized need; or

(iii) a systematic application of knowledge toward the production of useful materials, devices, and systems or methods, including design, development, and improvement of prototypes and new processes to meet specific requirements.

(E) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

(2) GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency that has an extramural budget for research or research and development that is in excess of $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, shall transfer 0.15 percent of such extramural budget for each of such fiscal years to the Secretary to enable the Secretary to carry out a grant program in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) GRANTS.—

(i) AWARDING OF GRANTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—From funds transferred under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall use the criteria developed by the Council to award grants to institutions of higher education, including consortia of institutions of higher education, for initiatives to improve commercialization and transfer of technology.

(II) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.—Not later than 30 days after the Council submits the recommendations for criteria to the Secretary under paragraph (3)(B)(i), and annually thereafter for each fiscal year for which the grant program is authorized, the Secretary shall release a request for proposals.

(III) APPLICATIONS.—Each institution of higher education that desires to receive a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary not later than 90 days after the Secretary releases the request for proposals under subclause (II).

(IV) COUNCIL REVIEW.—

(aa) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit each application received under subclause (III) to the Council for Council review.

(bb) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Council shall review each application received under item (aa) and submit recommendations for grant awards to the Secretary, including funding recommendations for each proposal.

(cc) PUBLIC RELEASE.—The Council shall publicly release any recommendations made under item (bb).

(dd) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration the recommendations of the Council under item (bb)).

(ii) COMMERCIALIZATION CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants to support institutions of higher education pursuing specific innovative initiatives to improve an institution's capacity to commercialize faculty research that can be widely adopted if the research yields measurable results.

(II) CONTENT OF PROPOSALS.—Grants shall be awarded under this clause to proposals demonstrating the capacity for accelerated commercialization, proof-of-concept proficiency, and translating scientific discoveries and cutting-edge inventions into technological innovations and new companies. In particular, grant funds shall seek to support innovative approaches to achieving these goals that can be replicated by other institutions of higher education if the innovative approaches are successful.

(iii) COMMERCIALIZATION ACCELERATOR GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants to support institutions of higher education pursuing initiatives that allow faculty to directly commercialize research in an effort to accelerate research breakthroughs. The Secretary shall prioritize those initiatives that have a management structure that encourages collaboration between other institutions of higher education or other entities with demonstrated proficiency in creating and growing new companies based on verifiable metrics.

(C) ASSESSMENT OF SUCCESS.—Grants awarded under this paragraph shall use criteria for assessing the success of programs through the establishment of benchmarks.

(D) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall have the authority to terminate grant funding to an institution of higher education in accordance with the process and performance metrics recommended by the Council.

(E) LIMITATIONS.—

(i) PROJECT MANAGEMENT COSTS.—A grant recipient may use not more than 10 percent of grant funds awarded under this paragraph for the purpose of funding project management costs of the grant program.

(ii) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—An institution of higher education that receives a grant under this paragraph shall use the grant funds to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of such grant funds, be made available for activities described in this subsection.

(F) UNSPENT FUNDS.—Any funds transferred to the Secretary under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year that are not expended by the end of such fiscal year may be expended in any subsequent fiscal year through fiscal year 2018. Any funds transferred under subparagraph (A) that are remaining at the end of the grant program's authorization under this subsection shall be transferred to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

(3) COUNCIL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Council shall convene and develop recommendations for criteria in awarding grants to institutions of higher education under paragraph (2).

(B) SUBMISSION TO COMMERCE AND PUBLICLY RELEASED.—The Council shall—

(i) submit the recommendations described in subparagraph (A) to the Secretary; and

(ii) release the recommendations to the public.

(C) MAJORITY VOTE.—The recommendations submitted by the Council under subparagraph (A) shall be determined by a majority vote of Council members.

(D) PERFORMANCE METRICS.—The Council shall develop and provide to the Secretary recommendations on performance metrics to be used to evaluate grants awarded under paragraph (2).

(E) EVALUATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days before the date on which the grant program authorized under paragraph (2) expires, the Council shall conduct an evaluation of the effect that the grant program is having on accelerating the commercialization of faculty research.

(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The evaluation shall include—

(I) the recommendation of the Council as to whether the grant program should be continued or terminated;

(II) quantitative data related to the effect, if any, that the grant program has had on faculty research commercialization; and

(III) a description of lessons learned in administering the grant program, and how those lessons could be applied to future efforts to accelerate commercialization of faculty research.

(iii) AVAILABILITY.—Upon completion of the evaluation, the evaluation shall be made available on a public website and submitted to Congress. The Secretary shall notify all institutions of higher education when the evaluation is published and how it can be accessed.

(4) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to alter, modify, or amend any provision of chapter 18 of title 35, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Bayh-Dole Act'').

(l) ECONOMIC IMPACT OF SIGNIFICANT FEDERAL AGENCY RULES.—Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REQUIRED REVIEW BEFORE ISSUANCE OF SIGNIFICANT RULES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before issuing a notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register regarding the issuance of a proposed significant rule, the head of the Federal agency or independent regulatory agency seeking to issue the rule shall complete a review, to the extent permitted by law, that—

''(A) analyzes the problem that the proposed rule intends to address, including—

''(i) the specific market failure, such as externalities, market power, or lack of information, that justifies such rule; or

''(ii) any other specific problem, such as the failures of public institutions, that justifies such rule;

''(B) analyzes the expected impact of the proposed rule on the ability of new businesses to form and expand;

''(C) identifies the expected impact of the proposed rule on State, local, and tribal governments, including the availability of resources—

''(i) to carry out the mandates imposed by the rule on such government entities; and

''(ii) to minimize the burdens that uniquely or significantly affect such governmental entities, consistent with achieving regulatory objectives;

''(D) identifies any conflicting or duplicative regulations;

''(E) determines—

''(i) if existing laws or regulations created, or contributed to, the problem that the new rule is intended to correct; and

''(ii) if the laws or regulations referred to in clause (i) should be modified to more effectively achieve the intended goal of the rule; and

''(F) includes the cost-benefit analysis described in paragraph (2).

''(2) COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—A cost-benefit analysis described in this paragraph shall include—

''(A)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of benefits anticipated from the proposed rule, such as—

''(I) promoting the efficient functioning of the economy and private markets;

''(II) enhancing health and safety;

''(III) protecting the natural environment; and

''(IV) eliminating or reducing discrimination or bias; and

''(ii) the quantification of the benefits described in clause (i), to the extent feasible;

''(B)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs anticipated from the proposed rule, such as—

''(I) the direct costs to the Federal Government to administer the rule;

''(II) the direct costs to businesses and others to comply with the rule; and

''(III) any adverse effects on the efficient functioning of the economy, private markets (including productivity, employment, and competitiveness), health, safety, and the natural environment; and

''(ii) the quantification of the costs described in clause (i), to the extent feasible;

''(C)(i) an assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs and benefits of potentially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives to the proposed rule, which have been identified by the agency or by the public, including taking reasonably viable nonregulatory actions; and

''(ii) an explanation of why the proposed rule is preferable to the alternatives identified under clause (i).

''(3) REPORT.—Before issuing a notice of proposed rulemaking in the Federal Register regarding the issuance of a proposed significant rule, the head of the Federal agency or independent regulatory agency seeking to issue the rule shall—

''(A) submit the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) to the appropriate congressional committees; and

''(B) post the results of the review conducted under paragraph (1) on a publicly available website.

''(4) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Any determinations made, or other actions taken, by an agency or independent regulatory agency under this subsection shall not be subject to judicial review.

''(5) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection the term 'significant rule' means a rule that is likely to—

''(A) have an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) adversely affect, in a material way, the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; or

''(C) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency.''.

(m) BIENNIAL STATE STARTUP BUSINESS REPORT.—

(1) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall regularly compile information from each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia on State laws that affect the formation and growth of new businesses within the State or District.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary, using data compiled under paragraph (1), shall prepare a report that—

(A) analyzes the economic effect of State and District laws that either encourage or inhibit business formation and growth; and

(B) ranks the States and the District based on the effectiveness with which their laws foster new business creation and economic growth.

(3) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) submit each report prepared under paragraph (1) to Congress; and

(B) make each report available to the public on the website of the Department of Commerce.

(4) INCLUSION OF LARGE METROPOLITAN AREAS.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of the first report under this subsection, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a study to Congress on the feasibility and advisability of including, in future reports, information about the effect of local laws and ordinances on the formation and growth of new businesses in large metropolitan areas within the United States.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(n) NEW BUSINESS FORMATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall regularly compile quantitative and qualitative information on businesses in the United States that are not more than 1 year old.

(2) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) regularly compile information from the Bureau of the Census' business register on new business formation in the United States; and

(B) conduct quarterly surveys of business owners who start a business during the 1-year period ending on the date on which such survey is conducted to gather qualitative information about the factors that influenced their decision to start the business.

(3) RANDOM SAMPLING.—In conducting surveys under paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary may use random sampling to identify a group of business owners who are representative of all the business owners described in paragraph (2)(B).

(4) BENEFITS.—The Secretary shall inform business owners selected to participate in a survey conducted under this subsection of the benefits they would receive from participating in the survey.

(5) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—Business owners selected to participate in a survey conducted under this subsection may decline to participate without penalty.

(6) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 3 months thereafter, the Secretary shall use the data compiled under paragraph (2) to prepare a report that—

(A) lists the aggregate number of new businesses formed in the United States;

(B) lists the aggregate number of persons employed by new businesses formed in the United States;

(C) analyzes the payroll of new businesses formed in the United States;

(D) summarizes the data collected under paragraph (2); and

(E) identifies the most effective means by which government officials can encourage the formation and growth of new businesses in the United States.

(7) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) submit each report prepared under paragraph (6) to Congress; and

(B) make each report available to the public on the website of the Department of Commerce.

(8) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

(o) RESCISSION OF UNSPENT FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of all available unobligated funds for fiscal year 2013, the amount necessary to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section in appropriated discretionary funds are hereby rescinded.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall determine and identify from which appropriation accounts the rescission under paragraph (1) shall apply and the amount of such rescission that shall apply to each such account. Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to the Secretary of the Treasury and Congress of the accounts and amounts determined and identified for rescission under the preceding sentence.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 7, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on January 7, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Syrian Refugee Crisis.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORTING ENHANCED MARITIME SECURITY IN THE GULF OF GUINEA

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to Calendar No. 270, S. Res. 288.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 288) supporting unenhanced maritime security in the gulf of Guinea and encouraging increased cooperation between the United States and West and Central African countries to fight armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime threats.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 288) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 288

Whereas, although the number of armed robbery at sea and piracy attacks worldwide dropped substantially in recent years, such acts in the Gulf of Guinea are increasing, with more than 40 reported through October 2013 and many more going unreported;

Whereas the United States imported more than 315,000,000 barrels of oil through the region in 2012, and United States businesses have extensive fixed assets in the region that are important to United States energy security;

Whereas the nature of attacks in the Gulf of Guinea demonstrates an ongoing pattern of cargo thefts and robbery, often occurring in the territorial waters of West and Central African states;

Whereas there are countries in West and Central Africa that are susceptible to acts of armed robbery at sea and piracy that lack adequate law enforcement and naval capabilities to stop or deter such attacks;

Whereas acts of maritime crime raise the costs and risks of trade and commerce in Africa and beyond because the security of vessels, crews, and cargoes cannot be guaranteed;

Whereas shipping insurance premiums increase after such attacks, and in so doing, create disincentives for local, regional, and international investors and companies seeking to do business in the region;

Whereas imports provide indispensable goods and services for the people of West and Central Africa, generate port fees and customs duties for their governments, and are essential in spurring economic growth and development in the region;

Whereas the U.S. Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa issued by President Barack Obama in June 2012 states, ''It is in the interest of the United States to improve the region's trade competitiveness, encourage the diversification of exports beyond natural resources, and ensure that the benefits from growth are broad-based.'';

Whereas a vibrant trade relationship between Africa and its partners, including the United States, can lead to expanded economic opportunities that can spur competition, raise productivity, and facilitate job creation in the economies of all participating countries;

Whereas the African Union, in collaboration with numerous official and nongovernmental stakeholders, developed the ''2050 Africa's Integrated Maritime Security'' strategy (the 2050 AIM STRATEGY) which seeks ''to address contending, emerging and future maritime challenges and opportunities in Africa . . . with a clear focus on enhanced wealth creation from a sustainable governance of Africa's oceans and seas'';

Whereas the African Union's 2050 AIM STRATEGY seeks to combat ''diverse illegal activities which include . . . arms and drug trafficking, human trafficking and smuggling, piracy, and armed robbery at sea'', among other objectives;

Whereas the June 24–25, 2013, meeting of the Gulf of Guinea Maritime Security Heads of State Summit held in Cameroon marked the culmination of a United States Government-supported Economic Communities of Central African States (ECCAS) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)-led initiative and process that produced an approved ECOWAS–ECCAS Memorandum of Understanding for regional cooperation, and adopted a Gulf of Guinea Code of Conduct to address maritime crime and a Heads of State Political Declaration;

Whereas ECOWAS and ECCAS states are working to cooperate and build their joint capacities in order to increase maritime security in the Gulf of Guinea and are working to achieve this goal with such partners as the United Nations Offices for West and Central Africa, the Gulf of Guinea Commission, the International Maritime Organization,

the Maritime Organization for West and Central Africa, and the African Union;

Whereas the United States Government in the Gulf of Guinea has focused on encouraging multi-layered regional and national ownership in developing sustainable capacity building efforts, including working with partners through the G8++ Friends of Gulf of Guinea Group, to coordinate United States Government maritime security activities in the region;

Whereas the United States Government has assisted the countries of West and Central Africa to enhance regional maritime security through programs such as the ''African Partnership Station'', operated by United States Naval Forces Africa ''to build maritime safety and security by increasing maritime awareness, response capabilities and infrastructure'', and the ''African Maritime Law Enforcement Partnership'', which ''enables African partner nations to build maritime security capacity and improve management of their maritime environment through real world law enforcement operations, and through provision of diverse types of training and equipment assistance and participation in diverse regional maritime military exercises'', as well as by employing analytical tools such as the Maritime Security Sector Reform Guide; and

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2039, ''expressing its deep concern about the threat that piracy and armed robbery at sea in the Gulf of Guinea pose to international navigation, security and the economic development of states in the region'', was unanimously adopted on February 29, 2012: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns acts of armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime crime in the Gulf of Guinea;

(2) endorses and supports the efforts made by United States Government agencies to assist affected West and Central African countries to build capacity to combat armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime threats, and encourages the President to continue such assistance, as appropriate, within resource constraints; and

(3) commends the African Union, subregional entities such as the ECOWAS and ECCAS, and the various international agencies that have worked to develop policy and program frameworks for enhancing maritime security in West and Central Africa, and encourages these entities and their member states to continue to build upon these and other efforts to achieve that end.

REGARDING CRITICAL NEED FOR POLITICAL REFORM IN BANGLADESH

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 273, S. Res. 318.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 318) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the critical need for political reform in Bangladesh, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to the title.

Mr. REED. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the committee reported title amendment be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 318) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 318

Whereas the nation of Bangladesh was established in 1971 after a bitter war in which it split from Pakistan, and for many of the ensuing years until 1990, it was ruled by military governments;

Whereas political tensions have at times turned to violence in Bangladesh, undermining the democratic process;

Whereas the last parliamentary elections in Bangladesh originally scheduled for January 2007, were postponed indefinitely after the military intervened amid rising violence and questions about the electoral process's credibility;

Whereas a military-backed civilian caretaker government held power until December 2008 when Bangladeshis returned to the polls to elect a new parliament for the first time in many years;

Whereas ongoing antagonism between the country's two ruling parties, the Awami League and the Bangladesh Nationalist Party, distracts from the important needs of the country;

Whereas concerns have grown about religious extremism in the otherwise usually tolerant country;

Whereas the United States-Bangladesh relationship is strong and involves many shared interests, including regional economic integration, counterterrorism, counter-piracy, poverty alleviation, food security, regional stability, and mitigation of natural disasters;

Whereas bilateral trade between the United States and Bangladesh now tops $6,000,000,000 annually, with major United States companies making significant long-term investments in Bangladesh;

Whereas the economy of Bangladesh has grown six percent per year over the last two decades, despite a range of challenges;

Whereas the poverty rate in Bangladesh dropped from 40 percent to 31 percent between 2005 and 2010—a notable accomplishment in a country in which poverty has been deep and widespread;

Whereas the Grameen Bank's revolutionary microfinance lending to the poor has helped reduce poverty not only in Bangladesh, but has served as an innovative and powerful model for helping the poor elsewhere in the world;

Whereas the Department of State, Congress, and other high profile international voices have recognized the Grameen Bank's innovative work and expressed great concern over actions by the Government of Bangladesh that undermine the Bank's independence;

Whereas Bangladesh, an example of a moderate and diverse Muslim-majority democracy, is scheduled to have national elections on January 5, 2014;

Whereas, in 2013, hundreds of Bangladeshis died in violent clashes as a result of political violence and unrest, and some opposition and human rights activists have been arrested;

Whereas trials held by the International Crimes Tribunal in Bangladesh—set up to prosecute those responsible for atrocities committed during Bangladesh's war of liberation with Pakistan in 1971—have fallen short of international standards;

Whereas the Government of Bangladesh eliminated a constitutional provision requiring the governing party to cede power to a neutral caretaker government three months before an election;

Whereas the 18-member opposition coalition in Bangladesh called for numerous nationwide strikes and transportation blockades in 2013, resulting in dozens of deaths;

Whereas Bangladeshi students cannot attend school and complete mandatory exams due to the strikes and blockades and related violence;

Whereas many citizens of Bangladesh have had their work and daily activities disrupted due to the strikes and related violence, which come at a cost to the economy and stability of Bangladesh;

Whereas a stable, moderate, secular, Muslim-majority democracy with the world's seventh-largest population, and the world's fourth-largest Muslim population, will have lasting positive impacts in the region and beyond;

Whereas the success of the democratic process in Bangladesh is of great importance to the United States and the world; and

Whereas during the week of December 8, 2013, United Nations Assistant Secretary General Oscar Fernandez-Taranco visited Bangladesh to foster political dialogue between Bangladeshi political parties and leaders in order to bring a halt to violence and allow for a credible peaceful election: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the political violence in Bangladesh and urges political leaders in that country to engage directly and substantively in a dialogue toward free, fair, and credible elections;

(2) expresses great concern about the continued political deadlock in Bangladesh that distracts from the country's many important challenges;

(3) urges political leaders in Bangladesh to take immediate steps to rein in and to condemn the violence as well as to provide space for peaceful political protests;

(4) urges political leaders in Bangladesh to ensure the safety and access of observers in its upcoming elections;

(5) supports ongoing efforts by United Nations Assistant Secretary General Oscar Fernandez-Taranco to foster political dialogue between political factions in Bangladesh; and

(6) urges the Government of Bangladesh to ensure judicial independence, end harassment of human rights activists, and restore the independence of the Grameen Bank.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the critical need for political dialogue in Bangladesh, and for other purposes.''

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 274, S. Res. 319.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 319) expressing support for the Ukrainian people in light of President Yanukovych's decision not to sign an Association Agreement with the European Union.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 319) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 319

Whereas, according to a poll conducted in November 2013, a majority of the people of Ukraine supported signing a historic trade and political agreement with the European Union;

Whereas a closer association between Ukraine and the European Union has been supported by Ukrainian civil society, business leaders, and politicians across the political spectrum and would bring lasting political, democratic, and economic benefits to the people of Ukraine;

Whereas Ukraine successfully passed much of the legislation required to conform to European Union standards for signing an Association Agreement;

Whereas, on September 22, 2012, and November 18, 2013, the Senate unanimously passed resolutions calling for a demonstrable end to selective justice in Ukraine and expressing its belief that Ukraine's future lies with stronger ties to Europe, the United States, and others in the community of democracies;

Whereas the experience of countries such as Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia provides a positive example of increased economic opportunity, enhanced personal freedom, and good governance. which can also be realized by Ukraine;

Whereas the Government and people of Ukraine have the sovereign right to choose their own foreign policy and economic course, and no other country has the right to determine their political and economic orientation, nor decide which alliances and trade agreements they can join;

Whereas, on November 21, 2013, President Viktor Yanukovych suspended Ukraine's preparations for signing the Association Agreement one week before a critical European Union Summit in Vilnius, Lithuania;

Whereas the abrupt reversal on the eve of the summit following Russian economic coercion and to protect the narrow interests of some officials and individuals in Ukraine prompted hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians all across the country, especially young people and students, to protest the decision and stand in support of furthering Ukraine's Euro-Atlantic integration;

Whereas international nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations provide essential care to needy Ukrainians, yet face direct threats and challenges to their existence and administrative and regulatory impediments, including challenges to operating with the tax-exempt status necessary to maximize the use of funds on the ground and threats to the fabric of civil society vital to democracy in Ukraine;

Whereas, on November 30, 2013, at Independence Square in Kyiv, special division police dispersed a peaceful demonstration of students and civil society activists who were calling on President Yanukovych to sign the Association Agreement;

Whereas approximately 35 individuals were detained or arrested, and dozens were hospitalized, some with severe injuries;

Whereas, on December 9, 2013, raids were conducted on three opposition media outlets and the headquarters of one opposition party;

Whereas, on December 11, 2013, Ukrainian authorities conducted an overnight police operation in an attempt to forcefully take control of Independence Square, but were resisted by brave Ukrainians who filled the square and rebuffed the police action;

Whereas all three former Presidents of Ukraine have underscored the need to refrain from violence and the importance of engaging in a dialogue with the opposition; and

Whereas Ukraine faces an impending economic crisis that can only be solved with long-term economic reforms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) stands with the people of Ukraine and supports their sovereign right to chart an independent and democratic future for their country;

(2) urges leaders in the United States and the European Union to continue working together actively to support a peaceful and democratic resolution to the current crisis that moves Ukraine toward a future in the Euro-Atlantic community and a long-term solution to Ukraine's economic crisis;

(3) encourages demonstrators and members of the opposition and civil society in Ukraine to continue avoiding the use of violence and engage in a dialogue of national reconciliation;

(4) urges all political parties to refrain from hate speech or actions of an anti-Semitic or other character which further divide the Ukrainian people when they need to be united;

(5) calls on the Government of Ukraine to refrain from further use of force or acts of violence against peaceful protestors, and to respect the internationally recognized human rights of the Ukrainian people, especially the freedoms of speech and assembly;

(6) condemns the decision by Ukrainian authorities to use violence against peaceful demonstrators on November 30, December 1, and December 11, 2013, and calls for those responsible to be swiftly brought to justice and all detained nonviolent demonstrators to be immediately released; and

(7) notes that in the event of further state violence against peaceful protestors, the President and Congress should consider whether to apply targeted sanctions, including visa bans and asset freezes, against individuals responsible for ordering or carrying out the violence.

NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY WEEK

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 329, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 329) expressing support for the goals and ideals of the biennial USA Science & Engineering Festival in Washington, DC and designating April 21 through April 27, 2014, as ''National Science and Technology Week''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 329) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2014

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 8, 2014; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1845, the unemployment insurance extension, postcloture, and that all time during adjournment count postcloture on the motion to proceed to S. 1845.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REED. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 8, 2014, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

SHARON Y. BOWEN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 13, 2018, VICE BARTHOLOMEW CHILTON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ERIC ROSENBACH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE PAUL N. STOCKTON, RESIGNED.

DAVID B. SHEAR, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE MARK WILLIAM LIPPERT, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

J. MARK MCWATTERS, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2019, VICE MICHAEL E. FRYZEL, TERM EXPIRED.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

JANET GARVIN MCCABE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE REGINA MCCARTHY, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DARCI L. VETTER, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE ISLAM A. SIDDIQUI.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MAX SIEBEN BAUCUS, OF MONTANA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PAIGE EVE ALEXANDER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE MARA E. RUDMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN CHARLES CRUDEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE IGNACIA S. MORENO, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

LEON RODRIGUEZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE ALEJANDRO N. MAYORKAS, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. DONALD R. LINDBERG

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM D. COBETTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BART O. IDDINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL ROY–ALAN C. AGUSTIN
COLONEL ROBERT G. ARMFIELD
COLONEL MARK A. BAIRD
COLONEL DIETER E. BAREIHS
COLONEL MITCHEL H. BUTIKOFER
COLONEL MARK D. CAMERER
COLONEL DOUGLAS A. COX
COLONEL STEPHEN L. DAVIS
COLONEL ERIC T. FICK
COLONEL KEITH M. GIVENS
COLONEL PAUL H. GUEMMER
COLONEL GREGORY M. GUILLOT
COLONEL GREGORY M. GUTTERMAN
COLONEL DARREN E. HARTFORD
COLONEL DAVID W. HICKS
COLONEL BRIAN T. KELLY
COLONEL DAVID A. KRUMM
COLONEL PETER J. LAMBERT
COLONEL EVAN M. MILLER
COLONEL THOMAS E. MURPHY
COLONEL DAVID S. NAHOM
COLONEL MARY F. O'BRIEN
COLONEL STEPHEN W. OLIVER, JR.
COLONEL SCOTT L. PLEUS
COLONEL JOHN T. RAUCH, JR.
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER M. SHORT
COLONEL KIRK W. SMITH
COLONEL ROBERT W. STANLEY II
COLONEL MARK E. WEATHERINGTON
COLONEL STEPHEN C. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

TERESA G. PARIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOEL K. WARREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JEFFREY P. TAN

To be major

CRISTALLE A. COX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ROBERT D. COXWELL
ROBERT J. GRAZULIS
AARON L. ULLMAN
KENT A. WILLIAMS

To be lieutenant colonel

BRIAN E. EARP

To be major

CHRISTOPHER ALFARO
STEVEN M. ANDERSON
JOHN H. BRINDLE
TRENT L. FRITZ
SHAWNTARA GOVAN
JOSHUA L. GREENSPAN
JOSEPH A. JOHNSON
MICHAEL D. JOHNSON
JAMES M. KRAMER
MATTHEW E. STIGLER
WESTON D. TURNER
SCOT L. WILLIAMS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DAVID W. BRYANT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JOSEPH B. BERGER III
ERIK L. CHRISTIANSEN
GAIL A. CURLEY
JONATHAN HOWARD
CHARLES T. KIRCHMAIER
NICHOLAS F. LANCASTER
JEFFERY D. LIPPERT
DAVID E. MENDELSON
MICHAEL E.J. MUELLER
CHARLES C. POCHE
LUIS O. RODRIGUEZ
JOHN T. ROTHWELL
MICHELLE L. RYAN
WILLIAM D. SMOOT III

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BAMIDELE J. ABOGUNRIN
JOSEPH T. ALLENA, JR.
PHILIP G. ANTEKEIER
HUGH L. ATKINSON
IAN D. BRASURE
TIMOTHY R. BRYANT
DANIEL T. CANFIELD, JR.
JAMES C. CARROLL III
RONNIE A. CARSON, JR.
BRIAN S. CHRISTMAS
ROBERT M. CLARK
CARL E. COOPER, JR.
DARYL G. CRANE
NICHOLAS E. DAVIS
MICHAEL E. DEHNER
THOMAS J. DODDS
CRAIG R. DOTY
ANDREW J. DRAKE
HAROLD B. EGGERS
CHRISTIAN T. ELLINGER
DAREN J. ERICKSON
LY T. FECTEAU
ROBERT A. FREELAND
EDWARD A. GARLAND
ERIC A. GILLIS
DONALD A. GORDON
JON L. HALVERSON
CHRISTIAN D. HARSHBERGER
CARLTON W. HASLE
CARL C. HENGER
PATRICK R. HITTLE
JEFFREY C. HOLT
BRIAN G. HUGHES
MICHAEL J. JERNIGAN
MATTHEW G. KELLY
ERIC S. LIVINGSTON
HENRY W. LUTZ III
KENDALL A. MARTINEZ
KEVEN W. MATTHEWS
ROGER T. MCDUFFIE
BOYD A. MILLER
THOMAS P. MITALSKI
MICHAEL C. MONTI
DAVID C. MORRIS
BRIAN W. NEIL
RICHARD F. NEITZEY
JULIE L. NETHERCOT
JOHN M. NEVILLE, JR.
ANDREW M. NIEBEL
RICHARD E. PETERSEN
MICHAEL A. PHILLIPS
RICARDO T. PLAYER
JOHN R. POLIDORO, JR.
THOMAS E. PRENTICE
MATTHEW PUGLISI
MATTHEW B. REUTER
ROBERT C. RICE
CHRISTOPHER S. RICHIE
RYAN S. RIDEOUT
JEFFREY N. RULE
MICHAEL V. SAMAROV
JAMES A. SCHNELLE
MICHAEL E. SCHUTTE
KEVIN R. SCOTT
CHANDLER P. SEAGRAVES
DANIEL L. SHIPLEY
TODD P. SIMMONS
DIANA L. STANESZEWSKI
JAMES B. STONE IV
CLAY C. TIPTON
STEPHEN K. VANRIPER
MICHAEL C. VARICAK
JOSEPH F. WADE
WILLIAM M. WANDO
MARTIN F. WETTERAUER III
JOSEPH D. WILLIAMS
CRAIG C. WIRTH
JASON G. WOODWORTH
JAY D. WYLIE
WILLIAM W. YATES
DEVIN C. YOUNG
PHILLIP M. ZEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ERNEST P. ABELSON II
BRIAN W. ACKERSON
STEVEN A. ADAIR, JR.
THOMAS R. ADAME
SAMUEL P. ADAMS
KARIN B. ALISSANDRATOS
STEVEN E. ALSOP
RYAN A. ALTER
MIGUEL ALVAREZ, JR.
CLINTON S. ANDERSON
CRAIG R. ANDERSON
WILLIAM H. ANDERSON
JOSEPH A. ANDREJACK
MICHAEL G. ANKRUM
ERIC M. ANTONELLI
SCOTT D. ARMSTRONG
LISA M. AROCHO
CHRISTOPHER A. ASHINHURST
MICHELLE E. AUGUSTINE
DANIEL R. BALLARD
ANDREW C. BANKSTON
WILLIAM A. BARTHOLOMAE
DAVID G. BATCHELER
JEFFREY D. BAYSE
MICHAEL C. BELL
JOHN L. BELSHA
CERA T. BENBOW
SAMUEL A. BENEFIEL
PETER D. BENNING
DANIEL H. BENSON
CLAUDE L. BERTHOLD
JEREMY S. BEST
ALISON M. BETSINGER
JOSHUA K. BEYER
BARNEY B. BLAINE
JONATHAN C. BODWELL
BROOKS W. BOEHLERT
JEFFREY R. BOGLE
AUSTIN C. BONNER
JOHN A. BORING
ANDREW J. BORMANN
ERIC D. BOWER
BRIAN V. BOYD
CHARLES W. BOYD
PATRICK M. BRALEY
ROBERT G. BUCK
NICHOLAS BUKOVAC
JASON L. BULLIS
MELVIN D. BURCH
RICKY D. BURIA
LARRY L. BUZZARD
GERALDINE C. CAREY
JOSHUA E. CARPENTER
BENJAMIN C. CARRUTHERS
ANDREW M. CASCI
JASON CASTILLO
JONATHAN I. CHAIKEN
ROY E. CHEEKS, JR.
SIMBA A. CHIGWIDA
COLE M. CLEMENTS
JEREMY M. CLEVENGER
MICHAEL F. CLEVENGER
ADAM C. COKER
ALEXANDER G. COLE
AMBER G. COLEMAN
RYAN C. COLLINS
RYAN D. COLTON
JOSE I. COLUNGA
JEREMY J. COLWELL
HARRY P. CONSAUL IV
DUSTY L. COOK
STEPHEN M. COOK
BRANDON E. COOLEY
JASON C. COPELAND
AARON J. CORONNA
JEREMY A. COTHERN
STEPHANIE L. COTHERN
DEREK M. COTTA
GABRIEL R. CRANE
JACK M. CRONAN
TROY J. CRONBAUGH
NICHOLAS J. CRUZ
JAMES N. CUNNINGHAM III
KENNETH H. CURTIS
THOMAS W. DAGGETT
ANTHONY R. DAMICO
DEAN V. DAMIN
CRAIG O. DAVIS
CHRISTOPHER M. DELL
SUZANNE M. DEMPSEY
CHRISTOPHER A. DENVER
BIJAN C. DERAKHSHAN
MICHAEL A. DEREDITA
JOHN B. DICKENS
SEAN P. DILLON
AMANDA N. DONNELLY
CASEY W. DOYLE
CHARLES R. DRENNAN

THOMAS J. DUFF
DOUGLAS I. DUFFIN
CHRISTOPHER S. DUNCAN
THOMAS J. DUNN
DANIEL B. EAGAN
PAUL D. ECKERT
JONATHAN R. ELLIOTT
THOMAS A. EYBL
ROSS A. FEARON
ROBERT W. FEATHERSTONE
TERRY A. FELLOWS, JR.
RYAN A. FERRELL
JASON M. FIDUCCIA
DANIEL M. FLETCHER
JOHN G. FLETCHER III
CARLOS R. FLORES
RICARDO S. FLORES, JR.
KATHARINE E. FOLZ
ERIC FONG
SCOT A. FOSTER
AARON M. FREY
JASON E. FRIDAY
CHRISTOPHER M. GAITENS
ANTHONY T. GAROFANO
JOSE B. GARZA, JR.
BRADLEY P. GAUTREAUX
CLINTON P. GEBKE
JAMES M. GEIGER, JR.
JAMES M. GEIGER III
JONATHAN M. GEISLER
CHARLES E. GEORGE
DEREK R. GEORGE
TIMOTHY J. GILLETTE, JR.
JAMIE M. GLINES
NATHANIEL C. GODDARD
PASCAL J. GONZALEZ
DANIEL E. GRAINGER
TAD A. GREER
WILLIAM P. GRIMES
ANTHONY J. GUIDRY
MARK A. GUTHRIE
ROBERT F. GUYETTE II
PAUL D. HAAGENSON
MICHAEL S. HAGER
KYLE P. HAHN
KALEB J. HARKEMA
CLAYTON T. HARLIN, JR.
MICHAEL B. HARMON
RICHARD D. HARPER
AARON J. HARRELL
KEATON H. HARRELL
ADAM M. HARRINGTON
TODD E. HARRISON
CHRISTOPHER R. HART
NATHAN M. HARVEY
ANGELA B. HATCH
CHARLES A. HATTON
JESSICA M. HAWKINS
MATTHEW M. HEMPHILL
MICHAEL S. HENSON
PAUL C. HERRERA
MATTHEW W. HOHL
CORY L. HOLIDAY
KRIKET S. HOLLEY
TYLER J. HOLT
CHRISTOPHER K. HUCKABY
JEREMIAH W. HUGHES
BERNARD W. HUND III
CHARLES P. HUNT
TREVOR L. HUNT
CHRISTOPHER J. JAMISON
JOHN F. JEDRA
BYRON R. JOHNSON
MICHAEL E. JOHNSON
ANDRE M. JONCKHEERE
JUSTIN A. JONES
LAWRENCE O. JONES
SCOTT L. JONES
PATRICK W. JUNICK
JASON D. KAISER
VERONICA L. KALTRIDER
RUTH E. KEHOE
STEVEN M. KEISLING
BRADLEY B. KELLER
CHRISTOPHER J. KELLY
ROBERT S. KEMPER
DUSTIN A. KERLIN
JOHN S. KIM
ASHLYN E. KING
MATTHEW F. KLOBY
ERIC J. KNECHT
NATHAN K. KNOWLES
ANTHONY M. KOEHL
ERIK B. KOLLE
STEVEN L. KOSNIK
JASON A. KOZAK
DAVID A. KRIEGBAUM
ETHAN C. KRUMNOW
LOWELL D. KRUSINGER
JENNIFER A. KUKLA
VALERIE N. KYZAR
JASON R. LAIRD
JASON A. LAMBERT
JONATHAN W. LANDERS
JARRIEL L. LANG
JARROD P. LARSON
JASON E. LATTA
RALPH E. LEMASTER
JASON R. LESHIKAR
JOHN M. LEWIS
RAYMOND F. LHEUREUX, JR.
JAMES J. LILLEY
ASHLEY E. LISH
JUSTIN D. LOKKESMOE
EDWARD A. LORD
JEFFREY L. LUDWIG
FRANK A. MACHNIAK, JR.
ADAM J. MALLO
MICHAEL F. MANNING
ERICA K. MANTZ
EFREN S. MANZANET
JONATHAN E. MARANG
PAUL M. MARCY
AHMAD J. MARTIN
THEODORE P. MARTIN
TRACY A. MARTIN
FREDDIE F. MARTINEZ
LINDSAY E. MATHWICK
MATTHEW S. MAYO
MATTHEW J. MCLANE
MICHAEL D. MCMAHON
SHAWN A. MEIER
JOHN T. MEIXNER
CHARLES E. MILLER II
JOHN C. MILLER
JOSHUA D. MILLER
YATES F. MINNER
JOSE N. MIRELES
JOSEPH D. MONTAGNA
BRIAN M. MONTALVO
JOSHUA E. MONTERO
MICHAEL W. MOORE
MITCHELL A. MOORE
FREDDY A. MORALES
PATRICK R. MORAN
MIGUEL MORENO
TRAVIS M. MORRIS
THOMAS C. MORSE
BRANDON W. MOTT
MARCUS D. MOYER
LINDSAY K. MURPHY
JAMES O. MYUNG
REID B. NANNEN
ANTHONY M. NAVARRETTE
MATTHEW J. NEELY
JEREMY M. NELSON
GEOFFREY T. NEWTON
KAHO NG
AARON C. NORWOOD
COURTNEY D. OBRIEN
KEVIN J. ODONNELL
WILBUR S. OLES IV
KYLE B. OPEL
WILLIAM C. OREN
PEDRO ORTIZ
BRIAN M. OSHEA
KRISTOPHER W. OTTEN
BENJAMIN M. PARENTE
FRANK N. PARISI
KIRA L. PARRISH
MARIO S. PARZINO
WILLIAM J. PATRICK
RAMON E. PATTUGALAN
MATTHEW A. PEDERSON
WILLIAM P. PENDLEY
LAURA J. PERAZZOLA
NICHOLAS B. PERKINS
ADAM F. PERLIN
BUCK A. PERRY
RYAN E. PETERSEN
JON T. PETERSON
TODD A. PETERSON
JOSEPH R. PETKUS
PHUONG H. PHAN
STEVEN M. PIACENTE
STEPHEN M. PIANTANIDA
STACIE M. PICCINICH
DANIEL D. PINKERTON
JUAN R. PLASCENCIA
JOSHUA R. PLUMMER
ERIC D. PORTER
LEVI G. PORTER
JUSTIN M. POTHEN
JEFFREY B. POTTER
WILLIAM M. POWELL
ADAM E. POWERS
JONATHAN S. PRATHER
AARON W. PRIDGEN
DAVID S. RAINEY
NATHAN T. RASMUSSEN
JOHNATHAN D. REED
JONATHAN P. REED
STEVAN D. REICHERT
STACI L. REIDINGER
HARRY REIFSCHNEIDER III
JASON R. REUKEMA
THEODORE C. RHODES
MATHEW J. RICE
OWEN Q. RIEMER
JONATHAN M. RINGLEIN
ANDREW C. ROBBINS
LUKE T. ROBERTS
ERIC C. ROBINSON
JEFFREY M. ROHMAN
CHRISTOPHER J. ROSS
STEPHEN R. RUBEO
JAMES P. RUBOCKI
EDWARD P. RUSHING
JOSEPH M. SALUCCI
MATTHEW J. SAMSON
JOSEPH C. SANDS
BRYAN P. SARGENT
LUKE A. SAUBER
ERIC A. SCHERRER
ANDREW P. SCHILLING
JOHN W. SCHINDEL
ERIK M. SCHMIDT
ERIK N. SCHNEIDER
TED W. SCHROEDER
ROBERT M. SCOTT
JONATHAN M. SECOR
ANDREW J. SEGAL
ANTON T. SEMELROTH
JOSEPH T. SEYKORA
RICHARD L. SHINN
GORDON M. SILLIKER
JAMES C. SMITH
JOSHUA E. SMITH
NICHOLAS A. SMITH
WILLIAM M. SMYTH
WALTER P. SNODGRASS
CHRISTOPHER A. SOUTHARD
TIMOTHY A. SPARKS
KATHERINE L. SPIES
JEREMY J. SPRIGGS
JON D. STIEBNER
ADAM C. STILES
BRANDON M. STOCKWELL
DANIEL J. STRUZIK
JAMES A. SUMLER
ERIC D. SWANSON
AUTUMN D. SWINFORD
STEPHEN G. TAUTE
ALEXANDER M. TAYLOR
BRETT V. TAYLOR
CHRISTOPHER A. TCHINSKI
JACK C. TEMPLETON II
CURTIS L. THOMAS
DANIELLE E. THOMAS
MATTHEW A. THOMPSON
CHRISTOPHER T. TIERNEY
JON C. TILLMAN
JARED L. TOWLES
CHANCE D. TROMBETTI
ADAM W. TROUT
EMMA C. TUCKER
WILLIAM D. TURNER III
KYLE A. UGONE
DAVID D. VANDAM
SAMUEL A. VERPLANCK
ESTEBAN T. VICKERS
BENJAMIN Y. VICTOR
NICHOLAS L. VOGEL
ALEXIS F. VOGELGESANG
NATALIE N. WALKER
TOBIN J. WALKER
SHANNON M. WALLER
JEREMY R. WALTER
JASON R. WAREHAM
MILES G. WARREN
WILLIAM D. WHALEY II
WILLIAM G. WHEATLEY, JR.
JOSEPH L. WHITE
LEE A. WHITE
MICHAEL W. WHITE
RANDALL C. WHITE
JOE A. WHITEFIELD, JR.
NICKOLAS D. WHITEFIELD
KIRK A. WHITTENBERG
ROBERT E. WICKER
ERIC A. WIENER
BRIAN S. WILLIAMS
THEODORE L. WILLIAMS II
JONATHAN M. WILLIAMSON
BRIAN J. WILSON
NICHOLAS R. WITTMAN
ANTHONY J. WLOTKO
ALLEN D. WOLD
ROBERT W. WOODARD
ALI I. YAKUB
ADRIAN E. YBARRA
JUSTIN A. YOUNG
JASON C. YURISIC
CHRISTOPHER L. ZACHARY
BRYAN L. ZUPPINGER
DAVID D. ZYGA

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF KATHERINE AGNES McMILLAN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of an extraordinary woman, Katherine Agnes McMillan, who passed away at the age of 89 on December 10, 2013. She was the youngest of nine children born to Irish immigrants, John Patrick and Margaret Kearns Trumble, and was the Valedictorian of her graduating class at Sacred Heart Academy.

Katherine McMillan served in the Navy as a nurse, and went on to serve her community uncommonly well as a devoted RN for 37 years at Sequoia Hospital where she worked in the Emergency Room and was a legend there.

After retiring from the nursing profession, Katherine launched a 'latchkey' day care program at St. Pius Catholic Church in Redwood City, the first of its kind in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. She provided quality child care for school age children with her trademarks of professionalism, discipline and caring.

Katherine gave generously of her time and considerable talents at Serra High School in San Mateo, the school her son Robert attended and she loved. She became the first woman to earn and be honored with the ''In Via Award'' by this all male school.

Katherine is survived by her beloved daughters, Katherine and Mary, her son Robert (Julie) and her two adored grandsons, Sean and Kenny.

I had the privilege of knowing Katherine McMillan for over three decades. With her Irish pride and her Boston accent, she was a force of nature, a loyal and loving friend, an extraordinary mother, and a woman of great faith. She lived her faith in all she did, and every day of her life was guided by it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of a woman who will be greatly missed by all who had the good fortune to know her and never be forgotten. Katherine McMillan was a true patriot, a woman who loved her family deeply and served her community, her church and her country with great dedication and joy. For this, the entire U.S. House of Representatives extends its condolences to the McMillan family.

CONGRATULATIONS TO FRIDA BAZAN, WINNER OF 1ST HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH ESSAY CONTEST

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the winner of the 1st Annual Hispanic Heritage Month Essay Contest for the 27th Congressional District of Texas.

Ms. Frida Bazan, from El Campo High School, in El Campo, Texas wrote the winning essay, entitled ''Honoring My Hispanic Heritage.'' I ask that Ms. Bazan's essay be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It reads as follows:

Hispanic Heritage makes a great influence in my life because it is a way of life. This culture is deeply important to me because it represents who I am, how I live my life, and how I view the world. All these characteristics form part of my life and personality, which I love, and lead me to proudly say that I am honored to be Hispanic.

Hispanic Heritage Month means celebrating our heritage by sharing stories and informing others of our traditions and customs, while honoring where we came from. As we share stories about the traditional Christmas posadas, Día de los Muertos celebrations, and the famous Grito de Independencia, we let others know more about our lives and at the same time spread our culture.

As a Hispanic, I have strict, conservative parents who have made me the person I am today. I have inherited ideas such as being respectful to our elders, the willingness to work, attending church, dedicating myself to help others, and above all being a strong person who overcomes obstacles I may face; these are important Hispanic characteristics that have been enforced to me by my parents and grandparents. All this has helped me during my lifetime and will continue to lead me in the correct path as I aspire for my life goals. I have many goals for my future, and my biggest dream is to one day become a physician assistant and make a difference in people's lives by helping those in need. My parents have taught me to use perseverance and never stop fighting for what I want because I can reach anything I put my mind to, and I know that with their advice and my hard dedication I can get very far in life. Hispanics are people who never give up when it comes to accomplishing their life goals and will face sacrifices and have dedication to reach their goals and persuade others to do the same.

Hispanic Heritage may fade away in families who move to live in the United States and adopt another culture. As a Hispanic, I consider it my duty to make sure that my heritage is not forgotten. As my parents have done with our family, I will ensure that our heritage is protected for generations by telling others about our traditions and customs. When I have a family of my own I will tell them all the memorable stories my parents told me about our family traditions. I will continue to use traditions, such as the piñatas, language, posadas, dances, and foods, to keep the Hispanic heritage alive in my life and inculcate those values to my descendants.

As a proud Hispanic I will never forget where my family's roots initiated. Even though I live in a different country with a different type of life and traditions, my Hispanic heritage will always remain in my memories and deep in my heart.

Congratulations to Frida Bazan for writing the winning essay. Thank you also for your participation in this contest and for sharing some of your traditions and customs. Best of luck to you in all your future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF MR. MARCUS KAUFFMAN

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Marcus Kauffman, a young man who tragically lost his life after being shot by home intruders on December 2nd of last year. He fought courageously to survive for three weeks before succumbing to his injuries.

Marcus Kauffman, often called Marco by friends and loved ones, was an outstanding citizen. He selflessly served as a volunteer firefighter with the Scotch Irish Fire Department in Woodleaf, North Carolina. As a firefighter, Marco heroically put himself in harm's way and displayed immense dedication to the safety of others. We are fortunate to have brave men and women like Marco who dedicate and risk their lives as firemen for our well-being and security.

Marco's life was taken much too soon. He will be remembered for his extraordinary heroism and devotion to his family in the face of danger. I applaud Marco for his bravery, and I thank him for his heroic and selfless actions.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kauffman was a proven leader in our community, but he was also a loving husband, a soon to be father, and a faithful friend to many. My wife Renee and I will continue to pray for the family and loved ones of Marco, including his wife Maryann and their unborn child. I hope that they find peace in this troubling time.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SHINER HIGH SCHOOL COMANCHE MARCHING BAND

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Shiner High School Marching Band on an outstanding accomplishment. On Monday, November 4, 2013, the 70-member Shiner High School marching band took first place in the 1A division of the state UIL marching contest at the Alamodome in San Antonio, Texas.

It was the first time in Shiner High School history that the marching band won the state championship. The band has come close to winning in the past, placing second at the state level in 2011, and fifth at the state level in 2007.

Mr. Stephen Krupicka, the Comanche Marching Band director, should be honored for such extraordinary commitment to these students, leading the band to such an outstanding victory. To the members of the band, Congratulations on a job well done! Your hard work and dedication certainly paid off.

It should also be noted that I am nominating the Comanche Marching Band to perform at the National Memorial Day Concert Series in Washington, D.C. in May, 2014. The concert series will commemorate the 70th Anniversary of D-Day May 24th-26th.

Again, Congratulations to the Shiner High School Marching Band. The community stands behind you in all your future endeavors!

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR RONALD T. RILING II

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Command Sergeant Major Ronald T. Riling II, the 14th Command Sergeant Major of the U.S. Army Materiel Command, on the occasion of his retirement following 31 years of exemplary service to the United States Army. He is one of only four Command Sergeants Major of Four Star Commands in the United States Army.

Command Sergeant Major Riling began his Army career in February 1983 as a 19D Cavalry Scout, completing his One Station Unit Training at Fort Knox, KY and will conclude his career as the personal advisor to the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Materiel Command on all enlisted-related matters; primarily focusing on the quality of life for Soldiers, Civilians and Families across the command; and Command Sergeant Major Riling has performed admirably and honorably at home and abroad.

His career achievements include three successful combat tours, two in Iraq and one in Haiti. CSM Riling's awards and decorations include the Silver Star, Legion of Merit (2nd OLC), Bronze Star (1st OLC), Meritorious Service Medal (Silver OLC), Army Commendation Medal (3rd OLC), Army Achievement Medal (4th OLC), and many other awards; and as Command Sergeant Major Riling's career winds down, he will be remembered for many of his attributes—strength of character, steadfast courage and superior and compassionate leadership. He will also be remembered and admired for being a ''Soldier's Soldier''.

As Command Sergeant Major Riling and his wife, Melinda, begin the next phase of their lives, I am pleased that they are retiring in my Congressional district. I want to express the warmest regards and heartfelt gratitude of the Nation for all that they have done and all that the Riling family has sacrificed to support the defense of the United States of America.

On behalf of all those touched by his service, we wish Command Sergeant Major Riling good luck, good ground, and Godspeed. Army Strong!

HONORING A–10 PILOTS BRIGADIER GENERAL MACKEY AND LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROE

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the brave airmen of the 442d Fighter Wing of Whiteman Air Force Base.

Specifically, I want to commend the A–10 pilots who courageously protected Sergeant Mauricio Alejandro Arias and 16 of his fellow soldiers as they came under fire while serving in Afghanistan.

I sincerely applaud Colonel James Mackey (now Brigadier General Mackey) and Lieutenant Colonel Tony Roe for their actions of June 5, 2008, as they provided close air support for 17 soldiers of the 201st Engineer Battalion of the Kentucky National Guard. The soldiers were pinned down for a lengthy time by enemy heavy-arms fire and running low on ammunition when these pilots intervened and suppressed the enemy threat. Sergeant Arias credits these pilots for saving his and the lives of 16 fellow soldiers that day and I stand with him in recognizing the heroic acts of these two pilots.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in applauding the bravery and commitment to service that General Mackey, Lieutenant Colonel Roe and the airmen of the 442d Fighter Wing exemplify. In doing so, they ask for no recognition, yet they protect our way of life while risking their own and are very deserving of such recognition.

TRIBUTE TO GRAND VIEW UNIVERSITY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 2013 National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics Football Champions, the Grand View University Vikings.

Grand View University is one of eighty-five football programs across the country that compete in the NAIA. Each year, the best teams in the association qualify for the post-season playoffs to determine a national champion. Only six years after establishing a football program, the Grand View University Vikings have expertly developed a top-tier football team. On December 21, 2013, Grand View obtained its first-ever national football championship by defeating the top-ranked University of the Cumberlands by a score of 35–23. The Vikings finished the 2013 season with a perfect 14–0 record and the top NAIA ranking.

Grand View University's recent success on the football field is emblematic of its long-held mission for both academics and athletics. Since its founding in 1896, Grand View has instilled its students with an uncompromising focus on the traditional Danish perspective of the ''whole person.'' Through this perspective, each of Grand View's 2,300 students is uniquely enabled to reach their potential through high expectations, smaller class sizes, and greater individual attention from professors and coaches. It is through this winning formula that Grand View University has positioned itself among our state's premier universities.

Mr. Speaker, the pride and excitement that this team has brought to their campus and to the state of Iowa cannot be understated. The unrelenting commitment of these coaches and players speaks volumes about the Iowa work ethic and the rewards of working together. It is truly an honor to represent the players, coaches and families of this team in the United States Congress and I invite my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating our 2013 NAIA National Champions. I wish President Henning, Coach Woodley, and all the students of Grand View University continued success, both on and off the field, for many years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE HOWARD M. HOLTZMANN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of an extraordinary man, Judge Howard Holtzmann, who passed away hours before his 92nd birthday on December 9, 2013.

Howard was the son of the late Lillian Plotz Holtzmann and Jacob L. Holtzmann. He attended the Poly Prep Country Day School, Yale College and Yale Law School. He loved all things 'Yale' and served it in many ways for seven decades, earning the prestigious award of the Yale Medal in 2006. Yale was one of many beneficiaries of Howard Holtzmann's legendary philanthropy. He endowed the Jewish Chaplaincy at Yale, the first such position at an American college campus. He also endowed a professorship in international law and established fellowships in that field.

Judge Holtzmann, a brilliant attorney, was an original member of the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal and served as a member of the United States Delegation to the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. An acknowledged expert in arbitration, he wrote and edited many books and treatises on the subject. He held leadership positions as a trustee or member of many organizations, including the Jewish Theological Seminary, St. Bonaventure University, the American Foreign Law Association, the Environmental Law Institute, Pace Law, the American Arbitration Association and the New York Weill Cornell Council.

Judge Holtzmann is survived by his beloved wife, Carol, and his devoted daughters, Susie and Betsey. He also leaves his grandsons, McLaren (Jodi), Anthony (Erin) and Abe Noyes, and Jill van Berg (David Manella), Elizabeth van Berg and Allison van Berg. He also leaves five great-grandchildren, and at the time of his death was aware that a sixth was due within days. He also leaves his stepdaughter Louise Mullen (Henry) and his stepson William van Berg. He was preceded in death by his first wife Anne Fisher Holtzmann and his step-son, Peter van Berg.

I have the privilege of knowing Judge Holtzmann's daughter, Susie Richardson, a

highly regarded member of the Palo Alto community who has contributed in countless ways to the civic life of our region. She is a woman of integrity and conscience, and I'm proud to call her my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life of Howard M. Holtzmann, a great and good man who will be deeply missed by all who had the privilege of knowing him. His humanity, brilliance, patriotism, generosity and his distinguished family are the legacies he leaves, making our nation stronger and better. For all this and more, the U.S. House of Representatives extends its deepest condolences to the entire Holtzmann family.

TRIBUTE TO ALLEN LAZARD

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Allen Lazard of Urbandale, Iowa for his participation in the 14th annual U.S. Army All-American Bowl.

Since 2001, the U.S. Army All-American Bowl has recruited the nation's top high school football players to participate in a nationally-televised, all-star football game. From millions of high school football players across our nation, the U.S. Army All-American Bowl Selection Committee evaluates thousands of top prospects throughout the year. After evaluation, the Selection Committee formally nominates 400 seniors to be considered for the annual game. Ultimately, only 90 players nationwide will be invited to participate in this prestigious event.

Allen's selection to the U.S. Army All-American Bowl galvanizes a remarkable 2013 season for the Urbandale High School senior. As a wide receiver for the Urbandale J-Hawks, Allen hauled in 49 passes for 1,065 yards and 16 touchdowns. At 6′ 5″, Allen has continued to be a top-receiving threat among our state's premier football players and has been named to Iowa's All-State team for three consecutive years. In December, Lazard was Iowa's only player to be named to the 2013 American Family Insurance ALL-USA High School Football Team. I am pleased to report that Mr. Lazard currently plans to take his talents to Jack Trice Stadium as an Iowa State Cyclone in the coming school year.

Mr. Speaker, Allen's accomplishments, both on and off the field, are a testament to the world-class work ethic for which our great state is renowned. It is an honor to represent Mr. Lazard and his family in the United States Congress. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Allen on his outstanding achievements and I wish him continued success in the years ahead.

HONORING LOUIS HERMAN ''RED'' KLOTZ OF MARGATE CITY

HON. FRANK A. LoBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. LoBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, today I extend my personal congratulations and the recognition of the U.S. House of Representatives to Louis Herman ''Red'' Klotz, a basketball legend and long-time resident of Margate City, New Jersey. At age 93, Red remains active in the sport for which he has long loved, making him the sport's oldest professional and one of its most-loved.

Playing well into his 60s and serving as a U.S. International Ambassador of Goodwill, Red has helped introduce basketball to more than 100 countries and countless youth around the globe. As the owner and former player & coach of the Washington Generals, he and his team have challenged the dominance of their greatest competitor—the Harlem Globetrotters—for sixty-two consecutive years. And, as if playing over 13,000 exhibition games wasn't a full-time career, Red and his wife Gloria operated successful businesses in Margate and Atlantic City for many years.

I join with the greater Margate community and basketball fans worldwide in honoring Red Klotz for his countless contributions to the game. While your impressive decades-long past on and off the court is well-documented, it is your dedication today to the sport and fifty years in the South Jersey community that define your legacy.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NAVAL DIVING AND SALVAGE TRAINING CENTER

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the incredible naval officers and sailors who run the Naval Diving and Salvage Training Center in Panama City, Florida.

I had the honor of touring this facility and I was privileged to be escorted by Commander Hung Cao. The deep water training was impressive and unique. Only the best get selected to train here and it showed. The dedication, resolve and commitment demonstrated by these service men was inspiring.

I know our nation is in great hands when I see the high quality instruction and the effort to train our men to be both highly skilled and safe. I commend them and I want them to know the people of the United States need them and appreciate them.

As Commander Cao told me, the ''instructors and staff here are true American Heroes, who have sacrificed a lot for this country.''

God bless these men and women.

HONORING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION OF DR. HECTOR P. GARCIA

HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th Birthday Celebration of Dr. Hector P. Garcia as put on by The Dr. Hector P. Garcia Memorial Foundation. Dr. Garcia was a proud Mexican-American, a World War II veteran, physician, humanitarian and civil rights activist.

Dr. Garcia was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1984 by President Ronald Reagan, and has been recognized by the United States Army as one of the most influential Hispanics ever to serve. The American Dream was believed and realized by Dr. Hector P. Garcia. He inspired those around him to educate themselves, participate in the democratic process, and work toward positive change.

The Dr. Hector P. Garcia Memorial Foundation was organized to educate our communities about the continuing historical relevance and legacy of Dr. Hector P. Garcia. The proceeds from this 100th Birthday Celebration will be donated to Texas A&M University Corpus Christi for the Dr. Hector P. Garcia library expansion at the Bell Library.

Dr. Garcia donated his papers in 1990 to Texas A&M University Corpus Christi and the library expansion is necessary so the papers can be properly displayed and fully appreciated by the public and the students.

Though Dr. Garcia was laid to rest in Corpus Christi in 1996 at the age of 82, his legacy will endure. He was truly an American hero and we honor him today.

TO RECOGNIZE THE BUCKS COALITION AGAINST TRAFFICKING

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Bucks Coalition Against Trafficking on its one-year anniversary, and to recognize the important work this local volunteer group is doing to raise awareness on human trafficking. The Coalition was launched to bring about an end to the suffering of the victims of this modern-day form of slavery. In particular, the Bucks Coalition Against Trafficking brings a strong, informed commitment to this issue as it reaches out to all levels of government to stop the exploitation of men, women, and children. The broad-based program includes community education, victim identification, legislative advocacy, and the prosecution of traffickers. Pennsylvania's 8th District is grateful for the Coalition's compassionate plan and its dedication to the awareness of this horrendous crime, while successfully enlisting the assistance of individuals, government agencies, and local law enforcement to help bring justice.

HONORING THE BEULAH CEMETERY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the most intact historic properties associated with the growth and development of the African-American community in the historic Vicksburg and Warren County, Mississippi, area.

Beulah Cemetery was established in 1884 by the Vicksburg Tabernacle #19 Independent Order of Brothers and Sisters of Love and

Charity, who bought the land from Harvey and Lucy Shannon for $1,000. It originally encompassed 52 acres; however, through sales and transfers to the National Park Service and individuals, the entire property is now 14.5 acres. From its establishment in 1884 until the 1940's, the cemetery was the most important cemetery for Vicksburg-area African Americans and remains today a visible landmark for the black community. Blacks were buried in churchyards or on private land until Beulah Cemetery became the main cemetery for Vicksburg-area African Americans.

The African American community has historically constituted about half of Vicksburg's population. Beulah provides significant historical information about this important group of citizens through its gravestones. So few historic resources concerning the area of the African American community remains therefore it's increasing the significance of Beulah Cemetery.

The cemetery is the final resting place for members of the most prominent black families in Vicksburg, including ancestors of almost every native black in the Vicksburg area. The cemetery documents the existence of generations of people for whom otherwise there might be no surviving material available.

Among the prominent people buried at Beulah are the founders of the black funeral homes (Jeffersons/Dillons); G. M. McIntyre, principal of Cherry Street School and school namesake; Robert Banks Marshall, the city's first black postal employee; and William Tillmon Jones, Grand Chancellor of the Knights of Pythias, 1889–1906.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Beulah Cemetery as they strive to preserve African American history in the Vicksburg and Warren County, Mississippi, area.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,308,849,523,342.94. We've added $6,681,972,474,429.86 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING AMY C. PERKINS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Amy C. Perkins, who is a remarkable teacher and extraordinary public servant.

Ms. Perkins was born in Leflore County, MS on January 31, 1976 to Laura Perkins, a single mother who did not know the importance of education. Education was never really emphasized to her and her six siblings. Ms. Perkins older siblings were often taken out of school by their mother to work in the fields. As a child, Ms. Perkins was not fascinated by learning because it was never a requirement in her household. On the verge of dropping out, she was inspired by her 6th grade teacher. From that point on she knew that she wanted to inspire students the way that her teacher inspired her.

Ms. Perkins attended Amanda Elzy High School in Greenwood, MS. There she earned her high school diploma and moved on to her next level of education. She obtained her first teaching job at Leflore County Elementary School where she worked as an assistant for a 2nd grade teacher for four years. During that time she helped empower young students while working to become a fully certified teacher for the state of Mississippi.

In 2009, she started teaching as a certified teacher at Woolfolk Middle School in Yazoo City, Mississippi.

Even though her job was an hour away, she felt that it was worth the drive. She had an opportunity to teach and inspire. After two years, she got an offer to teach closer to home at Davis Elementary in Greenwood, MS. There she is currently a fourth grade Math Teacher.

With her fun and non-traditional teaching style, she empowers students to enjoy learning. She requests that the lowest achieving students be challenged to improve their state assessment scores. So far, this method has been a success. As an employee of the Greenwood Public School District, Ms. Perkins has received numerous awards. These awards include: Teacher of the Month 2012, a monetary incentive for preparing students for state assessment 2011; Teaching Parent of the Year; and also received an additional monetary incentive for hard work in the 2011–2012 school year. During that year she had only one out of eighty students to score below state standards on a state assessment in mathematics.

Ms. Perkins continues to inspire students both in and out of the classroom. She volunteers as a cheerleading coach for the Davis Elementary Cheer Squad. She strives to instill in them the principles of hard work, dedication, character, and community service. Ms. Perkins has overcome adversity and set a wonderful example for her two children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a Teacher Extraordinaire, Ms. Amy C. Perkins for her dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER WARHAWKS

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater's Warhawks, who won the Division III Football National Championship on December 20, 2013. The Warhawks, led by quarterback Matt Behrendt and Head Coach Lance Leipold, displayed a tremendous amount of grit, determination, skill, and athleticism throughout their undefeated season.

In a battle of two of the best Division III programs, Wisconsin-Whitewater beat Mount Union in convincing fashion, 52–14. The win marked the fifth national title for the Warhawks and their first since 2011. The Warhawks have now won 20 straight postseason games dating back to the 2008 season.

The success of UW Whitewater football has made the residents of Wisconsin proud and I salute the entire team: Jake Kumerow, Mickey Morgan, Tyler Huber, Marcus McLin, Zach Howard, Josh Williams, Ryan Givens, Nick McCullough, Steve Morris, Coleton Hrgich, Joe Worth, Chris Nelson, Justin Howard, Lake Bachar, Shiloh Weber, Jack Deichl Jr., Matt Behrendt, Tommy Coughlin, Zack Gehant, Ryan Storto, Shawn Shillcox, Dylan Morang, Andrew Keister, Joe Paulus, Chris Treptow, Booker Ross, Jordan Ratliffe, Bennett Young, Zach Mutton, JD Marconi, Dennis Moore, Nick Patterson, Aaron Williamson, Colin Buck, Robert Johnson, Brady Grayvold, Jordan Strasburg, Jordan Gruettner, Spencer Jacque, Zach Schober, Eric Kindler, Ryan Winske, Brandon Bebow, Cole Klotz, Bryan Spakowicz, Kyle Christensen, Justin Dischler, Kyle Wismer, Zach Nellis, Ricky Valadez, Paul Foster, Ben Threloff, Ryan Cortez, Jesse DeLorme, Yuri Pogosyan, Matthew Hoppe, Spencer Shier, Jamison Cook, Conner Peters, Eli Sloneker, Eric Trautman, Tim Regan, Harry Green, Austin Jones, Jordan Edgerson, Nick Froland, Nick Feliciano, Andrew Keel, Griffin Schaefer, Tyler Janczak, Johnny Wiederholt, Pat Suffield, Evan Kurkowski, Lucas Skibba, Joe Matuschka, Pat Costello, Weston Wegener, Nick Ryczek, Tony Koepnick, Cole Van Schyndel, Brent Campbell, Zach Koch, Andrew Fuller, Chris Davis, Collin Nolen, Brian Washington, Tommy Miller, Logan Solano, Derric Junakin, Andrew Mulshine, Mykael Bratchett, Kevon Clunis, Brandon Tamsett, John Flood, Marshall Rutherford, Ryan Kranz, Loussaint Minett, and Zach Franz.

Winning a national championship is never easy. On behalf of my Congressional office and my constituents in Wisconsin's fifth district, I commend the coaches and players at UW Whitewater for their hard work and dedication, and wish them continued success in the future.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE BILL YOUNG

HON. JACK KINGSTON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the late Bill Young. On October 18, 2013, America lost one of its great national leaders. Bill Young was a gentleman, a passionate advocate for the military, and a devoted public servant.

During his twenty-two terms in Congress, Bill was the number one cheerleader for our service men and women. He was especially concerned for their personal safety and health care for the wounded. In these times of low public approval for Congress, Bill was the exception. He was respected by all, and, more importantly, never joined in the partisan bashing that is all too common in Washington

today. He was a proud Member and executed his job with great pride.

When I was a new member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I was surprised by his offer to visit the military installations in my district. Though I was new in representing Warner Robins Air Force Base that year, having Bill come and talk to their leadership sent a strong signal that they were in good hands. Bill did the same thing for many other members regardless of party.

I was once returning from an overseas trip with Bill, and we were in Shannon Airport in Ireland long after it closed. We ran into a group of soldiers from the Third Infantry Division returning home. Their reaction to seeing Bill was truly heartwarming. They immediately recognized him, and came over to greet him and get a picture. I believe that the reason they admired Bill had less to do with his title or position, but more to do with how he felt about the military. They knew Bill Young as one who knew the capability of weapons systems, but always remembered the young men and women whose lives depended on them.

Part of Bill's charm was that he was well grounded, rooted in a loving wife and family. He was even tempered, kind hearted, and the consummate gentleman. He set the tone for the Committee and Congress as a whole. Bill will be remembered and missed by Congress, the military, and a grateful nation. God bless his memory and his family.

HONORING THELMA BROWN-JAMES

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Thelma Brown-James, who is a remarkable Unsung Hero.

Mrs. Thelma Brown-James was born on April 29, 1955 in Mound Bayou, Mississippi to the late James and Lora Brown. She is the youngest of three girls and four boys. Mrs. Brown received her education in the Mound Bayou School District at I.T.M. Elementary School and in 1973 graduated from John F. Kennedy High School. Also, in 1973 she married her high school sweetheart, Mr. Jessie James, and they were blessed with six bundles of joy: Teresa, Jessie Jr., Robby, Lashay, Lakesha and the late Lamar.

Mrs. Brown was employed with Baxter's Travenol in Cleveland, Mississippi for 18 years. After leaving Baxter's she furthered her education in the medical field and earned numerous professional certifications. She worked as a nurses' assistant and home health nurse for several medical agencies within the Mississippi Delta.

Mrs. Brown is a faithful member of Fresh Encounter Ministry in Renova, Mississippi where she volunteers with various auxiliaries. Being inspired by God, in January 2013 she opened the Goshen Event Center in Drew, Mississippi to carter to the needs of the children, and offer other activities to enhance the lives of the citizens of Drew and the surrounding areas. Her dedication to the service of others has made her an asset within and outside of her community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an unsung hero, Mrs. Thelma Brown-James, for her dedication to serving others.

IN HONOR OF STUDENT WINNERS OF WINSLOW TOWNSHIP VETERANS DAY ESSAY CONTEST

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the winners of the Historical Society of Winslow Township's Veterans Day 2013 Student Essay Contest.

These nine students, attending Winslow Township Middle School and Winslow Township High School, wrote essays answering the question "How would you thank a soldier for his/her service?" The moving prose of these young men and women is a testament to the patriotic spirit of the citizens of South Jersey. Moreover, these students' awareness of the sacrifices of our military and their families is precocious and praiseworthy.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to submit the names of the winners to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. From the 7th grade class: Mary-Elizabeth Jimoh, 1st Place; Jordan Frazier, 2nd Place; Morgan Chambliss, 3rd Place. From the 8th grade class: Kelli O'Neill, 1st Place; Deanna Paul, 2nd Place; Aliyah Jones, 3rd Place. From Winslow Township High School: senior Rebecca Hall, 1st Place; sophomore Joshua Hansen, 2nd Place; senior Amanda Wellik, 3rd Place.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate these young men and women on having their essays selected by the Historical Society of Winslow Township. These students have bright futures ahead of them. It is my sincere hope that they will carry this abiding respect for the military and service with them as they continue to learn and grow.

HONORING WOOLF FUNERAL HOME

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable funeral home, Woolf Funeral Home.

Woolf Funeral Home was established in 1940 by Henry Woolf in Tunica, Mississippi. After opening in Tunica and his determination and desire to offer outstanding service to the bereaved, he opened a funeral home in Clarksdale, Mississippi.

After the passing of Mr. Henry Woolf in 1958, Woolf Funeral Homes was purchased by Mr. Ben Brown who continued on the legacy of Mr. Woolf. In 1978 Mr. Brown passed and his son, Willie A. Brown, a retired United States Air Force veteran and licensed funeral director, became owner.

Mr. Willie Brown's vision to make sure every family they serviced was special and deserved the best hours of their bereavement. He has, throughout the years, continued the establishment in the community. Woolf Funeral Home contributes and participates in numerous community and charitable organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Woolf Funeral Home for their dedication in being an outstanding establishment in the cities of Clarksdale and Tunica and the Counties of Coahoma and Tunica, Mississippi.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. RICK CASE FOLLOWING THE RECENT GRAND OPENING OF RICK CASE VOLKSWAGEN

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to recognize Mr. Rick Case following the recent grand opening of his Volkswagen dealership in Davie, Florida, as well as for the many contributions that his family of auto dealerships has made to the local community and state's economy as a whole. The new Volkswagen dealership is Mr. Case's fifth addition to the area known as "Davie/Weston auto row," and creates 200 new jobs, including sales staff, service technicians, and receptionists.

At eight stories high and 328,000 square feet, Rick Case Volkswagen claims the title of world's largest auto dealership for the German car company. Around 800 new and used Volkswagen vehicles are on display in each of the dealerships showroom floors. Furthermore, the new facility also features a service center, a cafe and lounge area for customers, and a floor for offices and staff training. Rick Case Automotive Group has 15 auto dealerships in Ohio, Georgia, and Florida, featuring a wide range of makes and models, and is expected to continue its growth.

Competitive customer benefits and employee training have come to be the hallmark of the Rick Case model. In 2013, Rick Case Automotive Group was named by Automotive News as its National All-Star Dealer for the Privately Held Dealer category, an honor received by only one dealer out of over 17,000 dealers nationwide. In addition, Mr. Case's commitment to his customers is matched by his dedication to the community. As a local partner, he has helped to raise millions of dollars for charities like the Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

The auto dealer industry contributes greatly to our nation's economy and that of our state and local communities. In particular, auto dealer sales represent about $47 billion annually. Florida ranks as the third-largest state in the country in terms of number of vehicles, the sale of which account for 16 percent of retail sales tax. Furthermore, there are approximately 850 new car dealers in Florida, providing tens of thousands of direct jobs and supporting millions more in related sectors. Auto dealers help many hardworking individuals afford the vehicles they need to access job opportunities and support their families.

Mr. Speaker, as our nation continues to recover from the greatest recession in recent memory, we should recognize American businesses that are driving job creation and economic growth. Once again, I would like to congratulate Mr. Rick Case and his wife Rita on the recent grand opening of their Volkswagen dealership, and wish them much continued success in the years to come.

HONORING DOUGLAS L. BRAGG

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Douglas L. Bragg for his extraordinary career of public service and leadership on the occasion of his retirement. Mr. Bragg is retiring after thirty-four years of dedicated service to the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), where he has served as Director of the Oakland VA Regional Office since October 2011.

Mr. Bragg is a Vietnam Era veteran who served in the United States Air Force from 1970 to 1973. Mr. Bragg began his career with the VA in 1979 at the San Francisco VA Regional Office. In 1986, he took on the role as a Veterans Benefits Counselor and also served as the station's outreach coordinator. He was at the forefront of the Regional Office's response to the Loma Prieta earthquake, as he was primarily responsible for the outreach efforts to victims of the earthquake.

He joined the Veterans Benefits Administration as a Supervisory Field Examiner in 1989. In 1994, he accepted a position as a Program Analyst in the Veterans Assistance Service (VAS) at the VA Central Office in Washington, DC, where he worked on the Foreign Medical Program, performed station surveys, and was a member of the VAS Business Process Reengineering team.

In 1996, Mr. Bragg went on to become an analyst for the Fiduciary Program on the Policy and Regulations staff. He returned to the field in 1999 following his appointment as the Assistant Veterans Service Center Manager at the Washington, DC VA Regional Office. During his tenure in this position, he was accepted into Leadership VA through the VA Learning University, the VA's corporate university for VA employees to develop leadership and other management skills, and graduated in 2002. He became the Acting Veterans Service Center Manager at Washington Regional Office in 2003.

In 2004, Mr. Bragg joined the management team of the St. Louis VA Regional Office as the Education Program Manager. He further developed his leadership credentials while serving as the Acting Assistant Director in 2007, completing the Leadership for a Democratic Society course at the Federal Executive Institute in 2007. He was accepted as a participant in the FY 2007 Assistant Director Development Program.

He served as Assistant Director of the St. Louis VA Regional Office from 2008 through 2011. He was appointed to the Oakland VA Regional Office as Director in October 2011. In this capacity, Mr. Bragg has had the responsibility of overseeing California's 1.8 million veteran population. From the Oakland VA Regional Office, over 127,000 Californian veterans receive benefits with the total monthly compensation and payment benefits paid at over $146 million.

Throughout his prolific career with the VA, Mr. Bragg has been praised for his strategy, strong leadership, integrity and compassion. He has worked hard to create opportunities for veterans, a critical commitment that we must continue to honor to make sure our veterans come home to good jobs and services that are necessary to help transition successfully into civilian life.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, Mr. Douglas Bragg, I salute you. I congratulate you on your many achievements, and I wish you and your loved ones all the very best as you transition to this exciting new chapter of life.

HONORING JIMMY DIXON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a hardworking and self motivated black farmer, Mr. Jimmy Dixon, who was born on June 12, 1953 to the late Colie and Anna Mae Dixon.

Mr. Jimmy Dixon was the 6th child of 12 children, a native of Copiah County, Mississippi and was born and raised on the farm.

Mr. Jimmy Dixon is passionate about the farming industry. His heart for farming stems from his late father, Mr. Colic Dixon, Sr. Even during struggling times for farmers, he and several of his siblings helped their father to build the legacy to raise cattle and harvest hay and plant corn, watermelons, okra, peas, sweet potatoes and other produce. They worked hard to acquire land and equipment. Together they owned over 300 acres of land.

Mr. Dixon went to Brushy Creek Attendance Center, an all black school and attended Holtzclaw High School and graduated from Crystal Springs High School, the first year they segregated in 1971. He joined the U.S. Army in 1979 and became a Military Policeman. He went to the conflict in the Persian Gulf in 1990 until 1991 and served in the Gulf War, receiving an Accommodation Medal Award in 1991 and retired in 1992.

Mr. Dixon is married to Marlene and they have three boys and one girl along with four grandchildren. He and his family attends Temple of Yah Hebrew Israelite Assembly in Terry, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Jimmy Dixon for his dedication and endurance of successful farming.

RECOGNIZING THE TIRELESS WORK OF MR. RICHARD A. JOANIS

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a great American who has spent his career working to help the underserved in our country—especially migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

Richard A. Joanis spent 33 years as Executive Director of Telamon Corporation, one of the nation's most successful nonprofit organizations operating federal programs. He retires on February 14, 2014 after 44 years of service to farmworkers, elderly and other disadvantaged populations including major program efforts in Head Start, adult and youth training and employment, home ownership, housing rehabilitation, and homeless services.

Mr. Joanis' more than three decade career at Telamon allowed him the opportunity to serve in many capacities on behalf of those to whom he gave voice.

He served on the U.S. Department of Labor's National Advisory Committee on services to migrant and seasonal farmworkers and also was a member of the Agricultural Employment Work Group set up by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Labor. Mr. Joanis was former president of the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, a national federation of farmworker services organizations, now in its 42nd year.

At Telemon Corporation, Mr. Joanis built the organization from a one-state operation into a nationally recognized multi-disciplinary nonprofit organization serving America's migrant and seasonal farmworkers, children, youth and the rural poor in eleven states.

In 2004, in recognition of his accomplishments, Mr. Joanis was inducted into the Order of the Long Leaf Pine in my great state of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joanis has spent his career building hope, helping others see their inherent potential, and positively impacting countless lives by creating an upward trajectory for people around the nation. Mr. Joanis answered the nation's calling to assist its citizens when they are most in need.

Through his efforts on behalf of disadvantaged Americans, Mr. Joanis demonstrated that as citizens we are at our best when we are engaged in service to others, especially when that service leads to the empowerment of our fellow citizens and the improvement of our communities.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and thanking Mr. Joanis for his tireless work on behalf of those who are less fortunate.

HONORING MAUDE L. WILLIAMS BALLOU

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mrs. Maude L. Williams Ballou, who was born in Fairhope, Alabama, and raised in Mobile. She received a Bachelor of Science in business administration in 1947 from Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. After marrying music instructor, Leonard Ballou, she and her husband relocated to Montgomery, Alabama in 1952. Mrs. Ballou met Jo Ann Robinson before the start of the bus boycott and talked with her about how to obtain better conditions for blacks in Montogmery.

After Martin Luther King's election as president of the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) at the start of the Montgomery bus boycott, Maude Ballou became his personal secretary.

After becoming King's secretary at the MIA, Mrs. Ballou helped coordinate carpools during the boycott. She often responded on King's behalf to his correspondence. Mrs. Ballou accompanied Dr. King when he moved to Atlanta in 1960, staying with the King family and assisting him in establishing his office at the Southern Christian Leadership Conference

headquarters there. Mrs. Ballou left that summer to rejoin her family in Peterburg, Virginia, where her husband had accepted a position at Virginia State College.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Maude L. Ballou for her dedication to serving others.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE ACHIEVEMENTS OF GORDON B. ZACKS

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life achievements of Gordon B. Zacks.

Expressing how much Gordy has meant to Central Ohio and the nation is an impossible task. As a fellow graduate of The Ohio State University, as an admirer and as a friend of this remarkable person, it gives me great pleasure to add my personal appreciation and commendation.

Gordy served with distinction as an advisor, confidant, and friend of U.S. presidents to help change the political landscape of the American Jewish community and improve U.S. relations on behalf of Israel and its neighboring Arab states. Gordy worked with three U.S. presidents and five Israeli Prime Ministers, and his political involvement reached its highpoint during the Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush presidencies. Gordy declined an ambassadorship in the Reagan-Bush Administration and a Cabinet post during the Bush-Quayle Administration in order to serve as unofficial advisor and confidant to Vice President and subsequently President Bush. He met privately with Vice President and then President Bush on a monthly basis to discuss Israeli/American relations, the Middle East peace process, Soviet Jewry, Ethiopian Jewry, and the political landscape of the American Jewish community.

Blessed with true ambition, Gordy is also a brilliant businessman who catapulted R.G. Barry Corporation from a small family firm into an international footwear industry leader. He joined the Columbus, Ohio-based company in 1955 and became president in 1965. He was elected CEO of the company in 1979 and retired in 2004. He is currently the Chairman of the Board of Directors for the company. Today, R.G. Barry is the world's largest marketer and supplier of at-and-around-the-home comfort footwear for men, women and children, under the brand name of Dearfoams.

Gordy's book Defining Moments—Stories of Character, Courage, and Leadership profiles remarkable leaders who have made the world a better place. Gordan Zacks has built his own legacy of leadership and integrity—the benefits of which have accrued to his family, his friends and all those who are privileged to know him.

On behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 12th Congressional District, I would like to thank Gordy for his devotion to the great state of Ohio and to all of the communities that have benefitted from his invaluable contributions.

RESOLUTION TO COMMEMORATE PAM TRUSDALE'S 15TH ANNIVERSARY AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TRAILER MANUFACTURERS

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent and friend, Pam Trusdale, on the occasion of her 15th anniversary as Executive Director of the National Association of Trailer Manufacturers. From NATM's headquarters in my Congressional District in Topeka, Kansas, Pam leads advocacy, outreach and safety-promotion efforts on behalf of the light and medium duty trailer industry, one that is responsible for hundreds of thousands of American jobs and several billion dollars of positive economic output.

The great work NATM does on behalf of its members and the industry at large would certainly not be possible without Pam's 15 years of leadership and vision. When she joined the organization in 1998, it was a fledgling group of a handful of companies who joined together to better the industry's future. Since that time, membership has expanded dramatically and NATM's advocacy on behalf of its members in Washington, D.C. has, as well. Soon, NATM will move into a new headquarters building in Topeka in order to accommodate its growth in staff and continue serving its members.

Among the many initiatives in which Pam's leadership has been instrumental is the creation of NATM's Compliance Verification Program. Through the Program, NATM's technical staff visits members' manufacturing plants to ensure the proper procedures are in place to build trailers that are in accordance with federal safety regulations and best industry practices. Pam has guided the Program from its creation through a unanimous vote to make participation mandatory for membership in the Association. When consumers across the country see the NATM decal on a dealer's showroom floor, they know instantly they are purchasing a safety compliant trailer.

In addition to her efforts leading NATM, Pam has also been active in serving the Topeka community. She currently serves on the Board of Regents of Washburn University, her alma mater, and is active with the Kansas Society of Association Executives. She is also a member of the Stormont-Vail Foundation Advisory Board and past chairwoman of the Stormont-Vail Foundation Board of Trustees.

Congratulations, Pam, on this milestone. May you and NATM enjoy many more successful years.

HONORING JOHN T. HART

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a hardworking and self motivated 65 year old black farmer, John T. Hart, who just keeps on going.

Mr. John T. Hart, a native of Holmes County, Mississippi, has been a farmer most of his life, with the exception of some years that he lived in Chicago. He left Mississippi, a farmer and relocated back to Mississippi approximately four decades ago. If it was possible, one might say that farming is in his DNA. He is just that passionate about the farming industry. His heart for farming stems from his late father, Harrison B. (HB) Hart, who was one of the largest African-American farmers in Holmes County, even during struggling times for farmers. John Hart and several of his siblings helped their father to build the legacy.

Today, Mr. Hart still carries on his father's legacy through a successful farming business of his own. One of his brothers also has a thriving farming business. To work from before sun up to pitch black dark is the norm for this hill farmer, who has also farmed hundreds of acres in the Mississippi Delta. Cotton, corn and soybeans have mainly been his crops of choice over the years. This year, just for fun, he has added 20 acres of ''delicious'' watermelons that have become in popular demand by local and area consumers and grocery businesses.

Just like other industries, the farming business for Mr. Hart and others have had its share of blows. In a November 22, 2009 New York Times article by Shaila Dewan titled, ''In Mississippi Delta, a Promising Summer Washed Away by the Fall,'' Mr. Hart was one of the featured farmers interviewed for the article about continuous rain that had damaged farm crops that year for farmers in Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, eastern Arkansas, and parts of Louisiana. ''You just keep going,'' Hart is quoted saying in the article.

Mr. Hart is also a cattle rancher. Yes, the man who has turned dirt for decades also raises cattle. He owns a herd of cattle from good stock. How does he do it all with only the help of two farm hands? Only God knows.

Although the Mississippi farming business has seen its share of ups and downs, Mr. Hart still remains steadfast to his passion even though at 65 he could be sitting on the beautiful front porch of their ranch house with his wife, Prince Ella Edwards Hart, of 44 years, looking out over the horizon of land God has blessed them with.

Mr. Hart is a graduate of Tchula Attendance Center (now, S.V. Marshall High School). He and his wife, a retiree in the medical arena, have three adult children and three grandchildren.

Will this be the year Mr. Hart brings all of his farm's heavy equipment out of the fields for good, recline in that chair beside his devoted wife and friends on that front porch? Who knows?

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. John T. Hart for his impeccable dedication and endurance of successful farming.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the District of Columbia Paperwork Reduction Act, to eliminate the wasteful congressional review process for legislation passed by

the District of Columbia Council and to align longtime congressional practice and the law. The congressional review process for D.C. bills provides no benefit to Congress, but imposes substantial costs (in time and money) on the District. Indeed, Congress effectively abandoned the congressional review process as a mechanism for overturning D.C. legislation twenty-three years ago, yet it still requires the D.C. Council to use Kafkaesque make-work procedures to comply with the abandoned congressional review process established by the Home Rule Act of 1973.

The bill would eliminate the congressional review process for legislation passed by the D.C. Council. Congress would lose no authority it currently exercises because, even upon enactment of my bill, Congress would retain its authority under clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the U.S. Constitution to amend or overturn any D.C. legislation at any time.

The congressional review process (30 days for civil bills and 60 days for criminal bills) includes only those days when both houses of Congress are in session, delaying D.C. bills from becoming law, often for many months. The delay forces the D.C. Council to pass most bills several times, using a cumbersome and complicated process to ensure that the operations of this large and rapidly changing city continue uninterrupted, or in the alternative, the lapse of the bill before it becomes final. The review period, based on legislative, not calendar, days means, for example, that a 30-day period usually lasts three calendar months and often much longer because of congressional recesses. The congressional review period for a bill that changed the word ''handicap'' to ''disability'' lasted nine months. The Council estimates that 50–65 percent of the bills the Council passes could be eliminated if the review period did not exist. To ensure predictability, the Council often must pass the same legislation in three forms—emergency (in effect for 90 days), temporary (in effect for 225 days) and permanent. Moreover, the Council has to carefully track the days Congress is in session for each piece of legislation it passes to avoid gaps and to determine when the bills have taken effect. The Council estimates that it could save 5,000 employee-hours and 160,000 sheets of paper per Council period if the review period were eliminated.

My bill would do no more than align the Home Rule Act with congressional practice over the last twenty-three years. Since the Home Rule Act, of the more than 4,500 legislative acts transmitted to Congress, only three resolutions disapproving D.C. legislation have been enacted—in 1979, 1981, and 1991—and two of those mistakenly involved federal interests in the Height Act and the location of chanceries. Placing a congressional hold on 4,500 D.C. bills has not only proven unnecessary, but also a waste of money and time for both the District and Congress. Instead of using the congressional review process to overturn D.C. legislation, Congress has preferred to use appropriations riders. It is particularly unfair to require the D.C. Council to engage in a labor-intensive and costly process that Congress has itself long ago abandoned. My bill would only eliminate the automatic hold placed on D.C. legislation and the need for the D.C. Council to use a process initially passed for the convenience of Congress, but one that Congress has since eliminated in all but law. The bill would promote efficiency and cost savings for the District, and carry out a policy stressed by Congress of eliminating needless paperwork and make-work redundancy.

I urge my colleagues to support this good-government measure.

HONORING WILLIESTINE ''PEGGY'' LARK

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable unsung hero, Mrs. Williestine ''Peggy'' Lark, a woman who is truly worthy of admiration.

Mrs. Lark is a wife, a mother, a grandmother, an educator, a mentor, and a friend who exemplifies true womanhood through her virtuous lifestyle. She has dedicated her life to empowering the lives of her family and community.

Mrs. Lark is the third of twelve children born in the small town of Monticello, MS. She has always desired to pursue a good education and become successful in life. After completing high school, she attended Mississippi Valley State University located in Itta Bena, MS. Mrs. Lark was the first in her family to graduate from college. After receiving her degree, she became a teacher in Durant Public Schools. In 1969, she married and started a family there in Durant, MS.

While raising her children, Denise, Monica and LaRonica, Mrs. Lark instilled in them the value of being well-educated. She lived by example and continued to pursue her education as well. She received her Master's Degree in Education in 1979 and continued to further her education with degrees from both Jackson State University and Delta State University. Mrs. Lark was relentlessly involved in her daughters' education and committed to supporting them in their extracurricular activities. She also voluntarily took on mentoring children in her community as well as the students she taught. With her support and encouragement, many of her students have successful careers. Among them are her daughters—Denise, who is an elementary school principal and Monica, a high school teacher.

In the year of 1995, Mrs. Lark lost her daughter, LaRonica to a car accident. Although this was a trying time for her, she thrived by sharing herself with the children in her community. Even through her daughter's death, she allowed her daughter to become an organ donor and donated her heart.

Today, Mrs. Lark is active in her grandchildren's education and encourages them to volunteer in their schools and community. Her grandchildren are honor students—one of who has graduated from high school attends college on scholarship, with an ACT score of 25. Her grandson and two granddaughters volunteer every summer in programs for youth.

Mrs. Lark is retired from teaching after 35 years in the Durant Public Schools system. She is presently the coordinator of the after-school tutorial program at the Community Students Learning Center in Lexington, MS, where she teaches and inspires children from her ''heart''. She can often be found voluntarily transporting community children to summer programs and activities throughout the community.

In Mrs. Lark's personal time, she often opens up her home to mentor, tutor, feed, and reward children for their achievements. She is also a devoted Christian and Sunday school teacher. She loves to help children learn, be creative, and feel good about themselves.

There is nothing more picturesque than the smile that Mrs. Lark wears for each child's accomplishments. She has the gift of making people feel good about themselves and finds the time to teach and inspire those around her, giving others the ability to wear that same smile that she wears everyday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an unsung hero, Mrs. Williestine ''Peggy'' Lark, for her dedication to serving others.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE SMITH-LEVER ACT, THE FOUNDING LEGISLATION OF THE NATIONWIDE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SYSTEM

HON. BILL FLORES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, whereas May 8, 2014 marks the centennial of the signing of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which established Cooperative Extension, the nationwide transformational education system operating through land-grant universities in partnership with federal, state and local governments.

Whereas U.S. Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia and U.S. Representative A. F. Lever of South Carolina authored the Smith-Lever Act to expand the ''vocational, agricultural and home demonstration programs in rural America'' by bringing the research-based knowledge of the land-grant universities to people where they live and work.

Whereas Cooperative Extension is a critical component of the three-part land-grant university mission and works collaboratively with research, particularly the Agricultural Experiment Station System, and academic programs in 106 colleges and universities; including historically black, Native American and Hispanic-serving institutions; in all 50 states, the District of Columbia and six U.S. territories to reach traditional and underserved audiences in all communities.

Whereas the Cooperative Extension System continues to receive federal programmatic leadership and support enabled by the Smith Lever Act and other legislation through the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Institute of Food and Agriculture.

Whereas Cooperative Extension's research-based education for farmers and ranchers helped establish the United States as a leading agricultural-producing nation in the world.

Whereas since 1924, when the clover emblem was adopted by USDA to represent 4-H, Cooperative Extension's nationwide youth development program has reached millions of youth and helped prepare them for responsible adulthood.

Whereas Cooperative Extension prepares people for healthy, productive lives through sustained education, such as the Expanded

Food and Nutrition Education Program, breaking the cycle of poverty and reducing expenditures for federal and state assistance programs.

Whereas Cooperative Extension provides rapid response to disasters and emergencies through the Extension Disaster Education Network and other similar efforts by providing real-time alerts and resources so Extension educators can respond to urgent needs resulting from hurricanes, floods, oil spills, fire, drought, pest outbreaks and infectious diseases affecting humans, livestock and crops.

Whereas Cooperative Extension translates science-based research for practical application through local and online learning networks where educators are uniquely available to identify emerging research questions, connect with land-grant university faculty to find answers and encourage application of findings to improve economic and social conditions.

Whereas Cooperative Extension engages with rural and urban learners through practical, community-based and online approaches, resulting in the acquisition of knowledge, skills and motivation to strengthen the profitability of animal and plant production systems, protect natural resources, help people make healthful lifestyle choices, ensure a safe and abundant food supply, encourage community vitality and grow the next generation of leaders.

Whereas many states and land-grant institutions are celebrating and commemorating the centennial of the signing of the historic Act.

Therefore, be it resolved, that the United States House of Representatives:

Recognizes the significance of the Smith-Lever Act to the establishment of Cooperative Extension nationwide.

Encourages the people of the United States to observe and celebrate the centennial with a focus on launching an innovative and sustainable future for Cooperative Extension.

Honors the university faculty and local educators who dedicate careers to providing trusted education to help people, families, youth, businesses and communities solve problems, develop skills and build a better future.

Expresses its appreciation to Cooperative Extension volunteers who provide thousands of hours to promote excellence for 4-H, Master Gardeners, family and consumer sciences and other programs in their communities.

Encourages the continued collaboration and cooperation among federal, state and local governments to ensure Cooperative Extension's sustainability as the nation's premiere nonformal educational network.

Celebrates the millions of youth, adults, families, farmers, ranchers, community leaders and others who engage in Cooperative Extension learning opportunities designed to extend knowledge and change lives.

HONORING ROGERS BENJAMIN MORRIS, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable farmer and hero, Mr. Rogers Benjamin Morris, Sr., who is a resident of Mound Bayou, MS.

His father, Mr. Ajax Julius Morris, Sr., was a fortunate man. His parents afforded him the opportunity to attend Alcorn State College, currently known today as Alcorn State University, during a time when most African Americans received very little or, in many instances, no educational opportunities at all. Also, his wife, Rowena Bell Morris, attended Natchez College. In 1974, after rearing and formally educating all five of their children, Mrs. Morris returned to college at Mississippi Valley State University and graduated with a degree in education at the ''tender age of 68.''

As staunch proponents of hard work and educational excellence, Mr. and Mrs. Morris worked unstintingly to ensure that their three sons and two daughters received the best education possible. Among those five children was Rogers Benjamin Morris, Sr., the youngest in the family. He was born on November 9, 1945, in the small, rural community of Winterville, MS, where he received his early education.

In 1964, he graduated as salutatorian from O'Bannon High School, in Greenville, MS. In 1968, he graduated from Jackson State University with a Bachelor's Degree in Biology and a Minor in Chemistry. In 1972, Mr. Morris received a Master of Science Degree in Environmental Health from the University of Cincinnati and furthered his education toward a master's degree in Public Health from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

As a youngster growing up on a farm, he learned what it meant to work hard and persevere; these qualities helped direct his career back to the family farm more than 35 years ago. Realizing that farming involves a lot more than the growing of crops, he taught his own sons farm work during the early stages of their lives, thereby providing them with experiences that cultivated and shaped their character, as well as careers.

In the early 1900s his grandfather acquired over 100 acres of land in Washington County, MS—land that has remained in the family for over a century. Presently, as a third generation farmer, he farms this land, in addition to over 600 other acres of crops in the region. As the owner of Morris Farms, he produces corn, rice, soybeans and wheat. He manages some timber and raises sweet potatoes.

Mr. Morris is a member of the Mound Bayou First Baptist Church where he serves as a deacon and chairman of the Board of Trustees, and a member of the sanctuary choir. He is also a member of the Shelby-Bolivar County Credit Union and a past member of the Mound Bayou School District Board of Trustees. As a member of the Bolivar County Farm Bureau and Delta Council of Mississippi, he has an opportunity to communicate the needs of farmers to all political and apiculture leaders. He is the assistant secretary of the National Black Growers Council, an organization that defines its mission as, ''We simply love farming''.

Mr. Morris states that ''We smile knowing the food and fiber we produce feed and clothe the world. We farm on lands handed down from generation to generation. We constantly integrate technology . . . . The organization confers with industry leaders to strengthen their mission of improving the efficiency, productivity, and sustainability of Black row crop farmers.''

One of Mr. Morris' greatest concerns is the lack of job opportunities for young people in the community. Sweet potato farming allows him to employ a limited number of persons in planting and harvesting.

In June of 2007 a reporter, Carol Guzy, shadowed Mr. Morris for a day on the farm and he was featured in an article in the Washington Post newspaper which detailed the plight of small Black farmers. On July 12–14, 2012, he was selected to present on the African American Farmers' Panel at the Urban-Ag Academy conference in Des Moines, IA.

Mr. Morris has been married to Mrs. DeVoyce Morris for 44 years and they are the proud parents of four adult sons, Rogers Benjamin Morris, Jr., Jeremy Kyle, Justin and Bertrand. They are gracious grandparents of three granddaughters, Jordan, Sydnee and Nia Marie and one grandson, Kyle Rogers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing farmer, Mr. Roger Morris for his dedication in agriculture.

TO RECOGNIZE SHUJI MARUYAMA SENSEI

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the House is pleased to recognize Shuji Maruyama Sensei, the founder of Kokikai Aikido, on the 45th anniversary of the introduction of Aikido to the greater Philadelphia region. Mr. Maruyama, who is acknowledged as one of the world's greatest living martial artists, brought Aikido to the United States 45 years ago. Now, at the age when most men are considering retirement, Shuji continues to educate his students and lead Kokikai Aidido on a successful path in the U.S. It is understood that this self-defense training system provides personal realization and ethical self-defense. The students of Aikido learn that as they become stronger, a peaceful resolution of conflict becomes more, not less, possible. So on this special anniversary, I am pleased to acknowledge Mr. Maruyama's personal achievements and the beneficial role Kokikai Aikido has played in enriching the lives of men and women in Bucks County, Pennsylvania and the United States.

HONORING JERRY L. SMITH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Jerry L. Smith, who is a remarkable Small Black Farmer, Businessman and public servant.

Mr. Jerry L. Smith was born in Leflore County, Mississippi on August 29, 1961 to Emma Lee and Elone Smith, Sr. He is the 7th child of twelve.

Mr. Smith attended Amanda Elzy High School. He was reared on a farm with his family. He and his brothers helped his father to farm part-time until their father decided to stop. He and his brothers took over the farming business and started the Smith's Brother Farm in the early 1980's. Later one of Mr. Smith's brothers was killed and one became disabled. He then continued the farming business under the present name Smith's Farm.

Well known for his early start of hard work, Mr. Smith started working as a city landscaper in Sidon, MS when he was still in high school under the leadership of Mr. Alford. His next job was with Leflore County Road Department in 1979 where he is presently employed now as County Road Manager.

Mr. Smith has served in many capacities contributing to this society. He served 10 years on the Leflore County United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Board. He currently serves on the Deacon and Trustee Board at Bell Chapel M.B. Church, on the Leflore County Sheriff Department, a Sidon Board Alderman, Yazoo Levy Board, Sidon Volunteer Fire Chief, and self-employed small farmer. As a farmer he has produced cotton, soybeans, and wheat.

Mr. Smith is married to the former Joyce Marie Thomas and they are the proud parents of Jeremy Smith and Jayla Smith.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a Small Business Farmer Extraordinaire, Mr. Jerry L. Smith, for his dedication to serving others and giving back to his communities by producing crops through his farming business.

THE RETIREMENT OF WAYNE S. BROWN

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of Wayne S. Brown, the Director of Music and Opera at the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), who is stepping down from his position this week. Mr. Brown is a well-loved and integral part of the NEA, and both he and his record of accomplishments will be greatly missed.

The NEA recognizes and supports a wide range of music, from classical to contemporary, including America's native art form: jazz. It works with performing ensembles and music presenting institutions to enrich the cultural lives of Americans. As Director of the NEA's efforts in this area, he has provided critical guidance for countless chamber music ensembles; choruses; early music programs; jazz ensembles; music festivals; symphony orchestras and opera companies.

Mr. Brown has been with the NEA since 1997, having previously served as musical producer for the Cultural Olympiad in Atlanta, Georgia for the 1996 Olympic Games, and as executive director of the Louisville Orchestra where he has managed thousands of music and opera grants. He has also overseen national music initiatives, including the NEA Jazz Masters Fellowships, the nation's highest award in jazz; the NEA Opera Honors, celebrating individuals who have made extraordinary contributions to opera in America; and Great American Voices, which brings vocal ensembles from opera companies to our men and women in uniform.

During his time he has not only been an administrator; he has been a leader in strengthening the NEA's largest discipline program and its ties with the broader music and opera community. His colleagues offer effusive praise for his accomplishments, his knowledge, and his steady judgment.

While the NEA is sad to see Mr. Brown go, as a Detroiter and lover of music and the arts I am very proud to say he will be bringing his record of achievement to our city, where he will be the President of the Michigan Opera Theater at the Detroit Opera House. As Detroiters face great challenges ahead, I'm reassured to know that Mr. Brown will be bringing decades of experience to a city with a long and rich tradition of cherishing the arts. We are happy to welcome him home to where he first began his career in music and opera as an assistant manager with the Detroit Symphony Orchestra.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA ON THEIR 2014 FIESTA BOWL VICTORY

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Central Florida (UCF) Knights for their victory in the 2014 Fiesta Bowl. UCF is the youngest school to compete in a Bowl Championship Series game. Despite being considered a 17-point underdog against their opponent, Baylor University, the UCF Knights won the Fiesta Bowl with an impressive 52–42 victory. Since its founding in 1963, UCF has become a prominent institution capable of competing on a national level in all aspects of university life. This most recent victory is a milestone for UCF, and a great way to celebrate the school's 50th anniversary.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF GERALD BLACK

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of the late Gerald Black, former Pleasanton Express news editor and United States Navy veteran. Mr. Black served in the U.S. Navy for 27 years and contributed to the community through his distinguished career as a writer and as an editor for 19 years in Pleasanton, Texas.

Mr. Black was born on March 30, 1946 in San Antonio, Texas and passed away due to heart complications on November 23, 2013. His accomplished career as a news editor stemmed from his humble beginnings. His childhood was spent in Kingsville, Texas with his parents Raymond Elmer and Corrine Byrne. Mr. Black was described as a big hearted, gentle loving, hard worker. This reflected during his college years where he held several jobs for the local radio station, college newspaper, as well as a staff photographer. Soon after, he enlisted in the United States Navy, where he was stationed in New Orleans, Memphis, Atlanta and California. Throughout his time in the Navy, Mr. Black continued his work in journalism. Finally, in July 1993, Mr. Black came to the Pleasanton Express where he wrote feature articles and was a photographer covering county and law enforcement news. His work for Pleasanton Express would lead him to win several awards throughout his career.

His efforts were helpful to many, including the Atascosa Water Watchers, where he would often attend Evergreen Underground Water Conservation District meetings. As a result of his continued support of the Atascosa water preservation efforts in the local newspaper, he was nicknamed ''Mr. Neptune''. Finally in 2012, he retired after nearly two decades of work in journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this time to recognize the late Gerald Wayne Black, former Pleasanton Express news editor, on his career and community involvement. He has contributed his time, knowledge and efforts to journalism, our country, and serving his community.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Central Florida (UCF) on its 50th anniversary. Founded as Florida Technical University, UCF has grown to prominence over the past 50 years. UCF is now the second largest university in the nation, educating almost 60,000 undergraduates and graduates each year.

UCF continuously strives for academic excellence. U.S. News and World Report ranks UCF as a top ''up-and-coming'' university, while The Princeton Review rated UCF as one of the best values in the country. UCF is also home to world-renowned programs like the Institute for Simulation and Training and the College of Optics & Photonics, both of which are leading the way in their respective fields.

Under the direction of President John C. Hitt, UCF recently opened its College of Medicine in Lake Nona Medical City. The medical school, in partnership with other research institutions in the Medical City, promises to make Central Florida a destination for medical research. The College of Medicine joins the Rosen College of Hospitality Management, located near the region's most popular attractions, in providing specialized education to UCF students. UCF has become ''America's Partnership University,'' working closely with governments, nonprofit organizations, and industry to prepare students for their chosen careers.

UCF is also committed to achieving diversity and accessibility. UCF students come from all 50 states and 148 countries. The University's student body is comprised of a minority population of nearly 40 percent, and 10 percent of students are adult learners. To increase accessibility, the college offers numerous online courses, including 69 entirely web-based degree and certification programs.

Perhaps fitting for a university on the rise, the UCF Knights recently won their first Bowl Championship Series (BCS) game, the 2014 Fiesta Bowl. They are the youngest university ever to win a BCS game.

It is my pleasure to recognize UCF for its accomplishments over the last 50 years. I congratulate the hard-working faculty and outstanding students that make UCF a destination for our nation's best and brightest young minds. Go Knights!

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S35–S85

Measures Introduced: One bill and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1896, and S. Res. 329. **Pages S68–69**

Measures Passed:

Maritime Security in the Gulf of Guinea: Senate agreed to S. Res. 288, supporting enhanced maritime security in the Gulf of Guinea and encouraging increased cooperation between the United States and West and Central African countries to fight armed robbery at sea, piracy, and other maritime threats. **Pages S81–82**

Political Dialogue in Bangladesh: Senate agreed to S. Res. 318, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the critical need for political dialogue in Bangladesh. **Page S82**

Expressing Support for the Ukrainian People: Senate agreed to S. Res. 319, expressing support for the Ukrainian people in light of President Yanukovych's decision not to sign an Association Agreement with the European Union. **Pages S82–83**

National Science and Technology Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 329, expressing support for the goals and ideals of the biennial USA Science & Engineering Festival in Washington, DC and designating April 21 through April 27, 2014, as "National Science and Technology Week". **Page S83**

Measures Considered:

Unemployment Benefits Extension—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits. **Pages S37–65**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 60 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. 2), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S39**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, post-cloture, at approximately 10:00 a.m., on Wednesday, January 8, 2014; and that all time during adjournment count post-cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S83**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO) Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM—26) **Page S68**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Sharon Y. Bowen, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2018.

Eric Rosenbach, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

David B. Shear, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

J. Mark McWatters, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring August 2, 2019.

Janet Garvin McCabe, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Darci L. Vetter, of Nebraska, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.

Max Sieben Baucus, of Montana, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China.

Paige Eve Alexander, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

John Charles Cruden, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

33 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Marine Corps. **Pages S83–85**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S69–70**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Page S70**

Additional Statements

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S70–81**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S81**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total 2) **Page S39**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:55 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 8, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S83.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SYRIAN REFUGEE CRISIS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights concluded a hearing to examine the Syrian refugee crisis, after receiving testimony from Anne Richard, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration; Nancy Lindborg, Assistant Administrator for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Molly Groom, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, Office of Policy, Office of Immigration and Border Security.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 3811–3816; 1 private bill, H.R. 3817; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 449–452 were introduced. **Pages H19–20**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H20–21**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 724, to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles (H. Rept. 113–320) and

H.R. 3527, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–321). **Page H19**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Foxx to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Cara Spaccarelli, Christ Church, Washington, DC. **Page H3**

Member Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Melvin L. Watt, wherein he resigned as Representative for the Twelfth Congressional District of North Carolina, effective January 6, 2014. **Page H3**

Whole Number of the House: The Chair announced to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Watt, the whole number of the House is 432. **Page H3**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:03 p.m. and reconvened at 6:32 p.m. **Page H3**

Call of the House: The Speaker called the House to order and ascertained the presence of a quorum (316 present, Roll No. 1). **Pages H3–4**

Resignation of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives: Read a letter from Daniel J. Strodel, in which he submitted his resignation as Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, effective at the close of business on January 6, 2014. **Page H4**

Electing the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives: The House agreed to H. Res. 449, electing Ed Cassidy of the State of Connecticut as Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives. Subsequently, Chief Administrative Officer-elect Ed Cassidy presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. **Pages H4–5**

Committee to Notify the President of the Assembly of the Congress: The House agreed to H. Res. 450, providing for a committee to notify the

President of the assembly of the House of Representatives. Subsequently, the Speaker appointed Representatives Cantor and Pelosi to the committee.

Page H5

Notifying the Senate That a Quorum of the House Has Assembled: The House agreed to H. Res. 451, authorizing the Clerk of the House to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business. **Page H5**

Meeting Hour: The House agreed to H. Res. 452, providing for the hour of meeting of the House.

Page H5

Morning Hour Debate: Agreed by unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 3, 2013, providing for Morning Hour Debate, be extended for the remainder of the 113th Congress, except that H. Res. 452 shall supplant H. Res. 9 and the Speaker may dispense with Morning Hour Debate upon receipt of a notification described in clause 12(c) of rule I and notify Members accordingly. **Page H5**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, as well as his written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the Agreement—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–86). **Pages H8–9**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One quorum call (Roll No. 1) developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H4 .

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Committee Meetings

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing entitled ''The United States Government Accountability Office September 2013 Report—Compact of Free Association Micronesia and the Marshall Islands Continue to Face Challenges Measuring Progress and Ensuring Accountability''. Testimony was heard from Nikolao I. Pula, Jr., Director, Office of Insular Affairs, Department of the Interior; David Gootnick, Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection, to hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report on government support for bank holding companies, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of John Roth, of Michigan, to be Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of John P. Carlin, of New York, and Debo P. Adegbile, of New York, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, James D. Peterson, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin, Nancy J. Rosenstengel, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, and Indira Talwani, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, 10 a.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2279, the ''Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013''; H.R. 3362, the ''Exchange Information Disclosure Act''; and legislation regarding the ''Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014'', 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1845, Unemployment Benefits Extension, post-cloture.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 8

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the following measures under suspension of the rules: (1) H.R. 724—To amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles; (2) H.R. 3527—Poison Center Network Act; and (3) H.R. 3628—Transportation Reports Elimination Act of 2013.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E7
Brooks, Mo, Ala., E4
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E8
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E6
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E12
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E12
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E3, E4
Farenthold, Blake, Tex., E3, E3, E5
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E5, E11
Flores, Bill, Tex., E10
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E5
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E12, E12
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E4
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E7
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E3
Jenkins, Lynn, Kans., E9
Kingston, Jack, Ga., E6
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E4, E5
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E8
LoBiondo, Frank A., N.J., E5
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E9
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E6
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E5, E6, E7, E7, E8, E8, E9, E10, E11, E11
Tiberi, Patrick J., Ohio, E9

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.