United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 2014 No. 7

# House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*January 13, 2014.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

## MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

## TOUGH, PERSISTENT DIPLOMACY WITH IRAN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, when our country honors an apostle of nonviolence, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Iran will begin reducing its nuclear stockpile.

This important action is part of an international agreement to begin implementing the interim Joint Plan of Action that was announced in November. Hope for a nonviolent resolution of our conflict with Iran will appropriately advance on a day that honors nonviolence.

Some in Congress have been unwilling to accept these negotiations or to acknowledge that the administration has been successful in uniting other countries around the world in enforcing sanctions against Iran.

Indeed, in what appears to have been largely a partisan outcry, some of our colleagues condemned the November agreement late on the Saturday night when it was announced, without knowing what was in it, other than that President Obama had approved it.

As a Member, myself, who has consistently voted here to impose tough economic sanctions on Iran, I believe that these sanctions have worked. The choice is not between sanctions and no sanctions. It is between recognizing that our sanctions have the potential to realize our important goals and not give up on them without even really trying.

The Iranians are well aware that this Congress can act almost instantly to add even more stringent sanctions if they waver from diplomacy.

Can we trust the current Iranian regime? Of course not. That is why the painstaking task of verifying every operational detail of any final agreement is so very important.

If done with the thoroughness required, this is a task that may well take more than 6 months; but as negotiations for a permanent agreement get under way, we will have new, regular inspections to verify compliance, something we have not had in the past.

To prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, and to ensure the safety of our families and families around the world, a measurable, verifiable negotiated agreement is the wiser course over the unknowable, unlimited risk of war.

Those who would intrude on these fragile negotiations now only increase the danger of Iran becoming a nuclear-armed power. They would undermine the international coalition that has enforced the existing sanctions, and they would empower those hard-line ayatollahs, giving them a pretext to stop progress, giving that to the very people, who reject any cooperation and regularly demand death to America and death to Israel.

Congress must not impede the diplomatic alternative to war. Ultimately, that diplomacy may not be successful. It may not achieve a final, verifiable agreement; but we should make every reasonable effort toward that end.

There are no more important issues considered in this Capitol Building, undertaken by this Congress, than the questions of war and peace.

Just as I do not trust Iran, I do not trust war as the best way to prevent a nuclear Iran, and war is the true alternative offered by those here who would interfere or limit these negotiations.

Starting a war in Iraq cost us so very dearly, and it did not make us safer. Let's not repeat that deadly mistake.

Congress should commend Secretary of State John Kerry, Under Secretary Wendy Sherman, and President Barack Obama for their leadership through tough, persistent diplomacy, through the wise use of American power.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 p.m.



Printed on recycled paper.

## PRAYER

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

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

We ask Your special blessing among the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times, with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

In these days, give wisdom to all the Members that they might execute their responsibilities to the benefit of all Americans, especially those who work for less than a living wage and struggle to make ends meet, and those who would work but are unable to find sustainable employment.

Bless them, O God, and be with them and with us all this day and every day to come.

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

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

## ECONOMIC GROWTH IS NOT PRESIDENT'S PRIORITY

(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, on Friday the Bureau of Labor Statistics released the weakest jobs report in 3 years. In the month of December, the economy only added a dismal 74,000 jobs, less than half those expected to be created. Sadly, more people lost hope and gave up the search for a job, causing the workforce participation rate to tumble to the lowest point in over three decades.

The President's policies are not working. For 5 years, while the President has focused on expanding the size of government, House Republicans have focused on job creation of the private sector.

We have passed dozens of bills that will create immediate jobs, reduce regulations to allow small businesses to begin hiring again, and reform our Tax Code so families will be able to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks.

Big Government destroys jobs and causes more economic uncertainty for families. I hope the President and Senate change course and begin working with us so we can help put the American people back to work.

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

## TAXPAYERS SHOULD NOT FUND LIBERAL NEWS ORGANIZATIONS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since 2002 over $362 million in government grants have gone to fund a liberal news organization by the name of Internews.

The Business and Media Institute describes Internews as a liberal journalism nonprofit, and states that not only does it push a liberal agenda, but it also has helped create three other liberal organizations.

Why are taxpayers' dollars subsidizing a liberal news outlet? This is a misuse of the public's money. People need unbiased information so they can form their own opinions and make educated decisions.

One of the greatest challenges that democratic America faces today is a biased media. It is inexcusable and irresponsible for the Federal Government to give any of the American taxpayers' dollars to a liberal media organization.

## JOBS ARE THE BEST CURE FOR POVERTY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week we marked the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty. While the standard of living of Americans has risen in the last 50 years, the number of those who fall under the poverty line has remained largely constant.

In war, good generals adjust when current tactics aren't producing results. Yet we continue to wage war on poverty with the same tired, bureaucratic ideas. This strategy was outdated in 1964; it is antiquated today. The solution to poverty isn't aid programs; it is jobs.

Last week also marked one of the worst jobs reports in years. President Johnson said he wanted ''to give our fellow citizens a fair chance to develop their own capacities.'' My bill, the SKILLS Act, would streamline the Federal Government's overlapping and outdated workforce development programs and help put Americans back to work.

The SKILLS Act passed the House with bipartisan support. It is time for the Senate to take action on this vital legislation.

## PROTECTING THE HALLOWED GROUND AT GETTYSBURG

(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, it was over 150 years ago, on a battlefield near a small town in Pennsylvania, that President Abraham Lincoln gave what many would argue was one of the most prolific and inspiring speeches in history. His Gettysburg Address may not have been long, but his words lifted a Nation and shone an everlasting light on the immense sacrifice and patriotism displayed on that battlefield only a few months earlier.

Lincoln's words and, to a larger extent, the actions of the brave soldiers who fought at the Battle of Gettysburg must never be forgotten. Today the House will pass legislation to give the National Park Service the authority to incorporate the Gettysburg Train Station into the Gettysburg National Military Park.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's national parks, including Gettysburg, are some of our greatest treasures. It is imperative that we continue working to ensure that future generations of Americans can visit the history, the scenery, the vistas, and the landmarks of our Nation's national parks.

## IN MEMORY OF BERNIE ANDERSON

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

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of retired Nevada Assemblyman Bernie Anderson, who passed away Friday at the age of 71.

A graduate of Bishop Manogue High School and the University of Nevada in Reno, Bernie was a high school government teacher in the Washoe County School District. Also, Bernie was a colleague of mine for 14 years in the Nevada Assembly, ruling the Assembly Judiciary Committee with an iron hand for many of those sessions. But behind that iron hand and that gruff surface was a gentleman who had a heart of gold and was basically a loveable teddy bear.

When you talk about a life well-lived, Bernie checked all the boxes. His family, his community, students, constituents, colleagues, and the State of Nevada can all attest to the fact that Bernie was a good man. I am privileged to have called Chairman Anderson my friend. Nevada is better off because of his service.

I offer my sincere condolences to Bernie's wife, Clyda; their children; his family and friends.

Rest in peace, my friend.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

## AFTER RECESS

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

## GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK BOUNDARIES REVISION

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1513) to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and certain land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township, to limit the means by which property within such revised boundaries may be acquired, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1513

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

**SECTION 1. GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.**

(a) BOUNDARY REVISION.—Section 1 of the Act titled ''An Act to revise the boundary of Gettysburg National Military Park in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes'', approved August 17, 1990 (16 U.S.C. 430g–4), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) ADDITIONAL LAND.—

''(1) COVERED LAND; CONDITION.—In addition to the land identified in subsections (a) and (b), the park shall include the following, as depicted on the maps titled 'Gettysburg National Military Park Proposed Boundary Addition', numbered 305/80,045, and dated January 2010, if the owner of the property has provided written consent to inclusion:

''(A) The land and interests in land commonly known as the 'Gettysburg Train Station' and its immediate surroundings in the Borough of Gettysburg.

''(B) The land and interests in land located along Plum Run in Cumberland Township.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1), the acquisition of property within the area described in such paragraph, or the management plan for such acquired property shall be construed to create buffer zones outside of such property. That an activity or use can be seen or heard from within such acquired property shall not preclude the conduct of that activity or use outside such property.''.

(b) LIMITED ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—Section 2(a) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 430g–5(a)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period the following: '', except that the Secretary is authorized to acquire property within the area described in section 1(d) by donation only''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1513, sponsored by our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), would revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park. The park will now include the site known as the Gettysburg Train Station, the historic depot where President Abraham Lincoln arrived and departed via train in 1863 to deliver the Gettysburg Address.

Currently, the depot is owned by the Borough of Gettysburg, but will be donated to the National Park Service. However, the depot will continue to be operated by local or nonprofit organizations.

In addition, H.R. 1513 includes within the park a 45-acre parcel that has already been donated to the Park Service.

Finally, I would like to thank again our colleague, Mr. PERRY, for including important property-rights protections in his bill that allow the Park Service to acquire property by donation only and requires that owners be provided written consent prior to property being included into the park boundary.

With that, I support the bill and reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Battle of Gettysburg is one of the Civil War's most revered and remembered events. Over the course of 3 days in southeastern Pennsylvania, approximately 50,000 Americans lost their lives, and the battle turned out to be one of the turning points in the war.

This tragic sacrifice will always hold a unique place in our national history and story, but it was the eloquence and humanity of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address that has helped it endure for 150 years.

H.R. 1513 expands the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and a 45-acre plot known as Plum Run.

The Borough of Gettysburg plans to donate the train station to the National Park Service so they can incorporate this significant resource into their efforts to appropriately protect Gettysburg, its story, and its contribution to our Nation. By authorizing the Park Service to accept the donation, H.R. 1513 makes this possible.

This bill passed out of committee by unanimous consent. I am pleased that we are able to vote on it today on the floor of the House. We support H.R. 1513 and urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1513, a bill to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Lincoln Train Station which is an important part of our Nation's history.

President Abraham Lincoln arrived at the Lincoln Train Station the day before delivering his historic Gettysburg Address. The station also served as a hospital during the Battle of Gettysburg and transported wounded soldiers after the battle. The Lincoln Train Station currently is operated by the Gettysburg Convention and Visitors Bureau and is owned by the Borough of Gettysburg.

The Gettysburg Foundation and nonprofit partner of the park secured the necessary private funds to purchase the train station from the Borough of Gettysburg. The foundation will donate the train station to Gettysburg National Military Park, where it will be used as a downtown visitors center and meeting place.

H.R. 1513 also allows the boundaries of Gettysburg National Military Park to include 45 acres of land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township. This property currently abuts land already owned by the National Park Service and will be donated by the Gettysburg Foundation to the National Park Service.

The Gettysburg Foundation and Gettysburg National Military Park recently commemorated the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the dedication of the Soldiers National Cemetery. In addition to preserving our heritage, such historic preservation and tourism efforts remain a critical part of the regional economy. More than 235,000 visitors took part in the 10 days of the 150th anniversary events and contributed about $100 million to the local economy.

Once the Battle of Gettysburg ended, both Union and Confederate armies moved on, leaving this small rural town to deal with the bloody and chaotic aftermath. Citizens were forced to care for the wounded, bury fallen soldiers and animals, rebuild their town, and begin the process of preserving this hallowed ground.

Like the residents of Gettysburg 150 years ago, a group of dedicated individuals, 18,000 to 20,000 from across the country and across the world, have come together to preserve this battlefield and increase public understanding of the causes and consequences of the Battle of Gettysburg and its place within the context of American history.

At a time when Federal and State budgets are tight, the great partnership between the Gettysburg Foundation, Main Street Gettysburg and the Borough of Gettysburg, and the National Park Service has led to the construction of a new visitors center, the preservation of the Cyclorama painting, the restoration of the battlefield to its 1863 appearance, and now the preservation of the historic Lincoln Train Station.

This legislation simply is the latest significant piece of that puzzle. All interested parties are fully supportive of the boundary revision, and because the land is already owned by the Gettysburg Foundation and to be donated to the National Park Service no—I repeat, no—Federal funds will be used to purchase these properties.

This legislation is good for Gettysburg, the National Park Service, and the American taxpayers. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1513, the Gettysburg Battlefield bill. I would also like to thank DOC HASTINGS, the ranking member, and the committee for the unanimous support.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1513.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## PEACE CORPS DC COMMEMORATIVE WORK ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 230) to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 230

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

**SECTION 1. MEMORIAL TO COMMEMORATE AMERICA'S COMMITMENT TO INTERNATIONAL SERVICE AND GLOBAL PROSPERITY.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—The Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation may establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to commemorate the mission of the Peace Corps and the ideals on which the Peace Corps was founded.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—The establishment of the commemorative work under this section shall be in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Commemorative Works Act'').

(c) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PROHIBITED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work under this section.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF PEACE CORPS.—The Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the commemorative work under this section.

(d) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—If, on payment of all expenses for the establishment of the commemorative work under this section (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), or on expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Interior for deposit in the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

**SEC. 2. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 230 will authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia to recognize the foundation of the Peace Corps and the ideals upon which it was founded. The project must be planned and constructed with non-Federal funds and executed consistent with the Commemorative Works Act, which includes the moratorium for projects on the National Mall reserve.

With that, I urge adoption of the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Last November, we marked the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy's tragic assassination. Losing President Kennedy left a lasting scar on the American psyche, but his legacy lives on through his words and ideas, including the establishment of the Peace Corps, an institution that has sent over 200,000 Americans to 139 countries in its 52-year history.

S. 230 authorizes construction of a memorial to commemorate the mission of the Peace Corps and the values on which it was founded. I cannot think of a better way to celebrate President Kennedy's legacy and the tremendous accomplishments of the Peace Corps.

With the passage of S. 230, we will be sending a worthwhile bill to the President's desk. I am glad we have been able to put our differences aside and pass such a meaningful bill in the first few weeks of the new year.

Both Congressman SAM FARR, who sponsored the House companion to this legislation in prior Congresses, and Representative KENNEDY, who is the sponsor this Congress, deserve our thanks for the diligence in getting this legislation approved today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), a former Peace Corps member.

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us, S. 230, which would authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a memorial in our Nation's Capital to honor the formation of the Peace Corps and the thousands of volunteers who have represented our American ideals to communities around the world for over 50 years.

I was honored to have the opportunity to serve in the Peace Corps in Somalia, and I saw firsthand the contribution that Peace Corps volunteers make to the communities they serve. The continued selfless and noble service outside our borders remains a testament to the American ideals embodied by the Peace Corps volunteers I served with and those who are serving our Nation today.

The creation of the Peace Corps by Congress and President John F. Kennedy in 1961 marked a fundamental turning point in American foreign policy. The values and ideals of America were put into action to help meet the needs of people and communities in developing countries through volunteer service abroad.

When I was serving, we were taught that we were representing the American people, not necessarily the American Government. Therefore, I believe that a memorial to mark over 50 years of service by our fellow Americans that is paid for with voluntary contributions is an appropriate indication of the public support for all the volunteers that have and will continue to represent America in many different societies around the world.

The memorials in Washington, D.C., tell the story of the people and events that have shaped our Nation's history and our fundamental ideals. The founding of the Peace Corps was an expression of those ideals and will continue to inspire new generations of Americans to embrace the belief that we can and should reach out to uplift those around us. As such, I believe a memorial commemorating 50 years of Peace Corps history and volunteerism would be a meaningful part of the National Capital landscape.

I encourage my colleagues to consider this bill in the spirit in which it is being offered, as a privately funded commemorative effort, and join me in supporting S. 230.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the sponsor of the House companion to the legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this piece of legislation. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their diligence and their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor.

I also want to recognize my esteemed college from Wisconsin for his service in the Peace Corps and his dedicated public service ever since, and recognize my fellow returned Peace Corps volunteers that are on the floor as well.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation seeks to recognize the commitment not just of Peace Corps volunteers, but some of the core values and ideals of our country. As a returned Peace Corps volunteer myself, serving in the Dominican Republic, I got to see some extraordinary, dedicated American citizens working day in and day out in some very tough circumstances over the course of their over-2 years of service.

□ 1715

And of all of the memories that come up in my 27 months abroad, one has particularly stuck with me. About a year or so into my service, I was on my way back into Santo Domingo, the nation's capital, on a bus initially designed for probably about eight, but with about 20 people crammed into it.

I was in the second-to-last row with a backpack on my lap, when an older gentleman tapped me on the shoulder and asked, in Spanish, Cuerpo de Paz, inquiring if I was actually a Peace Corps volunteer. Apparently, I didn't blend in quite as well as I had hoped.

The gentleman explained that he grew up on the outskirts of Santo Domingo in a rural village that, at the time, didn't have any running water, and a Peace Corps volunteer arrived and helped construct an aqueduct to bring clean water to the village.

He, at that point, thanked me, not for my work, but for the work that that other volunteer had done decades before. He never asked my name. He never asked where I was from. He never asked what I did. He just said thank you; and a few moments later, the bus stopped, he got off and I never saw him again.

It is that generosity of spirit, that dedication to the ideals and values of this country that Peace Corps represents and that this monument will seek to commemorate in our Nation's Capital for time to come.

I am so grateful for the support of our other Peace Corps volunteers that are serving in Congress and want to thank them for all the work that they did to make this day come to fruition.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), a returned Peace Corps volunteer who served his 2 years in Ethiopia.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. GRIJALVA, and I thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor.

What is there to say? 150,000-or-more men and women from America have gone out across the world to give the very best of this country, the service, to assist in numerous ways, everything from teaching to community development and everything in between.

My wife and I were two of those 150,000-plus Americans. Our service was in Ethiopia. And it is hard to say, coming back from those years, what actually happened. But what actually happened is progress was made.

The school in which my wife taught now has computers in their school as a result of her work and the work of her students who came back 30, 40 years after they had graduated from that elementary school, to help in their school to carry on the tradition of service.

This particular piece of legislation would simply authorize an effort by a nonprofit organization to build a commemorative program here in Washington, D.C. No Federal money is needed.

There is a long, long process that would lead to the culmination of this, but I believe, having seen the 50th anniversary program here in Washington, in which tens of thousands of returned Peace Corps volunteers and young men and women that want to become Peace Corps volunteers, came to Washington to commemorate the 50th anniversary. So, now, a year and a half later, here we are moving this piece of legislation.

We ought to do it; and, ultimately, I believe that there will be a commemoration, some sign of a memorial here in Washington, D.C., that will speak to peace, will speak to the yearning that Americans have for peace around the world, for a better world for all of us, wherever that may be, whether it is in the former Soviet Union countries or in those developing countries in Africa, Asia, or in Latin America.

This is a good thing, and I am going to give just one more example. In the year 2000, a group of returned Peace Corps volunteers returned to Ethiopia and Eritrea. In the midst of a war in which some 80,000 Ethiopians and Eritreans were killed, that group of returned Peace Corps volunteers were able to speak to the heads of state.

The U.S. Government couldn't talk to them, nor could other governments. But it turned out that both of those heads of state were taught in their high school by Peace Corps volunteers, and they were willing to talk to those returned volunteers. And from those discussions came the formulation of the settlement of that war.

You never know where the impact will be felt, but I know it is felt in every country in which Peace Corps volunteers have served, and it is felt here in the United States and in this Congress by men and women that have served in the Peace Corps.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), another returned Peace Corps volunteer, who served his 2 years in Colombia and who has sponsored this legislation in previous Congresses.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for scheduling and for bringing this bill to the floor.

I am so proud that this bill is being brought to the floor by a Kennedy. President Kennedy appealed to the youth of this country with his inaugural address. I was a junior in college when he was sworn in, and that speech which has been repeated so much, of asking this country to think about what people in this country could do to help the country, rather than the government helping them, that call for action.

Today, 7,209 volunteers are spread out in 65 different countries around the world.

In President Kennedy's last State of the Union address, he said this:

> Nothing carries the spirit of American idealism and expresses our hopes better and more effectively to the far corners of the Earth than the Peace Corps.

That is as true today as it was in the sixties, and what is so wonderful about this moment of sort of history and the folks that play in it is when I went into the Peace Corps in South America, the nickname, because the Kennedys were so popular, particularly in Colombia, the country that I went to, that we were called ''hijos de Kennedy,'' children of Kennedy. That is what the nickname for the Peace Corps was.

And isn't it so wonderful that we had a child of a Kennedy—JOE KENNEDY is

now a Member of Congress—who is now able to carry this legislation. The torch is getting passed to a new generation. I carried this bill before, and I was so glad to be able to pass that torch to JOE. He is going to pass this torch to his children and other children, and we are going to keep the Peace Corps alive.

This commemorative that we are going to do here in Washington will remind the world that the Peace Corps is our best hope and chance for world peace.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, before yielding back the remainder of our time, let me congratulate the sponsors of the legislation, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HASTINGS, for moving this rapidly through our committee, our chairman, and to the alumni of the Peace Corps that are a part of this great body, and to say that this legislation marks an acknowledgment of this great country providing to the world its greatest resource, its people, their talent, their intelligence, and their drive.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, which was repeated by, I think, every Member that spoke on this piece of legislation, that this legislation will require no Federal funds. And when you think about that, from the volunteer standpoint of those that went overseas and did what they did in their missions, I think that this is fitting that we should establish something from the private sector that commemorates what they have done on behalf of our government.

So I think this is a good piece of legislation. I urge its adoption.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 230.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## GRAND RONDE RESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 841) to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 841

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

**SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVATION.**

Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to establish a reservation for the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, and for other purposes,'' approved September 9, 1988 (Public Law 100–425; 102 Stat. 1594; 102 Stat. 2939; 104 Stat. 207; 106 Stat. 3255; 108 Stat. 708; 108 Stat. 4566; 112 Stat. 1896), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''Subject to valid'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid''; and

(B) by adding after paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (A)) the following:

''(2) ADDITIONAL TRUST ACQUISITIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may accept title to any additional number of acres of real property located within the boundaries of the original 1857 reservation of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon established by Executive Order dated June 30, 1857, comprised of land within the political boundaries of Polk and Yamhill Counties, Oregon, if that real property is conveyed or otherwise transferred to the United States by or on behalf of the Tribe.

''(B) TREATMENT OF TRUST LAND.—

''(i) All applications to take land into trust within the boundaries of the original 1857 reservation shall be treated by the Secretary as an on-reservation trust acquisition.

''(ii) Any real property taken into trust under this paragraph shall not be eligible, or used, for any Class II or Class III gaming activity carried out pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), except for real property within 2 miles of the gaming facility in existence on the date of enactment of this Act that is located on State Highway 18 in the Grand Ronde community of Oregon.

''(C) RESERVATION.—All real property taken into trust within those boundaries at any time after September 9, 1988, shall be part of the reservation of the Tribe.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking ''in subsection (a) are approximately 10,311.60'' and inserting ''in subsection (a)(1) are approximately 11,349.92''; and

(B) in the table—

(i) by striking the following:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ''6 | 7 | 8 | Tax lot 800 | 5.55''; |

and inserting the following:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ''6 | 7 | 7, 8, 17, 18 | Former tax lot 800, located within the SE ¼ SE ¼ of Section 7; SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 8; NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 17; and NE ¼ NE ¼ of Section 18 | 5.55''; |

(ii) in the acres column of the last item added by section 2(a)(1) of Public Law 103–445 (108 Stat. 4566), by striking ''240'' and inserting ''241.06''; and

(iii) by striking all text after

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ''6 | 7 | 18 | E ½ NE ¼ | 43.42''; |

and inserting the following:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ''6 | 8 | 1 | W ½ SE ¼ SE ¼ | 20.6 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | N ½ SW ¼ SE ¼ | 19.99 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | SE ¼ NE ¼ | 9.99 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | NE ¼ SW ¼ | 10.46 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | NE ¼ SW ¼, NW ¼ SW ¼ | 12.99 |
| 6 | 7 | 6 | SW ¼ NW ¼ | 37.39 |
| 6 | 7 | 5 | SE ¼ SW ¼ | 24.87 |
| 6 | 7 | 5, 8 | SW ¼ SE ¼ of Section 5; and NE ¼ NE ¼, NW ¼ NE ¼, NE ¼ NW ¼ of Section 8 | 109.9 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | NW ¼ SE ¼ | 31.32 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | NE ¼ SW ¼ | 8.89 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | SW ¼ NE ¼, NW ¼ NE ¼ | 78.4 |
| 6 | 7 | 8, 17 | SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 8; and NE ¼ NW ¼, NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 17 | 14.33 |
| 6 | 7 | 17 | NW¼ NW ¼ | 6.68 |
| 6 | 8 | 12 | SW ¼ NE¼ | 8.19 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | SE ¼ SW ¼ | 2.0 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | SW ¼ SW ¼ | 5.05 |
| 6 | 8 | 12 | SE ¼, SW ¼ | 54.64 |
| 6 | 7 | 17, 18 | SW ¼, NW ¼ of Section 17; and SE ¼, NE ¼ of Section 18 | 136.83 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | SW ¼ SE ¼ | 20.08 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 7 | 5 | NE ¼ SE ¼, SE ¼ SE ¼, E ½ SE ¼ SW ¼ | 97.38 |
| 4 | 7 | 31 | SE ¼ | 159.60 |
| 6 | 7 | 17 | NW ¼ NW ¼ | 3.14 |
| 6 | 8 | 12 | NW ¼ SE ¼ | 1.10 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 | SW ¼ SW ¼ | 0.92 |
| 6 | 8 | 12 | NE ¼ NW ¼ | 1.99 |
| 6 | 7 | 7 | NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 7; and | |
| 6 | 8 | 12 | S ½ NE ¼, E ½ NE ¼ NE ¼ of Section 12 | 86.48 |
| 6 | 8 | 12 | NE ¼ NW ¼ | 1.56 |
| 6 | 7 | 6 | W ½ SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 6; and | |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | E ½ SE ¼ SE ¼ of Section 1 | 35.82 |
| 6 | 7 | 5 | E ½ NW ¼ SE ¼ | 19.88 |
| 6 | 8 | 12 | NW ¼ NE ¼ | 0.29 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | SE ¼ SW ¼ | 2.5 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 | NE ¼ NW ¼ | 7.16 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | SE ¼ SW ¼ | 5.5 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | SE ¼ NW ¼ | 1.34 |
| | | | Total | 11,349.92''. |

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 841 clarifies the administrative process for the Grand Ronde Tribe in Oregon to apply for new trust lands as long as the lands are within the tribe's original 1857 reservation.

The bill also deems property placed in trust for the tribe after 1988 to be part of the tribe's reservation and adjusts the tribe's Reservation Act to reflect several previous trust land acquisitions.

Mr. Speaker, in 1954, Congress terminated the Grand Ronde Tribe and its 60,000-acre western Oregon reservation. While Congress restored the tribe in 1983, the process of rebuilding the land base for it has been done in a somewhat piecemeal fashion, beginning in 1988.

H.R. 841 resolves a problem the Grand Ronde Tribe has experienced when it applies to the Department of the Interior for trust lands within its former reservation area. Applications for such land are considered under a set of ''off-reservation'' rules that are quite cumbersome.

The bill requires the Department to treat land acquisition applications under less cumbersome ''on-reservation'' rules. It does not, however, reestablish the original 1857 reservation.

The bill was reported favorably out of the Natural Resources Committee and has bipartisan support from the entire Oregon congressional delegation.

I also want to point out that the suspension text contains an amendment to the reported bill. The new language prohibits the Grand Ronde Tribe from gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act on all lands it acquires through the Department's ''on-reservation'' process unless the lands are within a 2-mile radius of its existing rural casino.

Within the 2-mile radius, existing restrictions under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act remain in effect.

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

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

H.R. 841 makes technical corrections to the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Reservation Act. In the past, efforts by the tribe have been hindered in its effort to restore traditional land within its original reservation by a very cumbersome and long process.

The bill would end the current two-step process that requires the tribe to take the former reservation land into trust with approval from Interior and then get congressional approval to be designated reservation land.

Also, the bill would allow the property taken into trust within the boundaries of the tribe's original reservation after September 9, 1988, to be part of the reservation.

Congressman SCHRADER is to be commended for his leadership on this legislation and his commitment to working on behalf of our first Americans.

H.R. 841 has wide support, including the entire Oregon delegation, and I urge its passage today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde, which I have the privilege of representing, was terminated by the Federal Government in 1954. At that time, they not only lost their Federal recognition, but also its original reservation of over 60,000 acres.

In the decades that have ensued, members of the tribe have worked tirelessly to rebuild that Grand Ronde community. As was stated before, in 1983 these efforts resulted in the Grand Ronde Restoration Act, followed by the Grand Ronde Reservation Act in 1988, which restored nearly 10,000 acres of the tribe's original reservation to the Grand Ronde people.

Since restoration, the tribe has continued their pursuit of securing its sovereignty by acquiring additional parcels of its original reservation and providing much-needed on-reservation jobs and services to tribal members.

Unfortunately, the tribe's efforts have been hampered by a lengthy, expensive, and cumbersome BIA process, as you have heard. After the tribe acquires a parcel of land in fee, the tribe must prepare a fee-to-trust application package for BIA. The BIA then processes this application, either as an on-reservation or off-reservation acquisition.

□ 1730

Because the tribe does not have exterior reservation boundaries, all parcels are, therefore, processed under the much more rigorous and oftentimes unneeded off-reservation acquisition regulations, even if the parcel is located within the original boundaries of the reservation.

I introduced H.R. 841 to correct this problem and streamline the bureaucratic process the tribe continues to face as it brings parcels of land into trust. Under my legislation, any property located within the boundaries of the tribe's original reservation will be treated as ''on-reservation'' land for the purpose of processing acquisitions of property into trust, and deemed a part of the tribe's reservation once taken into trust.

Once enacted, H.R. 841 will not only save the Grand Ronde time and money, which could be better utilized serving their community and membership, but would also streamline the BIA's land-into-trust responsibilities to the Grand Ronde, thus saving taxpayer money.

There is no opposition in my State by State officials or local governments, and CBO scores this as no cost to the Federal Government. I am proud to say that H.R. 841 has the delegation's support, the Bureau of Indian Affairs' support, and unanimous support from the two counties affected by the legislation.

I want to thank my Oregon colleagues in particular for their continued support and efforts to move this bill forward; and, frankly, I would personally like to thank Chairman HASTINGS, Ranking Member GRIJALVA, Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member HANABUSA, and Representative DEFAZIO for their assistance in moving this important legislation forward and the tireless efforts that their staffs have put forward, particularly Travis Joseph and Chris Fluhr. Finally, I would like to thank the members of the Grand Ronde who have been very, very, very patient throughout this whole process.

With that, I ask Members of the House for their support for this important bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 841, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1513, by the yeas and nays;

S. 230, by the yeas and nays.

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

## GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK BOUNDARIES REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1513) to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and certain land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township, to limit the means by which property within such revised boundaries may be acquired, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—396

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

NOT VOTING—36

Blackburn
Buchanan
Campbell
Carney
Cleaver
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Ellmers
Engel
Gabbard
Gerlach
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Jones
Kingston
Lee (CA)
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meng
Miller, George
Pascrell
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Simpson
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1853

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PEACE CORPS DC COMMEMORATIVE WORK ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 230) to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to

establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 7, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—387

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

NAYS—7

Amash
Broun (GA)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Palazzo
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—38

Blackburn
Buchanan
Campbell
Carney
Cleaver
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Ellmers
Engel
Gabbard
Gerlach
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kingston
Lee (CA)
Lowey
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Meng
Miller, George
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Simpson
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Tiberi
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1900

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECOGNIZING THE 111TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARRIVAL OF THE FIRST KOREAN IMMIGRANTS

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the tremendous achievements that Korean Americans have made since the first Koreans arrived here in California, in the United States, on this day, on January 13, back in 1903.

In recognizing this special anniversary, we honor the rich cultural history, the wonderful contributions that those Korean Americans have made to the arts, to science, to commerce.

Korean Americans are leaders in business and government and in the community here. They serve bravely in our Nation's armed services and have made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I also see the positive impact of Korean Americans on the U.S. Republic of Korea relationship. Last year, I was honored to welcome President Park when she visited the U.S. and made a special stop in southern California to meet with Korean American leaders.

Next month, I will lead a bipartisan delegation to Seoul to meet with President Park to reinforce America's friendship with South Korea.

Having chaired the U.S.-Korea Interparliamentary Exchange, I know well the role that those members of the National Assembly and of our House of Representatives played in establishing the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

So, in the months ahead, Congress will continue its work on issues that deepen the relationship, the special relationship, with U.S. and South Korea.

## THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in marking the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty.

When I was 20 years old, I went to work for the Greater Los Angeles Community Action Agency, which was the administrative agency for the war on poverty in Los Angeles. This experience helped shape my commitment for public service.

The war on poverty has had a real, lasting, and positive legacy; but there is still much more that needs to be done. According to the U.S. Census, roughly one in three Americans lived in poverty for at least 2 months from 2009 to 2011, one in three.

Congress needs to make sure that we are doing all we can to help Americans by creating jobs and addressing the structural causes of poverty.

Without a doubt, the war on poverty was more than a speech; it was a commitment backed up by public policy and resources to help Americans escape the tyranny of poverty. On this golden anniversary, let us return to this commitment in our laws, our programs, and our communities.

## THIS MUST CHANGE

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, Friday's jobs report was discouraging: 347,000 people stopped looking for work. One commentator said people ''simply gave up.''

This has been the worst recovery since the Great Depression. The President's policies, massive spending, a destructive health care law, a promise to bankrupt the coal industry, and a refusal to build Keystone XL have not produced jobs. They have, however, helped Wall Street and Washington elites. This is not fair.

One of my bosses in Pennsylvania 12, Laurie, emailed about her husband, who lost his job as a result of the war on coal. He took care of his family with that job.

She writes:

> Many other industries besides the miner are affected. It trickles down to the truck driver, the blasting companies, and even down to our restaurants and retail stores.

To help families like Laurie's, this House has passed dozens of bills to promote job growth. Unfortunately, the Senate has failed to act. This must change so that more people do not simply give up.

## HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF ASSEMBLYMAN BERNIE ANDERSON

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to remember Assemblyman Bernie Anderson of Sparks, Nevada, who passed away last Friday.

Bernie was a true public servant, not just as a lawmaker, but as an educator as well. For 32 years, he was a dedicated teacher and was recognized with the Teacher of the Month Award by the Reno/Sparks Chamber of Commerce in October 1985.

As chair of the Assembly Judiciary Committee, he was a staunch advocate for children and drug treatment policy that provided people the help they needed.

When asked how he became successful at his job, he answered:

> I try to listen rather than talk. I like people. I care about what people are thinking and how they see solutions to the problems.

We desperately need more people like Bernie Anderson in this world. He will be missed by many. My thoughts and prayers remain with his family.

## OPPOSITION TO UNESCO FUNDING

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, because UNESCO admitted the nonexistent state of Palestine to its membership, we were obligated, under U.S. law, to cut off funding for that anti-American, anti-Israel organization.

Yet some in Congress are trying to change these laws in the upcoming omnibus spending bill without giving Members of Congress the opportunity to have an open and honest debate on the merits of having our constituents fund UNESCO.

There is no incentive for the House to go against our principles, to go against U.S. law; and I will remain in absolute opposition to any proposition that offers the administration a waiver on this or offers a plan to fund, partially or fully, any part of UNESCO.

UNESCO knew what it was doing when it voted Palestine into its club, but UNESCO counted on the squishy Obama administration to fund the agency anyway.

Well, Congress should say ''no'' to UNESCO. We should say to UNESCO, no, you are not worthy of the hard-earned taxpayer dollars of our constituents; and enough is enough, Mr. Speaker.

## RECOGNIZING THE 101ST ANNIVERSARY OF DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INCORPORATED

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Brooklyn Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, it is my deepest honor to extend warm wishes to my sorority on our 101st Founders Day.

Established on January 13, 1913, by 22 young women at Howard University in Washington, D.C., the women of Delta Sigma Theta soon demonstrated their commitment to social justice, public service, and active participation in our civil society.

The women of Delta Sigma Theta worked to support academic excellence at their colleges and universities and to provide assistance to women in need.

In 1950, its first overseas chapter was established in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. The sorority currently has more than 900 chapters located in the United States, England, Japan, Germany, the Virgin Islands, Bermuda, the Bahamas, and the Republic of Korea.

Many very prominent corporate, public, and community leaders are members of the sorority, including the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the Honorable MARCIA FUDGE, who is a past national president of Delta, and the Honorable Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY of Columbus, Ohio.

My predecessor in Congress, the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, was also a member of Delta Sigma Theta. Her work as an activist and an elected official provides an example of the capacity of leadership that the sorority has developed in generation after generation of young, college-educated women.

To the women of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, Happy Founders Day.

□ 1915

## KILLER DRINKING WATER—AFRICA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the Sun rises each morning in Africa, Angelina gathers water for her family. But the community water well in Muyayano, Malawi, is broken most every day. So she and other women like her are forced to go 10 miles to fetch water from a polluted river, water that is bacterially infested with waste, parasites, and other insects.

Going to the smelly river is physically hard. But it is also emotionally hard because Angelina's 2-year-old daughter got sick and died from the bug-infested river water, a girl similar to this one. But Angelina goes to the river because she has no other option.

Every 21 seconds, a child dies from water-related diseases. By the time I finish talking, three children will die. This ought not to be.

Representative BLUMENAUER and I have introduced the Water for the World Act. This will make U.S. water aid more efficient, and it will be more coordinated. We have it within our power to fix this tragedy so that mothers in Africa don't lose their daughters to polluted drinking water.

And that's just the way it is.

## HAITIAN EARTHQUAKE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind us that it has been 4 years since a 7.0 magnitude earthquake devastated Haiti, killing more than 300,000 people and displacing more than 2 million Haitians.

Today, according to the International Organization for Migration, 350,000 people remain in impoverished conditions, squalid tent cities litter the countryside, and the nation deals with an ongoing food crisis as it fights a cholera outbreak.

As we reflect on this ongoing tragedy and empathize with the continuing suffering of the people of Haiti, let's reinvigorate our resolute commitment to Haiti's full recovery and its future development.

## VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

(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, under the Affordable Care

Act's employer mandate, volunteer organizations with 50 or more employees could be forced to provide health insurance or pay penalties. This could decimate the financial solvency of firefighting organizations across my home State and the country.

I, along with colleagues from the House and Senate, have pushed to have the Internal Revenue Service clarify this situation. Last month I joined with Pennsylvania Representative LOU BARLETTA, along with 30 other colleagues, on the introduction of legislation that would ensure these volunteers are not counted as full-time employees under the ACA.

As a result of these efforts, on Friday, January 10, the IRS announced they will not be considering volunteer firefighters as employees for purposes of the law. While the IRS announcement is a huge step in the right direction, that does not make the decision final. The devil always tends to be in the details.

Mr. Speaker, this cloud of uncertainty for our volunteers and the populations they protect must be removed. With that said, I look forward to reviewing the final ruling and will work to ensure there is certainty provided in a timely fashion.

## IN MEMORY OF VICTIMS OF THE HAITI EARTHQUAKE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. To my Haitian constituents, those of Haitian descent in Houston, Texas, and those around the Nation, I want you to know that we have not forgotten you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of the victims of the Haitian earthquake that took so many hundreds of thousands of Haitian citizens in a terrible, massive disaster. Nearly 4 years after Haiti's devastating earthquake, there is still too little transparency and accountability, with too much work to do and too many Haitians suffering.

As Haitian Americans are caught up in our broken immigration system, it is important for them to know that we have not forgotten their loved ones. There are close to 300,000 people still living in tent camps, many of whom are facing forced evictions. Although there was a great deal of sympathy and help, now is the time to be able to look to those who are still suffering.

Cholera has killed over 8,400 Haitians and sickened over 689,000; hundreds of thousands of Haitians have little or no access to potable water or basic health services; Haiti is facing an impending food crisis; and the children are suffering, according to local and international organizations. That is why I have supported H.R. 3509, the Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2013. This legislation will give Congress information.

According to the GAO, Congress lacks information on the amount of funds that have been obligated and disbursed. But Congress must do something. They are our friends and neighbors; they are our allies, and Haiti cannot suffer this alone.

As I conclude, let me thank the Congressional Black Caucus for the work that it has done. Without ceasing, we will continue to work together and work with this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the victims of the massive earthquake in Haiti four years ago.

Nearly four years after Haiti's devastating earthquake, there is still far too little transparency and accountability around U.S. relief and reconstruction aid efforts.

There are close to 300,000 people still living in tent camps, many of whom are facing forced evictions. Cholera has killed over 8,400 Haitians and sickened over 689,400 since it was first introduced to Haiti in October of 2010.

Hundreds of thousands of Haitians have little or no access to potable water or basic health services, and Haiti is facing an impending food crisis according to local and international organizations, and the government of Haiti.

That is why we should pass H.R. 3509, the "Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2013." This legislation, which I am proud to co-sponsor, will greatly assist Congress in overseeing U.S. assistance in Haiti by providing lawmakers, the U.S. public, and Haitians with key details on the manner in which U.S. taxpayer money is being spent.

According to the GAO, "Congress lacks information on the amounts of funds obligated and disbursed and program-by-program progress of U.S. reconstruction activities [in Haiti]."

Mr. Speaker, the people of Haiti continue to face tremendous challenges and still need our help.

That is why it is essential that we ensure that U.S. assistance to Haiti is delivered efficiently is more essential than ever.

## 2010 HAITI EARTHQUAKE

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the fourth anniversary of the worst natural disaster in recent history, the earthquake in Haiti of 2010, I rise to honor those affected and salute the strength and resilience of the Haitian people.

The earthquake in January 2010 claimed hundreds of thousands of lives and destroyed the livelihoods of nearly 3 million more people. Take a moment to contemplate the enormity of this calamity:

More than three-quarters of the schools in the capital were rendered useless, leaving young Haitians with little opportunity to learn and no safe space to spend their time;

A quarter of the civil servants in Port-au-Prince were killed, resulting in an overwhelming need for administrative service providers and security personnel.

Thanks to the resolve and hard work of the Haitian people, as well as effective assistance from the Obama administration and our international partners, Haiti has started on the process of recovery.

The fourth anniversary of Haiti's tragedy provides an opportunity to honor those who lost their lives and recognize the progress that has been achieved. It is also a time to reaffirm our commitment to help Haiti rebound, by insisting on accountability and transparency.

## WATER SCARCITY

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, with all of the recent reporting on snow and rain events, it is hard to imagine that water scarcity is one of the greatest threats from climate change, but it is. And water scarcity already imposes tremendous costs and suffering on some 1.3 billion people around the world.

A study published in the proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences combined agricultural and water models to gain a more realistic estimate of the impacts of climate change on food production. The results were not encouraging. Agriculture is our largest single use of water, primarily for irrigation; and it is irrigation water that the study's authors project will be reduced significantly, converting between 48 and 148 million acres from irrigated to rain-fed land.

There are substitutes for many materials we use but not for water. We must protect water resources and use them with care. And part of that effort must be to address climate change by limiting the emissions that are threatening our futures and that of our children.

Food supplies, human health, and economic and social progress all require adequate, reliable clean water supplies. We should act now before any more people are forced to endure water shortages.

## DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY, INCORPORATED

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Fort Worth, Dallas, and Arlington chapters of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, on their Founders Day for 101 years of dedicated service to our communities.

Founded in 1913 by 22 women on the campus of Howard University, Delta Sigma Theta is an organization committed to scholarship, sisterhood, and service. Deltas are committed to service and provide assistance and support through established programs like Delta GEMS, a program the Fort Worth alumnae chapter hosts at T.A. Sims Elementary School each month,

which works to empower high school girls. In Arlington, Deltas help fight heart disease through Zumba and line dancing as a part of the Go Red Campaign. And in Dallas, Deltas provide free hair styling for senior citizens at their Joy Woodfork Beauty Salon.

I applaud the Dallas/Fort Worth alumnae chapters and the thousands of Deltas nationwide for their distinguished service to our country, State, and the world, and I wish them many more.

## CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS ADDRESSES UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this designated hour at the beginning of this week for the Congressional Black Caucus, as it normally does, to come to this floor to bring forward issues that are very important to the American people. Tonight I join with my colleagues to speak about the importance of extending unemployment insurance benefits, growing our economy, and putting people back to work. So for the next hour, the Congressional Black Caucus will talk about the dire need for emergency unemployment insurance benefits and the fact that it is time for Congress to do its job.

I would like to thank my coanchor, Mr. JEFFRIES from New York, and our chair, the Honorable MARCIA FUDGE from Ohio, for their leadership and working tonight to bring forward these important issues.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from New York, Representative CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Las Vegas (Mr. HORSFORD) for his leadership and guidance during this CBC Special Order.

Today I rise to support the extension of emergency unemployment benefits. Since 2008, both parties have come together to provide extra weeks of unemployment benefits for our fellow Americans. These Americans are our neighbors, our relatives, our friends, and constituents who are unemployed through no fault of their own. They have consistently tried to find employment, having pounded the pavement each and every day but, unfortunately, to no avail. They deserve our help.

Unemployment benefits help Americans pay for their most basic survival needs: food, housing, and medical care. If unemployment benefits are not extended, approximately 5 million Americans are expected to lose emergency unemployment benefits over the next 12 months; and of that number, 383,000 are New Yorkers.

Failing to extend the emergency benefits will reduce economic growth by 0.4 percent in the first quarter of 2014 and cost our economy 310,000 jobs next year. Is this really another problem that we want to have our Nation face?

It is important to realize that unemployment not only negatively affects individuals and their families but also our economy, in particular, small business owners. The mom-and-pop shops that are the pillars in our communities suffer more when their customers cannot patronize their businesses.

Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics, has found that every $1 spent on unemployment insurance grows the economy by $1.55.

□ 1930

These dollars circulating through the economy create jobs. Despite statements to the contrary made by some of my Republican colleagues, no one wants to be unemployed. Americans want to work. It is part of the American ethos. It is also part of the American ethos to help our fellow citizens out when they are down. We all must remember that, but for the grace of God, go I.

I close by asking Speaker BOEHNER to bring an emergency unemployment benefit extension bill to the floor, and, in doing so, help not only our economy but, most importantly, millions of deserving and unemployed Americans.

Mr. HORSFORD. I would like to thank the gentlelady from New York. Thank you for your hard work and for bringing your perspective to the need for extending the unemployment insurance benefits to the 1.3 million Americans who, as of this week, have now lost receiving that benefit. This is the week that they would have otherwise received that unemployment insurance benefit in the mail. So this is real for some 1.3 million Americans who are struggling this week to meet their obligations to keep the lights on, to put food on the table and to pay the rent. This is the week. Each week that Congress fails to act, 72,000 Americans—additional Americans—lose their unemployment insurance benefits. One person every 8 seconds, Mr. Speaker, loses their uninsurance benefits when Congress fails to act.

That is why the Congressional Black Caucus is here this evening, to bring attention to this urgency of now. Every week, 72,000 Americans are struggling—additional Americans—on top of the 1.3 million who already, as of December 28, have lost their unemployment insurance.

So this is real, and the impacts are real.

I would like to go to the vice chairman now of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from North Carolina, who provides tremendous leadership to our caucus and to the issues important to the American people, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank you, Mr. HORSFORD, for yielding to me this evening. Let me also thank you for your passion and your tireless work not only on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus but on behalf of the people of Clark County, Nevada, and all of the other people that you represent in your great State.

Thank you very much for your tireless energy. I have watched you from the first day that you have come to the House floor, and you are, no doubt, one of the hardest working Members of this House, and I thank you so very much.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to urge my Republican colleagues to pass an extension of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program and to do it now. This program is a crucial safety net for those who are most in need. My colleagues know that I represent North Carolina, but what many of you may not know is that my State, the State of North Carolina, already lost its Federal unemployment insurance last year. Republican Governor Pat McCrory turned away $780 million in Federal funding to assist the long-term unemployed. Now, on December 28, a few days ago, 1.3 million Americans joined tens of thousands of my constituents in losing out on the support that they deserve.

This program, Mr. Speaker, is a response to the greatest recession since the Great Depression. In the last 5 years, President Obama has led our Nation back from the brink of economic collapse, but there is still work to be done. Now is not the time to abandon this program. 1.3 million Americans have been searching for work for more than 26 weeks, often after being laid off from jobs they have worked at for years.

The need for emergency unemployment insurance is especially high in communities like those that I represent in North Carolina. Double-digit unemployment still persists in many counties that I represent. In my congressional district, one in four people, including 36 percent of our children, live below the poverty level. Families in transition depend on emergency unemployment insurance to put basic food on the table, to care for their children and to search for new employment.

Last year, North Carolina Governor Pat McCrory dealt a devastating blow to the long-term unemployed by reducing State unemployment benefits. That reduction caused the Federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation program to literally dissolve in our State. Governor McCrory made this decision knowing its harmful impacts and that it would make North Carolina the only State in the country to end emergency jobless benefits for its citizens.

The Governor's decision is a disgrace. That decision forfeited—forfeited—$780 million in urgently needed Federal benefits for long-term unemployed North Carolinians and cost our State $1.5 billion in economic activity. The elimination of the EUC program nationwide now could cost an additional

200,000 jobs due to reduced economic activity. This is according to the Congressional Budget Office.

At the beginning of this year, Americans from all 49 other States lost out on their emergency unemployment benefits, just like my State did last year. Now 1 million families will struggle to pay their bills and provide for their families during their search for employment. North Carolinians have already seen firsthand how devastating these cuts can be. My constituents are outraged. They are outraged with Governor McCrory and Republicans in the North Carolina General Assembly who chose to abandon this program.

We must extend this program to give families a chance to get back on their feet. Democratic proposals to extend the program would give my constituents a chance—a fair chance—to receive Federal unemployment benefits held hostage by our Governor. Two times in the last 2 months House Republicans on this floor have nearly unanimously defeated Democratic motions to hold votes on extending this program.

Therefore, we must stand up against those like Governor McCrory who seek to disenfranchise hardworking people who are down on their luck by extending emergency unemployment insurance and other critical programs, a program which they have paid into as insurance payments for many, many years.

We cannot, Mr. Speaker, we must not afford to turn a blind eye and to leave those behind who are most in need.

I want to thank you, Mr. HORSFORD, for bringing this to the attention of the American people. I hope my colleagues are listening tonight because this is a sense of urgency.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I thank him for his profound remarks this evening and the call to action, not only for the leadership in North Carolina but for the leadership in this House to do its job in bringing legislation forward to allow us to vote to extend unemployment insurance benefits for the people of North Carolina and across America, who this week, now because of the failure of Congress to act, when they went to their mailbox to receive their unemployment insurance benefit, this is the week that they opened that mailbox and nothing was there to provide that bridge. So this is real, and so people are impacted.

This has been an insurance program that has received bipartisan support in the past, and there is no reason why this Congress cannot do its job to get this done now. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership.

I would like to now turn to the gentlelady from Texas, who brought forward and who raised the objections prior to our even adjourning in December, along with 170 of our other colleagues, calling on the leadership to not go on recess but, in fact, to stay here and do its job. We are where we are now, but we have raised these objections, and the gentlelady from Texas has raised these objections.

I would like to yield now to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) and Mr. JEFFRIES again both for convening the Congressional Black Caucus, under your leadership and the leadership of our chairwoman, the honorable MARCIA FUDGE, and to be joining here on the floor, at least to date, with our colleague from New York, our colleague from North Carolina and our colleague from New Jersey, which is clearly showing the vast depth of this particular crisis going from South to North and to the far western State of Texas.

Let me say to those who are presently unemployed, the 72,000 a week that occurs as we stand on the floor of the House, that you can count on the Members on this floor, the Democratic Members, the Congressional Black Caucus and our good friends on the other side of the aisle, to recognize that this is not a partisan issue but an American issue.

Just a few weeks ago, or just last week, in fact, I had in the Houston Chronicle an op-ed that said the number one job of the House is to extend emergency unemployment aid. The program will help the economy by creating jobs and boosting growth.

I think it is important to emphasize and refute some of the negative stigma that comes from those who misunderstand what the unemployment benefit—or unemployment insurance, let's use that word—means. It means that individuals have actually worked. They are working people. They put into the idea of having an unemployment benefit, and the United States Federal Government determined in times of bad economic times to continue the 47 weeks through an emergency relief.

By the way, it was supported by President George Bush in 2008 when he offered to say that these individuals have worked previously, they are looking for work, and they deserve to be able to support their families.

Individuals like Anetta Parker, who has been looking for work for 2 years, who is holding up the very letter that she held up at my press conference in Houston to acknowledge that this is a letter that many people are getting in their mailboxes. Not only are they getting these letters, but they are not getting any indication for relief, call United Way, call social services. I can tell you, people who work do not have a tendency to know the local social services, and they are desperate. They get a letter that they are being cut off.

In the midst of this I met individuals who are looking for work and said, I am now homeless because those dollars were allowing me to pay week to week for a place to live, a place to clean myself, if you will, to make myself presentable for work, to look for work, which is a requirement of the emergency unemployment insurance benefit, and they are now on the streets.

Not only are they on the streets, Mr. HORSFORD, but when I went home on Friday and sat down again at the career and recovery resources to look for or to talk with more individuals, many of these persons are veterans, because veterans are taught to suck it up, and they have not even, in some instances, attempted to get these benefits—to those who would say that everybody just wants to be on the dole. So beyond the unemployment benefits of 1.3 million, there are many others that we have not approached.

So it is important that this Special Order is done to reach to the other side of the aisle for the Speaker to put on the floor of the House an emergency 3-month extension of unemployment benefits, to not cast aside individuals who have been looking for work and to not ignore the fact that over this cold December, we lost 16,000 jobs in construction, we lost some 11,000 jobs in the movie industry, we lost jobs in the sports industry, and we are continuing to lose jobs because this month was a cold month. So the production of jobs was 78,000. Even though this economy is rebounding and we have had some other good months, this month, the December month, it was 78,000.

Don't you think that those individuals who are looking for work were rebuffed by the fact, or were blocked by the fact, that there were jobs that were lost?

So I would like to encourage my friends in the other body to quickly find a way of coming together. As my colleagues know, they postponed the votes today. I believe that some of the suggestions being made about pension relief for military persons may be a basis of finding compromise, but I think when we pit the idea of fiscal responsibilities and deficits against individuals having a roof over their head and children having food on the table, it is disgraceful.

It is equally disgraceful when people misinterpret the idea of what unemployment benefits are all about. As I wrote this op-ed, it saddened me, though I believe in the First Amendment, when letters came in response to the op-ed, and they wanted to ask a question: Why don't these people get a job?

□ 1945

Why don't we have a jobs program? That didn't disappoint me; I think that is a good question. But they didn't seem to understand that it was people looking for work who could not find work. It was long lines of people who couldn't find work. They want to work. So I would say to them, this is not a hand out but a helping hand. I expect to introduce soon a training bill that allows individuals who are on unemployment benefits to get a stipend to be able to utilize for Labor Department-designated disciplines of work, to

train for work that needs additional workers.

So it is not a stipend to go out to your local job-training setup that somebody set up. It is actually to have officially documented needs for the particular profession that you are training for. You get your unemployment benefit, you are not cut off, and you get a stipend for that training. That creates jobs.

But just to say let's pass various bills, like the Keystone bill, and that is the cause of no jobs is not accurate. But I do think we can support the jobs bill of the President, and we will create jobs.

So I want to thank the gentleman for allowing us to come and to be able to highlight that in the cold of the winter there are people on line trying to get work, and that were people on line trying to get work in November and October and September and August and July, because this young lady, Ms. Parker, has been looking for work for 2 years. She is a very competent administrative assistant, along with many others. Veterans have been looking for work.

So I would like to say to those I met with on Friday, we will not forget you. We recognize that you are deserving of human dignity and that you want to work, that you have worked, that you are not looking for a handout, and that the unemployment insurance is not a handout. It is an emergency relief for those who have worked. Let us have compassion. Let us have sympathy. Let us care about others, and let us work together to extend the unemployment insurance benefit to provide for the families of America.

I thank the gentleman.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Jan. 8, 2014]

NO. 1 JOB FOR HOUSE: EXTEND EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT AID

(By Sheila Jackson Lee)

Right now, 1.9 million Americans are experiencing an economic emergency, which will turn into a catastrophe for them and their families if Congress does not act immediately to extend the emergency unemployment program that expired on Dec. 28. Unless the aid is extended through 2014, nearly 14 million Americans will be negatively affected—the 4.9 million workers who will see unemployment insurance cut off and the approximately 9 million additional family members those workers are supporting.

There are some who believe that there is no economic emergency justifying an extension of the emergency unemployment program. They are wrong. Let them tell that to jobless veterans looking for a new job in an economy in which there are still nearly 2 million fewer jobs now than there were before the recession began. Let them tell that to the persons who know from experience there are more than three applicants for each new job created. The national employment rate is 7 percent and of these unemployed, the long-term unemployment rate—the share of unemployed workers who have been unemployed for 27 weeks or longer—is 37 percent, the highest it has been in 20 years.

Behind these grim statistics are the heartbreaking stories of real people—veterans, parents, seniors—struggling to get by on about $300 a week. These benefits, which the recipients earned and paid for through their payroll taxes, are needed to pay rent and utilities, buy groceries, pay for Internet access to search for jobs and gas to get to job interviews.

This is why the most urgent task pending before the House of Representatives is to extend the emergency unemployment program. To address this emergency, I introduced legislation last month, the Unemployed Job Hunters Protection and Assistance Act (H.R. 3773), that would extend the program for 12 months to provide the benefits earned by the recipients and avoid what will be a tragedy not only for those who are unemployed but also for an economy still recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression.

Extending the program is good for the nation's economy because it will create an estimated 200,000 jobs, increase economic growth by .2 percent and generate $1.52 in economic activity for each dollar expended.

The emergency unemployment program was established in 2008 during the Bush Administration and has been reauthorized several times as the economy continues its recovery. Congress has never failed to extend emergency unemployment insurance when the rate of long-term unemployment was even half the current level of 37 percent. And because of the emergency nature of the congressional action, the extension was not subject to any offset requirements during the Bush Administration. There is no good reason to impose any such requirements now; doing so serves no purpose other than to punish the persons who need our help.

Despite a slowly recovering job market, these unemployed job hunters have not lost faith. Every morning, they get up and go out or online looking for jobs. They want to work. They still have hope that things will get better so they can provide for their families. But they need the help that unemployment insurance is intended to provide.

Now is not the time to scapegoat those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. Now is the time to extend the emergency unemployment aid. At a minimum, Congress should and must vote to extend the program for three months while negotiations continue on a long-term solution. On Tuesday, a bipartisan measure that would do this cleared a procedural vote in the Senate, allowing debate to continue on the three-month stopgap. This is an economic emergency. It is time for congressional Republicans to work with their Democratic colleagues on the issues of importance to the American people.

---

TEXAS AND 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

64,294 unemployed workers in Texas lost their benefits on December 28.

11,294 unemployed workers in Harris County lost their benefits on December 28.

An additional 16,900 unemployed workers will lose their benefits in the first six months of 2014.

Employment Situation in Texas:

Unemployment rate: 6.4 percent.

Maximum weeks of benefits available now: 54.

Maximum weeks of benefits if Congress doesn't act: 26.

Reduction in benefits since 2011: −42 percent.

The current average weekly benefit is $338.59.

If EUC is extended in Texas: 11,766 jobs will be saved through the end of 2014.

Percent of unemployed receiving UI before expiration of Federal program—TX—29.

Percent of Unemployed Receiving UI after expiration of Federal program—TX—20.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentlelady from Texas. I appreciate very much you bringing to our attention who is covered by unemployment insurance and putting a face to who is receiving this insurance. I am glad you focused on that term ''insurance'' and the fact that these are individuals who have paid into the program, as they have been gainfully employed for some time.

Due to no fault of their own, they are in need of this bridge. Many of them are in training, and this initiative of legislation you are proposing to link job-seekers to employer-based demands is exactly the type of reform that our side supports and that we are willing to work with the other side on, but we need to provide the extension of the unemployment benefits while we work on those reforms.

Right now, the Congress has failed to provide this bridge, and you have documented that very well in your remarks this evening. I thank the gentlelady.

Let me highlight, as well, some of the additional information on who is covered by unemployment insurance benefits. This is according to the Department of Labor: four out of five beneficiaries of unemployment insurance benefits, Mr. Speaker, are individuals with children in the household or another adult in the household, typically a spouse; 44.5 percent of individuals who receive emergency unemployment benefits are households with children. So just think about that for a moment. This is the week that those emergency employment benefits did not come in, the $300 or $400 or $500 that they may have received to help meet their basic needs this month. That impacted not only that job-seeker, not only that unemployed worker, but also their children.

Half of the people receiving emergency unemployment insurance have at least some college education. So for those who continue to use this rhetoric of these are people who are lazy, who are sitting at home channel surfing, they don't want to look for work, half of them are people already with college education or some form of education; 36.4 percent have high school degrees.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, 50 percent, over nine in 10 live in households with total income less than $75,000 a year. This is the working poor of our country. These are the people who are striving to be part of the middle class; and, if anything, they are using emergency unemployment benefits as a bridge until they can get back on their feet. I also want to point out that 43 percent are individuals with income over $75,000 a year. So this economy has hit virtually every stratum of income level, and so that is why it is important for this Congress to do its job in extending unemployment insurance benefits.

I want to commend the other Chamber, the leadership, Majority Leader HARRY REID from my home State of Nevada, and Republican U.S. Senator

DEAN HELLER, also from Nevada, in large part our State, because we have unemployment at about 9 percent. We are tied with Rhode Island for the highest unemployment in the country, not because job-seekers don't want to go to work, because the second highest industry in our State was construction and because of the bust of the construction economy in our State, there are no jobs or there are very few jobs for those trades workers, for engineering firms, for architecture firms. I have one architecture firm that has had to lay off 70 percent of their workforce in the last few years because there simply aren't the jobs in the construction sector. Despite the fact that our economy is beginning to rebound, it is not rebounding in all sectors or all regions of the country. That is why it is critically important that this Congress do its job to extend unemployment insurance benefits for the 20,000 Nevadans who have lost them, and the 1.3 million Americans who have also lost them.

I now would like to turn to my good friend and freshman colleague. It has been a great opportunity over the last year to get to know him and the work that he does in the great State of New Jersey and the commitment that he brings to serving the people of his congressional district. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, before I start, let me thank the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) for his leadership through the first session of the 113th Congress and into the second session of the 113th Congress. I am honored to be one of the freshmen—actually the ranking freshman in the CBC, if I can take that liberty—but the gentleman from Nevada and the gentleman from New York have distinguished themselves in the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus in the first session of the 113th Congress, and I am honored to serve with them.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the 90,000 New Jerseyans who lost their unemployment insurance on December 28 and the 89,000 more New Jerseyans set to lose unemployment benefits in the first half of the new year.

The people back in my district can't understand how out of touch some of my Republican colleagues have become to think that cutting off this assistance will force the unemployed to get a job. Well, I have news for my colleagues: these people are not lazy, quite the opposite. These people are out every single day searching desperately for work, but the fact of the matter is there just aren't enough jobs for the amount of people unemployed.

It is up to Congress to pass a jobs bill to put these people back to work, but this Congress has not done that. Until that time comes, we have a moral obligation to help our fellow Americans out and give them the economic security that they need to put food on the table, to keep a roof over their head, and to pay their bills so that they have the ability to continue to look for a job.

Mr. Speaker, it is called insurance for a reason. These people have paid into this fund, and they must be actively searching for work to receive this critical lifeline. They might have paid into the system for 5, 10, and even 20 years to receive this assistance, and now we talk about cutting them off.

They are filled with anxiety as they compete against hundreds of others for a job. I know, I have heard their stories.

A young man by the name of Adam, an arts teacher from Montclair, New Jersey, who holds a master's degree from Columbia University, recently lost his job—through no fault of his own—because of funding cuts in education. Despite his best efforts, he, like so many others, has been unable to find work. With every passing day, anxiety for the well-being of Adam's family grows. Through no fault of his own, he finds himself in this predicament.

Another young man from my district, Jeffrey from Bloomfield, New Jersey, is now gainfully employed, but was fortunate enough to have unemployment when he lost his job. When he hit hard times during the recession, Jeffrey was thankful that he had at least some money coming in to make ends meet. In his letter to me Jeffrey wrote:

> I am concerned for my friends and neighbors who might not have been so lucky, who will be devastated by the sudden loss of income. The ability to pay for a roof over one's head and basic living expenses may seem a small measure of dignity, but it means the world to someone who has lost their job that they have devoted years of their life to.

So I urge my Republican colleagues and the leadership to listen to people like Adam and Jeffrey, to understand this is not about people who are lazy or who are sitting around or who are just biding time and taking in a stipend that they haven't paid into or deserve. These are Americans, your friends, your neighbors, people we all know, relatives, that find themselves in this situation. We must do something for them. We must continue to make sure that they can meet their needs on a minimum basis to keep them afloat until they can find a job. So I urge the Republican House leadership to listen to people like them.

Mr. Speaker, we need to put a bill on the floor that extends unemployment insurance right away; otherwise each and every week my Republican colleagues delay, more than 3,400 more New Jerseyans are kicked off unemployment and find themselves in devastating circumstances.

It is unconscionable, it is unacceptable, and we must as the Congress of the United States of America do something about it.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. Again, I commend you for raising your voice and urging this body to do its job on behalf of your constituents, the people of New Jersey who elected you to bring their perspective to this Congress. You are asking the same question many of us are asking, which is to our colleagues on the other side: Do they know what it is like to be unemployed? Do they know what it is like to have to look for a job day after day, week after week, submitting resumes not knowing if you are going to be called back? Do they know what it is like to struggle, or to look one of your children in the eyes and worry about how you are going to make ends meet? That is the reality for 1.4 million Americans today because Congress has failed to act. Whether they have been in that situation or not, they need to understand that is the reality for many Americans.

I thank you for your comments and for being here during this Special Order hour on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I commend you for your hard work.

Mr. Speaker, the reality of the situation is significant for many.

□ 2000

Like my colleagues last week, I went to a local work center in my district, Workforce Connections, to talk with and meet with a group of workers, job seekers, people who were looking for work. When I walked into the center, the one-stop center where everybody looks for the jobs on the job board was packed. There was a waiting list to get in in order to get onto a computer to search for jobs.

I talked to one unemployed worker. Her name is Alfordeen. I want to just share a bit of her story with you because it hit me that this is who I am fighting for. She is one of those 20,000 Nevadans affected by the expiration of her unemployment insurance.

She worked for 20 years doing patient admissions for a local medical facility in southern Nevada. She was laid off in 2012, which resulted in her losing her health insurance. Unfortunately, she was later diagnosed with breast cancer and has been living with one of her children while she trains to become certified to get another job. Alfordeen is using her remaining unemployment insurance benefits to cover some of her medical costs, and she just found out recently, fortunately, that she qualifies now for health insurance under the Affordable Care Act.

But what Alfordeen told me, what all of the workers I talked to told me, is what she wants most is what she had in 2012: to go back to work, to regain her independence, and to help others do the work that she loves by admitting them and helping them get health care.

So Alfordeen is an example to me of the 1.4 million Americans who are out there who are trying, who want this Congress to try as well. They expected us to do our job, and we failed them. We failed when we left in December, and we are failing them every day that we don't extend unemployment insurance benefits.

So I am urging my colleagues to not allow another day to go without us

taking action. It is true that one person every 8 seconds loses unemployment insurance. It is true that 72,000 additional Americans will be affected every week that this Congress fails to act. But we have the ability to do something about it, and that is why we are here tonight.

I want to turn now to my coanchor of this Special Order hour. He is a great colleague, someone who I have profound respect for. He works tirelessly on behalf of the constituents who elected him from New York. He brings so many great perspectives to the Special Order topics that we have been able to cover. I would like to recognize him now, the gentleman from New York, Congressman JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Let me thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State and the anchor of today's CBC Special Order for his eloquence, his continued leadership and, of course, for all of the hard work that you have put in on behalf of the people that you represent back at home. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve with you, as well as with all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus who continue to be a voice for the voiceless, the conscience of the Congress fighting hard each and every day to bring to life the American Dream for the greatest number of people possible in this wonderful country of ours.

Last week we commemorated the 50th anniversary of the declaration of the war on poverty. In January of 1964, President Lyndon Baines Johnson came to this House before a joint session of Congress and rolled out a series of initiatives designed to march us toward what he would term the Great Society, a war on poverty to lift people out of their perilous condition and bring to life for them the American Dream.

His war on poverty produced programs like Medicare and Medicaid, school breakfast, Head Start, the Food Stamp Act, minimum wage enhancement, Job Corps, college work study, program after program enacted between 1964 and 1966, which, taken together, were effective in lifting millions of Americans out of their impoverished condition.

Fifty years later, we have made a tremendous amount of progress. But, unfortunately, there are many in this Chamber who, instead of continuing the great legacy started by President Lyndon Baines Johnson here in January of 1964, have instead engaged in what perhaps is more appropriately termed a war on the poor, a war on working families, a war on the middle class, a war on senior citizens, and, in its current manifestation, a war on the long-term unemployed.

Unfortunately, whenever folks identify, set their sights on a government program that they don't like, the operating procedure follows a script that is all too familiar: demonize, downsize, and ultimately pulverize.

First, the script says you have got to demonize the program; tell things to the American people that don't necessarily hold up to the scrutiny of a comprehensive factual examination. Once you demonize the program, it enables you to downsize it, to reduce its impact, to reduce our investment. Ultimately, the goal of those who are engaged in this war on the poor, war on the long-term unemployed in its current iteration, ultimately the goal is, once you have demonized it and downsized it, in some way, you just want to pulverize it.

So if you think about this in the context of what we face right now in America, we have heard emanating from this Chamber and other parts of the country this caricature of individuals who supposedly are the long-term unemployed. As the gentleman from Nevada has indicated, we have heard representations suggestive that these are individuals who are couch potatoes sitting at home channel surfing, who only get exercise once a month apparently when they are running out to get their unemployment check and then race back into the house, and that is the only exercise that they get.

What is the basis for this caricature? What analysis has been done of the 1.3 million Americans who you have unceremoniously thrown off the long-term unemployment rolls to come to this conclusion? You have no evidence to make this caricature.

In fact, we know that current statistics suggest that here in America, while we have made significant progress since the Great Recession, 8.1 million private sector jobs that have been created, we know that we still have a way to go. For every 2.8 Americans who are looking for a job, only one job exists.

So the facts are working against those who are unemployed at this point. It is not as if they are not working hard to find a job. The jobs statistically don't exist, simply in terms of the raw numbers. We have an economy that needs to produce more jobs.

Now, what I found fascinating about this whole situation, in addition to this unwarranted caricature that you have created—folks on the other side of this debate who don't necessarily like unemployment insurance and have been plotting to work against it, perhaps since the moment that it was first put into effect in this great country—is that during the short time that Representative HORSFORD and PAYNE and BEATTY and VEASEY and myself have been here, what folks here in the Congress have systematically done is to undermine our ability to actually recover and produce jobs.

This is now at least the third meaningful instance in which this type of unproductive legislative behavior has been witnessed. We first saw it in the march toward April 1 when economists subjectively warned that if we allow sequestration to take effect, what would happen is that we would cost the economy approximately 750,000 jobs. Yet folks on the other side of the aisle, many people in this town decided that, notwithstanding the random nature of the $85 billion in sequestration effects, the impact that it would have adversely on the economy, that we were going to allow sequestration to take hold on April 1. That is exactly what was done; an unproductive, unconstructive action that robs the American people of jobs that might have otherwise existed.

Then in October of this past year, we see another unproductive action taken by those who constantly complain about the alleged slow pace of the economic recovery but then consistently take actions to undermine it. So on October 1, we shut down the government because of this unbridled obsession that some people have with the Affordable Care Act, even though at the time it was the law of the land, it remains the law of the land, passed by a duly elected Congress in 2010, signed into law by President Obama as a first-term President, passed constitutional muster in a decision written by Chief Justice John Roberts, and then reaffirmed by the American people with the Electoral College landslide that took place in November of 2012. Yet you came to this floor and decided that you were going to shut down the government for 16 days.

Why was that unproductive? Because not only did you push hardworking civil servants out of work, but objective analyses of the situation said you cost the economy $24 billion. And then you create this caricature that you want all of us to believe that the unemployed are simply sitting home with this alleged plethora of jobs that exist and they can't find them.

Now we find ourselves in another situation where, instead of coming together to try and reasonably take steps to put Americans back to work, what you have decided to do, since unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed were allowed to expire on December 28, is that you are threatening to cost the economy an additional 240,000 jobs.

So for the third time within the last 12 months, legislative malpractice here in the Congress essentially has resulted, or will result, in the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars and billions of dollars in lost economic productivity. Yet you create this caricature that there are Americans sitting at home on the couch channel surfing, getting one day of exercise per month racing out to get their unemployment check.

□ 2015

There is no basis for that conclusion. That is why we are here on the floor of the House of Representatives, saying that we need to pass an extension of unemployment benefits and that we need to pass it now.

As I prepare to yield to my good friend, I just want to point out that, at

this point in time, as the chart reflects, the long-term unemployment rate in America is higher than it ever has been before as a percentage of those who are unemployed, which means that, today, 37.7 percent of those Americans who are receiving unemployment insurance are long-term unemployed, meaning they have been out of work for 27 weeks or more.

In prior instances, when this Congress and our government had allowed unemployment insurance to expire for the long-term unemployed, the percentage of those who actually had been out of work for 27 weeks or more was much lower—15 points lower when unemployment insurance was allowed to expire for this category of Americans in March of 2004, about 16 points lower when unemployment insurance was allowed to expire for this category of long-term unemployed folks in April of 1994 under President Clinton, and if my math serves me correctly, about 22 points lower in June of 1985 under President Reagan when unemployment benefits were allowed to expire.

So we are in a very different situation than we have been in the past. It is an urgent situation. Progress has been made. We still have a long way to go, and that is why it is necessary for us to do everything possible to help out those Americans in need and not leave them on the battlefield simply to fend for themselves.

Mr. HORSFORD. I appreciate very much the gentleman from New York—the coanchor—and the chronology and the facts that you have laid out to make the case that, unfortunately, it is not just the unemployment insurance benefits that have been under attack by the House Republicans to reauthorize or to extend but that there have been other bridges that have helped the middle class—or those who are aspiring to be part of the middle class—in just the last year that this Congress has failed to act on.

May I inquire of the Speaker how much time we have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HORSFORD. I would like to use that final 10 minutes then, Mr. Speaker, to close by highlighting the points that my colleague Mr. JEFFRIES just did a phenomenal job of laying out, one being that this is not the first time unemployment insurance benefits have been extended. In fact, this chart shows that while there is still more work to be done to help the unemployed—and I completely agree that our focus must be on creating jobs and on growing the economy. That is why the Congressional Black Caucus and individual Members like myself have proposed jobs-creating legislation. The first bill I introduced as a Member of Congress was a jobs-creating measure to help people in Nevada's Fourth District go to work, to help bring down our stubbornly high unemployment.

For those who are in the unemployment calculation, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, from January 2007 to date, unemployment insurance has repeatedly been extended, including by Republican administrations. It was in June of 2008 that then-President George W. Bush authorized emergency unemployment insurance benefits to be extended. What was the unemployment rate at the time? 5.6 percent. He didn't extend unemployment insurance one time—he extended it five times—and he didn't offer a proposal for how it had to be paid because it was an emergency. It was an emergency then, and it is an emergency now with the national unemployment rate just below 7 percent. When 1.4 million Americans who rely on the unemployment insurance benefit have now lost it, it is an emergency for these individuals, and it is an emergency for our economy.

So, for those on the other side who don't want to do this because it is the right thing to do for our neighbors, for hardworking Americans who have done everything that they can and at no fault of their own they are still unemployed, if you don't want to do it for that reason, then maybe do it because it is good for the local economy, because the money that is provided for under the unemployment insurance benefit is then spent by those beneficiaries in local grocery stores, and it is spent paying utility bills, paying rent, and that all helps affect the economy.

Failing to renew the emergency unemployment insurance program will cost the economy, as my colleague from New York said, over 200,000 jobs this year, including 3,000 jobs in Nevada, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The expiration of the Federal unemployment insurance at the end of last week is already taking more than $400 million out of the pockets of American job seekers nationwide and of State and local economies, according to analysis done by the Ways and Means Committee. In Nevada, in the first week from the loss of uninsurance benefits expiring, $5.4 million has been lost. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has found that unemployment benefits are one of the most effective fiscal policies to increase economic growth and to help employment.

So, if our colleagues on the other side don't want to do it because it is the right thing to do for those four out of five of the beneficiaries who have children, if they don't want to do it for half of the beneficiaries who have gone to some form of college, if they don't want to do it for the veterans who also rely in some part on unemployment insurance benefits, then do it for the local economy, but whatever your reason, do it.

I would like to ask my colleague if he has any final remarks that he would like to offer. Then I want to close by just debunking this pay-for argument that some on the other side have again proposed, which is that the only way they are going to vote for something is if there is a plan to pay for it.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Nevada.

I think that you have identified a subject matter that is important for discussion before the American people as a result of this argument that we have heard related to the need to pass unemployment benefits only if a pay-for or an offset or a host of programs on the GOP wish list is passed simultaneously to our trying to provide some measure of relief to unemployed Americans. I am going to let the distinguished gentleman from Nevada address this argument in the current situation, but I would note that we have seen this type of ransom-like behavior here in this Chamber before.

We saw it when I first arrived on the floor of the House of Representatives. It was when we were waiting day after day, week after week, month after month for a Superstorm Sandy relief bill to be passed—more than 75 days, unprecedented in the history of our country's response to a natural disaster—for the people I represent back home who were devastated by Superstorm Sandy. The reason for the holdup was that this ransom-like demand of offsets—unprecedented in American history—was put before us. It was the same situation as it relates to the government shutdown, in which we were told that you can keep the government open—that is a proper function for us here in the Congress—but only under circumstances in which you delay, defund or destroy the Affordable Care Act—ransom-like behavior.

Now we find ourselves in a similar situation, and I yield to my distinguished colleague from Nevada to lay out why we once again find ourselves dealing with unreasonable demands to do what otherwise is our proper duty here on the floor of the House of Representatives and in Washington.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

As I come to a close, let me just say directly that, President George Bush did it five times and not with a pay-for. On December 14, 2012, during his Weekly Radio Address, he was reminding the Congress that no final bill was sent to him extending these unemployment benefits for 750,000 Americans whose benefits would expire on December 28.

He went on to say:

> These Americans rely on their unemployment benefits to pay for their mortgage or rent and their critical bills. They need our assistance in these difficult times, and we cannot let them down.

As I said, the unemployment rate at that time was below 6 percent, and it is now below 7 percent. It is time for this Congress to act, but if you demand a pay-for, then I have one suggestion: What about eliminating or closing a number of the corporate tax loopholes, such as eliminating the tax incentives for companies that get benefits for shipping American jobs overseas? Right now, the United States loses an estimated $150 billion annually to tax

avoidance schemes involving tax havens. Many of our largest and most profitable companies paid no Federal taxes in previous years.

So, for the other side to make this argument is disingenuous. It is unconscionable that you would hold hostage the benefits for 1.4 million Americans for 3 months at a cost of $6.5 billion when you have a Tax Code that is littered with corporate tax incentives for shipping American jobs overseas. If we were to close those tax loopholes, we could re-shore those jobs back to America, putting Americans back to work, reducing our unemployment rate, and growing America's economy. That is what we should be doing. That is why this Congress needs to act, and it is time for this Congress, under the leadership of the Speaker, to do just that.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 14, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4450. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report entitled, ''How to Modernize and Improve the System of Insurance Regulation in the United States''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4451. A letter from the Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the FY 2012 report on activities to preserve and promote minority ownership of insured financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4452. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Residential Furnace Fans [Docket No.: EERE-2010-BT-TP-0010] (RIN: 1904-AC21) received January 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4453. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Alternative Efficiency Determination Methods, Basic Model Definition, and Compliance for Commercial HVAC, Refrigeration, and WH Equipment [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-TP-0024] (RIN: 1904-AC46) received January 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4454. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R01-RCRA-2013-0554; FRL-9904-47-Region 1] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4455. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: Transnuclear, Inc. Standardized NUHOMS Cask System [NRC-2012-0020] (RIN: 3150-AJ10) received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4456. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Unverified List (UVL) [Docket No.: 20524116-3986-02] (RIN: 0694-AF70) received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4457. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 131114960-3960-01] (RIN: 0694-AG01) received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4458. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4459. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report on the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act in accordance with Public Law 97-255 and Public Law 100-504; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4460. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting Fiscal Year 2013 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4461. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4462. A letter from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4463. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Notice: Sections 125 and 223-Cafeteria Plans, Flexible Spending Arrangements, and Health Savings Accounts [Notice 2014-1] received January 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4464. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Definitions and Reporting Requirements for Shareholders of Passive Foreign Investment Companies; Insurance Income of a Controlled Foreign Corporation for Taxable Years Beginning After December 31, 1986 [TD 9650] (RIN: 1645-BK67; RIN: 1545-BK91] received January 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4465. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Verification of Household Income and Other Qualifications for the Provision of Affordable Care Act Premium Tax Credits and Cost-Sharing Reductions''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

4466. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Physicians' Referrals to Health Care Entities With Which They Have Financial Relationships: Exception for Certain Electronic Health Records Arrangements [CMS-1454-F] (RIN: 0938-AR70) received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

4467. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare and State Health Care Programs: Fraud and Abuse; Electronic Health Records Safe Harbor Under the Anti-Kickback Statute (RIN: 0991-AB33) received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

4468. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Report to Congress on the Geographic Variation in the Cost of Living: Implications for the Poverty Guidelines and Program Eligibility''; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

## 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. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 3854. A bill to amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to reauthorize and modernize the Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 3855. A bill to amend section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, to require that the annual budget submissions of the Presidents include the total dollar amount requested for intelligence or intelligence related activities of each element of the Government engaged in such activities; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3856. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 2-year extension of the exclusion from gross income for the discharge of qualified principal residence indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 3857. A bill to authorize the House of Representatives and the Senate to bring an action seeking declaratory and injunctive relief in response to the failure of the President to meet the requirement of the Constitution to faithfully execute the law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 3858. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with health care providers to improve health care access and care coordination for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3859. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to adjust minimum bids and annual rentals for oil and gas and tar sands leases to reflect inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 3860. A bill to revise the formula for allocating funding to States under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 3861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for business start-up expenditures from $5,000 to $10,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 3547; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG:

H. Res. 457. A resolution recognizing Lunar New Year as a significant cultural holiday and encouraging local education agencies to consider closing school on the Lunar New Year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII.

168. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 223 memorializing the Congress to support Congressman GLENN THOMPSON'S efforts to add to the Farm Bill or his efforts to introduce new legislation known as the Forest Products Fairness Act of 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## 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. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 3854.

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

Article I—The Legislative Branch.

Section 1: The Legislature:

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 8:

Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 3855.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article 1 of the Constitution: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3856.

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

Article I, Section 8, which states ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes.''

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 3857.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, including, but not limited to, clause 18 as this legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress: ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''; and Article II, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 3858.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14, To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 3859.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3860.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3861. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 268: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 351: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 366: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 556: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 755: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylsvania.

H.R. 830: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 831: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 940: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1010: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VELA, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1020: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1122: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1144: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1186: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1199: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1250: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and MR. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1252: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1518: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1563: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1666: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1726: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1750: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1763: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. REED, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1771: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1806: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1827: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1835: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1878: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1962: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1971: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2041: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2066: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 2085: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 2193: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2223: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 2247: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 2317: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2560: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2607: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2717: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 2800: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2835: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2868: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2981: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 2994: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3040: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3043: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3077: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 3154: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 3211: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 3404: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3420: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 3450: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 3461: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3485: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 3489: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 3494: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3499: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3513: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3530: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3537: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3541: Mr. RADEL, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3544: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3578: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 3590: Mr. REED, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3635: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 3685: Mr. FORBES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KILMER, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 3698: Ms. MENG, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 3708: Mr. YODER, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 3711: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3717: Mr. SALMON and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3728: Mr. VELA, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 3732: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 3740: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3747: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3762: Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 3763: Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 3764: Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 3788: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3804: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3812: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3824: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HOLT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OWENS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BERA of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MENG, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BASS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CHU, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3826: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3851: Mr. JONES, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TIBERI, and Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Con. Res. 26: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H. Res. 97: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 218: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 284: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 417: Mr. PEARCE.
H. Res. 422: Mr. HIGGINS.
H. Res. 440: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. DINGELL.

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 2014 No. 7

# Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.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:

Eternal God, receive our prayers as incense of thanksgiving for Your goodness to the children of humanity. Lord, thank You for strengthening our Nation, protecting it from evil and guiding its citizens by the unfolding of Your powerful providence. Bless our Senators. Show them solutions to their problems and give them the courage to press on. Protect them from the traps of evil and the snares of transgression. Keep them from even desiring to do wrong as You guide them on the path that leads to life.

We pray in Your wonderful 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.

## HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 266, S. 1846, the flood insurance bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 266, 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.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1845, which is the unemployment insurance extension.

The filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to the bill is 3 p.m. today, and the deadline for all second-degree amendments to the Reed substitute is 4:30 p.m. today.

There have been some discussions going on. The Republican leader and I have spoken. I have spoken with Republican Senators and Democratic Senators, which I am sure my friend the Republican leader has done. We have one vote scheduled this afternoon at 5:30, and that is on Robert Wilkins to be a circuit court judge. We will see if we are going to go forward with the two additional votes on cloture tonight or put them over to tomorrow. We are not in a position today, neither the Republican leader nor myself, to do anything other than to proceed. If we get something worked out before we have the first vote, then we will maybe set this over for a reasonable period of time. If we can't, we will just have these two votes.

## CONSEQUENCES OF INACTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is often said that actions have consequences, and that is an understatement, but in the Senate inaction also has consequences. My Republican colleagues are very effective at creating gridlock in this body—at preventing the Senate from doing its job. While this type of obstruction may serve Republicans' political purposes, it does not serve this country's purposes generally; that is for sure. It may serve the Republicans' political purposes, but it does not in any way lead to something that is good for the country's purposes.

On Friday I received a letter, as did the Republican leader, from Secretary of State John Kerry. John Kerry is someone who understands the Senate, having served here for a quarter of a century. After a year at the State Department, more than a third of Secretary Kerry's leadership team remains vacant—1 year and it remains vacant. Four of his six under secretaries have yet to be confirmed, and 58 State Department nominees are pending before the Senate. In just that one department, that one cabinet slot, we have 64 spots that are left floating around out there someplace. This is unacceptable. At a time when our Nation needs a robust presence abroad, the Senate is stuck. The State Department cannot afford for a third of its leadership positions to be vacant. It is not good for the State Department, it is not good for our country, and it is not good internationally.

This is what Secretary Kerry said, among other things, in the letter he wrote to us:

It is not an overstatement that today so many critical national security positions are still awaiting confirmation that it is now affecting our ability to do the nonpartisan work of American foreign policy; defend the security of our Nation, promote our values, protect our interests and help our businesses compete overseas, which creates jobs for Americans. Simply stated, the backlog in confirmation of State Department nominees is impacting our national security and weakening America's role in the world.

Mr. President, the Senate's inaction, its failure to carry out its duty to advise and consent, has consequences.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

Why are we not moving forward? It is because of obstruction by the Republicans in the Senate.

Under the adept leadership of Chairman MENENDEZ, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is expected to report out at least 31 State Department nominees this week. Many of those nominations were made months ago and returned to the President at the end of the first session of the 113th Congress. Why were they returned? Because of obstruction of the Republicans.

It is incumbent upon the Senate to promptly consider all nominees, and in particular the vital nominees who will protect our national security and our role as a world leader. Unfortunately, Republicans have made it difficult and time consuming to confirm any nominee no matter how essential or how noncontroversial. If the Senate can't even fill its constitutional duties, how can we hope to engage in a robust amendment process?

We waste so much time trying to get simple nominations done. They complain about not having amendments. In this last work period, Mr. President, we spent weeks eating up time that meant nothing to anyone.

The same Republicans who wasted months of the Senate's time last year are now bitterly complaining that the Senate does not spend enough time considering amendments. Every hour Republicans force us to spend watching the clock, waiting to confirm nominees, to vote procedural motions before even beginning debate on legislation, is an hour we could have spent debating and voting on amendments.

We cannot have the extension of emergency unemployment insurance be bogged down by a raft of political amendments. Republicans are so obsessed with taking pot shots at the Affordable Care Act and staging political stunt votes that they are willing to derail a bill that will help 1.4 million out-of-work Americans. We can't allow that. It is unfair.

Still, the complaints of the minority have not fallen on deaf ears.

First my Republican colleague said they would not vote for an extension of unemployment benefits unless it was fully offset. I compromised. It is fully paid for in the bill before this body.

Next my Republican colleagues said they would not vote for this legislation unless it enacted real reforms for the unemployment insurance program. I agreed. That is in the bill before the body.

Now many of my Republican colleagues say they will turn their backs on Americans who have been out of work for months and months unless they have an opportunity to vote on amendments to this bill. Although I wonder what Republicans will demand next, I am willing to do what it takes to protect middle-class workers struggling to find jobs. So reasonable amendments, a reasonable number, relevant amendments, of course we would be happy to take a look at that. I would be happy to do that. We have Tuesday caucuses every week. I will go over this with my caucus in some detail. But my Republican colleagues can't take yes for an answer. If they insist on swamping this important measure with extraneous political amendments, it will be clear they never wanted to extend unemployment in the first place.

If Republicans are serious about offering relevant amendments to strengthen and improve this bill, I am willing to sit down and talk about it. I am willing to allow votes on these amendments. However, I am not going to allow this legislation to be bogged down, as I have indicated, by meaningless votes or derailed by another doomed crusade to strip millions of Americans of the affordable care they have now. And once Republicans get the amendment votes they want, I hope they will give 1.4 million out-of-work Americans the vote they want and need.

My Republican colleagues should remember that a final vote on this legislation—a vote for middle-class men and women who desperately want to work and desperately need help—is the only vote that really matters.

## RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, my friend the majority leader is talking about the crush of nominations. Of course, the reason we have a crush of nominations is because of the decision of the majority to break the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate last year, which produced the inevitable, entirely predictable consequence of sending an enormous number of nominations back down to the administration at the end of the session.

So the decision of the majority to run roughshod over the minority has a lot of consequences, one of which is pretty clear already: that it didn't streamline the nomination process as it was sold to the minority to do. It only made it more difficult.

On another matter, I would like to say a word about unemployment insurance.

The reason for the holdup should be pretty obvious at this point. Republicans have a lot of good ideas on how to pay for this extension. We also have a lot of proposals for getting at the root of the problem, proposals that would make it easier for folks who are struggling in this economy to actually find stable and fulfilling work or get retrained so they can find good jobs. That is a goal on which I expect we could all agree.

Unfortunately, up until the weekend the majority leader wasn't terribly interested in any of these ideas. He only seemed to want to extend the program without really paying for it, without doing much of anything to help private sector job creation, and without creating opportunities for targeted training that would help folks who are currently receiving unemployment assistance actually find a job.

So I think this is unfortunate. There is clearly no shortage of creative, constructive proposals out there which speak to the underlying problems, which speak to the urgent need to create more stable, good-paying jobs, and which make sure we don't increase our already out-of-control Federal debt. Some of these ideas actually come from Democrats. The Presiding Officer's senior Senator from Connecticut has an idea to create a program that subsidizes employment for low-income Americans so they aren't stuck in neutral while they search for permanent work. This is an idea which actually deserves debate and a vote.

As I have indicated in recent days, the majority leader should give other Senators more of a say in what we do around here, including members of his own conference. So hopefully his comments a few moments ago and over the weekend are a sign that we may be able to work this out in a way that the Senate can function the way it used to, which was that Members were able to actually offer amendments and get votes before we moved to final passage on important legislation.

Mr. President, 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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1845) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Reed) amendment No. 2631, relating to extension and modification of emergency unemployment compensation program.

Reid amendment No. 2632 (to amendment No. 2631), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 2633, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 2634 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2633) of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 2635 (to amendment No. 2634), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

### RESTORING DELIBERATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Senator MCCONNELL has made a very important call to restore the Senate as

the great deliberative body it was intended to be. I would like to continue to add my voice to that call. In fact, I am going to expand on some observations I made previously before the Senate, I believe in the month of December last year.

The Senate is a unique body designed with a very unique purpose in mind. In the Federalist Paper 62, attributed to the father of the Constitution James Madison, the unique role of the Senate is explained this way:

> The necessity of a Senate is not less indicated by the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions, and to be seduced by factious leaders into intemperate and pernicious resolutions.

When Madison talks about ''factious leaders'' and ''intemperate and pernicious resolutions,'' he basically means what we call partisanship and the ''my way or the highway'' approach to legislating all too common these days.

What might come as a shock to anyone who has followed the Senate lately is the fact that the Senate was specifically designed to check partisan passions and ensure that Americans of all stripes are fairly represented through a deliberative process. Clearly, the Senate is not fulfilling the role the Framers of the Constitution intended, in recent years.

To find out what went wrong, we first have to examine how the Senate was supposed to function. About this propensity of legislatures to be dominated by factious leaders acting intemperately, Madison goes on to say:

> Examples on this subject might be cited without number; and from proceedings within the United States, as well as from history of other nations.

Note that in advocating for the creation of a Senate to counter this negative tendency, Madison references examples from proceedings within the United States. Many State legislatures in the early days of our Republic were unicameral, with frequent elections and weak executives. This led to many instances where a temporary majority faction would gain control and quickly pass legislation that advantaged the majority at the expense of the minority.

The Senate has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world because it was specifically designed to proceed at a measured pace and to guarantee that the rights of the minority party be protected.

James Madison wrote in Federalist Paper No. 10:

> Complaints are everywhere heard from our most considerate and virtuous citizens, equally the friends of public and private faith, and of public and personal liberty, that our governments are too unstable, that the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties, and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minority party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority.

What is unique about the Senate is that the rules and traditions force Senators to work together to prevent Madison's ''overbearing majority'' from steamrolling the minority party. Because the rules of the Senate are built around consensus, as opposed to the House of Representatives where the majority party dominates, it forces Senators of all parties to listen to each other and to work together. While that was true most of my time in the Senate, it has changed in recent years. If anyone wonders why the tone in Washington has become so heated recently, the loss of the Senate as a deliberative body is certainly a big factor.

There is an apocryphal story which may or may not be historically accurate but which certainly depicts how the Senate was intended to function. The story goes that when Jefferson returned from France, where he was serving during the Constitutional Convention, he asked George Washington why the Senate had been created. Washington supposedly replied by asking Jefferson, ''Why did you pour that tea into your saucer?''

''To cool it,'' Jefferson said.

Washington responded, ''Even so, we pour legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it.''

In the House of Representatives, the Rules Committee sets out the terms of debate for each bill. If you want to offer an amendment in the House, you have to go hat in hand to the Rules Committee and ask their permission. If the House leadership doesn't like your amendment, you are out of luck.

By contrast, the Senate has a tradition of allowing extensive debate and amendments by any Senator without prior approval from anybody. However, that tradition has gone out the window under the current majority leadership. We have seen an unprecedented abuse of cloture motions to cut off the deliberative process paired with a tactic called filling the tree—blocking amendments from being considered. The Senate majority leader has effectively become a one-man version of the House Rules Committee, dictating which amendments will be debated and which ones will never see the light of day. He has done so again on the unemployment bill currently before this Senate. In fact, he has been quite unashamed about saying he is not going to allow any amendments. This strips the ability of individual Senators to effectively represent their State, regardless of political party. Blocking amendments also virtually guarantees that any legislation the Senate votes on will be more partisan in nature, violating the very purpose of the Senate according to James Madison.

By empowering the majority leader at the expense of individual Senators, the people of the 50 States lose their voice in the Senate and party leaders get their way instead. The people of Iowa sent me to the Senate to represent them, not to simply vote up or down on a purely partisan agenda dictated by the majority leader.

Everyone complains about the lack of bipartisanship these days, but there is no opportunity for individual Senators to work together across the aisle when legislation is drafted on a partisan basis and amendments are blocked.

Bipartisanship requires giving individual Senators a voice, regardless of party. That is the only way to get things done in the Senate. In the last decade, when I was chairman of the Finance Committee and Republicans controlled the Senate, we wanted to actually get things done. In order for that to happen, we knew we had to accommodate the minority, we had to have patience and humility and respect for that minority—attributes that do not exist on the other side anymore. We had some major bipartisan accomplishments, from the largest tax cut in history to the Medicare prescription drug program, to numerous trade agreements. Those kinds of major bills do not seem to happen anymore.

The Senate rules provide that any Senator may offer an amendment regardless of party affiliation. Each Senator represents hundreds of thousands to, in the case of California, 36 million Americans, and each has an individual right to offer amendments for consideration. The principle here is not about political parties having their say but duly elected Senators participating in the legislative process.

Again, as part of our duty to represent the citizens of our respective States, each Senator has an individual right to offer amendments. This right cannot be outsourced to party leaders. The longstanding tradition of the Senate is that Members of the minority party as well as rank-and-file Members of the majority party have an opportunity to offer amendments and get votes in the Senate.

The now-routine practice of filling the tree to block amendments has been a major factor in the destruction of the Senate as a deliberative body. This is usually combined with filing cloture to cut off further consideration of a bill, which has occurred to a truly unprecedented extent. In a deliberative body, debates and amendments are essential, so cloture should be rare. Abuse of cloture strikes to the very heart of how the Senate is intended to work.

It is important to note the majority leader has tried to pass off the cloture motions he has filed, which are attempts by the majority party to silence the minority party, as nothing but Republican filibusters. There seems to have been a concerted attempt to confuse cloture motions with filibusters. But the Washington Post fact checker has caught the majority leader in this distortion, giving his claim of unprecedented Republican filibusters two Pinocchios. In fact, a report by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service called ''Cloture Attempts on Nominations: Data and Historical Development,'' written by Richard S.

Beth, contains an entire section entitled ''Cloture Motions Do Not Correspond With Filibusters.''

The abuse of cloture, often combined with the blocking of amendments, prevents all Senators from doing what they were sent to do—not just Members of the minority party. It has even gotten worse. Even where the majority leader has decided he is going to be open to amendments, he has created out of whole cloth new restrictions to limit Senators' rights.

First, he normally only opens the amendment process if there is an agreement to limit amendments. This is usually only a handful or so of amendments. Then he has magically determined that only germane or relevant amendments can be considered. Of course, nowhere do the Senate rules require amendments to be germane, other than postcloture. Senators elected in the last few years appear to be ignorant of that fact. We will hear some of my colleagues argue against an amendment saying it is nongermane or nonrelevant. They have fallen totally for the majority leader's creative rulemaking, thus giving up one of their rights as a Senator with which to represent their State.

I cannot count how many nongermane or nonrelevant amendments I had to allow votes on when I processed bills when Republicans were in charge. They were usually tough political votes. But we took them because we wanted to get things done and that is the way the Senate operated. You do not see that nowadays. The current majority avoids tough votes at all costs. If you wonder why things do not get done around here in the Senate, that is one of the reasons they do not get done.

The American people sent us to get the work done and to represent our constituents and that means voting, not avoiding tough votes. We sometimes hear this is a question of majority rule versus minority obstruction. Again, that ignores that each Senator is elected to represent their State, not simply to be an agent of one of the political parties. There are policies that have majority support in the Senate that have been denied a vote. Understand, we have been denied votes on amendments that even a majority of this Senate supports.

What happened during debate on a budget resolution proves my point. The special rules of the budget resolution limit debate so it cannot be filibustered, but it also allows for an unlimited number of amendments. A Republican amendment to the Senate Budget Committee in support of repealing the tax on lifesaving medical devices in President Obama's health care law passed by an overwhelming 79-to-20 vote, with more than half of the Democrats voting with the Republicans rather than their party leader.

We also had a Republican amendment in support of the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline to bring oil from Canada, and that passed 62 to 37. Votes such as these that split the Democrats and hand a win to Republicans are exactly what the majority leader has been trying to avoid by blocking those very same amendments on legislation. Of course, that is probably the explanation of why we did not take up a budget resolution for more than 3 years prior to this year.

Until we put an end to the abuse of cloture and the blocking of amendments, the Senate cannot function as James Madison and the Framers of the Constitution intended. We must bring back the Senate as a deliberative body. Our politics today desperately need the cooling saucer of the Senate, as George Washington described the Senate to Jefferson. The action by the majority leader to make it easier to consider nominations on a purely partisan basis went in the wrong direction. In the face of bipartisan opposition and with no Republican votes, the so-called nuclear option established a precedent, effectively overruling the rules on the books. A better move would be for the Senate to establish the precedent that filling the tree and abusing cloture to block a full amendment process is illegitimate.

It is time to restore the Senate so it can fulfill its constitutional role. Senator MCCONNELL has made a thoughtful and well-reasoned appeal. I hope my colleagues will listen for the sake of this institution, for the good of the country as a whole, and out of respect for the Framers of the Constitution who set up the Senate as a unique deliberative body.

I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, last week I said on the Senate floor that serving in the Senate is becoming like being asked to join the Grand Ole Opry and not being allowed to sing. Here is what I meant by that. Take last week. The Democratic majority leader from Nevada brought up unemployment compensation.

How do we help unemployed Americans go to work? I can't think of an issue more important to our country. All of us have ideas about how to do this, but he brought up his idea. It hasn't been considered by a committee. When he put it on the floor, he cut off amendments, he cut off debate, and he cut off votes.

Soon we will be discussing minimum wage. How to increase family incomes in America is the foremost issue facing our country. We all have ideas about that.

We were elected to deal with it. We have been in a long period of unemployment. We believe the economy is bad for a variety of reasons. We—on this side—believe a big, wet blanket of rules and regulations have been increased by the Obama administration. We want to debate that. We want to talk about it. We don't believe the old idea of a minimum wage is the solution. We are for maximum new jobs and maximum job training and learning opportunities so people can get those jobs. We want the economy to grow. We should be debating that. That is why we are here. But the Senator from Iowa, my good friend and the distinguished chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, said, No, we won't hear this in committee. There might be embarrassing amendments. So, unfortunately, insofar as the way the Senate functions, this year is beginning just as last year ended, and Republicans objected to this.

Some of the news outlets wrote down—I read some of the stories this morning—and they said, After a while, the Senate will begin to debate internal procedure and process. Sometimes process is important. We have something called the U.S. Constitution. It is kind of old-fashioned. It has a lot of process in it. In fact, it has a checks-and-balances system in it that is envied by the world. There are citizens all over the world who would like to have a government that functions in the way ours has for over two centuries. Process can be very important. In this case, as the Republican leader often says, process and procedure are substance, because when we are not able to talk about unemployment compensation, when we are not able to offer our ideas about how to help unemployed Americans go back to work, that is substance.

That is a central issue facing our country. We think we have better ideas than the idea the majority leader put on the floor and we would like to present those ideas on behalf of the people who elected us. We are not the important ones. We are all political accidents here—all 100 of us. We all know that. We worked pretty hard to get here and we had some luck to go along with it. What does that give us? Not just a chance to have our say, but to have a say on behalf of the people of Tennessee, in my case. They want me to weigh in on the big issues before our country.

ObamaCare is one of the reasons so many people are unemployed. I am sure the other side doesn't want to talk about that. I wouldn't if I voted for it. But I was in a room with the chief executive officer of a major restaurant company who told me that because of the new costs of ObamaCare on his large company, they were going to start running their restaurants with 75 employees instead of 90 employees. That doesn't sound like more jobs to me; that doesn't sound like help for unemployed Americans.

This is the forum in which we debate these issues. So I suppose it might be

embarrassing for our friends on the other side to debate these issues, but it shouldn't be. If they believe in them, they should want to stand up and defend the issues, just as strongly as we want to say our point of view. I suspect there are a good number of my Democratic friends who have amendments they would like to offer on putting unemployed Americans to work. They might wonder, How did I ever get to a U.S. Senate where I can't do that, just as someone might wonder in Nashville, why did I join the Grand Ole Opry if they won't let me sing?

The majority leader's actions go to the very heart of our government. It is not about internal procedure, it is not about process. It is about the major issues facing our country.

Tennesseans didn't send me to Washington to rubberstamp the majority leader's ideas—not this majority leader or any majority leader. Tennesseans sent me here to represent them and to advocate their point of view and to give them a say on ObamaCare, on balancing the budget, on fixing the deficit, on helping unemployed Americans find jobs, on dealing with wages, on raising family incomes. That is why I am here. That is my job. And they expect me to have a chance to have not my say but their say on the issues that face the American people. By his actions, the majority leader is destroying the Senate, which was once described as ''the one touch of authentic genius in the American political system.''

There is a new book out which I mentioned on the floor the other day. My guess is it will become the leading history of this body. It is written by the former Senate Historian, Richard Baker, and the late Neil MacNeil, who wrote what many consider to be the best history of the House of Representatives. They say in the book that the genius I just talked about—''the authentic touch of genius that is the Senate''—the major reason for that is the opportunity for extended debate.

They point out, as I think any of us would, that there have been abuses with the filibuster, more delays than are necessary; that the Senate doesn't work as well as it should not just over the last few years but over a long period of time. But the fact is, in this body, which is virtually unique in the world in requiring that 60 of 100 Members must agree before we cut off debate, that helps forge consensus. That helps forge consensus, as we did on the student loan agreement earlier this year. There is a good example of a good debate, of different opinions on both sides of the aisle, of Democrats and Republicans working together. When we finally got to 60 or 65, we got a result with the Republican House of Representatives and the Democratic President going along with us, and it was a victory for the students of this country. We cut in half the interest rates they pay and took the whole argument out of a political football.

The Senate was created for three reasons. The first is to encourage and forge consensus. We govern a complex society with consensus, not with ramrodding partisan ideas through one body or the other. We have a body for that; it is called the House of Representatives. Win it by one vote—the Rules Committee has two times as many members of the majority as the minority, and the majority can pass anything they want to pass. Send it over here, and the tradition has been to slow it down and cool it off. We take a second look.

The passions of the democracy—what de Touqueville called in his trip across America in the early 1800s—the great danger he saw to our country was the tyranny of the majority. He saw that as one of the two great dangers to the American democracy. And the Senate has been, through all that period of time, the guardian—the guardian of minority rights, the guardian against the excesses of the Executive, which in our country is the President. The Founders didn't want a king, so they set up this elaborate system of checks and balances, and the Senate is the key to that.

What is different about the Senate is the opportunity for extended debate. But, the Majority Leader now brings up a bill—one Senator's idea—cuts off debate, cuts off amendments, cuts off votes, that is it. That is not the way to govern our country, particularly on an issue of how do we put unemployed Americans back to work.

The Senate is losing its capacity to do the things it was created to do in the following ways: No. 1, less advice and consent. On November 21, the Democratic majority decided 60 votes are no longer needed to cut off debate on most Presidential nominees. So try asking a nominee: Will the National Security Agency stop monitoring the Pope? Now there will be no response, because the majority can ram through nominees.

The Senator from Nevada, the distinguished majority leader, said in 2006—I heard him and he put it in his book—that cutting off—allowing the majority to cut off debate would be the end of the Senate. The end of the Senate. Apparently, he changed his mind.

Operating without rules. The distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator LEVIN, said on November 21: ''A Senate in which a majority can change the rules at any time is a Senate without rules.'' It is as if the Red Sox, finding themselves behind in the ninth inning in the World Series, added a couple of innings to make sure they won. When he wrote the Senate rules, Thomas Jefferson said it is not so important what the rule is, but that there be a rule.

Ignoring Executive orders. While it ignores its own rules, the Senate meekly watches as the Obama administration changes the health care law, suspends immigration laws, and rewrites labor laws.

Tolerating more czars. President Obama has appointed more czars than the Romanovs did. In both Russia and the United States, czars don't report to elected representatives.

Not passing appropriations bills. Hopefully, that is going to change. But the Senate's repeated failure to pass appropriations bills canceled the Senate's check on the Executive's power to spend.

Illegal recess appointments. That is being debated today in the Supreme Court. The majority acquiesced when President Obama used his recess appointment to appoint members to the National Labor Relations Board when the Senate was not in recess. Fortunately, three appellate courts disagreed with the President and the Supreme Court will decide. Hopefully, the Supreme Court agrees with the appellate courts. Otherwise, the Senate might go out for lunch and return and find that we have a new Supreme Court Justice.

There is blame to go around, and I am sure any of my friends on the other side who are listening would be quick to point that out. Baker and MacNeil pointed that out in their book. There have been abuses of the filibuster. It is true that some Republicans have unduly delayed nominations and unduly delayed legislation. And that is not new. I have seen it in other years. I have pointed out on this floor how Senator Allen from Alabama, in the 1970s and 1980s, would tie the Senate into knots with his knowledge of the rules. Senator Metzenbaum from Ohio would sit right down there on the front row and if a Senator wanted to pass a bill, that Senator had to go see him, and if the Senator didn't amend his bill to do what Senator Metzenbaum wanted done, he would use Senate rules to block it.

So this has never been an easy place to get something done, but it wasn't ever supposed to be. It was supposed to be a place where every single Senator is an equal, where every Senator's voice is not his or her voice but the voice of people that Senator represents. It is supposed to be a place of extended debate where almost any amendment can be discussed for almost any length of time, and usually the clock is all that would cut the debate off. But there has been a procedure by which a consensus can cut it off, and when we reach that consensus, we usually reach a result that can even pass unanimously after it has been massaged and changed and worked through and considered.

I think of the legislation we just passed on compounding pharmacies and making drugs more safely; making drugs more safe, 4 billion prescriptions a year. It went through the committee process, through both Houses, and eventually passed unanimously because we reached a consensus.

The delays that have occurred on nominations because, so-called, of the changes in rules on November 21 are hardly a crisis. Nonjudicial Presidential nominees have almost never

been denied their seats by a filibuster. Before the November rules change, there were two for President Obama, three for President Bush, two for President Clinton, and none before that, in history. That is seven. Only seven nonjudicial Presidential nominees, in the history of the Senate, had ever been denied their seats by a filibuster. Maybe it takes a while, but that is so we can ask questions.

The day before the rules were changed, I looked at the Executive Calendar—this calendar we have on our desks. It includes every single nomination that can be brought to the floor. If I have my numbers about right, there were not many people on the calendar. Half of them have been held up by the Senator from South Carolina who is trying to get some answers on Benghazi. That has happened many times in this body. If Senators want an answer, they do that to make the Executive tell them what is going on. There were only 8 nominees, I believe, who had been on the calendar for more than 9 weeks and only 16 others who have been on for more than 3 weeks.

So there were not very many people on the Executive Calendar, and we had changed the rules to make it easier to confirm them, anyway. There were 13 district judges, so the majority leader could bring them up on Thursday—Friday is the intervening day—and Monday there could be 2 hours of debate on each judge, and we could confirm four or five by doing it over the weekend in that way. But, no, we had to change the rules in the way that it was done.

The Senate does not need a change of rules; it needs a change in behavior. The current majority leader, I would respectfully suggest, could start by following the example of Majority Leaders Robert Byrd, a Democrat, and Howard Baker, a Republican, during the 1970s and 1980s. Here is how they would do things, and this is the way the Senate ran until 5 or 6 years ago. Baker and Byrd would bring legislation to the floor. Usually they would go to a committee and say to a chairman: We will put it on the floor if you and your ranking member of the other party agree. So you would have two Members—a chairman and a Republican ranking member; not the leaders—standing up there at the two desks. They would put the bill on the floor that already had gotten a consensus in the committee. Then, the majority leader would ask for amendments to the bill, and sometimes he would get 300—300. Then, he would ask consent to cut off the offering of amendments and to consider voting on them in an orderly way, all of which was written out in the unanimous consent agreement. Of course, he would get the unanimous consent to do that because everybody who wanted to offer an amendment could.

Then they would go to work. They would start on Mondays, and they would work into Monday night and on Tuesday and on Wednesday. They would table many of the amendments. That does not take long: 10 minutes of debate and table it with 51 votes.

Senator Byrd said in his book that when the Panama Canal Treaty came up at a time when he was the majority leader and Baker was the Republican leader, they had 192 amendments and reservations—many of them killer amendments—but he allowed every one of them, and he defeated every killer amendment. But he said: If we had not allowed them, we never would have gotten the ratification of the Panama Canal Treaty. The Senators had their say on the Panama Canal Treaty.

So after a while, those 300 amendments that might have been offered on Monday are whittled away. Some are accepted, some are dropped, some are voted on, some are tabled, and by about Thursday—the majority leader has said at the beginning of the week: We are going to finish the bill this week—people are ready to go home. Then they begin to think more carefully about whether their amendment is really that important. So they vote Thursday night, and they maybe vote Friday, and if they have to, they vote Saturday. But most of the time they finish their work on Friday.

They were not afraid, those majority leaders, to allow amendments. They were not afraid to defeat amendments. I believe if the majority leader would allow the Senate to work in this way, he would not have any problem on this side of the aisle with efforts to keep bills from coming to the floor. Almost all of the effort to keep bills from coming to the floor has to do with minority Members not being allowed to have the say of the people who elected them to serve.

Instead, the majority leader has set records for bringing legislation to the floor without committee approval, cutting off amendments, and records for cutting off debate. So there are no votes on reforming military sexual assaults, completing Yucca Mountain, sanctioning Iran, and other vital concerns, no votes on unemployment compensation or how to put unemployed America to work.

The Senate has become a Tuesday-Thursday club run by one Senator and orchestrated by the White House. One reason this is tolerated is that 43 Senators are in their first term—43 Senators are in their first term—most of them in the majority. They have never served in the minority. They have never seen the Senate function properly, the way it functioned for most of its 200-plus year history.

Most importantly, those Senators in their first term may not have heard Senator Byrd's final address when, among other things, he said that any majority leader could run the Senate under the then-existing rules. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, an article from the Wall Street Journal from last Friday on this subject.

In an important address last week, Mr. MCCONNELL, the Senator from Kentucky, the Republican leader, described three ways to restore the Senate: full committee consideration of bills; bills thoroughly debated, with robust amendments on the floor; and a decent week's work. We might work Monday through Friday instead of Tuesday through Thursday.

The Senate could change overnight. It does not need a change of rules. The Senator from Kentucky did not say that it has always been easy to navigate the Senate. The ideal regular order never has and never will be without exceptions. But what we call the regular order has become the exception rather than the rule.

I would hope we do not wait until November or the next year to restore the Senate to its proper place as the authentic piece of genius in the American government—the unique body, the unique senate in the world because of the opportunity for extended debate. It could change overnight by considering bills most of the time that went through committee, most of the time having a robust amendment process and debate on those bills, and vote on them. If it took Monday through Friday to get that work done, then we should do it. Otherwise, the great issues facing our country—what kind of health care system do we have? How do we help unemployed Americans go to work? How do we improve learning opportunities in this new America, where so much is decentralized and so much is on social media?

These are very exciting times. Daniel Boorstin, the former historian of the United States and Librarian of Congress, in his wonderful books on America, used to talk about verges, that when America was at a verge—and we have been there many times in our history—that we were more open to innovation, that we were more self-aware of where we were, that we tended to rely on each other, and that we changed our country for the better.

That is where we are today. We want better learning opportunities, better job training, better health care. Washington is in the way of much of that, and we need to debate how to change that.

So I would hope my friend, the distinguished majority leader, will listen to what the Republican leader had to say and reflect on the many years he has served here and realize all we are saying is we would like to have a say on behalf of the people who elected us on the great issues facing our country. Bring a bill through committee, bring it to the floor, let us have debate—defeat our amendments; you should be able to with a tabling motion—and then let's come to a result.

I think the American people would gain much more confidence in the Senate because it would deserve more confidence if it conducted issues in that way. But this diminishing of the Senate is tragic for a country with large problems to solve and whose system of checks and balances has been envied around the world.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 10, 2014]

HARRY REID'S SENATE SHUTDOWN

(By Kimberley A. Strassel)

The popular judgment that Washington's dysfunction is the result of ''partisanship'' misses a crucial point. Washington is currently gridlocked because of the particular partisanship of one man: Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid. And Republicans are warming to the power of making that case to voters.

It's often said the 113th Congress is on track to become the ''least productive'' in history—but that tagline obscures crucial details. The Republican House in fact passed more than 200 bills in 2013. Some were minor, and others drew only GOP votes. But nearly a dozen were bipartisan pieces of legislation that drew more than 250 Republicans and Democrats to tackle pressing issues—jobs bills, protections against cyberattack, patent reform, prioritizing funding for pediatric research, and streamlining regulations for pipelines.

These laws all went to die in Mr. Reid's Senate graveyard. Not that the Senate was too busy to take them up. It passed an immigration and a farm bill. Yet beyond those, and a few items Mr. Reid was pressed to pass—the end-year sequester accord; Hurricane Sandy relief—the Senate sat silent. It passed not a single appropriations bill and not a single jobs bill. Of the 72 (mostly token) bills President Obama signed in 2013, 56 came from the House; 16 came from the chamber held by his own party.

This is the norm in Mr. Reid's Senate, and for years he has been vocally and cleverly blaming the chamber's uselessness on Republican filibusters. This is a joke, as evidenced by recent history. Mr. Reid took over the Senate in early 2007, and it functioned just fine in the last two years of the Bush administration. It didn't suddenly break overnight.

What did happen is the Senate Democrats' filibuster-proof majority in the first years of the Obama administration—when Mr. Reid got a taste for unfettered power—and then the GOP takeover of the House in 2011. That is when the Senate broke, as it was the point at which Mr. Reid chose to subvert its entire glorious history to two of his own partisan aims: Protecting his majority and acting as gatekeeper for the White House.

Determined to protect his vulnerable members from tough votes, the majority leader has unilaterally killed the right to offer amendments. Since July, Republicans have been allowed to offer . . . four. Determined to shield the administration from legislation the president opposes, Mr. Reid has unilaterally killed committee work, since it might produce bipartisan bills. Similarly, he's refused to take up bills that have bipartisan support like approving the Keystone XL Pipeline, repealing ObamaCare's medical-device tax, and passing new Iran sanctions.

Here's how the Senate ''works'' these days. Mr. Reid writes the legislation himself, thereby shutting Republicans out of the committee drafting. Then he outlaws amendments.

So yes, there are filibusters. They have become the GOP's only means of protesting Mr. Reid's total control over what is meant to be a democratic body. It isn't that the Senate can't work; it's that Sen. Reid won't let it.

Pushed over the brink by Mr. Reid's November power play—scrapping the filibuster for Obama nominees—Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell began 2014 with a rip-roaring Senate-floor speech. On Wednesday he set the record straight on the Reid tactics that have created Senate dysfunction. He then outlined how a GOP majority would restore regular order and get Washington working. This is a ''debate that should be of grave importance to us all,'' he said.

It's of growing importance to Republicans, who are taking up this theme in speeches and media briefings—putting greater attention on Mr. Reid's singular role in Washington paralysis. Asked this week whether the GOP would be allowed to amend an unemployment-benefits bill, Sen. John McCain quipped: ''you'll have to go ask the dictator.'' Speaker John Boehner, at a recent news conference, lamented the ''dozens'' of House bills that ''await action in the Senate,'' while Majority Leader Eric Cantor berated Mr. Reid for sitting on ''bipartisan'' jobs legislation.

This brings to mind Republican Sen. John Thune's 2004 defeat of South Dakota's Tom Daschle, which he did partly by highlighting Mr. Daschle's obstructionist majority-leader record. The comparison isn't perfect, since Mr. Daschle was up for re-election (Mr. Reid is not) and since the obstructionism was more noticeable at a time when the GOP ran both the House and White House. Then again, the Reid theme is the sort that will resonate with the GOP grass roots, refocusing their efforts on a Senate victory.

In an election that is going to be about ObamaCare, Republican Senate candidates are already reminding voters that it was Mr. Reid's Senate abuse that created the law. And in the wake of the shutdown and endless government-created ''crises,'' more Americans are worried about the state of Washington institutions, and eager for change.

''Process'' arguments are hard to make to voters, but Mr. Reid is a face for the process problem. Demoting Harry Reid won't in itself fix Washington. But it would be a grand start—and that alone makes it a potentially powerful campaign theme.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we are currently debating yet another extension to the emergency unemployment compensation program. While there are differences of opinion in this Chamber about this particular program, I think we would all agree that the fact we are even having this debate is unfortunate.

Make no mistake, our Nation continues to face difficulties when it comes to job growth, labor force participation, and long-term unemployment, as has been the case throughout the Obama administration. Under this administration, it has been harder to find a job than at any other point in our Nation's recent history.

But let's be clear about something. The plight of the long-term unemployed is not the major problem facing America today. It is, instead, just a symptom of a much larger problem.

That larger problem is the fact that despite the efforts of many of us here in Congress, our government has not done enough to promote economic growth in this country. Far too often, our government has interfered in ways that have stunted growth and prevented a robust recovery from taking place.

Five years into his Presidency, it is clear that President Obama does not have a plan to address these problems. Surely, he has a list of ways that he would like to expand the government and redistribute income but nothing resembling a plan to promote private-sector job growth. Instead, he has a political plan of attack, and this debate over unemployment insurance is part of that attack plan.

Over the last 5 years we have seen a series of big-government ''solutions'' that have all failed to produce real economic results.

The administration pushed through the supposed temporary stimulus, which ended up being little more than a laundry list of longtime Democratic Party policy priorities that had little or nothing to do with actually stimulating the economy. The administration also decided to devote its attention to expanding the alphabet soup of financial regulators, while failing to address factors that were at the heart of the recent financial crisis.

Lacking ideas of its own, the Obama administration created and turned to a Jobs Council to try to understand private job creation, only to later dissolve the council while not having instituted any meaningful policies to create jobs.

The largest and most intrusive big-government edict we received from the administration and its allies in Congress is, of course, ObamaCare. On a daily basis, the American people continue to suffer from the impact of this very misguided law.

People have lost their jobs or have been moved into part-time work. People have been forced off their health care plans. People have been forced, under fear of penalty, to purchase insurance coverage they do not want or need. People have had their private and financial information put at risk thanks to the lack of security in the ObamaCare exchanges, and perhaps worst of all, people have seen the cost of their health care go up across the board.

ObamaCare is the worst in a series of bad economic policies we have seen since this President came into office.

The results speak for themselves. At the beginning of a new year, we see very clearly what the President and his Democratic allies in Congress plan to do about all of this. The answer is nothing. Instead of working with us to enact projob and progrowth policies, they are picking fights with Republicans on issues such as unemployment insurance. Instead of trying to root out the causes of our economic problems, they are giving speeches vilifying anyone who might have a different view on these issues.

As I said, President Obama and the Senate Democrats have no economic plan, only a political plan of attack. Let's consider this debate on unemployment compensation insurance for a moment. I think there are many who would question why we did not have this debate about extending long-term unemployment benefits sooner. Democrats knew that temporary Federal unemployment benefits for the long-term

unemployed were scheduled to expire at the end of 2013. Yet they did nothing to try to extend them before now.

Contrary to what some of my colleagues on the other side seem to believe, Republicans do not run the Senate. We do not control the committees. We do not run things on the floor. As we are seeing in the current debate over unemployment benefits, we do not even get a chance to offer amendments to many major pieces of legislation. Why is that? Why is it that the greatest deliberative body in the world can no longer offer amendments? It comes down to one thing—the Democratic leadership. They are afraid we might bring up amendments that are difficult for Democrats to vote on. Join the crowd. That has always been the case around here before this current leadership took over.

Every leader has tried to protect their side, but this has gone to the point of ridiculousness and the denigration of the Senate itself. The Democrats could have offered an extension of Federal unemployment benefits at any time before they expired in 2013. We could have debated the merits of the emergency unemployment compensation program, discussed alternatives, and perhaps even come up with a bipartisan compromise to help the long-term unemployed.

We could have even done that through regular order and using the committee process. But instead, Democrats ignored the program for an entire year, and in the very last days of the last congressional session and after we had adjourned for the year, we finally started hearing about the desperate need to protect the long-term unemployed, about how it was the highest priority for the President and Democrats in Congress to extend these benefits, and about those villainous Republicans standing in the way.

There are only two conclusions to draw from this: Either the Democrats forgot about unemployment benefits until the end of the year or they calculated it was better suited for their political attack plan to let them expire and then debate an extension afterward. I think it is pretty clear which conclusion is the correct one, especially since they control the Senate and they control the committees. They could have done just about anything they wanted.

So here we are debating another extension of the EUC Program, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program. We may as well be debating the merits of using a bandaid on a broken arm because, as I said, long-term unemployment is merely a symptom of the failures of the Obama economy. However, since the Democrats opted to put off this matter until we were actually beyond the last minute, we have not enacted or even debated any serious alternatives to Federal unemployment benefits and we are left with just another take-it-or-leave-it proposition from the majority leader.

That is what the majority leader seems to be saying to us. In fact, that is what he is saying to us in this debate—take it or leave it. Why would he do that? Apparently, no Republicans, not even the ones who supported cloture on the motion to proceed, will get an opportunity to offer amendments. The only amendment we will be voting on is the so-called compromise amendment the majority leader offered last Thursday. Of course, the amendment is not a compromise at all. It is nothing of the sort. Similar to the underlying bill it would add significantly to the deficit. The supposed pay-fors in the amendment would not even kick in under the normal 10-year budget window. Indeed, the Democratic whip in the House was voicing concern about using so-called savings from extending the sequester outside of the 10-year window asking, ''Frankly, if you adopt that logic, why don't we extend it until 2054 and fund everything we want to do?''

That is a dream some Democrats have. But fortunately there may be some people on the other side who realize this is a charade. In short, the amendment we will be voting on this afternoon, if we do, is a gimmick. It is designed solely to allow the majority to claim they are willing to pay for extending unemployment benefits, nothing more, nothing less.

Once again, this is apparently the only amendment we will get a chance to vote on when it comes to extending the Emergency Unemployment Insurance Compensation Program, which is par for the course under the current Senate majority. It is pretty clear what my colleagues in the majority want to do. Contrary to their claims, passing this legislation and extending unemployment benefits is not their highest priority. Their highest priority is to use the long-term unemployed as pawns in their political attacks on Republicans who support a different approach; one that is paid for, fairly paid for, honestly paid for, and understandably paid for.

If I am wrong and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are serious about wanting to extend this program, why would they not allow votes on Republican amendments or even Democratic amendments? There are some complaints on the Democratic side—even we the Democrats, they are saying, do not have the privilege of bringing up amendments.

As we continue, the committees are a waste of time under the way the Senate is currently being run, because everything is run right out of the leader's office. Republicans have offered a number of amendments to the underlying legislation. Why not allow them to come up for a vote? Are they afraid we might pass some Republican amendments when they have 55 Democrats in the Senate? If, as the majority leader has claimed, none of our ideas is serious enough to warrant consideration, why not bring them up and let Democrats who have a majority in the Senate vote them down? That could have been done.

The problem is they know some of these amendments are worthwhile, worthy amendments that might pass. It might cause some heartburn to some on both sides maybe. I am certainly used to heartburn over the years, I will tell you that.

Republicans have offered a number of amendments to the underlying legislation. Why not allow them to come up for a vote? If, as the majority leader has claimed, our ideas are not serious enough to warrant consideration, why not allow them to be brought up, limit the time for the debate, and let the Democrats, who once again have a majority in the Senate, vote them down?

The only conclusion we can draw is that they are afraid, if we held a vote, some of our amendments might actually pass, which would distract from the political message they want to send with this debate on the floor. The minority leader and I have offered such an amendment, one I believe would actually pass if it were to receive a vote.

It is something that makes a lot more sense than what is going on here over the last number of days, weeks maybe. I would like to just take a few minutes to talk about our amendment, the McConnell-Hatch amendment. The McConnell-Hatch amendment would, if enacted, extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program for a full year, taking unemployment benefits out of the 2014 political equation entirely. I would think my colleagues on the other side would jump at that kind of opportunity. In addition to this fix on the unemployment insurance issue, the McConnell-Hatch amendment would fix the military pension problems created under the recent budget agreement which has caused so much angst and heartburn among our military, among those who are serving our country in that manner.

There is bipartisan support for this endeavor. I believe we can fix it here and now. Best of all, unlike the underlying bill and the ''compromise'' offered at the end of last week, the McConnell-Hatch amendment is fully paid for within the normal 10-year budget window. In fact, it reduces the deficit by more than $1 billion over 10 years and does it in a fair, honest way.

One way it pays for the extension is to close the loophole in the law that allows people to claim both unemployment insurance and Social Security disability insurance. The majority leader claims he wants to do this. But our amendment does it in a much more efficient way, something that makes economic sense. However, the primary pay-for in our amendment, which once again allows us to extend unemployment benefits for a full year and fix the military pensions issue is a 1-year delay in the ObamaCare individual mandate—a 1-year delay. That is it.

I know some of my friends on the other side, including the distinguished

majority leader, have already deemed this proposal controversial. But it should not be. The problems with the implementation of ObamaCare have been fully cataloged at length on the floor and elsewhere. No one in their right mind would argue that the implementation is going well—nobody. It is not going well.

This would give them a chance to amend this bill over the next year, although I do not think we can amend the bill—but at least give them a chance to. Sooner or later they are going to have to do it anyway. So what do they give up? Members of both parties have come out in support of delaying the individual mandate—of both parties, not just Republicans but Democrats. They know it is a disaster.

Regardless of where you stand on ObamaCare, if you support it or if you, as I do, want to see it repealed, delaying the mandate is a bipartisan idea and it makes sense. What are they afraid of? With a law this unpopular and a rollout going this badly, I would think that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle would get on board with a 1-year delay. Once again, such a delay would allow us to pay for a less-politicized extension of Federal unemployment benefits as well as allow us to fix our military pension problems.

It is a win-win proposition. It is hard for me to understand why they will not do this. As I said, I know the Senate Democratic leadership despises this idea. They have already come to the floor and mischaracterized it on a number of occasions. However, I believe that if this approach, the 1-year extension of unemployment benefits and the military pension fix, paid for primarily by a 1-year delay in the individual mandate, were brought to a vote in the Senate, Members of both parties would support it.

It would be a bipartisan approach to these things that would be worthwhile. The same can be said for any number of amendments my colleagues have offered. I may be wrong about that, but I do not think I am. If I am wrong, what is the harm in having a vote on the McConnell-Hatch amendment? What is the harm in having a vote on any of the amendments Republicans have offered? What are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle afraid of?

We have been putting up with this now for too long a time. I remember the Senate when both sides worked together all the time. They battled even though they differed. They allowed amendments to come up even though sometimes it caused some heartburn to people on one side or the other. But we did it because this is a legislative body of freedom, which it has devolved in a way that there is not freedom. What is the harm in having a vote on any of the amendments? Let's have a limited number of amendments, not two, three or four. This is an important bill. Let's have some amendments that even Republicans can offer.

There are some Democratic amendments too. I suppose they may have some heartburn for Republicans. So what. What are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle afraid of? Once again, I do not think the Senate Democratic leadership is worried that I am wrong about some Democrats supporting the McConnell-Hatch amendment. They are worried I might be right. That is why my amendment will not receive a vote.

That is why as of right now, it appears no Republican amendments will receive votes, unless it happens among the few who were willing to support the first vote. Even then, I doubt they will have any votes. As I said, it seems as though Democrats are far more worried about sending a political message about unemployment insurance than they are with actually passing an extension. That is unfortunate. It is truly shameful.

However this debate unfolds, one issue is clear: The approach the President is taking is not working.

The economic approach the President is taking is not working. The tax approach the President is taking is not working. The so-called ''Affordable Care Act'' approach the President is taking is fraught with problems that could be solved if the Senate is allowed to truly work the way the Senate always has in the past. The approach the President and the Senate Democratic leadership is taking isn't working.

We are not creating jobs at a time when Americans need them. Americans need jobs, and we are not generating the type of growth that will allow for such job creation in the near future.

As far as I can see, we have two choices. We can either have these same fights over and over or we can work together to fix the real underlying problems facing our country instead of focusing on the symptoms and always playing the ridiculous game of politics.

I hope we will choose to work together. But if the tactics we have seen thus far on unemployment legislation are any indication, I think I am likely to end up quite disappointed.

I am concerned about the Senate. I am concerned about some of the very power-striking poses that have been going on around here that do not allow the Senate to work its will, do not allow for real bipartisanship, do not allow for bringing us together, and do not allow for decency on both sides. These are just plain power-seeking approaches that do not deserve praise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act.

I am pleased a 3-month extension of unemployment insurance for millions in Minnesota and across the country was able to clear its first hurdle in the Senate, but our work of course is not finished.

I urge my colleagues in the House and the Senate to pass an extension to renew these critical benefits so hard-pressed families in Minnesota and across our Nation can keep their heads above water while they search for work.

As I have traveled around Minnesota, I have heard from a lot of Minnesotans who wish to work. On Friday I had a roundtable conference. There were three women and some workforce professionals. These women are looking hard and have been looking. They are part of the long-term unemployed. These are women who were working: one is in her forties with two kids—one little kid, a 3-year-old child, a single mom; one was in her fifties; and one was about my age, in her early sixties.

While they are looking for jobs—and we had a professional there who said one of the hardest jobs is looking for a job. They need the unemployment insurance to stay in their homes and to put food on the table for their families.

In the wake of the worst recession since the Great Depression, too many people had good jobs and worked their entire lives—all of these women who had worked their entire lives had 20-, 30-, and 40-year careers and now they are out of work and remain out of work.

Unemployment remains high, and the long-term unemployment rate among workers who have been looking for work for at least 6 months has weighed down our economy. Today more then 4 million Americans, 37 percent of the unemployed, have been out of work for 6 months. This is the worst long-term unemployment since the Great Recession. That is why we need to extend the emergency unemployment compensation. These workers, the millions throughout the country, are worried they will lose their ability to pay for a roof over their heads and put food on the table for their families, for their children.

For most Americans, State-funded unemployment insurance runs out after 26 weeks. Yet the average unemployment spell now lasts over 2½ months longer. Emergency unemployment benefits provide for up to an additional 47 weeks of unemployment insurance for those Americans who need it while they are looking for a job.

When I talk about high long-term employment, these women, every one of them I talked to, were working very hard every day. One woman described it as saying: I am looking 24 hours a day. I have my smartphone, and I am hoping 24 hours a day that I get something, a response, an interview.

Right now we have three people looking for every job opening, but that doesn't mean that when someone applies for a job, there are only two other people looking. These women were telling me every time they applied for a job there were several hundred people looking. Very often they will apply for a job that a company announces, and the company will hire someone from

inside the company, which is great for that person.

But this is not about people waiting for their unemployment to run out and then look for a job. That is not what it is about.

After Christmas, 1.3 million Americans lost their jobs and who are looking for work, including 8,500 Minnesotans. They lost this critical lifeline of unemployment compensation.

Remember, these women I talked about paid in. I am talking about 20 years of working, 30 years of working, 40 years in the workforce. If we don't renew these benefits over the next year, that lifeline will run out for another 3.6 million people, including 65,000-plus Minnesotans.

While Minnesota has been fortunate to have a lower unemployment rate than other States, I believe the 65,000 Minnesotans who will lose benefits without an extension deserve our support as they are looking for work.

Congress has never allowed special extended unemployment benefits to expire when the long-term unemployment rate is as high as it is today. In fact, at 2.5 percent, the long-term unemployment rate is nearly double the level when previous emergency benefits were allowed to expire. The current unemployment rate of 6.7 percent is far above nearly all previous rates seen at expiration and is 1.1 percent higher than when President George W. Bush signed the current round of benefits into law.

As I said, on Friday I met with several unemployed Minnesotans. Two out of the three were affected by our not extending the emergency unemployment insurance.

I wish to share a little bit of their stories but also people who have written in, Minnesotans who have reached out to me about how failing to extend unemployment insurance will affect them.

John from Cushing, MN, wrote in December:

> I am a 58 year old sales and marketing professional that was laid off due to a force reduction and have been unemployed for a year. I have not been able to find even part time work. I have exhausted my severance package and most of my liquid savings just to cover financial obligations and essentials such as food and utilities. Additionally, I do not have any health care coverage as my income has been limited to unemployment compensation. Now that the Federal Extension is about to expire, beginning next week I will have zero income and no job offer pending. I would appreciate your support in doing what you can to re-instate the Federal Unemployment Extension in Minnesota as for me personally, it is of extreme need and I would expect many others around the country may also be in such dire straits.

Almost half—I believe it is the majority of Americans—sometime in their lives hit a hard patch and our job is to be there for them.

Debbie from White Bear Lake wrote:

> There are many of us out here who will run out of benefits next year and are still unable to find a decent job. I have been out of work for over 4 months and am spending at least 5–6 hours a day (EVERY day) looking for a job. While this may not seem that long, I am already concerned about my state unemployment running out and having nothing. . . . The people that actually work are the ones that spend money to help the economy.

She is right. We know from CBO that if we extend unemployment insurance these people spend the money and it goes immediately out in the economy and actually the CBO says this will sustain about 200,000 additional jobs. If we don't do this, we will create 200,000 less jobs over the next year.

On Friday I met with Ann from Eden Prairie, who wrote:

> I have unfortunately been unemployed since being downsized from a small consulting organization in April, 2013. . . . I have been extremely active in my job search—

Boy, has she. I will say all of these women were upgrading their skills. Some of them had gone back to school to upgrade their skills and are still not being successful in finding work.

She continues:

> —but have regrettably not found new unemployment. My Minnesota Unemployment Insurance ran out last week and I applied for Federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation just this past week. I understand it's going to expire at the end of the month.

She wrote to me in December.

> I ask you to please ask yourself what you would do to provide for your family. I have a 9 year old daughter . . . and a three year old son. I am the sole provider for my family. I volunteer extensively at the school and elsewhere in my community. . . .

She is a volunteer. She does that, but she also volunteers looking for a job. She is networking in her volunteer work. She is volunteering for her kids' school, for her 9-year-old's school.

She told me the 3-year-old went to preschool 5 days a week, then 4 days, then 3 days, then 2 days, and now 1 day a week—and how hard is it to look for a job with a 3-year-old.

She continues: ''I am not looking for a handout, nor do I believe that staying on unemployment insurance is in my best interest.''

But she says it ''will at least allow me to make my mortgage payment.''

Doug, from Bloomington, wrote that he and his family will lose their home if we allow benefits to expire.

He says:

> I unfortunately lost my job due to the economy last March . . . each position that I apply for has at least 500 candidates applying for the same position. If the Federal unemployment extension is not approved, my family and I will be homeless within a month! I have even tried to apply for ''temporary positions,'' however, they always reply that I am overly qualified!

We talked about this in the roundtable. We also had professionals there who are professional workforce people and are counselors. These people are working it. There was a woman in her fifties who said: They will not take me at McDonald's because they figure if I get some other job I will leave and it costs to train them.

It truly troubles me that those who have worked and contributed to our society the longest, I am saying 20, 30, 40 years, have been particularly hit hard by long-term unemployment; in other words, older workers who lose their jobs have experienced longer periods of unemployment than younger workers. Part of that is age discrimination. That age discrimination has made it more difficult for older workers to bounce back when they lose their jobs. According to AARP, 34 percent of older workers seeking work reported they had experienced, or know someone who has experienced, age discrimination in the past 4 years. This was the experience of all three of the women I talked to.

Extending unemployment insurance isn't just the right thing to do to help our fellow Americans who are out of work and searching for a job, it is also the smart thing to do for our economy. As I said, in 2011, the Congressional Budget Office said that aid to the unemployed is among the policies with ''the largest effects on output and employment per dollar of budgetary cost.'' CBO estimates that extending benefits through 2014 will help expand the economy and contribute to the creation of an additional 200,000 jobs. The Council of Economic Advisers estimates without a full-year extension, the economy will generate 240,000 fewer jobs by the end of 2014.

We know unemployment benefits work. The Census Bureau estimates that unemployment benefits kept 2.5 million people who are trying to stay in the workforce out of poverty in 2012 alone and have kept over 11 million unemployed workers out of poverty since 2008. Countless local businesses feel the positive effects when the unemployed are able to keep buying their basic necessities—food, utilities, gas, so they can drive to look for a job.

Unemployment insurance isn't the only thing we should be doing to help the unemployed either. There are lots of things we can and should be doing. There are more than 3 million jobs in this country that could be filled today if there were workers who had the right skills. With too many Americans unemployed, we have to find a way to fill those jobs, to train those workers. We should be helping workers get the training they need to fill the high-tech jobs that are growing in Minnesota and across the country—in Maine, in Alabama, in the State of every Senator I talk to in this Chamber when I talk about the skills gap and manufacturing returning to this country—but we don't have the skilled workers, and this at a time of such high long-term unemployment. We need to be training a workforce for the 21st century.

Sometimes these jobs are in advanced manufacturing. Sometimes this training takes 2 years, but we need to do it. We should be helping connect these people to educational programs that link them with employers, and that is why I have introduced the Community College to Career Fund Act. Under this program, businesses and

community colleges would apply for grants based on how many jobs that partnership would create, the value of the jobs to those hired and to the community, and how much skin the businesses have in the game.

There is a lot we should be doing to create jobs. We should be addressing our infrastructure deficit. You know, when you don't repair our infrastructure, when you don't create new infrastructure, that is a deficit too, and we need to get people into work that we need to be doing. But failing to extend emergency unemployment doesn't make sense. We shouldn't be punishing people such as John and Debbie and Ann and Doug who are looking for work and can't find jobs. We shouldn't be pulling the rug out from under them and millions of others who support the small businesses and local retailers in our cities and our towns. Extending these benefits is something we should do now to jump-start and to continue this recovery.

But we shouldn't stop there. I will continue to press this Congress to work to create jobs through investments in infrastructure, in innovation and education so that the unemployed can get back to work at good jobs that sustain long-term economic growth.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, this Nation is facing a debt crisis. That is fully understood by the American people and experts all over. Our total debt is now in excess of $17 trillion.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 was an important step in reining in some of our spending. It reduced the growth of spending from 2012 to 2022 by $2.1 trillion. That was the agreement. We raised the debt ceiling by $2.1 trillion, but we promised the American people we would restrain spending over the next decade by that amount.

The spending baseline for America, as calculated at that time by the Congressional Budget Office was expected to see spending increase by $10 trillion over the next 10 years over current levels. The Budget Control Act, which included the sequester, was to limit that growth to $8 trillion instead $10 trillion.

I wanted to reduce the growth of spending more than that, but the BCA levels did provide a cap on spending that was approved by President Obama, passed by both Houses of Congress, and signed into law by President Obama.

This year, fiscal year 2014, was the toughest year in terms of being able to meet the goals of the 10 years under the BCA and, therefore, we blinked, I would say, and there arose the Murray-Ryan bipartisan legislation, written not with our Budget Committee members but by these two leaders. They agreed we would spend $64 billion more than the BCA allowed.

This was a bitter pill for me, I have to say. I warned this was the first real violation of the Budget Control Act spending limits, and when I sought some other alternatives, that didn't happen. The legislation passed and it spent and agreed to spend more money. But it had a good point. It reaffirmed this was all that would be spent above the BCA level. It said: We have a tight time now. If you will just increase spending for the next 2 years, we will stay fundamentally with the BCA levels.

That was another promise, wasn't it? We promised in 2011 to limit our spending, and we come back in December 2013 and we say we can't live with our promises any longer. Now we are making these alterations, but we are going to stick with this. We are going to stay with this promise. If you will just give us this $64 billion extra to spend, we will not spend any more than that over the next several years.

It also left the BCA caps in place for the next 7 years. Unemployment compensation is a mandatory entitlement spending program that is before us now that Congress would like to spend more on than current law allows.

Of course, it appears that promises made in Washington are made to be broken. I sometimes think our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle see agreements such as Ryan-Murray as steps to advance their agenda—just to further the revolution—and not something that should be honored. Less than 6 months after this act passed, President Obama proposed a budget that would spend $1 trillion more than was agreed to in the BCA—a breathtaking violation of the plain law he had signed 6 months earlier. His plan, fortunately, was rejected, but he filed the same new budget in fiscal year 2013 with $1 trillion more in spending. All our Senate Democratic colleagues voted for the budget Senator MURRAY moved out of committee, and it would spend $1 trillion more than the BCA limits.

OK. So they said we couldn't live with that. We needed to spend more. That is how the Ryan-Murray agreement came about. OK, we will spend some more, and we will use this to pay for it, and we will do all this, and most of it—too much of it, frankly,—is gimmickry, and it passed—to spend more. It was to fix the financial pressure we were under. It was to fix the tight year or two we have here—the toughest year or two in the budget.

But now, just 4 weeks after that passed, in December—tough negotiations and secret talks concluded between MURRAY and RYAN and with the first bill on the floor in this Congress, we have an unemployment insurance extension that totally busts those levels. So now we are told we don't have to abide by those legal caps, just spend more money now, with no corresponding cuts or reductions anywhere to pay for it, as required. Former House Speaker NANCY PELOSI famously said once: ''There is no place left to cut.'' Well, there are places left to cut.

We know we have a lot of people hurting and unemployed today, and some sort of compensation is legitimate. But this idea we can waltz in here because there is a need in the country that we believe should be fulfilled and we can borrow the money and spend for it is not good. It is why this Nation is $17 trillion in debt.

People are angry with Washington. I would say to my colleagues: Why shouldn't they be angry? Didn't we promise to stay with the BCA limits? Didn't we promise after the Ryan-Murray agreement to spend more but we would stay there? Didn't we agree with that? And here we are, the first bill of this session, just a few weeks after that passed—Ryan-Murray, the ink hardly dry—and we are demanding now a huge new deficit spending program.

Make no mistake, my colleagues, we are in deficit. Any new spending over the Budget Control Act entails more borrowing. That is the way it works. Section 111 of H.J. Res. 59, the Ryan-Murray spending agreement, says this:

> Section 111(a)—Fiscal Year 2014. For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 2014, and for enforcing, in the Senate, budgetary points of order . . . the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply.

What are those levels, you might ask? This is what it says:

> Section 111(b)(2).—. . . committee allocations for—(A) fiscal year 2014; (B) fiscal years 2014 through 2018 . . .; and (C) fiscal years 2014 through 2023; consistent with the May 2013 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office . . .

The CBO baseline assumes extended unemployment benefits—that we have been extending beyond any historical pattern—will expire, as the law requires, because that is what Congress wrote into law. The ink is barely dry on the December agreement and we are already being pushed to violate it. Therefore, if we extend unemployment insurance benefits, it will cost us, will it not? Ryan-Murray would assume choices would be made between competing expenditure values and that the net spending would not increase above the baseline; that out of $3.7 trillion we spend a year, we can find the $26 billion necessary for Senator REED's proposal or other proposals which might be less to fund unemployment insurance, and we would find that somewhere or we wouldn't do it.

The Reed amendment before us includes a provision that would extend the Budget Control Act sequester for 1 year, to 2024. So he proposes that: Well, let's assume it continues, and then we can save money 11 years or 12 years from now, and then we can pay for that spending program today. Isn't that nice?

I am ashamed to see the Senate's favorite budget gimmick, ''spend now and pay later,'' devolved into something almost financially sinister: ''Spend now and pay way, way, way later.''

Ten years? We are not honoring the spending limits we agreed to in December, and now we are promising: If we are just allowed to spend this money, we will cut spending 11 years from now. There will be 5 different House elections, 5 different Senate elections, 10 different budgets written, 10 different appropriations bills written between now and then.

The American people know better. We are not adhering to the agreements we made while the ink is still wet. We are going to promise to save money out there? It is outrageous.

This is a legitimate offset. Why don't we do it for 1 year? We can extend the budget sequester 2 years—2024, 2025—and save enough money so we could give every Federal employee a raise and it wouldn't cost a dime. It would all be paid for. Wouldn't it?

Or how about we extend it 3 years, to 2027, and then we can double the highway bill? We would like to spend more money on highways. I would. I would like to increase that. We could pretend that we are going to extend these limits 13 years, 14 years from now, and that will pay for it.

This kind of gimmickry is how our Nation has gone broke. This is what we have been doing year after year—violating even our own generous spending limits and pretending we are cutting spending when we are just reducing the growth from $10 trillion to $8 trillion. And we think the country is going to sink into the ocean if we reduce the growth of spending from $10 trillion to $8 trillion.

One of the most successful parts of the 1996 welfare reform law was the work requirements for healthy working-age adults without children. The work requirements encouraged millions of Americans to improve their lives by working, going to school, or engaging in job training programs. However, this administration has granted States the ability to suspend the food stamp work requirements since 2012 as part of the extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program.

If the emergency unemployment program is extended again even for 1 week, the administration will have the authority to waive the work requirement for about 40 States for 2015. In other words, the food stamp work requirement will be suspended. He is going to do that. If this bill passes, it will give him the power to do that. That is going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars, too. It is an unexpected, unappreciated thing in the bill.

After analyzing the Reed amendment and the underlying bill before us, we have consulted with Senator MURRAY's staff—the Democratic chair of the Budget Committee and a very honorable person—and proposed that this proposal violates the Ryan-Murray law, and that several points of order apply against the Reed amendment:

It violates the Senate pay-as-you-go requirement. It increases the deficit by more than $10 billion inside the 10-year budget window without offsets to pay for the entire cost. It spends way more above what the Senate Finance Committee has allowed under the spending deal we enforced. And it violates the Budget Committee's own jurisdiction.

Finally, the amendment isn't paid for inside the budget window as the Budget Act requires. Instead, it tries to count savings 11 years out. That is not allowed under the Budget Act.

When I raise these points of order, I would expect that sooner or later the majority will move to waive all budget points of order against the amendment, and, perhaps, all budget points of order against the bill itself. If Senator Leader REID moves to waive, ignore, spend above the budget limits, it requires 60 votes.

Let me be clear: Senator MURRAY and her staff have acknowledged this does violate the Budget Act, and that a budget point of order—if I or others raise it—would be well taken, and it would take 60 votes to break it.

So the question will soon be on us: In the face of a pressing need we all believe should be addressed, will 60 of us agree that the best way forward is to turn our backs on the Murray-Ryan spending deal that Congress passed just 4 weeks ago and President Obama signed just 2 weeks ago?

Or will enough of us agree that the best way forward to help the unemployed and pay for that assistance is with other savings in the Federal budget, so we don't have to blow a hole in our budget agreement and our children and grandchildren will be stuck with paying the price?

Another point: By upholding the new spending arrangement the government just entered into, by defending it against even more spending, we can also accomplish one other thing—put aside the gag rule on amendments enforced by the majority leader.

We have talked a lot about this: We need to be able to offer amendments and have debate on how to make this bill better. If the majority makes a successful motion to waive the Budget Act points of order, it protects the gag rule, the blocking of amendments, the filling of the tree. Members need to have a chance to offer amendments to this legislation so improvements can be made, so we can pay for what is needed to be spent, and an actual bipartisan bill can emerge from the Senate.

So this is the question before us now: Do we adhere to the spending limits Congress passed and promised less than 1 month ago? Or do we break the Ryan-Murray limits like we broke the Budget Control Act limits? Will we do so in the first bill that comes before Congress this year?

This is not a vote on unemployment benefits when I am able to make the budget point of order. And I plan to do so. It is not about unemployment benefits when we vote on the budget point of order. It is a vote on whether we uphold the spending limits we agreed to, or whether we violate those limits in the first spending bill since this Congress took session this year. This is about the integrity of this institution.

In 2011, we passed a Budget Control Act and promised to spend a certain amount of money, and that amount only. But when the spending discipline proved too tough, Congress backed down and agreed to a new, looser spending limit under Ryan-Murray. That was a few weeks ago, just before Christmas.

Now here we are, on the first spending bill of the year, and our Democratic majority is proposing to bust the Ryan-Murray spending limits right out of the chute. How could any voter trust the Senate if this body votes today to break these new limits less than 1 month old?

A vote to uphold budget rules today is simply a vote to say that the bill should be paid for. Whatever we decide to do, pay for it. There are many ideas for doing so. Congress could easily offset these funds if the majority leader here in the Senate would allow us to propose amendments—which he hasn't done.

So let's uphold the rules of our institution, enforce our budget rules, and find a way to pay for this legislation—pay for what we intend to spend above the limit. Let's keep our promises to the American people.

I hope my colleagues who voted for the Ryan-Murray bill will not renege now. If they break this agreement today, why should any taxpayer trust our colleagues' promises in the future?

I hope all of us, no matter our policy disagreements, can agree to uphold Senate rules. I hope we can abide by the promises we made to the American people. And I hope we can agree that financial integrity is more important than partisan interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, while my colleague from Alabama is still here, I want to talk about a certain national championship game which just occurred.

Before I do, I want to say that a lot of the frustration my colleague has expressed is frustration which is shared by this Senator—not the specifics, but the fact that the Senate is not working as it should. Indeed, the Congress is not working as it should.

But I would remind anyone who is listening to these words the old adage: It takes two to tango. And if anything is going to get done, there is going to have to be a meeting of the minds between the parties, recognizing that you can't have it all one way—your way.

There are legitimate grievances in what has led to the dysfunction of the U.S. Congress, and we can speak here today with regard to the Senate.

Authorization committees, which have been so important in the history of this country and the functioning of

the Congress, at times are irrelevant in that they have not only been overtaken but the appropriations process has been overtaken as well.

When we cobble together these huge appropriations bills that are nothing but a continuation of the previous year's appropriations with some tweaks, where is the input of Members? In the past, it has been Mount Olympus which has come together at the last minute in an emergency situation to cobble together something to keep the government functioning.

That is not rational decisionmaking. It is not what we call around here regular order. It certainly isn't the authorization of bills. And it certainly isn't appropriations of the government, according to that authorization for appropriations.

As we get on down the line, I want to continue to work with my colleague, whom I have had the pleasure and privilege of working with, as we have worked on very thorny issues in the past on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of Armed Services on national missile defense. The Senator from Alabama and this Senator have been able to come together in agreement on those thorny issues years ago.

But times have changed, and this place is not functioning. It is going to take an extra special effort on both sides of that aisle which has become too big of a dividing line in our ability to get work done.

I empathize with the Senator's frustration and let him know there is frustration on this Senator's part as well.

(The further remarks of Mr. NELSON and Mr. SESSIONS are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

HAITI EARTHQUAKE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, yesterday marks the fourth anniversary of the devastating earthquake that hit Haiti on January 12, 2010. The U.S. Geological Survey said that precisely at 4:53 p.m. local time, the Caribbean and North American plates moved, resulting in a major earthquake of a 7.0 magnitude, with aftershocks greater than 5.0 that continued for months afterward. It has been described as the largest urban disaster in modern history because in just 30 seconds more than 10 million cubic meters of rubble were created, enough to fill dump trucks parked bumper to bumper, all the way from Key West, FL, to the northern tip of the State of the Presiding Officer, Maine, and then back again. That is how much rubble was created.

We remember today 230,000 victims of the earthquake, one of the deadliest in history. The earthquake also resulted in over 300,000 injuries and left 1½ million people homeless.

I went to Haiti immediately after the earthquake. It was a horrifying aftermath. During the last 4 years the path to recovery for Haiti has been very slow and arduous, particularly because that poor country has also faced so many other plagues: Rainstorms, the edges of hurricanes, a vicious outbreak of cholera, and many other tropical storms. Long-term reconstruction and rehabilitation is going to take years, but the Haitian government, with the support of the United States and the international community, hopefully, is going to keep the country moving forward.

This past year I visited with President Martelly and his officials. They are making progress. The international community has stepped up. But nobody has stepped up like the United States. We have led an unprecedented recovery effort, $3.5 billion for initial humanitarian needs and long-term assistance in health, infrastructure, rule of law, food, and economic security.

In this last visit this past August, I saw many of those reconstruction efforts already completed and others that are well underway, and others that are showing notable progress. But there is so much to be done.

The Haitian people are incredible; they are resilient; they are resourceful; they are a proud people; and they have utilized the support they have received from around the world, including the Haitian Diaspora. A lot of that Diaspora community is in Florida, and they have utilized that.

We all want Haiti to succeed and to continue to rebuild. So 4 years after such unbelievable devastation, let's pause to think about Haiti and reaffirm our commitment to her. We also congratulate the Haitian people as they celebrate their country's 210th anniversary of independence that is this year. It is a tough subject. Haiti is the poorest country in the entire Western Hemisphere. There is a certain special responsibility that those countries, particularly in the Western Hemisphere, that are more fortunate—a certain responsibility that we have to help that little country rebuild.

I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask, since I just arrived on the Senate floor, is it appropriate for me to speak on the judicial nominee we will be voting on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

WILKINS NOMINATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we are going to vote on the third of three nominees to the DC Circuit. Today it will be Judge Robert Wilkins. I will oppose the judge's nomination, just as I did when the Senate rejected the same nomination in November of last year.

This circuit, of course, is far and away the least busy in the country. This is one of the reasons why the Democrats blocked nominees to this very same circuit, based on the very same arguments regarding caseload, during the Bush administration. There were only two differences between then and now. Back then the caseload was even higher, and back then there was a Republican in the White House. Today, of course, there is a Democrat in the White House, and also a Democratic majority here in the Senate.

Today, by pushing this nomination for a circuit where there are not more judges needed based on caseload, I say that the Senate majority—meaning the Senate Democrats—do not want to play by the same rules they pioneered or by the same standards they established during the Bush administration.

Even though the Senate considered and rejected this nomination just a couple of months ago, today once again we will be voting on Judge Wilkins' confirmation. We will vote on the judge's nomination today because, on November 21, last year, the majority leader and the Senate majority invoked the so-called nuclear option. In one fell swoop, the majority leader did more damage to the institution than I have witnessed in more than 3 decades of service here in the Senate. In fact, when the majority leader broke the rules to change the rules last November and tossed aside two centuries of Senate history and precedent, he likely did more damage to this institution than any leader who preceded him.

It was a power grab. Of course it was a power grab. But it was more than that. It fundamentally has altered the way the Senate operates. It stripped the minority of its rights—under the rules, of course—but it was more than that as well. It cheapens the world's greatest deliberative body.

About 2 hours ago I spoke on this subject to the Senate based upon what James Madison said was the function of the Senate—to be a deliberative body, to bring stability to our political system, not to do things the same way the House of Representatives does.

As a result of the nuclear option, the Senate design has been forever altered, and it was done via brute force with zero buy-in from the minority. The result, as we have seen over the last 2 months, is less cooperation and more partisanship, something the people of this country abhor.

That is before you consider the current state of affairs regarding amendments here on the Senate floor. The majority leader routinely blocks all Senators from offering amendments by doing what we call ''filling the tree'' with amendments, and then sets aside his ''blocker amendments'' for only those amendments that the leader considers appropriate for us to discuss.

When you take into consideration the inability of Senators to offer amendments of their choosing and combine it with the leader's decision to strip the minority of their right to extend a debate on nominations, it becomes clear why today's Senate operates the way it does. There are two great rights Senators have: the right to debate and the right to amend. That is what makes us a deliberative body. That is what makes us so much different from the House of Representatives. By stripping away, on one hand, the right to extend the debate on nominations, and denying Senators, on the

other hand, the right to offer amendments, the leader has taken those two rights and shredded them. It is to a point where some Members of this body don't even have a full appreciation for the way the institution used to operate.

Is it any wonder that it is difficult to get things done in today's Senate? Is it any wonder Senators don't feel compelled to work and consult together?

Today we will vote on a nomination the Senate rejected a couple of months ago. Now—perhaps because the other side is having a bit of buyer's remorse—some of my colleagues have been doing their best to rewrite history.

Senate Democrats claim that Republican opposition to the DC Circuit nominees was, in their words, unprecedented, but conveniently failed to mention that Senate Democrats set the standard during the Bush administration when they blocked qualified nominees to the DC Circuit based on caseload, which is the same argument I used, but in those days the caseload was even heavier than it is today.

As I have said, back then the caseload was higher. You can't say that too often. The fact is that DC is the most underworked circuit in the Nation.

I have given previous speeches on this subject, and I have given a lot of statistics, so I won't go through all those statistics again today, but with the most recent data released by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the numbers still show the DC Circuit has the fewest number of appeals filed and appeals terminated among all of the Federal circuit courts.

On a per-active-judge basis, the DC Circuit now has 111 total appeals filed per active judge. The national average is over three times higher, at 377. The busiest court, the Eleventh Circuit, comes in at over seven times higher than the DC Circuit, at 796. In other words, a Federal appellate judge sitting in Florida has a workload seven times heavier than the circuit judge sitting here in DC.

I hope people don't fall for the phony argument that cases in the DC Circuit are more complicated. There are other circuits that handle more of these so-called complex cases than even DC. The bottom line is the empirical data has shown, and continues to show, that these judges could have been better used in other circuits. I have a piece of legislation that would move these three judges from the DC Circuit to other circuits where the caseload is greater.

To confirm what the statistics show, early last year I decided to go straight to the source, the judges who serve in DC on this circuit. Before these nominations to the DC Circuit were even made, I submitted a questionnaire to each DC Circuit judge asking them about their workload. Their responses independently confirmed that the data showed that the court is severely underworked.

One judge responded: ''If any more judges were added now, there wouldn't be enough work to go around.'' I hope you understand that the vacancies that are being filled are going to cost the taxpayers $1 million-plus a year forever as long as these seats are filled.

After looking carefully at the data, and, of course, confirming my understanding with the judges themselves, I opposed these nominations based, in part, on the same standards established by the Democrats during the Bush administration when they blocked nominees to the DC Circuit. Then, of course, there was a Republican President, and now we have a Democratic President.

Of course, that wasn't the only reason for opposition to these nominees. For instance, gun rights supporters are opposed to Judge Wilkins, not based on caseload but because of the Dearth v. Holder case where Judge Wilkins held that nonresident U.S. citizens don't have the Second Amendment right to purchase a firearm.

The last nominee we confirmed to the DC Circuit was about the farthest thing from a mainstream nominee as you can get. I won't repeat everything I said about that nominee in previous speeches or what that nominee has said or written, but I will give one example. Consider former Professor Pillard's view on religious freedom. She argued that the Supreme Court case of Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church, which challenged the so-called ''ministerial exception'' to employment discrimination represented—in her words—a ''substantial threat to the American rule of law.''

The Supreme Court, on appeal, rejected her view 9–0, and the Court held that ''it is impermissible for the government to contradict a church's determination of who can act as its ministers.''

Think about that. Former Professor Pillard argued the challenge to the ministerial exception to employment law represented a ''substantial threat to the American rule of law.'' Yet the Court rejected the view 9–0, and held ''it is impermissible for the government to contradict a church's determination of who can act as its ministers.''

Do my colleagues honestly believe it is within the mainstream to argue churches shouldn't be allowed to choose their own ministers? I don't believe it is in the mainstream.

We know these judges aren't needed. Far from it. We know these nominations aren't mainstream. Far from it. Then why did our Senate Democrats go to such lengths to stack this court? Why go so far as to change the Senate rules in order to fill these vacancies? Why go so far as to abuse and violate the Senate rules to change the rules? Well, because the President and his allies will do whatever it takes to get their way even if it means breaking Senate rules, silencing debate, circumventing Congress, or stacking the judicial deck in their favor to ensure that their executive actions are rubberstamped by the courts.

It is no secret the President has decided to circumvent Congress by relying heavily on Executive orders and regulatory action to carry out an unpopular agenda. We all heard the President pledge repeatedly, ''If Congress won't act, I will.'' What he means, of course, is that he is going to do it all by executive action. He won't go to Congress. He won't negotiate. In fact, he will go around Congress. He decided he doesn't need legislators to make these changes. He will just issue an Executive order or issue new agency rules.

As I have explained before, in effect, the President is saying: If the Senate won't confirm who I want, when I want them, then I will recess-appoint them when the Senate isn't even in session, or at another time, the President would say: If Congress won't pass cap-and-trade fee increases, then I will go around the Congress and do the same thing through administrative action at the Environmental Protection Agency or, again, if Congress won't pass gun control legislation, then I will issue a series of Executive orders. Quite simply, that is what the President means when he says: If Congress won't act, I will.

But remember. Under our system, it is the courts that provide a check on the President's powers. It is the courts that decide whether the President is acting unconstitutionally. So the only way the President's plan works is if he stacks the deck in his favor. The only way the President can successfully bypass Congress is if he stacks the courts with ideological allies who will rubberstamp these Executive orders. That is why it is so important for the President that he and his Senate allies stack the DC Circuit even though the DC Circuit doesn't have enough work, and it will be an additional $1 million for each of the three judges who are now being stacked into this court.

As I have said, in the last few weeks the other side has attempted to rewrite history in an effort to justify the actions they have taken, but the other side's effort to rewrite history isn't limited to the history of the DC Circuit in particular. It extends to the number of so-called filibusters during the past few years.

Several times last week the Senate majority claimed that the Republicans filibustered 20 of Obama's district court nominees. According to their narrative, only 23 nominees have been filibustered in the history of the Senate, and 20 occurred in the past 5 years. That is not remotely true, and the majority knows that. As near as I can tell, this claim is based on the number of times a cloture motion has been filed on district court nominees. Of course, everyone knows a cloture motion isn't a filibuster. A filibuster is a failure to end debate.

Nonetheless, let's look at those 20 nominees. Seventeen nominees were

filed at one time back in March of 2012. That maneuver, of course, was a transparent effort to manufacture a crisis where no crisis existed. Every single one of these cloture motions was later withdrawn. As a result, not 1 of those 17 nominees even had a cloture vote, let alone a failed cloture vote.

In fact, of these 20 so-called filibusters of district court judges, the Senate held only 1 cloture vote on a district court judge, and that cloture vote passed the Senate. Yet the Senate majority still claims we filibustered 20 district court nominees. That is revisionist history if I have ever seen it.

Let's review the alleged Republican obstruction of the President's nominees. Since President Obama took office, the Senate has approved 218 of the President's lower court judicial nominees. That is 99 percent. So we have rejected only two. If the majority leader hadn't invoked the nuclear option, the number would have, in fact, been 5 instead of 2, but not 20, and not 34, as I have heard some claim. It would not have even been 10, which was the number the Senate majority blocked by the fifth year of President Bush's administration. Five nominees.

At the end of the day, the majority was willing to toss aside two centuries of Senate practice and tradition over just five judicial nominees. So I continue to oppose this nominee, just as I did when the Senate rejected the nomination before the Senate Democrats broke the rules to change the rules.

This judgeship wasn't warranted before the majority leader and the Democrats invoked the misguided nuclear option, and it certainly hasn't suddenly become warranted in the weeks since that time.

I yield the floor.

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.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have a vote scheduled for 5:30; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### NOMINATION OF ROBERT LEON WILKINS TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. REID. The Republican leader and I have had a number of conversations today about how we should proceed on unemployment insurance. I have had conversations and he has had conversations with a number of our Members, both Democrats and Republicans. Right now, because the vote is not scheduled until 5:30, it has been difficult for me, and I am quite certain for the Republican leader, to talk to all of the necessary people involved in trying to come to some conclusion as to how we should proceed on this legislation. Two of the people I met with today, everyone knows, are people who are trying to work something out, including Senator COLLINS and Senator HELLER. Senator HELLER is a cosponsor of the underlying bill and Senator COLLINS is always trying to make peace with everybody. They have made a proposal. I have an outline of their proposal and I appreciate their good work.

However, I can't automatically agree to it because it calls for 3 months rather than the 11 months or so we had in the underlying proposal that is before the Senate. As everyone knows, the President is not in favor of a 3-month proposal and I am not either, but that doesn't mean we can't work something out. I have made statements indicating I prefer a longer period in the proposal and so has the President.

However, my main point in saying a few words this afternoon is that we need to be able to meet with Senators—I need to meet with my caucus tomorrow before I can determine how I would suggest—along with the two Republican Senators I met with—how we will proceed on this matter.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. REID. Of course; I am happy to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would observe that what I am hoping for is an open amendment process. We have the amendment tree filled and it remains my hope that we will be able to, through these discussions we have had, get to something closer to what we have been accustomed to in the past with a relatively open amendment process. So under those circumstances, and in the hope that by tomorrow we end up with a more fair process, I am happy to go along with what the majority leader has suggested.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to legislative session, out of executive session. When I finish my remarks and the Republican leader finishes his remarks, I ask that we go back into executive session.

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

### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1845

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on amendment No. 2631 occur at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow; further, that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 1845 occur following the disposition of amendment No. 2631 or, if cloture is not invoked on amendment No. 2631, the Senate proceed immediately to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 1845.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I hope this will allow us a way to move forward. We will do our best to move forward. I am trying the best I can to come up with an arrangement to move forward.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Senator from Maryland.

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. If I understand correctly, we are on the nomination of judge Robert Wilkins?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Judge Robert L. Wilkins to be a circuit judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. I was pleased to introduce Judge Wilkins to the Judiciary Committee in September and the committee favorably reported his nomination in October. He was filibustered in November, and I am pleased we are reconsidering his nomination today.

Judge Wilkins currently serves as a Federal District Judge in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. So he is a district court judge today, confirmed by the Senate for a lifetime appointment, and now has been nominated by President Obama to fill the circuit court, which is the court above the judicial court for the District of Columbia.

I am happy we are going to get a chance to vote on the merits of this nominee.

Judge Wilkins is a native of Muncie, IN. He obtained his B.S. cum laude in chemical engineering from Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology and his J.D. from Harvard Law School.

Following graduation, Judge Wilkins clerked for The Honorable Earl B. Gilliam of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California. He later served as a staff attorney and as

head of special litigation for the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia. He then practiced as a partner with Venable, specializing in white-collar defense, intellectual property, and complex civil litigation before taking the bench as a district court judge.

Besides Judge Wilkins' professional accomplishments as an attorney, he has also played a leading role as a plaintiff in a landmark civil rights case in Maryland involving racial profiling. During his tenure with the Public Defender Service and in private practice, Judge Wilkins served as the lead plaintiff in Wilkins, et al. v. State of Maryland, a civil rights lawsuit against the Maryland State Police for a traffic stop they conducted on Judge Wilkins and his family. Let me give some of the circumstances of what Judge Wilkins went through.

In 1992 Judge Wilkins attended his grandfather's funeral in Chicago and then began an all-night trip home with three of his family members. He was due back in Washington, DC, that coming morning for a court appearance as a public defender. A Maryland State Police trooper pulled over their car. The police detained the family and deployed a drug-sniffing dog to check the car, after Judge Wilkins declined to consent to a search of the car, stating there was no reasonable suspicion. The family stood in the rain during the search, which did not uncover any contraband.

Judge Wilkins later wrote:

> It is hard to describe the frustration and pain you feel when people pressure you to be guilty for no good reason, and you know that you are innocent. . . . [W]e fit the profile to a tee. We were traveling on I–68, early in the morning, in a Virginia rental car. And, my cousin and I, the front seat passengers, were young black males. The only problem was that we were not dangerous, armed drug traffickers. It should not be suspicious to travel on the highway early in the morning in a Virginia rental car. And it should not be suspicious to be black.

After the traffic stop, Judge Wilkins began reviewing Maryland State Police data and noticed that while a majority of those searched on I–95 were Black, Blacks made up only a minority of the drivers traveling on the highway.

Judge Wilkins filed a civil rights lawsuit which resulted in two landmark settlements that were the first to require systematic compilation and publication by a police agency of data for all highway drug and weapons searches, including data recording the race of the motorist involved, the justification of the search and the outcome of the search. The settlements also required the State Police to hire an independent consultant, install video cameras in their vehicles, conduct internal investigations of all citizen complaints of racial profiling, and provide the Maryland NAACP with quarterly reports containing detailed information on the number, nature, location, and disposition of racial profiling complaints.

These settlements inspired a June 1999 Executive order by President Clinton, congressional hearings, and legislation that has been enacted in over half of the 50 States.

This was a landmark case, and the settlement provided the wherewithal for many States to change their practices on traffic stops and how traffic stops would be conducted. It was an important action Judge Wilkins took as a private citizen in order to advance the rights of all people. I applaud him for that courage, not only to stand for what was right for him but also to be active in changing those practices around the country.

As my colleagues know, I have introduced S. 1038, the End Racial Profiling Act—ERPA—which would codify many of the practices now used by the Maryland State Police to root out the use of racial profiling by law enforcement. The Judiciary Committee held a hearing on ending the use of racial profiling last year, and I am hopeful that with the broader discussion on racial profiling generated by the tragic death of Trayvon Martin, we can come together and move forward on this legislation.

Judge Wilkins played a key role in the passage of the Federal statute establishing the National Museum of African American History and Culture Plan for Action Presidential Commission, and he served as the chairman of the Site and Building Committee of that Presidential Commission. The work of the Presidential Commission led to the passage of Public Law 108–184, which authorized the creation of the National Museum of African American History and Culture. This museum will be the newest addition to the Smithsonian and is scheduled to open in 2015 between the National Museum of American History and the Washington Monument on the National Mall.

I mention that because Judge Wilkins has been involved in our community. He is not only an outstanding jurist, he is a person who has stood for basic rights. He has taken action where things were wronged against him, and he has been very active in our community.

He also continues his pro bono work to this day. He currently serves as the court liaison to the Standing Committee on Pro Bono Legal Services of the Judicial Conference of the DC Circuit. He is committed to public service and equal justice.

As a U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia since 2011, Judge Wilkins has presided over hundreds of civil and criminal cases, including both jury and bench trials. Judge Wilkins already sits on a Federal bench which hears an unusual number of cases of national importance to the Federal Government, including complex election law, voting rights, environmental, securities, and administrative law cases.

Indeed, Judge Wilkins has been nominated for the appellate court that would directly hear appeals from the court on which he currently sits. He understands the responsibilities of the court that he has been nominated to by President Obama.

The American Bar Association gave Judge Wilkins a rating of unanimously ''well qualified'' to serve as a Federal appellate judge, which is the highest possible rating from the nonpartisan peer review.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit is also referred to as the Nation's second highest court. The Supreme Court only accepts a handful of cases each year, so the DC Circuit often has the last word and proclaims the final law of the land in a range of critical areas of the law because many of these cases are brought to the DC Circuit.

This court handles unusually complex cases in the area of administrative law, including revealing decisions and rulemaking of many Federal agencies in policy areas, such as environment, labor, and financial regulations.

Nationally, only about 15 percent of the appeals are administrative in nature—15 percent. That is the national number. In the DC Circuit, that figure is 43 percent. They have a much larger caseload of complex cases. The court also hears a variety of sensitive terrorism cases involving complicated issues, such as enemy combatants and detention policies.

Let me quote from former Chief Judge Henry Edwards, who said:

> [R]eview of large, multiparty, difficult administrative appeals is the staple of judicial work in the DC Circuit. This alone distinguishes the work of the DC Circuit from the work of other circuits. It also explains why it is impossible to compare the work of the DC Circuit with other circuits by simply referring to raw data on case filings.

I mention that because there have been some here who say ''the workload of the court.'' The workload of the court requires us to fill this vacancy.

Chief Justice Roberts noted that ''about two-thirds of the cases before the DC Circuit involved the Federal Government in some civil capacity, while that figure is less than twenty-five percent nationwide.'' He also described the ''D.C. Circuit's unique character, as a court with special responsibility to review legal challenges to the conduct of the national government.'' He should know. Justice Roberts came from that circuit court.

We have a person who is eminently qualified for this position, and that is Judge Wilkins. We have a need to fill this vacancy. The Senate should carry out its responsibility, and we are going to have that chance very shortly.

Let me remind my colleagues that the Senate unanimously confirmed Judge Wilkins in 2010 for his current position, and he has a distinguished lifelong record of public service. I am pleased that we have moved forward to get an up-or-down vote on this nomination. I ask the Senate and my colleagues to support confirmation of this eminently qualified judge.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, tonight we will vote on the nomination of Judge Robert Wilkins to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. Late last week, we were finally able to invoke cloture on his nomination, after it was unjustifiably filibustered by Senate Republicans for months.

Judge Wilkins was nominated to serve on this court last June, along with two other exceptional nominees who were both confirmed late last year, Judge Patricia Millett and Judge Nina Pillard. Once Judge Wilkins is confirmed, the DC Circuit, which is often considered to be the second most important court in the Nation, will finally be operating at full strength. The American people deserve no less.

Judge Wilkins is an outstanding nominee. He was unanimously confirmed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia 3 years ago. He has presided over hundreds of cases and issued significant decisions in various areas of the law, including in the fields of administrative and constitutional law. Prior to serving on the bench, he was a partner for nearly 10 years in private practice and served more than 10 years as a public defender in the District of Columbia.

During his time at the Public Defender Service, Judge Wilkins served as the lead plaintiff in a racial profiling case, which arose out of an incident in which he and three family members were stopped and detained while returning from a funeral in Chicago. This lawsuit led to landmark settlements that required systematic statewide compilation and publication of highway traffic stop-and-search data by race. These settlements inspired an Executive Order by President Clinton, legislation in the House and Senate, and legislation in at least 28 States prohibiting racial profiling or requiring data collection.

Despite the progress made in the past several decades, the struggle to diversify our Federal bench continues. When confirmed, Judge Wilkins will be only the sixth African American to have ever served on the DC Circuit.

Judge Wilkins earned the ABA's highest possible rating of unanimously ''well qualified.'' He also has the support of the National Bar Association, the Nation's largest professional association of African American lawyers and judges, as well as several other prominent legal organizations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of letters in support of Judge Wilkins.

I hope my fellow Senators will join me today to confirm this good man to serve on this important court. Our Nation will be better off with Judge Robert Wilkins serving on the DC Circuit.

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

LETTERS IN SUPPORT OF THE NOMINATION OF JUDGE ROBERT WILKINS

1. July 31, 2013—Diverse group of 97 organizations in support of Judge Wilkins. The organizations include National Bar Association, National Conference of Women's Bar Associations, Hispanic National Bar Association, American Association for Justice, National Association of Consumer Advocates, NAACP, and National Employment Lawyers Association.

2. August 28, 2013—Joseph C. Akers, Jr., Interim Executive Director, on behalf of National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE)

3. September 10, 2013—Benjamin F. Wilson, Managing Principal, Beveridge & Diamond, P.C. and John E. Page, SVP, Chief Legal Officer, Golden State Foods Corp. and Immediate Past President, National Bar Association on behalf of an ''ad hoc group of African American AmLaw 100 Managing Partners and Fortune 1000 General Counsel''

4. September 10, 2013—Nancy Duff Campbell and Marcia D. Greenberger, co-Presidents, on behalf of the National Women's Law Center

5. September 10, 2013—Doreen Hartwell, President, Las Vegas Chapter of the National Bar Association

6. September 18, 2013—William Martin, Washington Bar Association

7. September 27, 2013—Douglas Kendall, President, and Judith Schaeffer, Vice President, Constitutional Accountability Center

8. October 1, 2013—National Bar Association

9. October 1, 2013—Michael Madigan, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP

10. September 10, 2013 and October 2, 2013—Wade Henderson, President & CEO and Nancy Zirkin, Executive Vice President on behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert Leon Wilkins of the District of Columbia to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit?

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Ex.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—43

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Fischer | Moran |
| Ayotte | Flake | Murkowski |
| Barrasso | Graham | Paul |
| Blunt | Grassley | Portman |
| Boozman | Hatch | Risch |
| Burr | Heller | Roberts |
| Coats | Hoeven | Scott |
| Coburn | Inhofe | Sessions |
| Cochran | Isakson | Shelby |
| Collins | Johanns | Thune |
| Corker | Johnson (WI) | Toomey |
| Cornyn | Kirk | Vitter |
| Crapo | Lee | Wicker |
| Cruz | McCain | |
| Enzi | McConnell | |

NOT VOTING—2

| | |
|---|---|
| Chambliss | Rubio |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

## UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a lot of work going on around the Capitol this evening, and tomorrow morning we will see if we can figure out a way to move forward to help 1.4 million people who are unemployed to extend their unemployment benefits to them. It is something we need very much, and we will see if we can move forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my brief remarks, Senator LEE be recognized, and then after Senator LEE that Senator HARKIN be recognized.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as the leader indicated, we are working to develop a response to the 1.3 million Americans who on December 28 lost their unemployment extended benefits. Since that time, the number has increased. About 70,000 Americans a week are losing their unemployment insurance benefits. This number is now approaching roughly 1.5 million Americans and will approach a significantly

higher number of Americans throughout the year.

This is an emergency. These people have worked. They are in a job market where typically there are more than two applicants for every job, and we are seeing a job market that is moving sometimes forward and sometimes sideways. The numbers last Friday were quite disappointing. It could have been the weather or it could be other factors, but it does underscore the need to move very aggressively to address the issue of these unemployed Americans. The average benefit is about $300 to $350 a week. The only reason they qualify for the benefit is they did work and they are still looking for work.

One of the ironies of last week's numbers is even though we had very mediocre job creation, the unemployment rate fell. Why? Because people are leaving the workforce. They are giving up. We can't let that happen. One way we keep people looking for work and we keep them able to look for work is to provide this modest benefit each week.

So we are looking very hard and we have had a great deal of collaboration and cooperation. I thank Senators HELLER, COLLINS, PORTMAN, AYOTTE, MURKOWSKI, and COATS. They voted to keep this process going forward, and I respect and thank them for that. I know, over this last weekend, particularly Senators HELLER, COLLINS, and PORTMAN have been working to try to find a way to move forward. Let me say, though, we on our side have moved very far.

Typically these benefits are not paid for. Last year's 12 month extension of unemployment insurance was unpaid for. It was an emergency. It probably created on the order of 100-plus thousand jobs, which would not have taken place without that kind of increase in demand in the economy generated by these payments to individuals looking for work.

We heard what our colleagues said, that this has to be paid for. So we went ahead and proposed a pay-for. Again, many of my colleagues in the Democratic caucus in both the House and the Senate would prefer to see these benefits as emergency unpaid for. We have repeatedly done that.

We have also changed the duration of the benefits. We eliminated some weeks in the first two tiers so we would be able to afford this benefit and still give people the opportunity to move forward.

So we have moved from what we have typically done.

Again, if we look back over the years, the exception is paying for these benefits. Many times during the Bush administration, we provided unemployment benefits unpaid for. Now some of my colleagues are asking to pay for them. We have tried to pay for them. We tried to change the duration so we could afford them but still provide help for people. We have done this because we have heard from the other side: One, they have to be paid for; but, two, we can't use revenues.

A balanced approach to any public policy solution has to at least consider revenues. But our colleagues have been staunch about saying: We will not entertain at all any revenues to offset this payment.

There is a long list of egregious tax provisions which have been highlighted by many of my colleagues—particularly Senator LEVIN in his work—with respect to corporate tax loopholes which not only should be corrected but could be applied to allow these Americans the opportunity to have some support as they go forward looking for work. But because our colleagues said no revenue, OK, we have looked for ways to pay for this without engaging in rhetoric. So I think we have made a significant step forward.

In turn, my colleagues have come back and proposed variations on some of the things we have talked about. They have done it in good faith. They have done it with great ingenuity. Again, I thank them. We haven't yet come to a sort of meeting of the minds, but we are working.

Again, let me go back to the original proposal Senator HELLER and I made. We said: Let's do this for 3 months without a pay-for. That will give us time to do a lot of the work my colleagues have suggested. They have talked about how training programs have to be changed, how skills have to be matched up with jobs, very intricate programmatic changes. That is not going to be done here on the floor within 24, 48, or 72 hours.

I would conclude by again saying: There are now approaching 1.5 million Americans who were abandoned on the 28th of December. Their benefits were cut off. They are in some cases desperate, trying to pay their mortgages, trying to keep their homes, trying to put food on their table. They are trying to put gas in their car, natural gas to heat their homes in the cold weather, and I think we have to respond.

Again, I thank my colleagues who have helped. Tomorrow we are going to get closer to a sort of point of reckoning, and I hope we can come together and move forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

## WILKINS NOMINATION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues from Rhode Island and Iowa for their cooperation in establishing the speaking order this evening. I would like to speak for a moment about the vote we just cast. We just confirmed Judge Wilkins to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. I voted against this judge. In doing that, I joined my Republican colleagues for one simple reason. Several years ago, when President George W. Bush was in the White House, he nominated an eminently qualified lawyer named Peter Keisler who had bipartisan support.

He was not a partisan hack; he was a true craftsman in the law. He was someone whom no one had any ideological opposition to, but he was blocked by the Senate Democrats at that time for the simple fact, based on the simple reason, that according to the Senate Democrats the DC Circuit's caseload was not sufficiently robust to justify the filling of this position.

Since that time, not very many things have changed. Since that time, if anything, the DC Circuit's caseload per judge has remained about the same or some would argue has gone down a little, depending on which metric you use. One change is that we have now a Democratic President in the White House instead of a Republican President in the White House. Suddenly my friends across the aisle have forgotten about the caseload-based arguments they used a few years ago to keep Peter Keisler off the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit.

We have now confirmed, just in the last few weeks, three additional judges to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. This has happened against substantial Republican opposition that has been based on the very analysis I have just outlined. This has been facilitated by virtue of the fact that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada, joined by his Democratic colleagues, chose a few weeks ago to exercise what has been referred to as the nuclear option. They broke the rules of the Senate in order to change the rules of the Senate, and they did that so they could put more people on the bench, so they could put more people into top-level positions in this administration while more or less squelching the view of the minority party within the Senate.

This is unfortunate. The most unfortunate aspect of it is that it is part of a broader strategy that is not limited to the DC Circuit; in fact, it is not even limited to the Senate's confirmation process with respect to these judges or other judges. It extends much more broadly than that. It is part of the same effort that convinced the President of the United States, on January 4, 2012, to make four appointments, three to the National Labor Relations Board and one to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, pursuant to the President's recess appointment power.

Citing Article II, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution, the President claimed he had the power to appoint these individuals without going through the Senate advice-and-consent process because, as he asserted, the Senate was in recess. There was only one problem with this. The Senate was not in fact in recess. Under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2 of the Constitution, each Chamber of Congress, including the Senate, has the right to determine its own rules, its own procedures. According to the Senate's own rules and according to the Senate's own Journal, the Senate was in fact in session as of January 4, 2012, the moment these supposed recess appointments were made. This was a problem.

Fortunately, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit—prior, I would add, to the confirmation of the three recent judges we have confirmed just in the last few weeks—concluded that this was a lawless act; that it was unconstitutional; that the President did not have the right to deem the Senate in recess when, according to the Senate's own rules, the Senate was in session. The Senate was not in recess.

That case today was reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States. I had the privilege of sitting in the courtroom just across the street and watching those proceedings. I was pleased to see the checks and balances within our system were functioning—at least to the extent that we have our court system reviewing this act by the President of the United States. I think it is fortunate we have this kind of judicial system that can review it. Based on what I saw today and the quality of the arguments presented to the Court, I am hopeful the Court will reach the same conclusion. I am hopeful the Supreme Court will affirm the judgment entered by the DC Circuit.

In a broader sense it is sad, it is disappointing that it even had to get that far, and it is disappointing that the President of the United States was willing to engage in such a lawless act; that the President of the United States was willing openly to flout the plain text, history, tradition of the U.S. Constitution.

Ours is not a government of one. It was with good reason that the Founding Fathers split up the power, including the power to appoint people to high Federal office such that the President could nominate but the Senate got to confirm. By the President's approach, pursuant to which the President of the United States could himself deem the Senate in recess if he did not think the Senate was doing enough when it went into brief sessions, the President himself could substantially circumvent the advice-and-consent role the Founding Fathers and the Constitution wisely placed in the hands of the Senate.

The reason I said it is unfortunate it had to get to that level, it is unfortunate, first of all, the President felt it was OK, it was acceptable do this. He, of course, took an oath, not once but twice, to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

It is unfortunate, secondarily, that there was not more of an outcry from this body. Sure, there were a lot Republicans who joined me in calling this action lawless, because it was. It was sad that none of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle—at least not publicly—were willing to acknowledge the lawlessness of this act. Some acknowledged to me in private that it was problematic. Some acknowledged to me that there were some implications behind this that threatened the Senate as an institution. But I think we need to be more open, more faithful, more forceful, and less partisan about the way we defend the Constitution of the United States.

To me it would not matter—if this were a Republican President I would be arguing with equal strength on this issue. In the future when we have a Republican President, if any Republican President is lawless enough to try this, I will oppose it with everything within me. We ourselves take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I think that involves doing more than simply leaving it to the courts to iron out the details.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

## UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Utah for agreeing to the way we worked this out so we could all have our time to speak on the Senate floor. I appreciate it very much.

Extending unemployment compensation benefits is one of the most important things, vital things we should be doing right now in Congress, both for the people who are unemployed but also for our economy. Our economy is improving—slowly. There are still 20 million Americans either out of work or marginally employed who want to work. Almost 4 million of those have been out of work for over 6 months. So, faced with this, it is reprehensible that Congress failed to extend Federal unemployment benefits at the end of last year, 3 days after Christmas.

To correct this failure, last week the Senate began considering a bill that was intended to extend those benefits, and I wholeheartedly support this effort. As our economy makes steady improvements on the long road of recovery from the great recession, we continue to support our fellow Americans who are out of work through no fault of their own. The way to do that is to restore Federal unemployment insurance programs for the long-term unemployed. But to garner the votes needed to pass the unemployment insurance extension, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle insisted we find a way to pay for it, through cuts to existing programs, cuts that one columnist for the Los Angeles Times said were Swiftian in their absurdity and cruelty.

I refer to the January 10 issue of the Los Angeles Times by Michael Hiltzik. It is titled ''An awful idea: hammer the disabled to pay for unemployment benefits.''

The first paragraph says:

> It would take the pen of Jonathan Swift to fully describe Congress's willingness to beat up on the least fortunate members of society to protect the richest. The latest example is a plan to pay for a one-year extension of unemployment insurance by cutting Social Security benefits for the disabled.

First of all, I wish to say I do not believe that an extension of Federal unemployment insurance benefits needs to be offset. We have done it before. We did it under the Bush administration and we have done it before and it has always been an emergency. It is just as if a hurricane hits or terrible storm; this is a terrible storm for people who are unemployed for long periods of time. Frankly, the recent budget deal we just passed reduced the deficit by $25 billion. I disagree with having to find extra money. But the other side—the Republicans—says we have to find offsets. I guess I am reluctantly willing to do so.

However, the proposal before us would do so in one of the most pernicious ways possible. I guess the most positive comment I can make about it is it is comparatively less damaging than some of the amendments that have been filed by some of my Republican colleagues. But understand this. The proposal before us to extend unemployment benefits and to ''pay for it,'' what it would do is it would deny individuals who have a disability and who are receiving Social Security disability insurance—it would say that if someone gets unemployment compensation, their disability payments will be reduced, dollar for dollar, for every dollar they get in unemployment compensation. That is bad enough. I will get into that in a second. Amendments filed on the Republican side would go further, and they would say if someone gets $1 in unemployment compensation payments, they would lose all their disability rights, all their disability payments, and all their Medicare support that comes along with being approved for SSDI—Social Security disability insurance.

The proponents of these policies say that people with disabilities who receive disability insurance payments and unemployment compensation payments are double dipping. They claim this is a loophole; that somehow people who receive both are scamming the system. This is not true. This is simply not true. SSDI, Social Security disability insurance, is designed to address the needs of people with disabilities. Unemployment insurance is designed as a partial, temporary replacement of income for people who lost jobs through no fault of their own. They are two separate programs with two separate designed benefits. It is possible for an individual to be eligible for both.

How can this be? First of all, we have to disabuse ourselves of what we keep hearing on the Senate floor from my friends on the Republican side. They keep talking about disability insurance as though, if someone gets Social Security disability insurance, then they are unable to work. That is not true. That is simply not true. SSDI is set up as system to give some support while looking for work—or get a job and supplement that.

Under the law, people who qualify for SSDI, Social Security disability—I will just say disability. People who qualify for disability insurance can work and are encouraged to work, and they can make up to $1,070 a month without losing their SSDI. Why is it? Because we

want people to work to the best of their ability—especially when they have a disability. People with disabilities also want to work.

Keep in mind the SSDI Program is not a freeloader program. When you work and get a paycheck, they take out FICA taxes, which is the Federal Insurance Contribution Act. There are three parts of it. You pay to an insurance program for Social Security, old age, and survivors. It is indemnity insurance so when you get old, you get a check. Most people think of it as Social Security. The second part is hospital insurance, or Medicare. The third part is disability insurance. If you don't work and you haven't paid your FICA taxes, you don't get SSDI.

Listen to this. An adult becomes eligible for disability insurance compensation when they have worked at least 10 years. You have to work at least 10 years and at least 5 years prior to getting Social Security disability, and you have to have earned at least $4,800 a year. You have to earn at least $400 a month for 5 years before you even qualify.

So this idea that I keep hearing about, oh, someone works for 4 weeks, and then they go out and file for disability and are on disability for the rest of their lives is nonsense. That is not true. Yet we keep hearing these stories going around and around. You will have worked at least 10 years and will have had earnings during at least 5 of the previous 10 years prior to receiving it, and you have to have made at least $4,800 a year before you qualify.

Then let's say you do become disabled and file for disability. What is your chance of getting it? One out of three. For every three persons who file for Social Security disability insurance compensation, only one out of three actually gets it. Why is that? You have to go through a long evidentiary process—a medical evidentiary process—and the administrative law judge is going to send you back to get further opinions. So it is not something you just file and you get it. Only one out of three qualifies for it.

That is why if a person works and pays taxes—your FICA taxes—and is then laid off, they can get unemployment. But if they also qualify for disability insurance, they should get that if they paid into the system. People with disabilities who work and pay into that system can also be eligible for unemployment compensation. Why shouldn't they get that?

Listen to this. If we deny people with disabilities their right to the insurance they have paid for, we are discriminating against a group of people in a way that no other group is singled out. In other words, we are discriminating against you just because you are disabled. How do you like that? Is that what we are about? We are going to discriminate against you just because you are disabled. Because if you are not disabled, you won't be discriminated against. If you are not disabled, you will get your unemployment compensation. You might even be eligible for some other government programs, such as section 8 housing or something like that. We don't take that away.

God forbid you become disabled and you are working—you are disabled, you get a disability check, and you go to work. You can work and make up to $1,070 a month. You are providing a little bit of extra income so you can live independently and maybe provide a few things for yourself. But you, and only you—if you get unemployment compensation, we are going to take away your disability payments. Only you. Nobody else. Nobody else is denied their full unemployment compensation. Under the bill we have, only people with disabilities will be affected.

Let me provide a real-life example of what this means to a real person. I will call him Henry. This is a real person. Henry lives in the District of Columbia. Henry has a disability. He is deaf, and he has other health problems on top of being deaf. But Henry worked. He worked for 10 years. He worked and paid his taxes, but then in his thirties, because of other health reasons, he couldn't continue to work full time so he went on disability and qualified for it. So now he is making $740 a month on his disability insurance—$740 a month. Well, he can earn up to $1,070 a month, as I said, under the law and still get that. He can't work full time, but he likes to work. He wants to work. He wants to be a productive citizen, so he went out and got a part-time job consistent with his disabilities. He makes $950 a month.

If you add $950 and $740, you get $1,690 a month. Big deal. But I can tell you what that $1,690 does for him. It allows him to live independently. It allows him to provide some payments for a support system. It allows him to sign up for cable TV. It allows him to go see a movie once in a while and maybe even go out and have a hamburger—$1,690 a month. That is what Henry was doing.

Henry became unemployed. But now mind you, every month he worked and made $950 a month, he paid his FICA taxes every month. Now he is unemployed. Well, what happens? He went on unemployment compensation and he gets $520 a month. He gets $740 for disability, $520 for unemployment, which adds up to $1,260 a month. It is a little over $400 and some less than what he was getting when he worked full time. Still, $1,260 a month allows him to live independently. It allows him to support himself.

Under the amendment that is in this bill, here is what happens: He gets his $520 in unemployment, but his disability is reduced to $220 a month. Now Henry is getting $740 a month. What is he going to do? He won't be able to afford his apartment, let alone have cable TV. I don't know if Henry has cable TV. But $740 a month?

No other person working in America and paying their FICA taxes is treated like that—no one. And they still aren't unless this amendment is adopted, and then we will discriminate against you simply because you are disabled. I mean, you wonder what people are thinking about.

Yes, I have compassion for those who are unemployed. I would like to see our economy improve. We have to extend unemployment benefits but not at the expense of people who are on the lowest rung of our ladder—people with disabilities, who have paid into the system, and who have become unemployed. Henry wants to work. He wants to work. He wants to make that $950 a month. Pernicious? Pernicious? That is just a fancy way of saying it is abominable that we would even consider it.

Henry is not double dipping. He is not scamming the system. He is not a slacker. He is not defrauding anybody. He is only getting what is rightfully his because he paid into the program. If people with disabilities are earning income, as Henry was, and paying into the disability insurance program, they should be eligible for that just as any other citizen who paid into that program. Again, to do otherwise would be to discriminate against someone just because they are disabled.

One of my proudest moments in my history here in the Senate—indeed, in the entire Congress—is when I stood on this floor as a chief sponsor of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990. When we passed that and President Bush signed it into law, the cheers went up. It was passed 25 years after the passage of the great Civil Rights Act of 1965. That was sort of the emancipation proclamation for people with disabilities. Because of that law, we have encouraged people with disabilities to work. They want to work. Now we want to break down the barriers, provide for accommodations and transportation and ramps and widen doors and all the other factors that make it possible for people with disabilities to get a job and go to work. It changed the system.

I can remember when we had the hearings. We had people come in and testify. Employers said they would hire people with disabilities, but sometimes they don't show up for work and this and that. Well, I looked into it, and I found out they couldn't get on the bus because the bus wasn't accessible. How are they going to get to work? They couldn't drive because they were in a wheelchair and they couldn't get on the bus. So we changed it. We made the buses and the metro accessible. Everything is accessible now. People with disabilities are working, and they want them to work.

Now we are saying to them, you can work. Like Henry, you can work, and you should. If you qualify for disability insurance, you can get your disability insurance and make up to $1,070 a month because we would like you to work if you want to work. But if you are like Henry and pay into the system and become unemployed, you will go

from $1,690 to $740 a month simply because we are discriminating against you. What kind of signal does that send?

That is why this provision is opposed by members of the entire disability community, Arc, the National Disability Rights Network, the National Organization of Social Security Claimants Representatives, American Association of People with Disabilities, and on and on and on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter expressing opposition to this proposal from these groups be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that this article from in the L.A. Times be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

As I pointed out, you hammer the disabled to pay for unemployment benefits? You sometimes wonder.

I want to be clear about one thing: I don't ascribe bad motives to anybody in this body—not in the least. As a matter of fact, I am told there will be a motion to strike this provision when we vote on the cloture on this tomorrow, and that is good. I hope it is generally supported by everyone here. So I don't ascribe bad motives, but what happens sometimes is we don't think these things through. Someone starts this thing, and they say these people are double dipping and scamming the system, and all of a sudden it sounds—oh, my gosh, yes.

But when you look into it and examine it, and you see these people have been paying their FICA taxes—they have been paying their taxes. But you say because you are disabled, you don't get it if you become unemployed.

We are busy around here, and we look at different things, so there are no bad motives. I take the floor to set the record straight and to let everyone know just what is at stake. Do we really, truly want to discriminate against 117,000 Americans? That is what the General Accounting Office said in a study done a couple of years ago—that there were about 117,000 Americans at any one time who are getting disability insurance as well as unemployment.

If Henry's health improved, and he was able to get a full-time job, he wouldn't get his disability. He would go back and start earning money full-time. So are we saying that somehow we are going to take away their incentive to work? No, I don't think so. I think it is just one of those things that comes up and people say they are double dipping and they are scamming the system. But, no, that is not what is happening at all. They pay into the system. It is insurance. They pay for it. They ought to receive it, and they shouldn't have their disability payments reduced because they are getting unemployment. They are two separate programs.

So I hope two things happen. I hope we can get cloture on the bill to proceed to extend Federal unemployment benefits. But I also hope all of my colleagues will see the error of this part of the amendment and move to strike it. Fundamentally, it is the only right thing to do. So I hope we will do that. I hope we will begin to take a look more and more at disability insurance in terms of what it means, how it operates. The notion that, somehow, if a person gets disability insurance they cannot work—that is not true. A person can work. If a person is able to work, they can earn up to $1,070 a month without losing their disability payments.

So I hope as we go forward, we will begin to shed more light and have a more enlightened discussion on this program and how it operates and why it is so essential to ensure that people with disabilities are not discriminated against in a manner that no other part of our society would be, if this provision were left in the bill.

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

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES,
*Washington, DC, January 11, 2014.*

U.S. SENATE,
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS: The undersigned members of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities are writing to express our opposition to proposals to eliminate or reduce Social Security Disability Insurance (DI) benefits for individuals who concurrently receive Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits as a partial offset for extending the Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) program.

The DI and UI programs have been established for different purposes and largely serve different populations. As highlighted in a 2012 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), less than one percent of individuals served by the DI and UI programs receive concurrent benefits.

At the same time, receiving UI and DI is not inconsistent. This has been the longstanding position of the Social Security Administration and of the courts. Individuals who receive concurrent benefits do so because they have significant disabilities that make them eligible for DI, and because they have also attempted to work at a low level of earnings but have lost their job through no fault of their own. According to the GAO, the average quarterly concurrent benefit in fiscal year 2010 was about $1,100 in DI and $2,200 in UI for a quarterly average of about $3,300 in total benefits.

These benefits can be a lifeline to workers with disabilities who receive them, and their families. We are concerned about any cuts to these already modest benefits, and about the prospect of worsening the economic security of workers with disabilities and their families at a time when the economy continues to struggle.

Finally, we believe that changes to our nation's Social Security system should be carefully considered as part of discussions about how to strengthen Social Security, and that benefit cuts to Social Security should not be considered as part of offsets for other important benefit programs.

In closing, while we strongly support extending the EUC program, we oppose amendments to partially offset the costs by eliminating or reducing concurrent DI and UI benefits.

Sincerely,

ACCSES, The Advocacy Institute, The Arc of the United States, Association of University Centers on Disabilities

Autism National Committee, Autistic Self-Advocacy Network (ASAN), Community Legal Services, Inc., Brain Injury Association of America, Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund, Easter Seals, Goodwill Industries International, Health and Disability Advocates, Lupus Foundation of America.

National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), National Association of Disability Representatives, National Association of County Behavioral Health & Developmental Disability, Directors National Council for Community Behavioral Healthcare, National Council on Independent Living (NCIL), National Disability Rights Network, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, National Organization on Disability, National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives, TASH, United Cerebral Palsy, United Spinal Association, World Institute on Disability.

---

[From the LA Times, Jan. 10, 2014]

AN AWFUL IDEA: HAMMER THE DISABLED TO PAY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(By Michael Hiltzik)

It would take the pen of Jonathan Swift* to fully describe Congress's willingness to beat up on the least fortunate members of society to protect the richest. The latest example is a plan to pay for a one-year extension of unemployment insurance by cutting Social Security benefits for the disabled.

This flinthearted idea has been endorsed by Senate Democrats, of all people, who have written it into a proposal that could reach the floor as early as Monday. Its chief sponsor is Sen. Jack Reed, D–R.I., but it's got the support of Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid too.

Advocates for Social Security and for disabled workers are in a fully justified uproar over this measure for two main reasons: it uniquely burdens the disabled among all workers, and it sets a terrible precedent of raiding Social Security to pay for other social programs. As a coalition of disabled advocacy groups put it in a letter to Sen. Tom Harkin, D–Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, the measure would mean ''worsening the economic security of workers with disabilities and their families at a time when the economy continues to struggle.''

How crucial is this offset for the federal budget, you fiscal hawks in Washington? It would save about $100 million a year. That's less than three thousandths of a percent of the annual federal budget. Sure, fiscal responsibility has to start somewhere, but surely there are deeper pockets to mine than those of disabled people struggling to make ends meet.

The offset, moreover, is based on the unjustified treatment of disability pay and unemployment compensation as somehow two sides of the same coin, so that receiving one should disqualify you from the other.

The idea that disabled persons are ''double-dipping'' by collecting wages or other compensation while also getting a disability check is enshrined in conservative attacks on disability. But it's untrue. The Social Security disability program is designed as a bridge to full employment. Its benefits aren't intended as a substitute for wages, but a supplement.

As the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities observes, disabled beneficiaries can earn up to $1,070 a month in wages this year without jeopardizing their benefits so they can ''test their ability to return to work'' and ease their transition back into the labor market.

The average monthly disability benefit was about $1,130 last year and the average unemployment check $1,200, so no one is getting

rich here. Add together the averages, and we're still talking about poverty level income for a family of four.

The coalition of disability groups points out that the unemployment and disability programs were designed for different purposes and for the most part serve different populations. But there is an overlap estimated at about 117,000 of the 8.9 million Americans receiving disability, according to Rebecca Vallas of the National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives, a leading advocacy group.

These are people who have passed through the very stringent gauntlet necessary to qualify for disability benefits, and they've also worked long enough to become eligible for unemployment. There's no justification in law or logic for offsetting one benefit by the other.

Vallas and other advocates are especially nervous that this sort of proposal encourages lawmakers to view Social Security benefits as a ''piggy bank'' to pay for other social programs. ''It's death by a thousand paper cuts to call this a pay-for'' to cover the expansion of unemployment insurance, she says.

But the idea is becoming disturbingly common in Washington. The disability-unemployment offset also appeared in President Obama's 2014 budget proposal, which called it a ''smart reform . . . (to) root out duplicative or wasteful spending.'' (The budget hasn't been passed.)

It's anything but a ''smart reform'': it's a hacking away at the safety net for the disabled and unemployed that only a Scrooge would contemplate. The very idea that we should bill the disabled to pay for benefits for the jobless suggests that our national standards of fairness and civilization have fallen very, very low indeed. This is a proposal that should die in its crib.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

## VERMONT ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. LEAHY. As the longtime co-chair of the Senate National Guard Caucus, I have the honor of advocating for the amazing men and women of the National Guard and of supporting their role in protecting our Nation, both at home and abroad. It is always a great pleasure for me to be able to point to the men and women of Vermont's own National Guard as an example of everything the National Guard does right. This weekend, a battalion of the Vermont National Guard was honored with the Army's prestigious Valorous Unit Award for their service in Afghanistan. I recognized the achievements of this acclaimed unit last week here in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from today's Burlington Free Press commemorating the award ceremony held January 12 in Norwich, Vt., and the amazing service that led to the award be printed the RECORD.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press, Jan. 13, 2014]

COMMENDED FOR COURAGE: GUARD UNIT, COMBAT MEDIC HONORED FOR ACTIONS IN AFGHANISTAN

(By Sam Hemingway)

Three years after the Vermont Army National Guard concluded its largest deployment since World War II, 600 members of the mountain infantry contingent were given a Valorous Unit Award on Sunday for their service in Afghanistan.

''You served in a very hostile area,'' Brig. Gen. Brian Carpenter told the soldiers as they stood in formation during a ceremony at Shapiro Field House at Norwich University in Northfield. ''For a unit to be recommended, as you are, takes tremendous leadership.''

The award, the second highest award a military unit can receive, honored the combat performance of the 3rd Battalion, 172nd Infantry while it was carrying out its 2010 mission in Paktya and three other provinces in eastern Afghanistan near the Pakistani border.

The unit was attached to the active Army's 101st Airborne Division and stationed at the Herrera and Rahman Kheyl combat outposts and at the Gardez forward operating outpost. The unit is largely made up of Vermonters, but includes soldiers from Maine and New Hampshire.

Also recognized during the ceremony was combat medic Sgt. Michael Mulcahy, who was awarded the Bronze Star for Valor for his bravery during a platoon ambush that claimed the lives of two Guard soldiers, Sgt. Tristan Southworth of Walden and Sgt. Steven Deluzio of Glastonbury, Conn.

Mulcahy who was assigned to the small Herrera outpost in Paktya province, braved enemy fire during back-to-back ambushes near Mullafatee village on Aug. 22, 2010, according to a narrative detailing his exploits.

Carpenter, reading a portion of the narrative to soldiers and attendees at the ceremony, described how Mulcahy ''led the way uphill through accurate heavy volumes of enemy fire'' in order to reach injured soldiers.

At one point, according to the narrative, Mulcahy used his body to shield a wounded Southworth from heavy enemy fire.

''Mulcahy moved with very little cover through RPG (rocket-propelled grenade) and extremely heavy machine gun fire to . . . Southworth,'' the narrative said.

After determining Southworth had died, Mulcahy again risked his life to treat another wounded soldier.

Mulcahy, described by a colleague at the ceremony as a ''very humble guy'' went up to Southworth's parents after the ceremony. The three exchanged long, tearful embraces.

''We are proud to know him,'' Julie Southworth, Tristan Southworth's mother, said of Mulcahy after the ceremony ended. She said the family had not met Mulcahy previously. Mulcahy told Guard officials he did not want to be interviewed.

Carpenter, speaking of the unit award, said the 172nd Infantry carried out 4,300 combat patrols during the Afghanistan deployment. Twenty-six members were awarded Purple Hearts for injuries sustained during combat, he said.

''Their expertise in bringing decisive combat power to bear on the enemy wherever and whenever needed set the conditions for overwhelming victory and represents a phenomenal effort,'' the unit award narrative said in part.

The unit also served in the only province where no civilians were harmed or killed during parliamentary elections in 2010. Paktya's turnout for the elections topped 94,000, a 15 percent increase over its turnout in the previous election.

The unit also worked on various economic development and governance projects, and helped train Afghan army, police and medics.

Attending Sunday's ceremonies were U.S. Sen. Bernie Sanders, I–Vt., Rep. Peter Welch, D–Vt., Gov. Peter Shumlin and Lt. Gov. Phil Scott, who had spent the day before as an honorary Guard member. John Tracy, a veteran and Vermont office director for Sen. Patrick Leahy, D–Vt., represented Leahy. All but Scott spoke briefly at the ceremony.

''This is a really emotional day for me,'' said Lt. Col. Robert Charlesworth, who was based at Gardez and oversaw the 172nd Infantry's operations in Afghanistan. ''To finally see these guys and gals recognized for the accomplishments that they had in Afghanistan is very satisfying.''

Charlesworth, who now works at the Pentagon as a staff planner with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the gains made by the infantry unit in Paktya have mostly held up since the deployment ended.

He said the outposts at Herrera, Rahman Kheyl and Gardez where the soldiers served have been either dismantled or substantially altered since the unit left Afghanistan.

Charlesworth said he's hopeful for the future of Afghanistan as the United States continues to withdraw combat troops from the country and wind down its operations there.

''It's a pretty pivotal moment in history right now in Afghanistan,'' he said. ''We're in the final stages of trying to put together our bi-lateral security agreement with Afghanistan to try to solidify all of the gains we helped the Afghans build over there. I think the next year is going to be critical.''

During the course of Sunday's ceremony, one of the soldiers in the unit collapsed as the result of an apparent seizure. The proceedings were halted briefly while several soldiers came to his aid. The soldier, who was not identified, was able to walk under his own power out of the building. Maj. Chris Gookin, the Guard's spokesman, said later Sunday he did not believe the soldier had to be hospitalized.

Two other of the 600 soldiers who stood during the hour-long event also grew faint during the proceedings and were assisted by their comrades.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### TRIBUTE TO BERNICE JOSEPH

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and achievements of Bernice Joseph, who committed her life to improving our State through education reform and to ensuring the success of Alaska Native students.

As the vice chancellor and executive dean of the College of Rural and Community Development at the University

of Alaska Fairbanks, Ms. Joseph played an important role in advancing university services to Alaska Native and rural students throughout 160 communities within the State of Alaska. As a member of the university's senior management, she was a respected leader throughout the University of Alaska system and throughout the State. It has been said that if it had not been for Bernice and her work to build the College of Rural and Community Development, many would not have been able to earn their college degree.

From 1995 to 2000 Bernice served as assistant professor at UAF in the Department of Alaska Native and Rural Development. Prior to her work at the university, Bernice served as deputy commissioner of the Alaska Department of Community and Economic Development, overseeing rural development programs as the tribal liaison and as a key advisor to Governor Tony Knowles. She worked tirelessly to strengthen rural Alaska communities and was a conduit in bringing rural Alaska concerns to the attention of the administration. She also served her community in many ways, including as a trustee for the Greater Fairbanks Community Hospital Foundation.

As I reflect on her short time on this earth, I realize that she achieved so much. Bernice advanced our State's dialogue on Native education. In her 2005 keynote address to the Alaska Federation of Natives, during which she summarized her journey as a leader, she said:

> We are all too familiar with the statistics facing Alaska Natives about educational attainment, suicide, alcohol and drug abuse and the number of Alaska Natives in prison. Education is the key to overcoming many of the barriers Alaska Natives face. Yet, it must be an education that is sensitive to Native Ways of Knowing.

She was tireless in working to help our State's leaders understand that a strong cultural foundation and an education system that values Alaska Native knowledge are vital to the success of our Native students. One of her greatest joys was attending college graduation ceremonies across rural Alaska.

Living in Fairbanks, and originally from Nulato, Ms. Joseph maintained her personal connections to her heritage and culture. She went to fish camp every summer and enjoyed moose hunting with her husband. She did it all, from the bush to the boardroom and in 2012 was named citizen of the year by the Alaska Federation of Natives.

She will continue to be an inspiration to leaders, both current and emerging, throughout Alaska. The impacts of her contributions to ensure that our education system is relevant to Native students will be felt for generations.●

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Development.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2279. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities.

H.R. 3811. An act to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2279. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 3811. An act 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

## EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4225. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Fiscal Year 2013 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4226. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4227. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Health and Human Service's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 2013 through September 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4228. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4229. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary, National Protection and Program Directorate, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4230. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Fiscal Year 2013 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4231. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Financial Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4232. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-up for the period of April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4233. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4234. A communication from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4235. A communication from the Director, Office of General Counsel and Legal Policy, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Regulations; Exempted Senior Employee Positions'' (RIN3209–AA14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4236. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4237. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4238. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4239. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4240. A communication from the Treasurer, National Gallery of Art, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Gallery's Performance and Accountability Report for the year ended September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4241. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs' Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4242. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4243. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4244. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4245. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4246. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Preserving the Integrity of the Federal Merit Systems: Understanding and Addressing Perceptions of Favoritism''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4247. A communication from the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4248. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4249. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Small Entity Compliance Guide'' (FAC 2005–72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4250. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Trade Agreements Thresholds'' (FAC 2005–72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4251. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Prioritizing Sources of Supplies and Services for Use by the Government'' (FAC 2005–72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4252. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Service Contracts Reporting Requirements'' (FAC 2005–72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4253. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–72; Introduction'' (FAC 2005–72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 27, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4254. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Energy's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4255. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4256. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4257. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4258. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4259. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4260. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address for the Department of Veterans Affairs 2013 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4261. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of the Interior's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4262. A communication from the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of April 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4263. A communication from the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service.

*Jo Emily Handelsman, of Connecticut, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

*Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

*Robert Michael Simon, of Maryland, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

*Debra L. Miller, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for a term expiring December 31, 2017.

*Terrell McSweeny, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of seven years from September 26, 2010.

*Paul Nathan Jaenichen, Sr., of Kentucky, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1913. A bill to make permanent the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1914. A bill to designate the Federal building housing the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Headquarters located at 99 New York Avenue

N.E., Washington, D.C., as the ''Eliot Ness ATF Building''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 1915. A bill to permit health insurance issuers to offer additional plan options to individuals; 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. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 330. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of ''Smoking and Health: Report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the United States'' and the significant progress in reducing the public health burden of tobacco use, and supporting an end to tobacco-related death and disease; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 331. A resolution congratulating the Florida State University football team for winning the 2014 Bowl Championship Series national championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. Res. 332. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2013 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 314

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 397

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 397, a bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lena Horne in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement.

S. 644

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 644, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the abuse of dextromethorphan, and for other purposes.

S. 809

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 809, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients be labeled accordingly.

S. 1114

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1623

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1623, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) 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. 1759

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1759, a bill to reauthorize the teaching health center program.

S. 1788

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1788, a bill to make it a negotiating principle of the United States in negotiations for bilateral, plurilateral, or multilateral agreements to seek the inclusion of provisions that promote Internet-enabled commerce and digital trade.

S. 1808

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1808, a bill to prevent adverse treatment of any person on the basis of views held with respect to marriage.

S. 1844

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1844, a bill to restore full military retirement benefits by closing corporate tax loopholes.

S. 1869

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1878

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1878, a bill to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent sex trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes.

S. 1880

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 1880, a bill to provide that the annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62 under the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 shall not apply to members retired for disability and to retired pay used to compute certain Survivor Benefit Plan annuities.

S. 1891

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1891, a bill to require a study and report by the Comptroller General regarding the restart provision of the Hours of Service Rules for Commercial Truck Drivers, and for other purposes.

S. 1897

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1897, a bill to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to ensure privacy, to provide notice of security breaches, and to enhance criminal penalties, law enforcement assistance, and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personally identifiable information.

S. 1902

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1902, a bill to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1907

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1907, a bill to amend a provision of the Bank Holding company Act of 1965 regarding prohibitions on investments in certain funds to clarify that such provision shall not be construed to require the divestiture of certain collateralized

debt obligations backed by trust-preferred securities or debt securities of collateralized loan obligations.

S. 1908

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1908, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

AMENDMENT NO. 2615

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2615 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2618

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2618 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 330—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ''SMOKING AND HEALTH: REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE SURGEON GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES'' AND THE SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS IN REDUCING THE PUBLIC HEALTH BURDEN OF TOBACCO USE, AND SUPPORTING AN END TO TOBACCO-RELATED DEATH AND DISEASE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 330

Whereas ''Smoking and Health: Report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the United States'' (referred to in this preamble as the ''1964 Report of the Surgeon General on Smoking and Health'') was the first Surgeon General of the United States report to definitively link smoking with lung cancer and heart disease;

Whereas the 1964 Report of the Surgeon General on Smoking and Health paved the way for a series of important public health initiatives aimed at reducing the burden of tobacco use, including the addition of health warnings to cigarette packages, bans on cigarette advertising in the broadcast media, and the removal of fruit flavoring that appeal to children from cigarettes;

Whereas tobacco control policies and public health initiatives aimed at curbing tobacco use contributed to a decrease in the prevalence of smoking by people of the United States from 42 percent in 1965 to 18 percent in 2012;

Whereas tobacco use remains one of the most pressing public health concerns of the United States and is the leading preventable cause of disease, disability, and death in the United States;

Whereas tobacco use causes 18 types of cancer, heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, pregnancy complications, and a host of other diseases and conditions;

Whereas in January of 2014, more than 43,000,000 adults of the United States smoke, more than 8,000,000 of such adults live with a serious illness caused by smoking, and more than 440,000 people of the United States die prematurely each year as a result of tobacco use;

Whereas most tobacco users begin smoking as children, every day more than 3,000 children try a cigarette for the first time, 700 children become daily smokers, and ⅓ of such children are projected to die prematurely as a result of tobacco use; and

Whereas smoking exacts a $193,000,000,000 toll on the economy of the United States each year, including $96,000,000,000 in direct medical costs and $97,000,000,000 in lost productivity: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 50th anniversary of ''Smoking and Health: Report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the United States'' and the significant contributions of such report in reducing the public health burden of tobacco use; and

(2) supports ending tobacco-related death and disease.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 331—CONGRATULATING THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2014 BOWL CHAMPIONSHIP SERIES NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 331

Whereas on January 6, 2014, before a crowd of more than 94,000 fans in Pasadena, California, the Florida State University Seminoles won the 2014 Bowl Championship Series (BCS) national championship with a 34-31 victory over the Auburn University Tigers;

Whereas Florida State University completed the largest comeback ever in a BCS national title game, giving the university its third national championship;

Whereas the Seminoles finished the 2013 season with a record of 14 wins and 0 losses;

Whereas Florida State University football head coach Jimbo Fisher won his first national title as a head coach, bringing his total record at Florida State University to 45 wins and 10 losses;

Whereas Florida State University quarterback Jameis Winston was awarded the 79th Heisman Memorial Trophy;

Whereas Jameis Winston is the only freshman quarterback to ever lead a Football Bowl Subdivision team to 13 wins and a BCS national title game;

Whereas the Seminoles finished 2013 ranked first in the Harris Poll, the USA Today Coaches Poll, the Associated Press Top 25, and the BCS Standings;

Whereas the Florida State University Seminoles triumphed over the Duke University Blue Devils 45 to 7 to win the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) championship title on December 7, 2013;

Whereas Florida State University football had 17 players named to the 2013 All-ACC team, the most of any school in the conference;

Whereas Florida State University fans worldwide supported and encouraged the Seminoles throughout the 2013 football season;

Whereas Florida State University president Eric J. Barron and athletics director Stan Wilcox have led the Florida State University to excellence in both academics and athletics;

Whereas Florida State University is one of the preeminent research universities in the State of Florida; and

Whereas the Florida State University students, faculty, alumni, and all Seminole fans have brought pride to their institution and the entire State of Florida: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Florida State University football team for winning the 2014 Bowl Championship Series national championship;

(2) recognizes the players, coaches, students, staff, and fans whose dedication helped Florida State University win the championship; and

(3) respectfully requests that Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the president of Florida State University, Eric J. Barron;

(B) the athletics director of Florida State University, Stan Wilcox; and

(C) the head coach of the Florida State University football team, Jimbo Fisher.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 332—CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2013 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 332

Whereas the North Dakota State University (referred to in this preamble as ''NDSU'') Bison won the 2013 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Division I Football Championship Subdivision title game in Frisco, Texas, on January 4, 2014, in a hard fought victory over the Towson University Tigers of Maryland by a score of 35 to 7;

Whereas the NDSU Bison and coach Craig Bohl had an incredible 2013 season and finished unbeaten for the first time since 1990;

Whereas NDSU has won 11 NCAA Football Championships and has now won 3 consecutive NCAA Football Championships since 2011;

Whereas during the championship game, the NDSU Bison offense scored 35 points against the Towson University Tigers;

Whereas Coach Bohl and his staff have instilled character and confidence in the NDSU players and have done an outstanding job with the Bison football program;

Whereas the leadership of President Dean Bresciani and Athletic Director Gene Taylor has helped bring both academic and athletic excellence to NDSU;

Whereas an estimated 17,000 Bison fans attended the Championship game, reflecting the tremendous spirit and dedication of Bison Nation that has helped propel the success of the team; and

Whereas the 2013 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision title was a victory not only for the NDSU football team, but also for the entire State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the North Dakota State University football team as the champion of the 2013 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title;

(2) commends the North Dakota State University players, coaches, and staff for their hard work and dedication; and

(3) recognizes the students, alumni, and loyal fans for supporting the Bison on the successful quest of the team to capture another Division I trophy for North Dakota State University.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2640. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) 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 2641. 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 2642. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2643. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2644. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2645. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2646. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2647. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2648. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

## TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 2640.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) 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 12 of the amendment, after line 12, add the following:

**SEC. 10. REPEAL OF ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT OF RETIRED PAY AND RETAINER PAY AMOUNTS FOR RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER AGE 62.**

Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 is hereby repealed.

**SA 2641.** 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. _____. REQUIREMENT THAT INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BE ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN A SYSTEMATIC AND SUSTAINED EFFORT TO OBTAIN SUITABLE WORK.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(h) ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b)(4), payment of emergency unemployment compensation shall not be made to any individual for any week of unemployment—

''(A) during which the individual fails to accept any offer of suitable work (as defined in paragraph (3)) or fails to apply for any suitable work to which the individual was referred by the State agency; or

''(B) during which the individual fails to actively engage in seeking work, unless such individual is not actively engaged in seeking work because such individual is, as determined in accordance with State law—

''(i) before any court of the United States or any State pursuant to a lawfully issued summons to appear for jury duty (as such term may be defined by the Secretary); or

''(ii) hospitalized for treatment of an emergency or a life-threatening condition (as such term may be defined by the Secretary),

if such exemptions in clauses (i) and (ii) apply to recipients of regular benefits, and the State chooses to apply such exemptions for recipients of emergency unemployment benefits.

''(2) PERIOD OF INELIGIBILITY.—If any individual is ineligible for emergency unemployment compensation for any week by reason of a failure described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), the individual shall be ineligible to receive emergency unemployment compensation for any week which begins during a period which—

''(A) begins with the week following the week in which such failure occurs; and

''(B) does not end until such individual has been employed during at least 4 weeks which begin after such failure and the total of the remuneration earned by the individual for being so employed is not less than the product of 4 multiplied by the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the individual's benefit year.

''(3) SUITABLE WORK.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'suitable work' means, with respect to any individual, any work which is within such individual's capabilities, except that, if the individual furnishes evidence satisfactory to the State agency that such individual's prospects for obtaining work in his customary occupation within a reasonably short period are good, the determination of whether any work is suitable work with respect to such individual shall be made in accordance with the applicable State law.

''(4) EXCEPTION.—Extended compensation shall not be denied under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) to any individual for any week by reason of a failure to accept an offer of, or apply for, suitable work—

''(A) if the gross average weekly remuneration payable to such individual for the position does not exceed the sum of—

''(i) the individual's average weekly benefit amount for his benefit year, plus

''(ii) the amount (if any) of supplemental unemployment compensation benefits (as defined in section 501(c)(17)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) payable to such individual for such week;

''(B) if the position was not offered to such individual in writing and was not listed with the State employment service;

''(C) if such failure would not result in a denial of compensation under the provisions of the applicable State law to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of paragraphs (3) and (5); or

''(D) if the position pays wages less than the higher of—

''(i) the minimum wage provided by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, without regard to any exemption; or

''(ii) any applicable State or local minimum wage.

''(5) ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN SEEKING WORK.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall be treated as actively engaged in seeking work during any week if—

''(A) the individual has engaged in a systematic and sustained effort to obtain work during such week, and

''(B) the individual provides tangible evidence to the State agency that he has engaged in such an effort during such week.

''(6) REFERRAL.—The State agency shall provide for referring applicants for emergency unemployment benefits to any suitable work to which paragraph (4) would not apply.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SA 2642.** Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. DONNELLY) 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:

Add at the end the following:

**TITLE II—AMERICA WORKS**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the ''American Manufacturing Efficiency and Retraining Investment Collaboration Achievement Works Act'' or ''AMERICA Works Act''.

**SEC. 202. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) Recent data show that United States manufacturing companies cannot fill as many as 600,000 skilled positions, even as unemployment numbers hover at historically high levels.

(2) The unfilled positions are mainly in the skilled production category, and in occupations such as machinist, operator, craft worker, distributor, or technician.

(3) In less than 20 years, an overall loss of expertise and management skill is expected to result from the gradual departure from the workplace of 77,200,000 workers.

(4) Postsecondary success and workforce readiness can be achieved through attainment of a recognized postsecondary credential.

(5) According to the January 2011 Computing Technology Industry Association report entitled ''Employer Perceptions of Information Technology Training and Certification'', 64 percent of hiring information technology managers rate information technology certifications as having extremely high or high value in validating information technology skills and expertise. The value of those certifications is rated highest among senior information technology managers,

such as Chief Information Officers, and managers of medium-size firms.

**SEC. 203. INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED AND NATIONALLY PORTABLE CREDENTIALS FOR JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS.**

(a) WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT OF 1998.—

(1) YOUTH ACTIVITIES.—Section 129(c)(1)(C) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2854(c)(1)(C)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (ii) through (iv) as clauses (iii) through (v), respectively; and

(B) inserting after clause (i) the following:

''(ii) training (which may include priority consideration for training programs that lead to recognized postsecondary credentials (as defined in section 204 of the AMERICA Works Act) that are aligned with in-demand occupations or industries in the local area involved, if the local board determines that the programs meet the quality criteria described in section 123);''.

(2) GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Section 134(d)(4)(F) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2864(d)(4)(F)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) PROGRAMS THAT LEAD TO AN INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED AND NATIONALLY PORTABLE CREDENTIAL.—In assisting individuals in selecting programs of training services under this section, a one-stop operator and employees of a one-stop center referred to in subsection (c) may give priority consideration to programs (approved in conjunction with eligibility decisions made under section 122) that lead to recognized postsecondary credentials (as defined in section 204 of the AMERICA Works Act) that are aligned with in-demand occupations or industries in the local area involved.''.

(3) CRITERIA.—

(A) GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—Section 122(b)(2)(D) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2842(b)(2)(D)) is amended—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) in the case of a provider of a program of training services that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential (as defined in section 204 of the AMERICA Works Act), that the program leading to the credential meets such quality criteria as the Governor shall establish.''.

(B) YOUTH ACTIVITIES.—Section 123 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2843) by inserting ''(including such quality criteria as the Governor shall establish for a training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential (as defined in section 204 of the AMERICA Works Act))'' after ''plan''.

(b) CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.—

(1) STATE PLAN.—Section 122(c)(1)(B) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2342(c)(1)(B)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(B) how'' and inserting ''(B)(i) how'';

(B) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) in the case of an eligible entity that, in developing and implementing programs of study leading to recognized postsecondary credentials, desires to give a priority to such programs that are aligned with in-demand occupations or industries in the area served (as determined by the eligible agency) and that may provide a basis for additional credentials, certificates, or degree, how the entity will do so;''.

(2) USE OF LOCAL FUNDS.—Section 134(b) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2354(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (11), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (12)(B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) describe the career and technical education activities supporting the attainment of recognized postsecondary credentials (as defined in section 204 of the AMERICA Works Act), and, in the case of an eligible recipient that desires to provide priority consideration to certain programs of study in accordance with the State plan under section 122(c)(1)(B), how the eligible recipient will give priority consideration to such activities.''.

(3) TECH-PREP PROGRAMS.—Section 203(c)(2)(E) of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2373(c)(2)(E)) is amended by striking ''industry-recognized credential, a certificate,'' and inserting ''recognized postsecondary credential (as defined in section 204 of the AMERICA Works Act and approved by the eligible agency),''.

**SEC. 204. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title:

(1) INDUSTRY-RECOGNIZED.—The term ''industry-recognized'', used with respect to a credential, means a credential that—

(A) is sought or accepted by employers within the industry sector involved as recognized, preferred, or required for recruitment, screening, hiring, or advancement;

(B) is endorsed by a recognized trade or professional association or organization, representing a significant part of the industry sector; and

(C) is a nationally portable credential, meaning a credential that is sought or accepted, across multiple States, as described in subparagraph (A).

(2) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.—The term ''recognized postsecondary credential'' means a credential consisting of an industry-recognized credential for postsecondary training, a certificate that meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (1) for postsecondary training, a certificate of completion of a postsecondary apprenticeship through a program described in section 122(a)(2)(B) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2842(a)(2)(B)), or an associate degree or baccalaureate degree awarded by an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

**SEC. 205. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

This title, and the amendments made by this title, take effect 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

---

**SA 2643.** Mr. TOOMEY 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:

Strike sections 2 through 6 and insert the following:

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF THE EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.**

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 4007 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''January 1, 2015''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of an individual who has amounts remaining in an account established under section 4002 as of the last day of the last week (as determined in accordance with the applicable State law) ending on or before January 1, 2015, the following rules shall apply:

''(A) Taking into account any augmentation under subparagraph (B), emergency unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual under this title for any week beginning after such last day as long as the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this title.

''(B) Augmentation under subsection (c), (d), and (e) of section 4002 may occur after such date as long as the requirements for such augmentation are otherwise met.

''(2) LIMIT ON COMPENSATION.—No compensation under this title shall be payable for any week beginning after October 3, 2015.''.

(b) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO WEEKS OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) FIRST TIER.—Section 4002(b) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; Public Law 110–252) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to—

''(A) for an account established after December 28, 2013, and before March 30, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 54 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 14 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(B) for an account established after March 29, 2014, and before June 29, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 43 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 11 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(C) for an account established after June 28, 2014, and before September 27, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 27 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 7 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year; or

''(D) for an account established after September 26, 2014, and before January 1, 2015, the lesser of—

''(i) 16 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 4 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.'';

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) SECOND TIER.—Section 4002(c)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; Public Law 110–252) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) for an account established under subsection (a) after December 28, 2013, and before March 30, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 54 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during

the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 14 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(B) for an account established under subsection (a) after March 29, 2014, and before June 29, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 43 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 11 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(C) for an account established under subsection (a) after June 28, 2014, and before September 27, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 27 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 7 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year; or

''(D) for an account established under subsection (a) after September 26, 2014, and before January 1, 2015, the lesser of—

''(i) 16 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 4 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.''.

(3) THIRD TIER.—Section 4002(d) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; Public Law 110–252) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) for an account established under subsection (a) after December 28, 2013, and before March 30, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 35 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 9 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(B) for an account established under subsection (a) after March 29, 2014, and before June 29, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 27 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 7 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(C) for an account established under subsection (a) after June 28, 2014, and before September 27, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 20 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 5 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(D) for an account established under subsection (a) after September 26, 2014, and before January 1, 2015, the lesser of—

''(i) 12 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 3 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (5).

(4) FOURTH TIER.—Section 4002(e) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; Public Law 110–252) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) for an account established under subsection (a) after December 28, 2013, and before March 30, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 39 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 10 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(B) for an account established under subsection (a) after March 29, 2014, and before June 29, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 27 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 7 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year;

''(C) for an account established under subsection (a) after June 28, 2014, and before September 27, 2014, the lesser of—

''(i) 20 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 5 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year; or

''(D) for an account established after September 26, 2014, and before January 1, 2015, the lesser of—

''(i) 12 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual during the individual's benefit year under such law; or

''(ii) 3 times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (5).

(c) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by inserting ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act;''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2013.

**SEC. 3. FLEXIBILITY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENTS.**

(a) FLEXIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall not apply with respect to a State that has enacted a law before December 1, 2013, that, upon taking effect, would violate such subsection.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) is effective with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2013.

(b) PERMITTING A SUBSEQUENT AGREEMENT.—Nothing in title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall preclude a State whose agreement under such title was terminated from entering into a subsequent agreement under such title on or after the date of the enactment of this Act if the State, taking into account the application of subsection (a), would otherwise meet the requirements for an agreement under such title.

**SEC. 4. 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 December 2013.

**SEC. 5. 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.''.

(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.

**SEC. 6. LIMITATION ON PAYMENT OF PORTION OF PREMIUM BY FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION.**

Section 508(e) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) LIMITATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the total

amount of premium paid by the Corporation on behalf of a person or legal entity, directly or indirectly, with respect to all policies issued to the person or legal entity under this title for a crop year shall be limited to a maximum of $50,000.

''(B) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Corporation shall carry out this paragraph in accordance with sections 1001 through 1001F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308 et seq.).''.

---

**SA 2644.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) 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 4, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(e) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall terminate on the day that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act if the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in coordination with the heads of other Federal agencies, including the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, fails to publish in the Federal Register a report that models the impact of major Federal regulations on job creation across the whole economy of the United States.

(2) UPDATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shall update the report described in paragraph (1) not less frequently than once every 30 days.

(B) TERMINATION.—The amendments made by this section shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the most recent report described in subparagraph (A) is required if the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, fails to update the report in accordance with subparagraph (A).

---

**SA 2645.** Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. PRYOR) 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 end, add the following:

**SEC. 7. REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS IN MILITARY RETIREMENT BENEFITS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.**

Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–67) is repealed effective as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

---

**SA 2646.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) 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 amendment, add the following:

**SEC. _____. REQUIREMENT THAT INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BE ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN A SYSTEMATIC AND SUSTAINED EFFORT TO OBTAIN SUITABLE WORK.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(h) ACTIVELY SEEKING WORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b)(4), payment of emergency unemployment compensation shall not be made to any individual for any week of unemployment—

''(A) during which the individual fails to accept any offer of suitable work (as defined in paragraph (3)) or fails to apply for any suitable work to which the individual was referred by the State agency; or

''(B) during which the individual fails to actively engage in seeking work, unless such individual is not actively engaged in seeking work because such individual is, as determined in accordance with State law—

''(i) before any court of the United States or any State pursuant to a lawfully issued summons to appear for jury duty (as such term may be defined by the Secretary); or

''(ii) hospitalized for treatment of an emergency or a life-threatening condition (as such term may be defined by the Secretary),

if such exemptions in clauses (i) and (ii) apply to recipients of regular benefits, and the State chooses to apply such exemptions for recipients of emergency unemployment benefits.

''(2) PERIOD OF INELIGIBILITY.—If any individual is ineligible for emergency unemployment compensation for any week by reason of a failure described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), the individual shall be ineligible to receive emergency unemployment compensation for any week which begins during a period which—

''(A) begins with the week following the week in which such failure occurs; and

''(B) does not end until such individual has been employed during at least 4 weeks which begin after such failure and the total of the remuneration earned by the individual for being so employed is not less than the product of 4 multiplied by the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the individual's benefit year.

''(3) SUITABLE WORK.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'suitable work' means, with respect to any individual, any work which is within such individual's capabilities, except that, if the individual furnishes evidence satisfactory to the State agency that such individual's prospects for obtaining work in his customary occupation within a reasonably short period are good, the determination of whether any work is suitable work with respect to such individual shall be made in accordance with the applicable State law.

''(4) EXCEPTION.—Extended compensation shall not be denied under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) to any individual for any week by reason of a failure to accept an offer of, or apply for, suitable work—

''(A) if the gross average weekly remuneration payable to such individual for the position does not exceed the sum of—

''(i) the individual's average weekly benefit amount for his benefit year, plus

''(ii) the amount (if any) of supplemental unemployment compensation benefits (as defined in section 501(c)(17)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) payable to such individual for such week;

''(B) if the position was not offered to such individual in writing and was not listed with the State employment service;

''(C) if such failure would not result in a denial of compensation under the provisions of the applicable State law to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with the provisions of paragraphs (3) and (5); or

''(D) if the position pays wages less than the higher of—

''(i) the minimum wage provided by section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, without regard to any exemption; or

''(ii) any applicable State or local minimum wage.

''(5) ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN SEEKING WORK.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall be treated as actively engaged in seeking work during any week if—

''(A) the individual has engaged in a systematic and sustained effort to obtain work during such week, and

''(B) the individual provides tangible evidence to the State agency that he has engaged in such an effort during such week.

''(6) REFERRAL.—The State agency shall provide for referring applicants for emergency unemployment benefits to any suitable work to which paragraph (4) would not apply.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

---

**SA 2647.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) 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:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 2 and all that follows through the end, and insert the following:

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.**

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 4007(a)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2014'' and inserting ''April 1, 2014''.

(b) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO WEEKS OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) NUMBER OF WEEKS IN FIRST TIER BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 28, 2013.—Section 4002(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by inserting '', AND WEEKS ENDING BEFORE DECEMBER 30, 2013'' after ''2012''; and

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', and before December 30, 2013'' after ''2012''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO AMOUNTS ESTABLISHED IN AN ACCOUNT AS OF A WEEK ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 29, 2013.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), in the case of any account established as of a week ending after December 29, 2013—

''(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '24 percent' for '80 percent'; and

''(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting '6 times' for '20 times'.''.

(2) NUMBER OF WEEKS IN SECOND TIER BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 28, 2013.—Section 4002(c) of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO AMOUNTS ADDED TO AN ACCOUNT AS OF A WEEK ENDING AFTER DECEMBER 29, 2013.—Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), if augmentation under this subsection occurs as of a week ending after December 29, 2013—

''(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting '24 percent' for '54 percent'; and

''(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting '6 times' for '14 times'.''.

(c) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by inserting ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act;''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

**SEC. 3. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXTENDED BENEFIT PROVISIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), is amended—

(1) by striking ''December 31, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''March 31, 2014''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''June 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''.

(b) EXTENSION OF MATCHING FOR STATES WITH NO WAITING WEEK.—Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''June 30, 2014'' and inserting ''September 30, 2014''.

(c) EXTENSION OF MODIFICATION OF INDICATORS UNDER THE EXTENDED BENEFIT PROGRAM.—Section 203 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2), by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

**SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND REEMPLOYMENT AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4004(c)(2)(A) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking ''through fiscal year 2014'' and inserting ''through the first quarter of fiscal year 2015''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

**SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT.**

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 2(c)(2)(D)(iii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 352(c)(2)(D)(iii)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''June 30, 2013'' and inserting ''September 30, 2013''; and

(2) by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''March 31, 2014''.

(b) CLARIFICATION ON AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS.—Funds appropriated under either the first or second sentence of clause (iv) of section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act shall be available to cover the cost of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D) by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) as well as to cover the cost of such benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATION.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Railroad Retirement Board $62,500 for administrative expenses associated with the payment of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a), to remain available until expended.

**SEC. 6. FLEXIBILITY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENTS.**

(a) FLEXIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall not apply with respect to a State that has enacted a law before December 1, 2013, that, upon taking effect, would violate such subsection.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) is effective with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2013.

(b) PERMITTING A SUBSEQUENT AGREEMENT.—Nothing in such title IV shall preclude a State whose agreement under such title was terminated from entering into a subsequent agreement under such title on or after the date of the enactment of this Act if the State, taking into account the application of subsection (a), would otherwise meet the requirements for an agreement under such title.

**SEC. 7. REPEAL OF REDUCTIONS MADE BY BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013.**

Section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67) is repealed as of the date of the enactment of such Act.

**SEC. 8. 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 subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

---

**SA 2648.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) 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:

Strike section 7 of the amendment.

## NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 16, 2013, at 10:00 a.m., in room SD–106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Strengthening Federal Access Programs to Meet 21st Century Needs: A Look at TRIO and GEAR UP.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Aissa Canchola of the committee staff on (202) 224–2009.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet in executive session on Monday, January 13, 2014, at 5:30 p.m. in room S–214.

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

## CONGRATULATING THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 331.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 331) congratulating the Florida State University football team for winning the 2014 Bowl Championship Series national championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am going to take advantage of the fact that the Senator from Alabama is here, because we are bringing forth today a resolution which will pass by unanimous consent, if the Senators from Alabama will so agree. The fact is that it was a marvelous national championship game. Whichever won, it was obvious that one was going to be No. 1 and the other one, as it turned out, was going to be No. 2, as it should have been, in the entire national collegiate football program.

I want to tell the Senator how much I admire his university, Auburn University, and that it is my privilege to speak on behalf of Florida State University, and there is no question, I knew that whoever ended up with the score by the end of the game, they were the national championship team and, lo and behold, did that score go back and forth. With a little over a minute left, Florida State, led by their Heisman Trophy winning-quarterback, took it down the entire length of the

field. It was a sight to behold. I just wanted to say those words while the Senator from Alabama was here.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I think it is a remarkable achievement. Some people think our young people are not willing to work, not willing to discipline themselves, but those two teams played their hearts out. They did not get there working at it a few weeks ago. They worked all year in the weight rooms and studying, preparing themselves to reach this high level of excellence that delivered a thrilling game for us all. Florida State is a terrific team. I think everybody knew Auburn was going to have to be really up to speed to be able to compete—and they were able to. The Senator is right, and I am pleased to note that our Heisman Trophy winner this year is a native of Hueytown, AL. We will claim credit for that too.

Mr. NELSON. I concede that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Auburn drove down the field on that last drive, having to score to win the game, and just pounded away and Tre Mason ran down there and ran over somebody and scored the touchdown. But you are a Heisman Trophy-winning team, and all of you pulled together and came back and won with a few seconds to spare. It was spectacular. You well deserve the right to recognize them by resolution. I certainly will not object.

I will add one more thing. Had Auburn won, it would have been the fifth consecutive year Auburn or Alabama had won the national championship. We would have liked to have seen that happen, but congratulations go to Florida State. They deserved to win, and they played well enough to win and did win.

Mr. NELSON. This Senator is wearing a garnet and gold tie. I noticed the Senator from Alabama is wearing a crimson tie, but certainly his allegiance is orange and blue, I take it?

Mr. SESSIONS. Orange and blue. I celebrate them. I did have my Auburn tie on the day of the game. But I love Alabama; it is a fabulous program. I spent 3 years there and remain a big fan. I am maybe one of the few people in the State who really, truly had a divided allegiance about whom to be for. Those are super universities.

I would say to Senator NELSON, as I shared with him, I am really impressed with the University of Florida where my grandson had some great surgery done by the finest doctor in the world, I believe, for the condition he had. He has done so well. I know both of us are proud of the great institutions in our State.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this resolution awaits unanimous consent by the Senate, which I assume will occur today. We tried it for last Thursday night before the Senate adjourned, but I think everything has been cleared now. The resolution will commemorate the fact that Florida State is now the BCS champion. Senator RUBIO and I have submitted the resolution. It commends the university for the 34-to-31 championship game, which the Senator from Alabama and I have just talked about. It caps a remarkable season of 14 and 0 for the Seminoles, led by head coach Jimbo Fisher and his Heisman Trophy-winning quarterback Jameis Winston.

This Senator will concede to the Senator from Alabama that he is originally from Hueytown, AL—which is not too far north of the Florida line. So, for all the players, the coaches, the students, the staff and indeed the fans—all of those of Florida State have made the university and the entire State of Florida very proud by winning this game in such an exciting, hard-fought and well-fought game.

I am grateful to our Senate colleagues for helping to agree to this resolution today.

Mr. REID. Mr. 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. 331) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

## CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 332.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 332) congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2013 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. 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. 332) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

## ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 14, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1845, the unemployment insurance extension legislation, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees—and that would be controlled time—with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes; further, that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 1845 be 11 a.m., Tuesday; that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings; and finally, that the time from 2:15 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders.

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

## PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there could be two rollcall votes tomorrow at 2:30 p.m.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. 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 7:10 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 14, 2014, at 10 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

STANLEY FISCHER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JANET L. YELLEN.

STANLEY FISCHER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR THE UNEXPIRED TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2006, VICE BEN S. BERNANKE.

LAEL BRAINARD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2012, VICE ELIZABETH A. DUKE, RESIGNED.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 13, 2014:

### THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT LEON WILKINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## RECOGNIZING THE GARY FRONTIERS SERVICE CLUB AND ITS HONOREES

### HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the birth of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and reflect on his life and work, we are reminded of the challenges that democracy poses to us and the delicate nature of liberty. Dr. King's life, and, unfortunately, his untimely death, reminds us that we must continually work to secure and protect our freedoms. Dr. King, in his courage to act, his willingness to meet challenges, and his ability to achieve, embodied all that is good and true in the battle for liberty.

The spirit of Dr. King lives on in the citizens of communities throughout our nation. It lives on in the people whose actions reflect the spirit of resolve and achievement that will help move our country into the future. I am honored to rise today to recognize several individuals from Indiana's First Congressional District, who will be recognized during the 35th Annual Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Breakfast on Saturday, January 18, 2014, at the Genesis Convention Center in Gary, Indiana. The Gary Frontiers Service Club, which was founded in 1952, sponsors this annual breakfast.

This year, the Gary Frontiers Service Club will pay tribute to local individuals who have for decades unselfishly contributed to improving the quality of life for the people of Gary. Notably, Judge Calvin Hawkins will be honored with the prestigious Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drum Major Award for 2014. Additionally, several individuals will be recognized as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Marchers at this year's breakfast, including Bishop Dr. Dale Cudjoe, Master Alex Dunlap, Stephen Mays, Dr. Deborah McCullough, MD, and Sadie Newby-Ethridge. Finally, Linnal Ford was selected as the 2013 Yokefellow of the Year.

Though very different in nature, the achievements of each of these individuals reflect many of the same attributes that Dr. King possessed, as well as the values he advocated. Like Dr. King, these individuals saw challenges and faced them with unwavering strength and determination. Each one of the honored guests' greatness has been found in their willingness to serve with ''a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love.'' They set goals and work selflessly to make them a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending these honorees, as well as the Gary Frontiers Service Club officers, President Oliver J. Gilliam, Vice President Sean Jones, 1st Vice President James Piggee, Recording Secretary Linnal Ford, Financial Secretary Sam Frazier, Corresponding Secretary Ferba R. Hines, and Treasurer/Seventh District Director Floyd Donaldson, as well as Clorius L. Lay, who has served as Breakfast Chairman for the last twelve years, in addition to all other members of the service club for their initiative, determination, and dedication to serving the people of Northwest Indiana.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide a reason for my absence during a series of votes on Thursday, January 9, 2014. During Roll Calls 7–10, I was suffering from severe back spasms and went immediately to the Attending Physician's office for assistance. If present, I would have voted yes during Roll Calls 7, 8 and 9 and I would have voted no during Roll Call 10.

## COMMEMORATING THE FOUR YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE CATASTROPHIC EARTHQUAKE IN HAITI

### HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 12, 2014, at 4:53 p.m. marked the fourth anniversary of the catastrophic earthquake that rocked the island nation of Haiti, the poorest country in our hemisphere. Though much has been written about it, it is difficult to describe the devastation left by the quake. I travelled to Haiti soon after it struck and can scarcely describe it myself. Casualties numbered in the hundreds of thousands, and an even greater number of dwellings were destroyed. Haiti's already poor infrastructure was decimated.

The international community did respond, with the U.S. leading the charge. Our initial disaster relief was nothing short of heroic, and prevented significant further harm in the days and weeks following . Relief eventually gave way to recovery and then reconstruction. Four years out, the U.S. remains heavily involved and engaged in the process of building Haiti back better.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, where I am ranking member, has been active in this process. We commissioned a GAO report to give us an assessment on U.S. assistance, which found, among other things, that the administration was not providing sufficient information to the Congress to fulfill its oversight role. We then sent a bipartisan staff delegation to look into specific problems GAO found, and soon after held a full committee hearing on the matter.

Capping that oversight process, this past December the House overwhelmingly agreed to bipartisan legislation to address some of these issues, and sent the bill to the Senate. The Assessing Progress in Haiti Act of 2013 is authored by a recognized champion advocating on behalf of the people of Haiti, Barbara Lee of California. It enjoys strong bipartisan support, such as from Foreign Affairs Chairman Royce. It seeks to fill the information gap by requiring the State Department to report on various aspects of our assistance program, and includes a Statement of Policy that articulates the direction we believe that assistance program should take.

The reality is that a multi-year and multi-billion dollar commitment, borne of the generosity of the American people, calls for ongoing vigilance —- both in terms of accountability as well as policy direction, and I believe H.R. 3509 goes a significant way to achieve that goal.

I intend to work with my colleagues in the Senate to see that this legislation becomes law in the next few months. I believe the Haitian people, who have endured more than their fair share of misery at the hands of this horrific natural disaster, deserve nothing less.

## IN HONOR OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY DEPUTY SHERIFF GEORGE ''TONY'' JACK

### HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. FARR. Ms. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Santa Cruz County Deputy Sheriff George ''Tony'' Jack who served 28 years in local law enforcement. Tony was born in Los Gatos, California and spent most of his life in Santa Cruz County, attending Soquel High School and Cabrillo College.

Tony was involved in the 4-H and the Santa Cruz County Fair and enjoyed teaching at Cabrillo College as well as counseling troubled youth, spending time with the elderly, and assisting the homeless. He was known for treating others with dignity and respect and knew early in life that he was destined to have a career in law enforcement.

Tony had a variety of assignments throughout his career, having worked as a patrol officer, gang investigator, field training officer, SWAT member, and an instructor for driving and the safe use of firearms. Most recently Tony was pleased to serve as Superior Court Bailiff for the Honorable Judge Timothy Volkmann.

Tony was a devoted husband and father, often bragging about his three sons, Gavin, Owen, and Kyle, and his significant other, Narine. The entire Santa Cruz Sheriff's Office and its extended family mourn the loss of Deputy Tony Jack, and the entire community of Santa Cruz share in the sadness felt by the Jack family.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respects to Tony and his commitment to community service and family, and I wish his family peace and solace during this difficult time.

## HONORING KAYLYN ANTOINETTE NORWOOD

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of MIssissippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable young lady that is a community servant, Ms. Kaylyn Antoinette Norwood, who has shown what can be done through hard work, setting goals, and aiming high.

Ms. Kaylyn Antoinette Norwood is the daughter of Marcus, Sr. and Linda Norwood of Crystal Springs, MS.

Ms. Norwood is a member of White Oak United Methodist Church where she sings in the choir and is a teacher for children's church.

Ms. Norwood attended Crystal Springs High School and was a member of Mu Alpha Theta, BETA Club, FBLA, Student Council, SADD Club, FCA (Fellowship of Christian Athletes), Soccer and a Cheerleader. She received the highest overall GPA in 10th, 11th and 12th grades, highest GPA in English I, AP English II, Biology I, Spanish II, MS Studies, Algebra II, World History, JROTC II, BCT I, Human A & P and Highest Overall GPA Female Athlete (9th, 10th, & 11th grade) and the Robert Green Tiger Award (cheerleader).

Ms. Norwood graduated from Crystal Springs High School on May 24, 2013 as Valedictorian. This is the highest honor for a high school student. Not only is Kaylyn a scholar, but she is a Model for Barbizon Modeling/Acting School. She was crowned Ms. Barbizon in 2011 and has traveled to Hollywood, California where she earned the title of National Cover Model for the National American Miss Pageant. She was also crowned 2010–2011 Debutante Queen for the Heroines of Jericho 11th District Debutante Ball.

Ms. Norwood has participated in the Lions Club of MS Girls Leadership Conference and the American Legion Auxiliary Girls State Leadership Conference.

Ms. Norwood is currently attending the University of Southern Mississippi in Hattiesburg, MS where she is majoring in Accounting.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Kaylyn Antoinette Norwood for her dedication to serving her community.

## RECOGNIZING SCOUTMASTER JERRY McCAFFREY OF BOY SCOUT TROOP 1

### HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his retirement as Scoutmaster of Boy Scout Troop 1, Sellersville, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, we recognize Jerry McCaffrey Jr. for 21 years of service to the oldest, continuously operating Boy Scout troop in Bucks County. As Scoutmaster, he is acknowledged as an outstanding role model who contributed years of leadership to Scouting, including active participation in the many volunteer community services provided by Troop 1. Scoutmaster McCaffrey is recognized by his colleagues for his inspiration and dedication to Scouting, overall, and Troop 1, in particular. He dutifully followed the mission of the Boy Scouts of America, which is to instill good character and morals in the Scouts. And his personal characteristics made him a successful mentor to many Scouts as they worked their way through the ranks. We are proud at this time to recognize the accomplishments of Scoutmaster McCaffrey, who has set a precedent for others to follow.

## HONORING GLORIA ROGERS

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a jovial and ambitious woman Ms. Gloria Rogers. Gloria has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to achieve.

Gloria Rogers, a resident of Rolling Fork, Mississippi, was born on March 26, 1966 to Alean and Robert. She is a graduate of Rolling Fork High School located in Rolling Fork, MS. After graduation Gloria enrolled at Hinds Community College for one semester before moving to Panama City, Panama for three years.

In November 1987 Gloria moved to Edwards Air Force Base in California where she attended Lancaster Community College. She later moved to San Diego, California and attended San Diego Community College. Gloria then attended Marie College of Medical Careers where she received her certification as Medical Assistant. She began work at Balboa Naval Hospital and the Gastroenterologist Clinic upon receiving her certification.

Gloria later moved to Altamonte Springs, Florida where she lived for three years before returning to Mississippi in 1998. Upon her return to Rolling Fork, Mississippi, Gloria landed a job as a dispatcher for the Sharkey County Sheriff Department. She later began working as a dispatcher in Leland, MS. While working for Leland Police Department, Gloria decided at the ripe age of 38 to go to the Police Academy and become a police officer.

After graduating from the Police Academy, Gloria served in the capacities of Officer, Investigator, Shift Supervisor while working for the Leland Police Department. Upon leaving the Leland Police Department she took a job as a Probation Offic the Mississippi Department of Correction Greenville, MS. Currently, Gloria is a School Resource Officer for the Leland School District Security Officer for Kroger stores.

Gloria has two children: Kendrick and Brittany and three grandchildren: Jaylin, Justin and Kenya. She enjoys being a grandmother.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join m in recognizing Ms. Gloria Rogers for her dedication for change and serving her community.

## IN RECOGNITION OF BEVERLY BEASLEY JOHNSON

### HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Beverly Beasley Johnson for her 37 years of outstanding public service in California and Michigan. Beverly is driven by her dedication to justice and has touched the lives of thousands of people, particularly children.

For the last seven years, she was the Director of the San Mateo County Human Services Agency (HAS) which envisions a world where every child, adult and family lives in a safe, healthy and thriving community. The agency provides an always-expanding list of family services, child care, financial assistance, employment services, veterans services, food assistance and now even enrollment into the new health care system. Under Beverly's leadership the agency has implemented California's child welfare system improvement plan and focused on the disproportionate representation of African American children in the child protective services system. Beverly and I share a steadfast determination to stop commercial sex trafficking which enslaves between 100,000 and 300,000 children in our country alone.

The level of professionalism and excellence at the agency is experienced by San Mateo residents every day, and has been recognized by the Council on Accreditation (COA) and the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF). In fact, San Mateo County's HSA was the first public agency in California to receive the COA accreditation and it was just renewed for another four years.

Beverly has been working closely with the state's parole re-entry program. She led her team to research, design and implement the award-winning ''Service Connect'' model to ensure that formerly incarcerated residents had the best chances to successfully reintegrate into the community by having easy access to services and support. Beverly has worked hard to remove the stigma of food stamps as a government handout and to educate the general public about food insecurity. She partnered with the county and the nonprofit Code for America to create an app that will help residents connect with valuable local services and programs.

Before joining NSA, Beverly held a similar position at the Kern County Department of Human Services for four years. There she launched ''Heart Gallery'' for children awaiting adoptions and the Child Welfare Parent Leader Program. She employed parents who had successfully reunited with their children to mentor other child welfare families and she championed the Annie E. Casey Family to Family Program.

Beverly grew up in Michigan and earned her Bachelor's Degree in Psychology from Oakland University and her Law Degree from Michigan State University Detroit College of Law. She served as the chief deputy director of the Michigan Department of Civil Rights after working for 26 years as a social worker, supervisor, manager and administrator of public welfare and human services for what is now named the Michigan Human Services Agency.

Mr. Speaker, as you can tell by these accomplishments, Beverly Beasley Johnson has a steel backbone and a generous heart. She believes that every person should be presumed to be worthy until proven otherwise, and she has worked hard to ensure that the purposes of social service programs are upheld. Ultimately, those purposes are to feed and house the poor, to relieve suffering for those wrongly afflicted, and to ennoble the human spirit by educating, supporting and guiding good people towards sound choices. Beverly has been outstanding in achieving these purposes during her career.

In her well-deserved retirement, Beverly will split her time between California and Michigan. She is looking forward to spending more time with her husband Thomas, her four children, five grandchildren and soon her first great-grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Beverly Beasley Johnson, a genuine public servant, a champion for people in need and a woman with a huge heart. She has led so many onto a path to a better life.

## HONORING SHERIFF CHARLES L. JONES

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Sheriff, the Honorable Charles L. Jones who is a resident of Clarksdale, Mississippi.

Sheriff Jones was born in Quitman County, Mississippi to Mrs. Georgia Jones and has three brothers who are all law enforcement officers.

Sheriff Jones received his education from Clarksdale High School, Coahoma Agricultural High School, Coahoma Community College, and Almeda University where he received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice.

Sheriff Jones began his law enforcement career in 1994 with the Clarksdale Police Department where he received certification in Basic Law Enforcement and moved up in the ranks from patrolman to gang officer, investigator, and to the SWAT Team Squad. In 2002 he ended his tenure with the Clarksdale Police Department and became a deputy sheriff at the Coahoma County Sheriff's Department and was employed their until 2004. He became Chief of Police for the Town of Friars Point where he was instrumental in reducing crime with the assistance of state and federal law enforcement agencies until 2009.

In 2007 he ran for election to become sheriff of Coahoma County. Sheriff Jones challenged the irregularities of that election process and in 2009 a special election was ordered by the Governor of Mississippi upon the direction of the Mississippi Supreme Court and he was elected Sheriff of Coahoma County.

Throughout his law enforcement career he desired to be the best enforcer of the law by taking various seminar classes and making sure his staff participates as well. Sheriff Jones has earned numerous certificates and awards.

Sheriff Jones is married to Mrs. Andrea Jones; and they are the proud parents of five children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing law enforcement officer Sheriff Charles Jones for his dedication in protecting and serving the citizens of Coahoma County, Mississippi.

## IN RECOGNITION OF V. LANE RAWLINS' SERVICE AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

### HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of V. Lane Rawlins as the 15th President of the University of North Texas (UNT). Dr. Rawlins joined UNT in 2010 at a critical time in the school's history as it sought to become a tier-one research institution. Under his leadership, great strides have been made in this effort. He remains a strong advocate for students, recognizing that ultimately their success is the measure by which all University accomplishments are made.

Since the entry of the fall 2010 freshman class, UNT has emphasized efforts to increase the number of high-quality students by focusing on recruitment, retention, and enrollment. Under his direction, UNT's fall 2013 enrollment reached a record 36,221 students, an 18 percent growth with an average SAT score of 1108, 7 points higher than three years prior.

Dr. Rawlins sought to strengthen the culture of research at UNT by attracting distinguished faculty and emphasizing the significance of research activity. Through this focus, UNT has increased research funding across the board, now counting two National Academy of Engineering members and a National Academy of Sciences member among the institution's outstanding faculty.

During his tenure, UNT also unveiled its five-year strategic plan: Four Bold Goals for the Future of One Great University, to establish common goals for providing the best educational experience for students and achieving status as a tier-one research institution. Additionally, an updated brand campaign "A green light to greatness" was introduced to expand brand awareness, pride, and engagement among the University's various constituencies. Pride for the University has continued to grow as the Mean Green football team earned the right to play in the Heart of Dallas Bowl in 2014. UNT won 36–14, taking the first bowl trophy in over a decade to Denton's Apogee Stadium in the University's inaugural season under the Conference USA banner.

At a time when traditional sources of higher education funding are in decline, Dr. Rawlins helped launch the public fundraising campaign, The light is green. The time is now. The Campaign for UNT. As a leading proponent to increase sources of financial support, Dr. Rawlins established an era of strengthened fundraising and greater alumni and stakeholder engagement which helped secure two of UNT's largest pledged gifts in 2011.

With Dr. Rawlins' support, UNT opened three of its four LEED-certified environmentally friendly facilities, earning recognition by Princeton Review as a "Green College". UNT also achieved the highest rank in the State by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education, underscoring UNT' s sense of responsibility through commitment to conservation research and application, and modeling the leadership necessary to support US economic growth in an increasingly competitive worldwide energy market.

I am grateful to Dr. Rawlins for bringing his wisdom, boldness, vision, and discipline to the University of North Texas. I am also indebted to his wife Mary Jo as she became an important member of the Denton Community, supporting him through the challenges faced in guiding UNT. I am pleased to hear they will remain in Denton, becoming Texans by choice, as he accepts the title of President Emeritus. It is my continued privilege to represent them, UNT, and the great State of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives.

## HONORING A.C. GARNER

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a hardworking and self motivated man, Mr. A.C. Garner.

Mr. Garner, a son of a sharecropper, was born in Grand Gulf, Claiborne County, Mississippi. He was reared on a plantation, educated in the public schools and later joined the United States Armed Forces. He received a Bachelor's Degree in Sociology from Alcorn State University, Alcorn, Mississippi.

Mr. Garner is a veteran of the U.S. Navy where he was trained as a power plant operator. In 1958 he participated in Nuclear Testing of A and H bombs at Bikini Island. He has worked as a sales representative and also as an engineering inspector for public roads.

Mr. Garner became President of the Claiborne County branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in 1980. In that same year he helped to carry a 13 year boycott case from Port Gibson, Claiborne County, Mississippi to the United States Supreme Court known as the "Port Gibson Boycott". He personally appeared before the United States Supreme Court as a guest of the court and the case was won in the NAACP's favor.

In that same year of 1980, Mr. Garner was appointed by the Claiborne County Board of Supervisors as director of Emergency Management. At that time he started attending colleges and universities across the United States in order to be certified to help bring the one and only nuclear power plant in Mississippi on line by 1985.

In 1994, Mr. Garner completed all courses and was certified by the Emergency Management Institute in Emmitsburg, MD.

Mr. Garner is retired and is a small farmer in Port Gibson, Mississippi. He raises beef cattle. He serves as the President of the Black Farmers Association of Claiborne County. He is the President of the Claiborne County Port Commission and is a lifetime member of the NAACP.

Mr. Garner is married to Charity Carpenter Garner and they have four children: Albert, Jr., Andra, TaWanda and Exzavian.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a dynamic man, Mr. A.C. Garner.

## IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HAVILAND AVENUE GRADE SCHOOL

### HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Haviland Avenue Grade School.

In 1913, the town of Audubon, NJ purchased land for Public School #3. Beginning as a four room school house, it expanded in 1926 to accommodate the growing population in the surrounding area. Due to a lack of funds and support, the school began to show its age in the 1970s and was in danger of closing. More than 300 engaged citizens signed a petition asking the school board to keep the school open. In 1979, the school board allocated funds for an extensive renovation, allowing the Haviland Avenue School to continue serving students. During its 100 year existence, Haviland Avenue School has served as the starting point for numerous young men and women who have become doctors, teachers, professional athletes, elected officials and even Purple Heart recipients.

Mr. Speaker, this beautiful school has fostered learning and community values for generations of New Jerseyans. On the centennial of the founding of this school, I join all of South Jersey in wishing students, staff, and alumni at Haviland Avenue Grade School another hundred years of happiness and prosperity.

## HONORING TYRONE LEWIS

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Tyrone Lewis, who is a native of Jackson, Mississippi and a proud product of Jackson Public Schools as a 1978 graduate of Lanier High School. Upon completing high school, he went on to attend Jackson State University and graduated in 1982 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Mass Communications. While exploring his career options, Tyrone's desire to serve and build community affirmed to his decision to apply to the Jackson Police Training Academy.

After completing the training and certification process in 1983, Tyrone Lewis began his successful career in law enforcement with the Jackson Police Department.

During his 28-year career, he steadily rose through the ranks; mastering each position he was assigned. Having been directly and indirectly involved with virtually every facet of the Jackson Police Department, Tyrone developed an intense understanding of the importance of transparency, integrity, and communication.

He has become well aware of the law enforcement needs that the citizens of Hinds County have as a whole. Tyrone knows that all citizens deserve a safe and orderly community maintained by firm and fair law enforcement.

Tyrone's career began as a Patrolman. He worked steadily and was later promoted to a Shift Sergeant. Eventually, he was promoted to a Neighborhood Enforcement Team Commander and then Acting Precinct Commander. As his stellar career continued, Tyrone was made Commander/Director of the Jackson Police Academy where he served until his promotion to Acting Chief of Police in 2009.

In 2010, Tyrone retired from the Jackson Police Department as Deputy Chief of the Community Services Division. While in each position, he provided a solid leadership base for personnel, effectively managing the overall operations and procedures, and handling the fiscal responsibilities with respect to his assignment.

Having worked in so many capacities with the Jackson Police Department, Tyrone underwent extensive training in a wide variety of areas of law enforcement and public safety including: crime prevention, police supervisory training, field officers' training, control & restraint techniques, evidence, crime scene, search & seizure, weapons of mass destruction, Constitutional law, police tactical driving, and diversionary devices.

Throughout his stellar service career, Tyrone has been recognized for his contributions to the community as he was named Jackson's Best in 1994 and Officer of the Year in 1992. He is also a member of the Mississippi Law Enforcement Officers Training Academy and both the Mississippi and National Associations of School Resource Officers. He is also a member of the MS Underage Drinking Prevention Coalition of Hinds County and the Metro Jackson Community Prevention Coalition of Hinds County.

Over the years Tyrone has made it a point to continually participate in a variety of community and civic organizations. He organized the 1st Annual Officer Thomas Catchings Toy Drive in 2008 through the Jackson Police Department and has also served as a Board Member for the Farish Street Heritage Festival since 2008.

Tyrone is a very active member of Stronger Hope Baptist Church where he is a Deacon and Pastor's Armor Bearer. He also serves on the Board of Directors of Apostolic Restoration Ministry. Tyrone is a member of Masonic Lodge #701 and of the Jackson Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Incorporated.

Tyrone is fully aware of the crime and economic conditions that presently face our community. He is also keenly aware of the perceptions that many citizens have of the Hinds County Sheriff's Department. As such, upon his election his goals include restoring safety to our communities and rebuilding trust in the Sheriff's Department. He will also work to create a greater relationship with all law enforcement agencies and increase the visibility and accountability of the department and its' officers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sheriff Tyrone Lewis for his dedication to serving.

## RECOGNIZING RABBI ELLIOT M. STROM

### HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Elliot M. Strom has served the Shir Ami, Bucks County Jewish Congregation for 35 years with distinction. On the occasion of his retirement we acknowledge Rabbi Strom's spiritual leadership to his congregation and his many contributions to the greater Bucks County community. Under his leadership, the Shir Ami, Bucks County Jewish Congregation has grown to become the largest Jewish congregation in Bucks County and the spiritual home to more than 800 families and 2,000 members. Additionally, Rabbi Strom has dutifully served and contributed to the boards of directors of many community organizations, including his advocacy on behalf of the American Red Cross Homeless Shelter and Habitat for Humanity. We know him to be a strong advocate of open dialogue between local and national leaders and their constituents, while being honored with several invitations to the National Prayer Breakfast in Washington, DC. Throughout his tenure, Rabbi Strom has stood alongside thousands of congregants at the most significant moments in their lives —both blessings and sorrows. And generations have flourished under his spiritual leadership, knowledge and his tender heart. We sincerely congratulate Rabbi Elliot Strom on this milestone and wish him more blessings, much happiness and good health in the coming years.

## HONORING DEPUTY TERRY WILLIAMS, SR.

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Law Enforcer, Deputy Terry Williams, Sr.

On August 4, 1968, Henry and Emma Roberts gave birth to Terry Williams, Sr. He is a 1986 graduate of Quitman County High School in Marks, MS.

Deputy Williams furthered his education by attending Northwest Community College and majoring in Communication.

His first job was a machine operator for the Thermos Company, where he learned leadership skills. After leaving Thermos, he began working at Frame Picture Enterprise in Batesville, MS. During his time there, he supervised for 9 years.

In 2001, Deputy Williams began a job with the Quitman County Sheriff Department as a part-time jailer. Since his employment with the Quitman County Sheriff Department, he has served in many capacities such as County Arson Investigator, Triad Coordinator, Juvenile Resource Officer, Jail Administrator, Dispatcher and Deputy Sheriff. Also he serves and is acting Chief of Police for the town of Sledge, MS.

Deputy Williams is married to Lucille Williams, who has worked for the Quitman County Justice for the past 16 years. He is the father of four children.

Deputy Williams' goal is to continue to serve and protect the citizens of Quitman County for many more years to come.

Through God and determination, Deputy Williams will continue to make a difference in his community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Deputy Terry Williams, Sr. for his dedication in being an outstanding Law Enforcer.

## HONORING OFFICER CHUCK STRATTON

### HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Chuck Stratton of Poplar Bluff, Missouri for his exemplary service to his community through the Poplar Bluff Police Department. Officer Stratton first served our country in the United States Air Force, and began working for the Police Force in 1984 as a reserve officer. Over the next 29 years Officer Stratton served in a variety of positions within the Poplar Bluff Police Department, excelling in all. His work investigating narcotics began as a Canine handler before joining the SEMO drug task force in 1990. Towards the end of his career, Officer Stratton worked in the Evidence and Accreditation departments, and lastly as the Chief of Police and Director of Campus Safety for the Three Rivers College System.

Officer Stratton has been an invaluable asset to his community throughout his long career, during which he served hundreds of search warrants. During his tenure at the Poplar Bluff Police Department, Officer Stratton supervised every single division of the department at one time or another. He obtained a grant to bring a Methamphetamine Laboratory Collection Station to the Poplar Bluff Police Department which is still in use today. He has been recognized many times by his own community and by larger institutions such as the FBI. I am grateful that we have such dedicated and hardworking members of the Poplar Bluff community, such as Officer Stratton whose hard work helps keep the community safe. It is my pleasure to recognize his efforts and achievements before the House of Representatives.

## HONORING RILEY'S BOOKKEEPING SERVICE

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a well-established rural town minority owned business, Riley's Bookkeeping Service.

Riley's Bookkeeping Service is owned and operated by Mr. LeRoy Riley. Riley's Bookkeeping Service has served its customers for more than 30 years. It has provided over 30 years of income tax preparation and currently offers bookkeeping service, full processing of payroll checks, along with quarter report forms and also batch provider for EFTPS.

Mr. Riley said that his business began as a little side service that he used to do to help people.

Mr. Riley is a Mississippi Valley State University alum and a math major that had more than 35 years as a public school educator, including serving as an assistant principal. He is also a certified notary, a hunter educator and gun safety instructor for the state of Mississippi.

Through his bookkeeping services, Mr. Riley says he roughly serves more than 400 people per year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. LeRoy Riley and the Riley's Bookkeeping Service for his steadfast dedication to serving his community with great, dependable, and compassionate service.

## OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

### HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 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 $17,281,164,714,573.43. We've added $6,654,287,665,660.35 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 RICO SMITH

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a diligent law enforcer, Chief Rico Smith.

Mr. Smith was born and raised in Coahoma, Mississippi. He is the only son of Robert and Bettye Smith Malane. Chief Smith attended Coahoma Agricultural High, and Coahoma Community College, in Clarksdale, Mississippi. He entered the United States Army for 3 years and was in the Army Band. He also graduated from Valley State in Itta Bena, Mississippi.

Chief Smith began his law enforcement career in 1995 as a patrolman and juvenile officer with the Friars Point Police Department where his dedication and commitment afforded him an opportunity to work with juveniles and participate on numerous boards, committees and forums.

Chief Smith served on the Coahoma County School Board, a board member for the Boys and Girls Club, a team facilitator for the Coahoma County Multidisciplinary Child Abuse Review Team and was appointed by the former Governor Haley Barbour to the Children's Justice Act Task Force for the State of Mississippi.

Chief Smith is an advocate for juveniles by working with such programs as the Adolescent Opportunity Program and the Toney Gobar Program.

Chief Smith is the former Chief of Police for the Town of Coahoma and is presently the Police Chief for the Town of Tutwiler, in Tutwiler, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Chief Rico Smith for his dedication in being an outstanding Law Enforcer.

## IN RECOGNITION OF THE CAREER OF JULIA LAVOIE

### HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the accomplishments of Julia Lavoie, best known as Julie. She has been with the Greater Springfield Credit Union in Springfield, Massachusetts for thirty-five years and currently serves as its CEO. She will be retiring as CEO of the credit union on January 17, 2014.

The Greater Springfield Credit Union was chartered on March 2, 1927. Its original charter was limited to mainly Springfield municipal employees and their families. Today it is open to any resident of Hampden or Hampshire Counties, while many of its members are City of Springfield employees, police officers, and firefighters.

Thirty-five years ago, Julie began working at the credit union as a teller. Over the course of the next three decades she held several positions including loan officer, assistant manager, and COO before being named the CEO in 2008.

Many credit union members have said that getting a loan from Julie was like going to the confessional, because no matter what the disclosed financial problem or the issue, she found a way to help the member. Over her more than three-decade career, spanning several generations of members, she has developed lifelong friendships due to both her friendliness and professionalism.

She has left the credit union in outstanding financial shape. Julie credits her success as CEO to its loyal members, hard-working staff, and dedicated Board of Directors. Due to Julie's vast institutional knowledge and tremendous value, she has been named "CEO Emeritus" by the credit union's board.

I know I join Julie's husband Ron Lavoie, her three daughters, and seven grandchildren in wishing her a happy retirement and continued success in all of her future endeavors.

## HONORING MACK'S CAFÉ

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a well-established rural town minority owned business, Mack's Café.

Mack's Café opened for business August 2001 in Bolton, Mississippi. The owner, Mrs. Flora Bell Watson, has been known in the community as an extraordinary chef. Alongside her daughter, Anitra Watson, Ms. "Flo Bell" (as she is affectionately called) has nurtured her masterful skills of seasoning and marinating soul food meals for most of her life.

Mrs. Watson spent most of her life in Bolton and was employed with SOS Truck Stop in Clinton, Mississippi for nearly 30 years. She served as cook and waitress while working alongside her daughter Anitra, who worked with the same company for 22 years.

Once SOS Truck Stop went out of business, Mrs. Watson and her daughter took the opportunity to open her own restaurant in the town

she grew up in. She acquired restaurant space for lease in the heart of town and after a few modifications, she opened for business. At the time of her opening, there was only one other restaurant in town.

Throughout the years, Mrs. Watson has had to make small modifications to keep up with the change of time, but overall her restaurant has remained a constant staple within the community. Many people come from various locations daily to indulge in the soulfully cooked meals of Mack's Café. Her business is only open Monday through Friday for full spread lunch and short orders. Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays reduce business the most, and the closing of her town's Boys & Girls Club also noticeably decreased her clientele. She currently employs four other workers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Flora Bell Watson and Anitra Watson for their steadfast dedication to serving the Bolton community through great, dependable, and compassionately prepared meals and service in Mack's Café.

## CELEBRATING THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DALLAS/FORT WORTH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

### HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (DFW), which operated its first commercial flight on January 13, 1974. More than a massive facility, DFW is an economic and development engine that has transformed the course of North Texas in the past four decades.

Ground was broken for DFW on December 11, 1968, with Dallas Mayor J. Erik Johnson and Fort Worth Chamber President J. Lee Johnson III leading their respective cities in the joint venture. Four years prior, the Civil Aeronautics Board sought for the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth to choose a site for a new airport to service them both. Ultimately, a space that lay seventeen miles from either city's core was chosen in an area covering parts of the cities of Coppell, Euless, Grapevine, and Irving.

DFW has a unique history in aviation. At a 1973 dedication ceremony one year before its general opening, it was the first airport in the U.S. to welcome the landing of a supersonic Concorde. Supersonic service between DFW and Europe was then inaugurated in 1979 with the parallel landings of two Concorde jets. American Airlines, today the largest airline in the world, made DFW its first hub in 1981 and invented the modern ''hub and spoke'' route system there in 1982. In 1989, Atlantis, piggybacking on a modified Boeing 747, made DFW the first commercial airport to host a shuttle landing.

The 1990s saw significant expansion, including the addition of a seventh runway in 1996 and the first of four runway extensions starting that same year. To this day, DFW is the only airport in the world with four paved serviceable runways longer than 4,000 meters. In 2005, the Skylink rail and the international Terminal D were added. DFW now hosts fifty-nine international destinations, twenty-five of which were added in the last three years; and its 11.1% growth rate in international traffic in 2012 (and even more in 2013) was double that of its U.S. peers.

DFW serves 200 destinations and is the fourth busiest airport in the world in terms of aircraft movement. It ranks eighth in passenger traffic at 60 million per year, or 164,000 per day. It is also the second-largest in the U.S. in terms of physical space, with approximately 18,000 acres (larger than the island of Manhattan). It moves 645,000 tons of cargo per year. Its parking spaces alone are staggering at 40,000. Ultimately, according to the University of North Texas, DFW airport is responsible for adding $31.6 billion to the economy annually and for 148,000 jobs. Even that is only part of the story.

The population of the Dallas/Fort Worth area has grown from 2.5 million to 6.7 million in the 40 years since DFW airport opened. This telling growth has come with a boom in the size and quality of life in the two namesake cities and also for numerous nearby suburban cities, many of which are in the 24th District of Texas. Several major corporations—including American Airlines, Fluor, Kimberly Clark, and Exxon Mobil, to name a few—located their headquarters in the area for the strategic and logistic boon that DFW offers from its prime position between the coasts. Manufacturing plants, entertainment venues, conferences, and businesses of all types have sprung up over the years as a result of the airport.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating the fortieth anniversary of Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport, as well as the vibrancy that it has brought to the 24th District in which it sits, and in thanking the countless people of all trades, services, and professions who have made this economic engine possible.

## HONORING LESHAUN MCWRIGHT

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable veteran and community servant, Mr. LeShaun McWright, who has shown what can be done through hard work, setting goals, and aiming high.

Mr. LeShaun McWright is a lifelong resident of Leland, Mississippi. He is a 1989 honor graduate of Leland High School. In March 1990 he graduated from the U.S. Marine Corps Basic Training in Paris Island, South Carolina. LeShaun served in the Marine Corp during Desert Shield/Desert Storm from December 1990 to July 1991. He received an Honorable Discharge from the United States Marine Corp in December of 1993.

Mr. McWright joined the Leland Police Department as a Patrol Officer in April 1995. In June 1996 he graduated from the Mississippi Law Enforcement Officer Training Academy. LeShaun worked as a Patrol Officer for the Greenville Police Department from May 1997 to August 1999. From 2000 to 2002 he was a Contract Security Officer at Federal Buildings in the Central and Northern Districts of Mississippi while still working with local law enforcement agencies in the MS Delta.

Mr. McWright worked as a Patrolman with the Oxford, Mississippi Police Department from 2002–2004 and later returned to Greenville, MS Police Department from 2005–2006 as a First Class Patrolman and later a Juvenile/Gang Officer.

Mr. McWright was deployed with Mississippi National Guard to Operation Iraqi Freedom from 2007–2008. Upon his return from deployment LeShaun returned to the Greenville Police Department's Juvenile/Gang Division and also worked with the Mayor's Protective Services Division. In October of 2011 LeShaun joined the Greenville Public School District as a Resource Officer where he is the Captain/Commander of Ground Operations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. LeShaun McWright for his dedication to serving our great Country, his community and Greenville Public Schools.

## HONORING THE CAREER OF LT. CHRISTINE BISHOP

### HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Lieutenant Christine Bishop of Rockford, Illinois, who retired from the Rockford Police Department at the beginning of this year.

Lieutenant Bishop joined the Department on March 6, 1989 and served the city of Rockford for almost 25 years. She advocated for, and helped establish the department's K–9 unit, becoming one of the first K–9 handlers in 1994. Later, she became the first woman from the Department to earn the rank of lieutenant and was the first woman to go to the FBI National Academy for advanced supervisor training.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Christine Bishop for her years of dedicated service to our community and congratulate her on her retirement.

## TRIBUTE TO U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICER JOSEPH PIRANEO

### HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Piraneo defends our country everyday as a U.S. Customs and Border Protection officer. Thank you to Mr. Joseph Piraneo for his service.

## TO RECOGNIZE MASTER HARRY PFISTER

### HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Master Harry Pfister and Villari's

Self Defense Center for their outstanding contributions, particularly the special assistance provided to the needy in our communities. The Self Defense Center has been training children and adults in the martial arts in the Bucks-Mont area with great success; however, the lessons also have included enhancing the spirit of volunteerism and charity under the tutelage of Master Pfister. I would like to acknowledge that more than $50,000 was raised for local charitable causes, including Manna on Main Street, a kickathon held to ''kick'' hunger. This charity and other help for the neediest in the community made Villari's Self Defense Center more than a training ground for the martial arts. Master Pfister and all the associates understand the importance of helping others and I sincerely appreciate their work, knowing they will continue to be an inspiration for their students and the greater community in the future.

## CONGRATULATING MR. AND MRS. TOM AND PHYLLIS FREUDENBERG

### HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 2014*

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Tom and Phyllis Freudenberg who celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary on January 2, 2014.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, January 14, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 15

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To receive a closed briefing on the situation in Iraq and Syria.

SVC–217

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Sarah Bloom Raskin, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, and Rhonda K. Schmidtlein, of Missouri, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nomination of R. Gil Kerlikowske, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security, and L. Paige Marvel, of Maryland, and Tamara Wenda Ashford, of Virginia, both to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court.

SD–215

2 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection

To hold hearings to examine regulating financial holding companies and physical commodities.

SD–538

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Support for United States-Republic of Korea Civil Nuclear Cooperation Act'', and the nominations of Cynthia H. Akuetteh, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, Catherine Ann Novelli, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, Tina S. Kaidanow, of the District of Columbia, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large, Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile, Kevin Whitaker, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Daniel W. Yohannes, of Colorado, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador, Sarah Sewall, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, Helen Meagher La Lime, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, Larry Edward Andre, Jr., of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Eric T. Schultz, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia, Puneet Talwar, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize, Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Frank A. Rose, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary for Verification and Compliance, Adam M. Scheinman, of Virginia, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, Robert A. Sherman, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Portuguese Republic, Karen Clark Stanton, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, Amy Jane Hyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau, Tomasz P. Malinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Crystal Nix-Hines, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and Charles Hammerman Rivkin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Economic and Business Affairs, all of the Department of State, Catherine Ann Novelli, of Virginia, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, and to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Carolyn Hessler Radelet, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps, Michael G. Carroll, of New York, to be Inspector General, United States Agency for International Development, and Mark E. Lopes, of Arizona, to be United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine implications of the crisis in Ukraine.

SD–419

2:15 p.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine aging in comfort, focusing on assessing the special needs of America's Holocaust survivors.

SD–562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the future of unmanned aviation in the United States economy, focusing on safety and privacy considerations.

SR–253

3 p.m.

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control

To hold hearings to examine strategies to counter the drug trade as United States troop drawdown continues, focusing on the future of United States counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan.

SD–138

JANUARY 16

9:15 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine a review of the President's Climate Action Plan.

SD–406

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, and Brad R. Carson, to be Under Secretary of the Army, and William A. LaPlante, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, both of the Department of Defense.

SD–G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

TBA

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine a progress report on public transportation under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21).

SD–538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine advancing Congress's trade agenda, focusing on the role of trade negotiating authority.

SD–215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine strengthening Federal access programs to meet 21st century needs, focusing on TRIO and the Global Education and Awareness Research Undergraduate Program (GEAR UP).

SD–106

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 619, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments, S. 1410, to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders, S. 1675, to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and the nominations of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, and Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, John B. Owens, of California, and Michelle T. Friedland, of California, both to be a

United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, David Jeremiah Barron, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Jeffrey Alker Meyer, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, Beth Labson Freeman, and Vince Girdhari Chhabria, all to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, Pamela L. Reeves, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, James Maxwell Moody, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Matthew Frederick Leitman, Judith Ellen Levy, Laurie J. Michelson, and Linda Vivienne Parker, all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Christopher Reid Cooper, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, M. Douglas Harpool, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., and Edward G. Smith, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Sheryl H. Lipman, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, Stanley Allen Bastian, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington, Manish S. Shah, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Daniel D. Crabtree, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas, Cynthia Ann Bashant, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Jon David Levy, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine, Theodore David Chuang, and George Jarrod Hazel, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, and Peter Joseph Kadzik, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD–226

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine income inequality in the United States.

SH–216

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet

To hold hearings to examine locating 911 callers in a wireless world.

SR–253

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert C. Barber, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iceland, George James Tsunis, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Norway, and Colleen Bradley Bell, of California, to be Ambassador to Hungary, all of the Department of State.

SD–419

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

# *Daily Digest*

# Senate

## *Chamber Action*

***Routine Proceedings, pages S267–S298***

**Measures Introduced:** Three bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1913–1915, and S. Res. 330–332. **Pages S290–91**

**Measures Reported:**

S. 1352, to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

**Measures Passed:**

***Congratulating the Florida State University Football Team:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 331, congratulating the Florida State University football team for winning the 2014 Bowl Championship Series national championship. **Pages S297–98**

***Congratulating the North Dakota State University Football Team:*** Senate agreed to S. Res. 332, congratulating the North Dakota State University football team for winning the 2013 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title. **Page S298**

**Measures Considered:**

**Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act:** Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1846, to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. **Page S267**

**Unemployment Benefits Extension—Agreement**: Senate resumed consideration of S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S268–83**

**Pending:**

Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631, relating to extension and modification of emergency unemployment compensation program. **Page S268**

Reid Amendment No. 2632 (to Amendment No. 2631), to change the enactment date. **Page S268**

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid Amendment No. 2633, to change the enactment date. **Page S268**

Reid Amendment No. 2634 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 2633), of a perfecting nature. **Page S268**

Reid Amendment No. 2635 (to Amendment No. 2634), of a perfecting nature. **Page S268**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631 (listed above) occur at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 14, 2014; and that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill occur following disposition of Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631, or if cloture is not invoked on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631, Senate immediately vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill. **Page S281**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m., on Tuesday, January 14, 2014, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees, with the Majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes; that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to the bill be 11 a.m., on Tuesday, January 14, 2014; and that the time from 2:15 p.m., to 2:30 p.m., also be equally divided and controlled. **Page S298**

**Nomination Confirmed:** Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 55 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 7), Robert Leon Wilkins, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. **Pages S281–83, S298**

**Nominations Received:** Senate received the following nominations:

Stanley Fischer, of New York, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Stanley Fischer, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2006.

Lael Brainard, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal

Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2012. **Page S298**

**Messages from the House:** **Page S289**

**Measures Referred:** **Page S289**

**Executive Communications:** **Pages S289–90**

**Executive Reports of Committees:** **Page S290**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S291–92**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:** **Pages S292–93**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S288–89**

**Amendments Submitted:** **Pages S293–97**

**Notices of Hearings/Meetings:** **Page S297**

**Authorities for Committees to Meet:** **Page S297**

**Record Votes:** One record vote was taken today. (Total—7) **Page S283**

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:10 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 14, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S298.)

## *Committee Meetings*

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Arun Madhavan Kumar, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Trade Promotion and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, and Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, both of the Department of Commerce, Robert Michael Simon, of Maryland, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Debra L. Miller, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, and Paul Nathan Jaenichen, Sr., of Kentucky, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration, both of the Department of Transportation, Terrell McSweeny, of the District of Columbia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, and Jo Emily Handelsman, of Connecticut, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

# House of Representatives

## *Chamber Action*

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 8 public bills, H.R. 3854–3861; and 2 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 74; and H. Res. 457 were introduced. **Pages H182–83**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages H183–84**

**Reports Filed:** There were no reports filed today.

**Speaker:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Petri to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H165**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H165**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 2:07 p.m. and reconvened at 5 p.m. **Pages H166–67**

**Suspensions:** The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

***Revising the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and certain land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township:*** H.R. 1513, to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and certain land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township and to limit the means by which property within such revised boundaries may be acquired, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 396 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 12; **Pages H167–68 H172**

***Authorizing the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs:*** S. 230, to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 387 yeas to 7 nays, Roll No. 13; and **Pages H168–70, H172–73**

***Amending the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections:*** H.R. 841, amended, to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections. **Pages H170–72**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 5:31 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H172**

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H172, H173. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

# *Committee Meetings*

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* Subcommittee on Energy and Power began a markup on H.R. 3826, the ''Electricity Security and Affordability Act''.

# *Joint Meetings*

No joint committee meetings were held.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2014

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

### Senate

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense counterterrorism operations, 10:15 a.m., SVC–217.

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* business meeting to consider the nominations of John Roth, of Michigan, to be Inspector General, and Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs, both of the Department of Homeland Security, and William Ward Nooter, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine conference and travel spending across the Federal government, 10:15 a.m., SD–342.

Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight, to hold hearings to examine management of air traffic controller training tactics, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* to hold hearings to examine the report of the President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

### House

*Committee on Armed Services,* Subcommittee on Seapower; and Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled ''People's Republic of China Maritime Disputes'', 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* Subcommittee on Energy and Power, continued markup on H.R. 3826, the ''Electricity Security and Affordability Act'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

*Committee on Financial Services,* Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''How Prospective and Current Homeowners Will Be Harmed by the CFPB's Qualified Mortgage Rule'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on the Judiciary,* Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet, hearing entitled ''The Scope of Copyright Protection'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Natural Resources,* Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Obama Administration's Questionable Application of Sequestration to the Secure Rural Schools Program and the Costs to States, Local Economies, and Rural School Children'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,* Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled ''TSA Oversight: Examining the Screening Partnership Program'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

*Committee on Rules,* Full Committee, hearing on Senate Amendment to H.R. 3547, a bill to extend Government liability, subject to appropriation, for certain third-party claims arising from commercial space launches, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

*Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,* Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled ''Scientific Research at the Smithsonian—More than a Museum'', 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,* Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Building the Foundation for Surface Transportation Reauthorization'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

*House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,* Full Committee, business meeting on Member access to Benghazi investigation transcripts; member access request; and hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 2 p.m., 304–HVC. This is a closed hearing.

## CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

### Week of January 14 through January 17, 2014

### Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday,* at 10 a.m., Senate will continue consideration of S. 1845, Unemployment Benefits Extension, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631 to the bill, and the motion to invoke cloture on the bill at 2:30 p.m. The filing deadline for second-degree amendments to the bill is 11 a.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

### Senate Committees

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

*Committee on Armed Services:* January 14, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense counterterrorism operations, 10:15 a.m., SVC–217.

January 15, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on the situation in Iraq and Syria, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

January 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, and Brad R. Carson, to be Under Secretary of the Army, and William A. LaPlante, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, both of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* January 15, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection, to hold hearings to examine regulating financial holding companies and physical commodities, 2 p.m., SD–538.

January 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine a progress report on public transportation under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21), 10 a.m., SD–538.

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* January 15, to hold hearings to examine the future of unmanned aviation in the United States economy, focusing on safety and privacy considerations, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

January 16, Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet, to hold hearings to examine locating 911 callers in a wireless world, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* January 16, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., Room to be announced.

*Committee on Environment and Public Works:* January 16, to hold hearings to examine a review of the President's Climate Action Plan, 9:15 a.m., SD–406.

*Committee on Finance:* January 15, business meeting to consider the nominations of Sarah Bloom Raskin, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, and Rhonda K. Schmidtlein, of Missouri, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nomination of R. Gil Kerlikowske, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security, and L. Paige Marvel, of Maryland, and Tamara Wenda Ashford, of Virginia, both to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, 10 a.m., SD–215.

January 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine advancing Congress's trade agenda, focusing on the role of trade negotiating authority, 10 a.m., SD–215.

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* January 15, business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Support for United States-Republic of Korea Civil Nuclear Cooperation Act", and the nominations of Cynthia H. Akuetteh, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, Catherine Ann Novelli, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, Tina S. Kaidanow, of the District of Columbia, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large, Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile, Kevin Whitaker, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Colombia, Daniel W. Yohannes, of Colorado, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador, Sarah Sewall, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights, Helen Meagher La Lime, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, Larry Edward Andre, Jr., of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Eric T. Schultz, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia, Puneet Talwar, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Carlos Roberto Moreno, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize, Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Frank A. Rose, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary for Verification and Compliance, Adam M. Scheinman, of Virginia, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, Timothy M. Broas, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, Robert A. Sherman, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Portuguese Republic, Karen Clark Stanton, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, Amy Jane Hyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau, Tomasz P. Malinowski, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Crystal Nix-Hines, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, John Hoover, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Sierra Leone, Thomas Frederick Daughton, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Namibia, Dwight L. Bush, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco, Matthew T. Harrington, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, Janet L. Yellen, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and Charles Hammerman Rivkin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Economic and Business Affairs, all of the Department of State, Catherine Ann Novelli, of Virginia, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, and to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Carolyn Hessler Radelet, of Virginia, to be Director of the Peace Corps, Michael G. Carroll, of New York, to be Inspector General, United States Agency for International Development, and Mark E. Lopes, of Arizona, to be United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine implications of the crisis in Ukraine, 2 p.m., SD–419.

January 16, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert C. Barber, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iceland, George James Tsunis, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Norway, and Colleen Bradley Bell, of California, to be Ambassador to Hungary, all of the Department of State, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* January 16, to hold hearings to examine strengthening Federal access programs to meet 21st century needs, focusing on TRIO and the Global Education and Awareness Research Undergraduate Program (GEAR UP), 10 a.m., SD–106.

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* January 14, business meeting to consider the nominations of John Roth, of Michigan, to be Inspector General, and Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs, both of the Department of Homeland Security, and William Ward Nooter, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine conference and travel spending across the Federal government, 10:15 a.m., SD–342.

January 14, Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight, to hold hearings to examine management of air traffic controller training tactics, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* January 14, to hold hearings to examine the report of the President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

January 16, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 619, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments, S. 1410, to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders, S. 1675, to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and the nominations of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, and Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, John B. Owens, of California, and Michelle T. Friedland, of California, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, David Jeremiah Barron, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Jeffrey Alker Meyer, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Timothy L. Brooks, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, James Donato, Beth Labson Freeman, and Vince Girdhari Chhabria, all to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, Pamela L. Reeves, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee, James Maxwell Moody, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Matthew Frederick Leitman, Judith Ellen Levy, Laurie J. Michelson, and Linda Vivienne Parker, all to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Christopher Reid Cooper, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, M. Douglas Harpool, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, Gerald Austin McHugh, Jr., and Edward G. Smith, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Sheryl H. Lipman, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, Stanley Allen Bastian, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington, Manish S. Shah, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Daniel D. Crabtree, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas, Cynthia Ann Bashant, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Jon David Levy, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine, Theodore David Chuang, and George Jarrod Hazel, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, and Peter Joseph Kadzik, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* January 16, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

*Special Committee on Aging:* January 15, to hold hearings to examine aging in comfort, focusing on assessing the special needs of America's Holocaust survivors, 2:15 p.m., SD–562.

*United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control:* January 15, to hold hearings to examine strategies to counter the drug trade as United States troop drawdown continues, focusing on the future of United States counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan, 3 p.m., SD–138.

## House Committees

*Committee on Armed Services,* January 16, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled "Future Recruiting Challenges in the Fiscally Constrained Environment", 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* January 15, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled "#CommActUpdate: Perspectives from Former FCC Chairman", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

January 16, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "2014: Seeking PPACA Answers", 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

*Committee on Financial Services,* January 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Impact of the Volcker Rule on Job Creators, Part I" 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on Foreign Affairs,* January 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled "South Sudan's Broken Promise?", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

January 15, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled "A Report on the G8 Dementia Summit", 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

January 15, Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled "NAFTA at Twenty: Accomplishments, Challenges, and the Way Forward", 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

January 16, Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled "Water as a Geopolitical Threat", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

*Committee on Homeland Security,* January 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled "A False Narrative Endangers the Homeland", 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

January 15, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, markup on H.R. 3696, the "National Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2013", 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

*Committee on the Judiciary,* January 15, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7, the "No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act", 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,* January 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Strengthening Agency Oversight: Empowering the Inspectors General Community", 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

January 16, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''HHS' Own Security Concerns about HealthCare.gov''; and business meeting to consider the release of deposition transcripts of former EPA official John C. Beale, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

*Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,* January 16, Full Committee, meeting on approval of amended Majority Subcommittee Roster, 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

January 16, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Healthcare.gov: Consequences of Stolen Identity'', 9:10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Committee on Small Business,* January 15, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Power of Connection: Peer-to-Peer Businesses'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

January 16, Subcommittee on Investigation, Oversight and Regulations, hearing entitled ''SEC's Crowdfunding Proposal: Will it Work for Small Businesses?'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,* January 15, Subcommittee on Railroad, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing entitled ''A Review of the Challenges Facing California High Speed Rail'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs,* January 15, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Vendors in the OR—VA's Failed Oversight of Surgical Implants'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

*Committee on Ways and Means,* January 16, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing entitled ''Social Security Disability Fraud Scheme in New York'', 9 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

*House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,* January 16, Full Committee hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 9 a.m., 304–HVC. This is a closed hearing.

## Joint Meetings

*Joint Economic Committee:* January 16, to hold hearings to examine income inequality in the United States, 10 a.m., SH–216.

*Next Meeting of the* SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, January 14

Senate Chamber

**Program for Tuesday:** Senate will continue consideration of S. 1845, Unemployment Benefits Extension, with up to two votes on the motion to invoke cloture on Reid (for Reed) Amendment No. 2631 to the bill, and the motion to invoke cloture on the bill at 2:30 p.m. The filing deadline for second-degree amendments to the bill is 11 a.m.

*(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)*

*Next Meeting of the* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Tuesday, January 14

House Chamber

**Program for Tuesday:** Consideration of the following measures under suspension of the rules: (1) H.R. 801—Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act of 2013; (2) H.R. 2274—The Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act, as amended; (3) H.J. Res. 106—Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; (4) H.R. 2860—OPM IG Act; and (5) H.R. 1233—The Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments.

## Exensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E54
Bentivolio, Kerry L., Mich., E56, E57
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E53
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E56
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E55
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E51
Farr, Sam, Calif., E51
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E52, E54, E56
Garamendi, John, Calif., E51
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E56
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E55
Smith, Jason T., Mo., E55
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E52
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E52, E52, E53, E53, E54, E54, E55, E55, E55, E56
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E51

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.