



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2014

No. 8

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 14, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART 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 11:50 a.m.

LEGALIZING MARIJUANA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, no sooner had the United States recognized the failure of alcohol prohibition by repealing the 18th Amendment than the United States embarked upon another failed experiment in prohibition: marijuana. For three-quarters of a century, the United States has waged a futile attempt to prohibit marijuana based upon emotion and flawed science.

Since 1971, the Federal Government has classified marijuana as a schedule 1

prohibited substance, like heroin, more dangerous, according to the law, than cocaine or meth. It declared in statute, contrary to proven research, that marijuana has no therapeutic value.

Every day a million authorized users of medical marijuana reject that notion by using it by doctor's prescription to relieve symptoms like intense nausea due to chemotherapy, relief for veterans with PTSD, from chronic back pain, and neurological disorders like multiple sclerosis.

New York has now joined 21 other States and the District of Columbia authorizing medical marijuana. Colorado is now allowing adult use; and Washington State is soon to follow, after strong approval by both States' voters.

The revolution in medical marijuana policy has been led at the State level, usually as a result of popular vote. The facts are that marijuana does have therapeutic use.

It is also less destructive to human health than alcohol or tobacco. Not one death has ever been proven from a marijuana overdose; yet we continue to disrupt the lives of more than two-thirds of a million people arrested for possession each year.

We send billions of dollars to the hands of underworld and drug cartels. Many people know that it is easier for a 13-year-old girl to buy a joint than a six pack of beer.

No marijuana seller, except in Colorado, checks ID or has a license to lose. Even though White kids use marijuana more than teenagers of color, African Americans are almost four times more likely to be arrested and jailed.

Our Federal laws are frozen in time, but the American public has moved on. Majorities now say it should be legal, and even more say the Federal Government should not interfere with whatever State laws are in place.

It will be a while before Congress summons the courage to end the hypocrisy and irrationality of the futile

Federal prohibition, but it should stop making things worse. For instance, it is insane to force hundreds of legal marijuana businesses to be all cash. We should end the grotesque punitive federal taxation for these legal small businesses.

It should explicitly allow State-approved medical marijuana. While we are at it, we should allow the cultivation of industrial hemp, which a dozen States have already approved. Hemp products are perfectly legal in the United States. Why shouldn't our farmers be able to grow the raw material like they used to?

Several dozen Members have cosponsored bipartisan legislation to help bring us out of these dark ages. These should be approved without delay. Sometime in this decade we will tax and regulate marijuana. Until we end the unfair discriminatory and costly Federal prohibition, we should at least end the most foolish and counterproductive policies.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANCES SARGENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Frances Rohrer Sargent, a courageous woman who selflessly helped defend our country during World War II. Being a member of the renowned Women Airforce Service Pilots or WASP, Frances pushed beyond the boundaries that limited opportunities at that time for women of her generation.

The Women Airforce Service Pilots were the first women to fly military aircraft, flying noncombat operations between the years 1942 and 1944.

These pioneers paved the way for women pilots to fly nearly every type of military aircraft from F/A-18 to the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H185

space shuttle today. My daughter-in-law, Lindsay, flew combat missions over Iraq and Afghanistan for the marines, but she would not have been able to do so without the women who came before her, Frances and all the other members of WASP.

Frances had a fulfilled life. She began flying at the age of 22 in Atlanta and would come to be one of only 1,704 women who were accepted to the prestigious Women Airforce Service Pilots, WASP, out of more than 25,000 women who had applied for the program.

Frances and other female pilots from our south Florida community, including Helen Wyatt Snapp, Ruth Schafer Fleisher, Shirley Kruse, and Bee Haydu, flew more than 60 million miles between '42 and '44.

As the author of the legislation awarding WASP the Congressional Gold Medal in the year 2009, I had the privilege to present the award to Frances Sargent for her patriotic service. The Congressional Gold Medal, as we know, is the highest civilian award in the United States; and it was presented to these women who were the first females to ever fly military aircraft. Their missions were mainly composed of safeguarding the U.S. coastal line so that male pilots could take on combat roles abroad.

Quite often Frances' life and that of her colleagues were on the line with constant attacks from enemy forces. The service of the WASPs to the U.S. military greatly contributed to the triumph and success of the U.S. and our allies in the defeat of the Axis powers during World War II.

Frances' deep passion for flying is what led her to pursue flight and become part of the prestigious WASPs. She never sought to break the barriers for women, but through her service she demonstrated her excellent skills that made her as well qualified a pilot as any of the male pilots in the military.

With her success, and that of her many other female pilots, more opportunities then became available for women in all fields.

After her retirement from WASP, Frances continued her love of flying by passing on her skills that she had gained. She became a professor at my alma mater, Miami-Dade College, where she took charge of developing the aviation program.

South Florida has been blessed to have had true heroines like Frances Rohrer Sargent, and we honor the service of her and her fellow south Florida WASP patriots: Helen Wyatt Snapp, Ruth Schafer Fleisher, Shirley Kruse, and Bee Haydu.

Aim high. Fly, fight, and win.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 7 months ago, the Senate passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration re-

form bill, and for 7 months we have waited.

We have taken over 600 votes in the House of Representatives this Congress: finding the time to vote 46 times to overturn Obama administration; finding the time to pass nine bills that harm our environment; finding the time to twice pass bills that weaken our education system; finding the time to rename 40 post offices. But we haven't taken one vote, not a single vote, to advance immigration reform. We simply haven't found the time.

This despite the support of an overwhelming majority of Americans. This despite the support of interests as varied as labor unions and the Chamber of Commerce, high-tech companies, and faith leaders. This despite the CBO reporting that immigration reform will provide a much-needed jolt to the American economy.

With over half of the 113th Congress behind us, we have ignored one of the signature issues that the American people sent us here to solve. Sure, we have talked about immigration reform. We have even had our Gang of Eight on this side of the Capitol; but the old saying goes: talk is cheap.

Months of discussions by this Congress on one of the most important and complex issues in a generation have yielded only one point and one point only.

The only thing we have decided so far is that if we take on this issue, if we pass immigration reform, we will do it piece by piece. That is it. That is the only progress this body has made on this critical issue. We have made no substantive decisions about the fate of over 11 million people currently living their lives in legal limbo in this country—no substantive decision about whether their children, many of whom know no other country than this, will be sent thousands of miles away to live in a foreign country, separated from their families, denied the American Dream they fought so hard for, or even whether LGBT families will be torn apart.

The only progress we can point to at this time is instead of one large bill, we have decided on several small bills. If that is not definitive of a do-nothing Congress, I don't know what is.

But, okay, Mr. Speaker, you have convinced the President. If piecemeal is the only way we are going to pass immigration reform, then piecemeal it is. Here is the most important point. Where are the pieces? See, here is the thing: even if you are going to do something on a piecemeal basis, you still have got to do the first piece.

The second problem with a piecemeal approach is that you run the risk of cherry-picking, pushing through issues like increased border security, high-tech visas, while ignoring the harder decisions like providing a path to citizenship for the millions living in the shadows.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have introduced several immigra-

tion bills this Congress, with a few of them even passing out of committee; but not one bill has been offered that comes close to offering a pathway to citizenship.

While we may accept the piecemeal approach for the sake of getting something done, what we cannot accept—what we will not accept—is an approach that leaves a pathway to citizenship on the sidelines, because the pathway to citizenship remains the cornerstone of any serious immigration reform plan. The rest of the immigration reform structure is built around that piece. Without it, immigration reform will not stand. Without it, our system will remain broken.

The American people have called on us to fix our broken immigration system. At the very least, we owe it to them to give it a try. The window is still open; the opportunity is still there. We simply need to find the courage to complete the task.

REGULATIONS ON COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has repeatedly asserted their regulations on coal-fired power plants will not be a death blow to the industry. Unfortunately, the Environmental Protection Agency's most recently published rule for new coal-fired power plants tells us this claim could not be further from the truth.

The administration asserts this regulation on new coal-fired plants will make use of "adequately demonstrated" technologies. Well, according to the Washington Examiner's editorial board:

Federal law has long barred the EPA from mandating industry use of technology that has not been "adequately demonstrated" as ready for commercial use. It is simply ludicrous for the EPA to claim in its proposed new rule that CCS technology has reached such a point.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is dead-set on eliminating coal from our fuel mix without a plan to make up for the energy that it provides or the jobs that it supports. It is an anti-energy agenda that is costing jobs, harming economic growth, and placing a greater burden on family budgets. The American people deserve better.

□ 1015

THE LIFE OF EDDIE A. BOGGS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to rise to honor a man who made a difference. I wish to pay tribute to the extraordinarily generous life of American patriot Eddie Boggs, an exceptional educator and music man

from Sylvania, Ohio, and Toledo. Eddie was a man held in particular affection by the thousands of people whose lives he touched so positively. Some said his being embodied the Midwestern caring spirit we each wish that we could emanate to those whose paths we cross.

Eddie was actually born in Soldier, Kentucky, and came north to attend the University of Toledo, where he received his master's degree and devoted his life to teaching and to his family. He was a musician and a composer, a great humanitarian, and an indefatigable social studies teacher who was recognized as Educator of the Year in 2005.

The Toledo Blade says of his life:

His smile, his sparkling blue eyes, his servant's heart and infectious love of life is the Eddie that we remember.

He was an educator on so many levels for nearly four decades, inspiring and caring about thousands and thousands of his students and fellow citizens.

Even after retiring from teaching, he did not really stop working. Eddie became a licensed tour guide. An engaged citizen, he made the extra effort year after year when he was a teacher and afterwards to bring hundreds and hundreds of students from Timberstone Junior High, for example, to visit the Capitol. It was always a grand and unforgettable occasion. Eddie would stand outside the east front here with his guitar, winding his way among hundreds and hundreds of students and begin singing, and his resonant and clear voice would filter across the Capitol lawn. It always seemed the sun was shining as the students gathered under the oak trees and the linden trees. These were unforgettable moments.

In Eddie's so-called retirement, he also furthered his love of music by performing nationally with the New Christy Minstrels. He composed songs of his own. He played over a thousand songs. His music never stopped. He was one of the best known entertainers in northeast Ohio and southeast Michigan. Eddie's wife, Chris, stated:

Eddie got 26 hours out of a 24-hour day. That is how Eddie was, a positive man.

In addition to teaching and performing, Eddie contributed mightily to the community through fundraising, and through the Christmas season he would organize a Christmas variety show that would raise more than \$250,000 for area charities. This man was a real citizen.

Mr. Speaker, Eddie is a gift that keeps on giving for us who had the joy of knowing him and sharing in his life. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family: his wife, Chris; his daughters, Allison, Sara, and Grace; his grandchildren, Landon, Jackson, Kate, Grant, and Nola; his mother, Pearl; and mother-in-law, Pat; his brothers and sisters and extended family. Eddie's music will always play in our hearts. He lifted us to be a better and more caring people.

May God give his family comfort, and may Eddie's life inspire others to emulate his goodness.

[From Toledo Blade, Jan. 11, 2014]

EDDIE A. BOGGS, 1945-2014, MUSICIAN HAD POSITIVE VIEW ON LIFE

(By Mark Zaborney)

Eddie A. Boggs, 68, a longtime Sylvania educator and a musician who became one of the best known entertainers in northwest Ohio and southeast Michigan, died Thursday in Ebeid Hospice Residence, Sylvania.

Mr. Boggs learned in May, 2013, that he had non-Hodgkins' lymphoma, his wife, Chris, said. Through treatment and hospital stays, he performed when he could, most recently Dec. 7 in Fayette, Ohio. Since retiring in 2007 from education, he toured regularly as a member of the New Christy Minstrels, the folk-style group formed in the early 1960s. At the hospital for a biopsy and spinal tap, he asked whether he'd be able to make a Dec. 31 flight.

"That was his way of coping," his wife said. "Eddie got 26 hours out of a 24-hour day. That's the way Eddie was, a positive man."

Also in retirement, Mr. Boggs was a licensed guide, leading tours to Washington—often by school groups—and other destinations.

Most nights, weekends, and summers throughout the last 40 years, Mr. Boggs performed in public, singing the songs he wrote or the 1,000 he memorized, playing guitar or banjo or mandolin, and connecting with audiences.

"I always know there's somebody out there who can play greater or sing it better than me, but nobody who loves it more than me," he told The Blade in 2008. "I guess the music is the vehicle, the means to an end to reach out to people."

Mr. Boggs organized an annual Christmas season variety show, which raised more than \$250,000 for area charities, and a family-friendly New Year's event in Sylvania for several years. He also established the Lake Erie West Hall of Fame for the performing arts.

He was master of ceremonies for Sylvania's annual fall festival.

"Everywhere he went, somebody knew him," his wife said.

In 2007, he was among local finalists in the Jefferson Awards for Public Service.

"He was a positive, outgoing individual," Sylvania Mayor Craig Stough said. "He was positive in his outlook to everybody."

Mr. Boggs became a social studies teacher at McCord Junior High School in 1973 and, later, a guidance counselor at Timberstone Junior High School. He was recognized as an "educator of the year" in 2005.

"He went that extra mile to make sure that new kid or teacher felt welcomed," his wife said.

He was born Aug. 10, 1945, in Soldier, Ky., to Elmer and Pearl Boggs. The family moved north, and he was a graduate of Mansfield High School. A counselor told him he wasn't smart enough for college. He went to work in the steel mill—but he took the night shift while attending the Mansfield branch of Ohio State University.

"That's why he went into education—he said he didn't want anybody to ever hear they weren't good enough to do something," his wife said.

After two years, he transferred to the main campus in Columbus and received a bachelor's degree. He also had two master's degrees from the University of Toledo.

Surviving are his wife, Chris Boggs, whom he married Sept. 20, 1991; daughters, Allison Boggs, Sara Roemer, and Grace Barton;

mother, Pearl Boggs; sister, Ernestine Obney; brothers, Carl, Verlin, and Glenn Boggs, and five grandchildren.

Visitation will be from 2-8 p.m. Sunday in the Walker Funeral Home, Sylvania Township. Services will be at 11 a.m. Monday at Flanders Road Church of Christ, where he was a member.

The family suggests tributes to the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT INVESTIGATOR ADAM SOWDERS

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Adam Sowders, sergeant investigator with the Burleson County Sheriff's Department.

On December 19, 2013, Sergeant Sowders was killed in the line of duty. Sergeant Investigator Sowders passed away due to wounds he received while serving a search warrant with a team of deputies in Burleson County, Texas.

Adam graduated from Somerville High School in 2001, and like his father and his brothers, he became a volunteer firefighter at the Somerville Fire Department.

He began his career with the Burleson County Sheriff's Department as a patrol deputy in 2006 after serving as an officer with the Somerville Police Department.

Sergeant Investigator Sowders was loved and respected by his community, by his friends, and by his family. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and his friends.

Today, we honor and remember Adam for putting himself in harm's way for the good of his neighbors, his family, his friends, and his community. We thank him for his service and his sacrifice for public safety. He devoted his life to public safety and to being a first responder, and he will be forever remembered as an outstanding individual who lived to selflessly serve his community.

Adam was a model public servant, however; and, more importantly, he was a servant leader who modeled the words of Jesus in John 15:13, which states:

Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends.

His death marks the 17th first responder lost in the line of duty in the 17th Congressional District of Texas since the time I was sworn in in January 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by reminding all Americans to continue praying for our country and for our American men and women who serve in our military and for our first responders. Their selfless service protects our lives, our freedoms, and our liberties from both internal and external dangers.

God bless our first responders and our troops, and God bless America.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my support for the reinstatement of emergency unemployment insurance for thousands of residents in the Inland Empire and millions of other Americans across the Nation. These Americans rely on these benefits so they can put food on their table, so they can pay for heat, and so they can continue their search for work.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle will have you believe that these millions of Americans are just too lazy to find work and that they are only interested in handouts. My Republican colleagues believe in making the long-term unemployed more desperate and that this desperation will be the necessary motivation for them to find work. Well, when has an unpaid gas bill ever created a job? When has forcing someone to go to sleep hungry ever created a job?

Let me remind my colleagues that the Great Recession was the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression and that there are still three people competing for every job opening. While our recovery is gaining momentum, it has been the wealthiest that have benefited the most, leaving far too many Americans behind.

Let's extend these emergency benefits for the long-term unemployed. Let's create jobs, not desperation.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

On this day we ask Your blessing on the men and women, citizens all, whose votes have populated this people's House. Each Member of this House has been given the sacred duty of representing them.

We ask Your blessing as well on the Members of this House, whose responsibility lies also beyond the local interests of constituents while honoring them. Give each Member the wisdom to represent both local and national inter-

ests, a responsibility calling for the wisdom of Solomon. Grant them, if You will, a double portion of such wisdom.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KENNEDY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

NEW YORK SSDI FRAUD

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this past summer, we learned of the largest disability fraud in the history of Social Security taking place in Puerto Rico.

Now, less than 6 months later, we hear of an even more shocking scandal in New York, where 106 people have been arrested, including former policemen, FBI employees, and firemen. Worse, about half of the defendants falsely claimed that their "disability" was caused as a result of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, even though many had never even worked at Ground Zero.

These individuals are stealing from a program that serves those who can no longer work due to a disability. This is unacceptable.

The American people are outraged and fast losing confidence in Social Security, and rightfully so.

That is why this Thursday I will be holding a hearing to ensure Social Security makes fighting fraud and protecting hardworking taxpayer dollars its number one priority. The time for excuses is over.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we begin today's activities, 1.3 million individuals face a harsher reality because Congress failed to extend unemployment insurance benefits. That includes 2 million children and 20,000 veterans who face a more uncertain future because Congress failed to do the right thing.

The moms who attended my Chicagoland job fair don't want an unemployment check more than a job. They do want a Congress that recognizes that any one of us could use a little help when an economic crisis hits and leaves us vulnerable.

The families I represent aren't looking for handouts. They are my friends and neighbors and paid into the unemployment insurance system with the promise that, if times got tough, they would still be able to provide for their families using the benefits they paid for as a bridge over troubled waters.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 3824, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act, because I stand by my friends in tough times. I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to do the same by passing a bipartisan unemployment insurance extension now.

MODERNIZING BANK TRANSFERS

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to question why banks and their customers are still burdened by rules designed in an era that, when most bank transactions ended, a free lollipop was given to the customer.

Regulation D, which was implemented in the 1980s, restricts customers to just six transfers between their accounts for 1 month. These rules made a lot of sense in an era when most bank transactions were done manually; but today, through modern technology, this is truly obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask support for H.R. 3240, the Regulation D Study Act. This bill will direct the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, to study Regulation D and recommend appropriate changes to modernize the regulation. H.R. 3240 has strong bipartisan support. I am grateful for Congresswoman MALONEY's being the lead Democrat sponsor for the bill.

Credit unions tell us that modern customers today hit the six-transfer limit just in a matter of moments as they work online. We need to change this, Mr. Speaker, so that individuals can manage their money on a daily basis. Updating this regulation is important to benefit consumers and bank institutions.

MORTGAGE FORGIVENESS TAX EXCLUSION

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, the tax exclusion for mortgage forgiveness expired. What does that mean? It means if someone sells their house for less than they owe, they have to pay tax on the difference.

The failure of the House Republican leadership to extend this forgiveness provision, which has been on the books since 2009, means that underwater properties all across the country—6 million of them—now basically face paying taxes in terms of trying to do the right thing and get these properties to move.

In Connecticut today, there are 772 pending short sale closings that, again, the owners are going to be taxed because of the failure of the Republican leadership to move.

Mr. CAMP said the other day that there is nothing to worry about; we have all year to deal with this. Well, the housing market can't wait. We need to move. H.R. 2994 will extend that mortgage forgiveness tax relief. It is time for this Chamber to take this measure up and vote on it.

Ask a realtor; ask a home builder; ask a mortgage broker. They all know. This market needs to get the overhang of distressed properties cleared out if we are going to have a healthy housing market and a strong recovery.

This Chamber needs to act. The Republican leadership needs to listen to people who are in the front trenches of the economy.

OBAMACARE IS HURTING SOUTH CAROLINIANS

(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, besides sticker shock, American families are beginning to realize that they were misled and that ObamaCare is not as great as advertised. Sheryl from Columbia says:

I realize the ACA is controversial, but it was billed as something better than what the insurance companies were offering to private parties. What we actually purchased is very inferior to the high deductible policy I currently have when out of network.

Edward from Chapin has made several attempts to enroll his family in the government health care insurance

program since the beginning of October. Unfortunately, due to the faulty government-run Web site and the complicated nature of the law, he tried for 2 months to successfully enroll his 17-year-old daughter in a government health plan.

The government's role is to protect our fellow citizens, not make tasks such as enrolling in health care more expensive or difficult. ObamaCare must be repealed and replaced to create jobs and put health care decisions back in the hands of the American people.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXTENSION

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that today we extend the crucial and critical unemployment insurance lifeline to the 1.3 million jobless Americans who have already lost coverage. In California alone, 214,000 people have already lost their unemployment coverage, including almost 19,000 people in San Diego County and 3,500 people in Imperial County.

With unemployment unacceptably high, now is not the time to take money out of the pockets of those who are struggling to find work. Unemployed Americans are actively looking for work but, unfortunately, are unable to find jobs in our economy.

We must continue to provide unemployment benefits to jobless Americans so they can purchase crucial life needs like food and shelter. So let us heed the better angels of our nature and immediately restore unemployment benefits to out-of-work Americans.

FIRST LEGISLATIVE ACT: REPEALING OBAMACARE

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, last week I was sworn in as the newest Member of this body. As my very first legislative act, I have announced my cosponsorship of the American Health Care Reform Act, a bill that will repeal the destructive ObamaCare law and replace it with conservative, market-based solutions.

ObamaCare is hurting families across south Alabama, causing dropped coverage, skyrocketing premiums, and adding to the debt when we just can't afford it. It is becoming painfully obvious for families and small businesses in this country that this law is not working, and that it simply cannot be fixed.

We have a responsibility in this body to do what is right for the American people, and it is urgent and obvious we must act now to end this unworkable law.

To my colleagues on the other side: I respect you and stand ready to work with you to replace this law with solutions that will actually lower costs and provide quality care for all of the people in America.

THE VETERANS' RECORDS RECONSTRUCTION ACT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3397, the Veterans' Records Reconstruction Act.

In 1973, a fire at the National Personnel Records Center in Overland, Missouri, destroyed as many as 18,000 military records. While efforts were made to reconstruct these records, many records were left incomplete, which makes it difficult to determine veterans' eligibility for service recognition.

This legislation would create guidelines and allow alternative methods of authenticity verifying veterans' records using unofficial sources, thus creating a pathway toward getting due benefits and recognitions for veterans whose files were destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, while this legislation does not completely solve the problem of missing records, it is a way for our Nation to thank veterans for their service by helping them to best have a chance to receive the recognition that they are due.

I want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPAS, for her leadership in introducing the legislation. I urge its swift passage.

SECOND WAVE OF OBAMACARE CANCELATIONS' EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, due to ObamaCare, potentially millions of small business employees will be affected by a surge of health care plan cancelations. The hundreds of thousands of individual cancelation notices we saw last year were just the beginning, and there will be more before the next open enrollment period.

Mr. Speaker, small business owners are forced to buy more expensive comprehensive coverage, so they must find ways to offset the costs. They will have to cut employees' and workers' hours. And employees they can afford to keep will have restricted choices when selecting doctors and filling prescriptions; so they might not be able to keep the doctor they like, and if they can, it likely will be more expensive.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses create jobs and grow our economy. Around 40 million people have health insurance through their small business employer, and for them, the next wave of ObamaCare cancelations could be catastrophic.

□ 1215

CLEAN ENERGY FUTURE

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that power generation produces the vast majority of carbon pollution that is causing climate change. In order to mitigate the impacts of climate change, we have no choice but to find cleaner, more sustainable energy sources. The good news is we have been making progress. For example, thanks to both Federal and private investments, my district on California's central coast is now home to two of the largest operating solar farms in the world, and more are on the way.

I had the pleasure of visiting these facilities last week, and they are truly a sight to behold. Together, the California Valley Solar Ranch and the Topaz Solar Farms are already generating 550 megawatts of electricity and powering hundreds of thousands of California homes. The clean energy generated from these two projects alone is equivalent to removing 135,000 cars from our roads. Not to mention that these projects have also created hundreds of local construction jobs.

There is no silver bullet to stopping climate change, but renewable energy is certainly a big step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to join in in helping to stop climate change. Let's invest in a clean energy future.

RIGHT TO LIFE

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, this week the congressional conversation is on spending, the national debt, and rightfully so. The budget work in the past 3 years has only made a dent in the looming debt crisis in our future, but America's story is about more than budget and spending. America is about its people, their opportunity and hope and dream for a better future for all of our children.

A few months ago, the March of Dimes released its scorecard for premature birth rates in Oklahoma. We lowered our preterm birth rate for the third year in a row in Oklahoma. That is good. Every child is a gift of God, and they should have a chance to live to his or her fullest potential. We all know that a baby in the womb is not tissue; that is a child. A child that should have the same opportunity, the same chance for hope, the same dreams for a better future. That dream begins with the opportunity for life.

How can we as a Nation work so hard to prevent premature births so each child can reach their full potential and then be callous to the reality that some children will never have the chance to even be born? That is why

Americans will stand on the National Mall for the March for Life January 22. We are Americans. We believe in the inherent right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. That right extends to all people, regardless of their size.

EXTEND EMERGENCY
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, another week, another bill, another missed opportunity to extend emergency unemployment benefits for 1.4 million Americans.

Today, the House will be voting on the 2014 omnibus spending bill, but one key part is missing: an extension of emergency unemployment benefits. To add insult to injury, on Friday, this body will adjourn for another week of recess without addressing this issue, leaving 1.4 million Americans without this critical lifeline, a number that grows every day. It is terrible for these families and for our economy.

Just yesterday, I spoke with a constituent, Margaret, a mother of four who is suffering with Parkinson's disease whose benefits were cut. She has worked her whole life. This is the first time she has ever had to ask for help. She is among more than 4,900 Rhode Island families and 1.4 million Americans who are struggling to find work and need this insurance to help them survive.

We should not adjourn before resolving this issue, and I urge my colleagues to press the Speaker to bring a bill to the floor to extend emergency unemployment insurance today.

CONGRATULATING DRESS FOR
SUCCESS MIAMI

(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, Dress for Success is celebrating 20 years of service to Miami-Dade County residents who have benefited through its training and clothing programs. This noble organization promotes self-sufficiency to low-income women by providing professional attire, while equipping them with the tools and resources to help them thrive in work and in life.

Over 35,000 women in Miami have already succeeded and transitioned from unemployment to economic independence. We have seen that when women have the possibility to earn an income, find stability, and invest back into their communities, they successfully break the dreadful cycle of poverty.

The Dress for Success celebration will also honor the first woman to serve as president of any State senate in the United States, Florida Senator Gwen Margolis. I have had the pleasure of knowing Gwen for over 30 years and

can testify on her commitment to public service, to our community, and to her many capacities as a member of the Miami-Dade County Commission, the Florida House of Representatives, and the Florida Senate.

I thank Florida Senator Gwen Margolis and Dress for Success Miami for what they do on behalf of low-income women of south Florida.

ECONOMY PRIORITY NUMBER ONE

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advocate for the 1.3 million Americans and their families who have been hit hardest by this recession. Affording the most basic necessities—food, transportation, rent, and health care—just got even harder. Their needs are not extravagant. The benefits of unemployment insurance are not a blank check. They are a modest lifeline for families who are in need of desperate help over the holidays and in a cold winter.

Since Congress has failed to act, over 60,000 residents of Massachusetts have lost access to these benefits. If we fail to do so, 140,000 more residents of our State are in jeopardy. At a time when the State's overall jobless rate is around 7 percent, and rises to 12 or 13 percent in some of our most challenged communities, to not extend these benefits today is wrong.

My colleagues that are blocking this bill will tell you they are concerned with the number of people accessing these benefits. Well, you know what? So am I, and cutting those benefits off today is wrong.

The funding that we seek today is an essential lifeline for these individuals at a time when we need to be expanding workforce development programs, workforce training programs, community colleges, vocational schools, and STEM education. We have to support our small businesses, an economic engine for so many American communities. I am in support of transportation upgrades, investments in infrastructure, and affordable housing.

While there is a whole lot we should be working on right now, getting our economy going again and getting people back up should be priority number one.

FLEXIBILITY TO PROMOTE
REEMPLOYMENT ACT

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

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for the Flexibility to Promote Reemployment Act. Under the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, States were granted unprecedented flexibility in the use of unemployment insurance funds to help unemployed individuals

collect paychecks instead of benefit checks.

Unfortunately for States, the DOL issued restrictive, burdensome, and costly application requirements. To date, one State has completed the application process, only to have the application swiftly denied. The Flexibility to Promote Reemployment Act increases flexibility in the use of State UI funds by enabling the DOL to revisit current application guidance and allow States to operate demonstration projects that test alternative means of helping the unemployed return to work.

At a time when our unemployment rate remains unacceptably high, we need to be doing everything we can to advance solutions that will promote job creation. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation.

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on December 28, 3 days after Christmas, this Federal Government allowed 1.3 million American families to be cut off of long-term unemployment insurance. It comes at a time when we are in the dead of winter, at a time when construction employment is dormant, when agriculture is not hiring. It comes at a time when the national unemployment rate is close on 7 percent, when the national long-term unemployment rate is 2.6 percent, which is twice what it ever was when we ever cut off long-term unemployment before, going back to 1959. It comes at a time when jobs growth is its weakest in 3 years, and it comes at a time when we know it is going to cost 240,000 jobs for our economy. This is money, Mr. Speaker, that goes right back into the economy because people are living hand to mouth on these checks and they need to spend it right away.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring up the modest 90-day extension for unemployment insurance before we break for recess.

GROW ECONOMY, NOT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the new year is an opportunity for Congress to get back to work for the American people, and that means supporting good-paying jobs and a growing economy.

Over the coming weeks, we are going to hear debating of proposals that would put more people on unemployment support for longer periods of time. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is the wrong direction for our country.

What the American people want and need are greater job opportunities, not

bigger government programs. Let's grow the economy, not the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, we live in the land of opportunity, the greatest Nation on Earth, a place for everyone. No matter what their economic or racial or socioeconomic background, everyone has a chance to live the American Dream.

The policies of bailouts, borrowing, and Big Government only serve to threaten those opportunities. Rather than focus on expanding government programs, let's expand opportunity. Let's empower the American people to grow and build and create. Let's focus on bills that create more opportunities for employment, and let's come together to help honest, hardworking Americans realize the great American Dream.

RAISE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal minimum wage has remained the same for 4 years and has failed to keep up with the cost of living. According to the recently released Shriver Report, nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women, and 42 million American women either live in poverty or are right on the brink of it. This is wrong. No one who works hard at a full-time job to provide for their children and family should be living in poverty.

Today, with one in five children in America still living in poverty, we must act and pass the Fair Minimum Wage Act, which would increase the Federal minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour for American workers over the next 3 years. This modest increase would raise the wages of approximately 30 million Americans and bring over 4.5 million people above the poverty line. Increasing the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour will not only put more money into the pockets of those in need, but it will infuse an additional \$51 billion into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, this will not be a job killer; it actually will help to create 140,000 new jobs. Our success as a Nation hinges on the success of women. When women succeed, America succeeds.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXTENSION

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, because of the House Republican leadership's inaction, 3 days after Christmas, 127,000 New Yorkers were cut off from their jobless benefits. Every week in 2014, another 5,100 working families in New York lose unemployment compensation. These families are struggling to make ends meet and put food on the table.

This inaction not only harms dislocated workers who stop receiving a check in the mail, but it also slows economic growth. When families have to further cut spending, there is a ripple effect. As families spend less on necessities like food and clothing, local businesses take a hit. Indeed, it has been estimated that failing to pass an unemployment insurance extension will cost our economy 310,000 new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this could end today. Let's do what is right for working families and for the American economy. Let's reinstate unemployment insurance, and let's do so now.

WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind my colleagues that the war on poverty, begun 50 years ago by President Johnson, is still relevant today. As we debate the great issues, we must not forget that nearly 50 million Americans in 2012 were below the poverty level, and that includes 13 million children. Most startling, Mr. Speaker, 16 million of those live below half of the poverty line. Were it not for the safety net that some want to dismantle, 41 million more would live in poverty.

It is undeniable that the poverty rate has decreased, but the fact remains that the face of poverty continues to be low-income Whites and racial minorities and females and children. The omnibus bill will continue to dismantle nondefense discretionary spending to a level that will reverse the gains made over the past 50 years.

I plead with my colleagues to be vigilant in our fight to end poverty in America. Our oath requires us to provide for the common defense, but it also requires that we provide for the common good and enable every American to achieve the American Dream.

□ 1230

WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, President Johnson declared an unconditional war on poverty in America and established landmark programs—such as Head Start, Medicare, and Job Corps—that were designed to give all Americans the opportunity to succeed.

These programs have had a substantial impact, cutting poverty by one-third since 1967. Despite the progress, however, we still have a lot to do.

Today, 100 million Americans live in or near the brink of poverty, including 42 million women and 28 million children. In Nevada, nearly 18 percent of women and 24 percent of children live in poverty, a situation made even

worse by the gender wage gap and the lack of paid leave and affordable care. It is hard to lean in when you are barely hanging on.

What is more, cuts to SNAP and unemployment insurance have placed even greater hardships on those already struggling to get by. Denying this vital lifeline is morally indefensible and economically shortsighted.

To win the war on poverty, we must strengthen, not gut, the programs that protect and empower millions of people every day, giving everyone in this great country an opportunity to succeed.

DANIEL K. INOUYE ARROW ANTI-MISSILE DEFENSE FACILITY

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, just today, for the first time, Israel named a military facility after a non-Israeli. Named after Daniel K. Inouye is an Arrow anti-missile defense facility.

As we know, the U.S. and Israel have successfully developed the Arrow anti-missile system through joint cooperation. A steadfast symbol of cooperation is perhaps the most appropriate way to remember him, as our Senator played an integral role in transforming the relationship between our two countries, and I am pleased that our allies around the world continue to honor him and carry on his legacy.

When former colleagues recall Senator Inouye, they insist that, without him, there would be no U.S. aid to Israel as we know it today. The Senator's interest in Israel stemmed from learning of the fate of the Jews in Europe after his own military experience in Italy in the 442nd, a legendary unit of Japanese Americans, which earned him the highest military honor, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

This honor is another example of how Senator Inouye's influence and hard work have deeply impacted not only Hawaii, but also our Nation and the world. This time, he was recognized some 8,664-plus-or-minus miles from his beloved Hawaii.

UNEMPLOYMENT EXTENSION

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

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reinstate a critical lifeline for the unemployed.

Since the expiration of the unemployment insurance benefits in December, 1.3 million people nationwide have been affected, one in six of whom live in California.

This extension of unemployment benefits is especially needed for the residents of San Bernardino County, where the unemployment rate is 9.1—well above the national average.

Unemployment benefits keep individuals actively looking for work, they

prevent families with a reduced income from becoming homeless, and infuse the economy with much-needed dollars.

My constituents have contacted my office on a daily basis. I hear them. They need this vital lifeline back.

I ask that the Speaker work with the Senate and take up this extension.

UNEMPLOYMENT EXTENSION

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is completely insensitive, unjust, and flat out wrong that Congress would deny the now more than 1.4 million Americans unemployment insurance, including over 18,000 Nevadans.

Mr. Speaker, this is the week that checks stop coming in the mail. For those who maybe never have been unemployed or don't know what it is like to struggle, for many Americans this is the week that the pain takes hold.

The hypocrisy from across the aisle is staggering. I don't quote the former President often, but on December 14, 2002, in his weekly radio address, then-President George W. Bush scolded Congress because "no final bill was sent to me extending unemployment benefits for about 750,000 Americans whose benefits will expire on December 28."

He went on to say:

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

The unemployment rate in December 2002, it was just 6 percent. Congress then extended those unemployment benefits, Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 416-4. If it was an emergency then, it is an emergency now.

It is time to do the right thing and extend unemployment insurance for the 1.4 million Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). 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.

SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2274) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connec-

tion with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2274

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

"(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

"(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

"(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

"(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

"(D) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

"(i) CONTROL.—The term 'control' means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

"(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or officer exercising executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

"(II) has the right to vote 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

"(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 20 percent or more of the capital.

"(ii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term 'eligible privately held company' means a company that meets both of the following conditions:

"(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

"(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

“(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than \$25,000,000.

“(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than \$250,000,000.

“(iii) M&A BROKER.—The term ‘M&A broker’ means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

“(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

“(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent year-end balance sheet, income statement, statement of changes in financial position, and statement of owner’s equity of the issuer of the securities offered in exchange, and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, the related report of the independent auditor, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

“(E) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

“(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012; and

“(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

“(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000.”

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and any amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials for the

RECORD on H.R. 2274, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this good piece of legislation, H.R. 2274. It is the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act. It is introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), who will be speaking momentarily.

Mr. Speaker, during the period of overly burdensome Big Government—of ObamaCare and of Dodd-Frank and thousands and thousands more regulations costing Americans literally trillions of dollars—it is really no surprise that the economic growth and job creation in this country remain sluggish.

America’s small businesses are the primary engine of job creation, for they are the ones who are disproportionately affected by simply a deluge of new rules and regulations coming out of Washington daily. In fact, according to a recent survey, small businesses continue to identify government regulation and red tape as the single most important problem facing them.

While our colleagues in the Senate appear unwilling these days to pass any legislation to help create jobs, well, we have H.R. 2274 in the House that we take up, and it is done in a bipartisan manner. It is a commonsense piece of legislation that will remove some of these unnecessary regulations and obstacles to small business development, growth, and job creation.

What it would do is exempt brokers who perform services in connection with the transfer of ownership of small, privately held companies—that are also known as M&A brokers—from the SEC’s costly one-size-fits-all registration requirements that we have right now.

While terms that we sometimes hear in the press and elsewhere—mergers, acquisitions, brokers—may give you the image of big Wall Streets and what have you, make no mistake about it, this bill is about helping Main Street.

M&A brokers play a very, very important role helping small businesses and small business owners successfully navigate their way through and transfer their company, or sell their company, to new owners, new enterprises, instead of simply closing up their shop and going out of business.

Yet under the current SEC one-size-fits-all registration regime, M&A brokers face a myriad of costly regulations. Unfortunately, M&A brokers have to pass these costs on to, well, other small businesses and, of course, eventually the public.

It is no wonder this legislation has now received widespread and bipartisan support. In fact, this bill was unanimously approved by the committee 57-0. Let me get that straight: 57-0.

I would like to thank the sponsor, Mr. HUIZENGA, for all his hard work on this legislation and bringing it to the floor at a time like this when America’s small businesses are struggling through a mire of regulation and red tape. This type of bipartisan pro-small business, pro-jobs legislation is exactly the type of thing we need.

I urge my colleagues on both sides to pass it, as we did in the committee, in a bipartisan manner.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 2274, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013.

H.R. 2274 provides a much-needed exemption and clarification for current M&A brokers who perform services in connection with the transfer and ownership of small- and medium-sized businesses in privately negotiated transactions.

Small- and medium-sized businesses play a critical role in our economy. They provide jobs, they spur innovation, and they strengthen our overall economy. In fact, over the past decade and a half, America’s small businesses and entrepreneurs have created 65 percent of all new jobs in this country.

As businesses grow, many small- and medium-sized businesses reach a point where they want to and need to expand their businesses. They turn to mergers and acquisition professionals to facilitate such sales.

Currently, M&A brokers who facilitate the private sale of small- and medium-sized privately owned companies must register with the SEC. SEC registration as a broker also requires membership in FINRA—the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority.

The burdens and costs of initial broker-dealer registration and ongoing compliance with both SEC and FINRA requirements are substantial. These costs adversely impact and unnecessarily increase the costs that business owners incur to sell, buy, or grow their small- and medium-sized businesses.

H.R. 2274 is a legislative acknowledgement that one size does not, indeed, fit all when it comes to transactions. Prior to my election, I was a securities lawyer with over a decade of experience working in capital markets for a Wall Street law firm. I had the opportunity to work on a variety of transactions.

Not all mergers and acquisitions are alike, and so not all require the same type of registration and requirements. Some transactions are privately negotiated transmissions of relatively small dollar amounts with sophisticated investors, not for public sale. By streamlining and simplifying the regulatory structures of these small- and medium-sized businesses, we allow them to safely, efficiently, and effectively sell their companies while preserving growth and protecting jobs in these companies.

This bill, H.R. 2274, allows smaller privately held companies to save time and money on the services rendered during the transfer of ownership allowing for smooth sale and transfer. To qualify for the exemption, the transaction would have to involve a business with less than \$250 million in gross revenues and/or pre-tax earnings of less than \$25 million with no securities, and the buyer of the business is someone who will actively manage and control the business, either directly or indirectly.

I fully support this bipartisan legislation and its efforts to simplify the regulatory structure in the sale and transfer of ownership of small- and medium-sized businesses in privately negotiated transactions.

This reform was welcomed by regulators and passed, as the chairman of the subcommittee so accurately noted, by a vote of 57-0, unanimously, with full bipartisan support. The ABA Private Placement Broker-Dealer Task Force recommended this change in its 2005 report, which is available on the SEC Web site. Similar recommendations to simplify broker-dealer registration for M&A brokers were made in the final report by the advisory committee to the SEC on small business companies in 2006.

I think appropriately scaling Federal registration of M&A brokers is a good thing. It is something that I would not only support, but encourage my colleagues to support as well.

H.R. 2274 would amend the Exchange Act by adding a new subsection, section 15, which would govern broker-dealer registration. The amendment would cut regulatory costs incurred by sellers and buyers of small- and mid-sized privately held companies in privately negotiated transactions.

Federal law would continue to provide important investor protections through the SEC registration and SEC regulation of the capital, custody, margin, recordkeeping, bonding, and operational reporting requirements applicable to M&A brokers, and existing State security laws will continue to apply.

□ 1245

I think that this is sensible legislation that should be supported by both sides of the aisle. I am indeed honored to stand with my colleagues in support of H.R. 2274.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman for working with us on this, as she says, sensible piece of legislation.

And with that, I yield such time as the gentleman may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the sponsor of the legislation before the House at this time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage passage of H.R. 2274, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act. Maybe we need to work on the titles getting a little simpler, too. It is very complex. It

is a very complex set of laws and rules that have been put in place.

I do want to say thank you to my subcommittee chairman, Mr. GARRETT, and Ranking Member Sewell for their work on this, as well as Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS, as we have explored this and dove head-first, really, into this issue.

It has been estimated, Mr. Speaker, that there are approximately 10 trillion—that's "trillion" with a "t"—privately-owned, small family-owned type of businesses that will be sold or potentially closed in the coming years as baby boomers retire.

Now, we want to see one of those things happen. We want people to see the fruits of their hard work over the years, and we want to see them be able to sell those companies. We don't want to see them close them unnecessarily, because we know the impact that happens to small communities, much like has happened in some of my hometown communities, when we have seen that happen.

Mergers and acquisitions are also known as M&A. Brokers play a critical role in facilitating the transfer of ownership of these smaller privately held companies. Currently, all M&A brokers are subject to costly, burdensome requirements which adversely impact and unnecessarily increase the cost that business owners incur when they buy or sell their businesses. Often we have heard anecdotally and statistically that they have to make a decision sometimes. They can't move ahead and can't really afford to sell that small—literally, sometimes—corner store, mom-and-pop-type operation, and so they end of closing it because they can't afford to go through the sale.

In fact, the issue has been highlighted by the SEC's Forum on Small Business Capital Formation, which, for the last 7 years—that is over the last two administrations, this current administration and the last administration—has repeatedly recommended that the SEC modernize and streamline the regulation of M&A brokers. But, unfortunately, the SEC has never acted on these recommendations.

Well, we think the time is up. We believe that 7 years is long enough. It is time that this body and hopefully our colleagues in the Senate, as well, will take this bill and finally put some closure to this issue. That is why I, along with Representatives BRIAN HIGGINS and BILL POSEY, introduced H.R. 2274. This bipartisan bill would create a simplified system for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies.

By simplifying the regulation and reducing the cost of these business brokerage services, these smaller privately owned companies would be able to safely, efficiently, and effectively transfer their company, preserving jobs currently in existence, while also allowing for continued economic growth

and job creation to take place at these companies.

There is no risk to the public; there is no threat to the safety and soundness of our economic system; but it is very, very important to those communities that have those kinds of businesses in them and where they are located.

In October 2013, a piece in The Hill newspaper, Michael Nall, president of the Alliance of Merger & Acquisition Advisors, a leading international organization serving the middle-market M&A industry, stated:

H.R. 2274, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013 is an excellent bipartisan bill, one whose time has come. Congress should get it done before the end of the year.

Sorry, Mr. Nall. We are a little behind schedule, but we are getting there.

He goes on:

It's not a sexy bill, not one that prime time TV will be talking about, and not one that will evoke a question in the next Presidential debates; but it is a bill that does have teeth, and it is a serious and substantive piece of small business legislation.

Well, maybe we can inject this into the next Presidential election because this ultimately is about the foundation of our country. It is about that ability for entrepreneurs to go out, strike out on their own, go become successful and then reap the rewards of that and, all the while, provide jobs to communities like we all represent.

Well, in today's highly charged political environment, it is nice to show the American people that a positive, effective initiative can be considered and passed with strong bipartisan support. In fact, this important legislation, as has been mentioned, overwhelmingly passed the Financial Services Committee by a bipartisan vote of 57-0. It is legislation like H.R. 2274 that demonstrates Congress can act in a bipartisan manner to positively impact the lives of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, with that I urge a "yes" vote on this legislation, and I look forward to working with my Senate colleague to see H.R. 2274 make it to President Obama's desk.

I want to thank Chairman GARRETT for his leadership on this issue.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Alabama for yielding me time, and my friend from New Jersey and Mr. HUIZENGA for the sponsorship and leadership on this bill.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2274.

We spend a lot of time in this Chamber talking about the American Dream, and of course in many cases the apex of the American Dream is when that entrepreneur who started a bunch of restaurants or car washes or a local retailer or a local service organization, after working hard over a period of a lifetime, has the opportunity to reap

the rewards of that labor, to sell that business, and to really achieve that success an individual worked a lifetime to do.

Of course, if you have run car washes or restaurants or retail operations, you probably know very little about the very complicated task of selling a small business. There is no reason in the world why that transaction, which again is at the very apex of the American Dream, should be overburdened by regulatory costs that don't make sense.

At the end of the day, the M&A brokers that we are talking about here are not selling stocks to retail investors. They are not marketing mortgages. They are doing a very technical transaction that, again, is so important to wealth creation in this country.

So I thank my colleagues on the other side.

I don't want to let the moment go by without reminding my good friend from New Jersey that, as he blanket condemns regulation today on the floor, there are 300,000 people without drinking water in West Virginia today, in the greatest country on Earth, not because there is too much regulation, but because the regulations weren't good enough.

Years ago in west Texas, a fertilizer train blew up, killing 15 people and injuring 160 people, not because there was too much regulation, but because there was poor regulation.

In the area of our expertise, financial services, this economy was also devastated, not because there was too much regulation, but because there was effectively no regulation under derivatives—complicated, large instruments that brought down institutions like AIG and others because, before Dodd-Frank, you could go into a neighborhood and sell somebody a mortgage without asking for their income.

We succeed and the economy succeeds because we do exactly this, because we find the right balance. We acknowledge that good regulation can save lives in Texas, drinking water in West Virginia, and prevent the destruction of \$17 trillion of American's wealth as occurred 5 years ago.

Again, I celebrate and thank my good friend from New Jersey and promise to continue this dialogue on how we don't condemn all regulation, but seek a balance that allows our economy to thrive as it always has.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut has the unique ability, in order to come to the floor and work in a manner where both sides said we had a bipartisan joint piece of legislation, a jobs-creating legislation, to turn this moment into a partisan attack.

No, I never once said I am against a blanket condemnation of all regulations. In fact, if the gentleman from Connecticut had listened closely, he would have heard that we are, I think, in a bipartisan manner, opposed to overly excessive regulation, regulation

that does not make sense, regulation that hurts jobs. I think that is what his colleague also said. She is opposed to those unnecessary regulations, and that is what this bill is about. We are in favor—I think the gentlelady and I both said this—of smart regulation. That is what this bill before us is about trying to achieve.

If he wants to take a look at bad regulation, all we need to do is look at the excessive and the inappropriate regulation that we had prior to the '08 crisis, the fact that we had examiners and regulators in each and every one of the major failed institutions that led up to this crisis, and those individuals failed to do their jobs. Those individuals failed to find the problems before they came to a head. Those individuals failed to find situations even when they were told about them in such cases as Stanford or Madoff or a list of other ones I could go down here as well.

We had regulators who did not perform their job. Even though they had the authority, the ability, the financing, the money and everything else necessary to do it, they turned a blind eye to it and failed to do so. This is not a time for a partisanship. This is a time to commend both the sponsor of the legislation and the gentlelady who joins with me on this to say that we can get together; we can find commonality when we want to have smart legislation and smart regulation. And I think that is what we should be commending and moving forward on this legislation today.

With that, I don't believe we have any other speakers; but I reserve the balance of my time to close, unless the minority have other speakers.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2013, H.R. 2274.

I want to thank Congresswoman SEWELL and Congressman HUIZENGA for bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

Small businesses are the fabric of our economy and oftentimes the fabric of the communities in which we live. Many of these businesses are family-owned businesses. They provide the wherewithal, the stability, and the future aspirations for many families. These businesses frequently are passed from generation to generation, but sometimes the next generation does not or is not able to take over the next business.

It is critical for our communities and critical for our economies that these businesses are able to pass to a new owner to continue to employ people, to continue to drive our economy, and that is exactly what this bill does. It allows those businesses to bring in the expertise, to bring in the knowledge, to

bring in the capacity, to move from generation to generation even outside the family. So that is why I rise and I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Right-sizing Federal regulation on M&A brokers in these small business transactions I believe makes good sense. All of us have small- and medium-size business owners in our districts who sooner or later will want to sell or grow their businesses through acquisition or transfer of ownership. They will seek advice and hire highly trained professionals to help them find and screen potential targets. These buyers and sellers are represented by lawyers and accountants who will conduct the due diligence. They will rely on written representations and warranties in these negotiated transactions for their protections.

We should reduce the barriers to capital formation, and this bill is an important step towards that. This bill, by streamlining small private transactions, will free up SEC resources to protect the public against public markets and passive investors.

As baby boomers age, there is a tremendous transfer of wealth and streamlining that will occur over the next generation. As my colleagues so aptly said, it is estimated that over \$10 trillion of privately owned businesses will be sold or closed as baby boomers retire.

Jobs are preserved and created when existing businesses are acquired by entrepreneurs or other companies. In Main Street, typically business brokers play a vital role in facilitating these private business mergers and acquisitions. This bill will encourage such business growth.

Helping our small businesses is not a partisan issue. We all benefit when small businesses grow and flourish. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make strategic and economically beneficial policy decisions that will be smart regulations, that will strengthen our economy and create jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2274, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I begin by thanking the gentlelady for her leadership on this legislation, adopting the word I just used, which is smart regulation is smart legislation, but also the words you used as well as far as reducing barriers and streamlining, which is really what the gentleman from Michigan has accomplished in this legislation that is before us.

The other takeaway I am going to take from the gentlewoman's comment as well is twofold: A, this is being done in a bipartisan manner; but B, we need to move this thing forward. By that, I

mean the House of Representatives today, in a bipartisan manner, is going to be moving a good piece of job-creating legislation.

The next step, we know, of course, is just across the Capitol, in the U.S. Senate. We want to make sure that this legislation, in a bipartisan manner, also moves there as well. Hopefully, we can link arms and join in getting them to move this legislation there as well.

With that, I thank the gentlelady. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for all of his leadership in the committee and his work on this legislation and the other legislation he is leading on as well.

With that, I encourage the passage of H.R. 2274, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2274, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. GARRETT. 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.

HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 801) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 801

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. REGISTRATION THRESHOLD FOR SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 12(g)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting after "is a bank" the following: "a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act)"; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by inserting after "case of a bank" the following: "a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act)"; and

(2) in section 15(d), by striking "case of a bank" and inserting the following: "case of a bank, a savings and loan holding company (as defined in section 10 of the Home Owners' Loan Act)";

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). Pursuant to the rule, the

gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 801, currently under consideration.

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

I rise today, as I did a moment ago as well, in support of this good, commonsense legislation, which is H.R. 801, the Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act. I also, just like with the prior legislation, would like to commend the bipartisan nature of the legislation before us and the bipartisan nature of the sponsors of this legislation, Representatives WOMACK, HIMES, DELANEY, and Mrs. WAGNER, as well, for their outstanding work on getting this important measure to the floor today.

What does it do?

H.R. 801 basically corrects a technical oversight from last Congress' JOBS Act, which was the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, and it does so by ensuring that savings and loans holding companies, or SLHCs, are able to take advantage of the law's provisions that modify the thresholds by which bank holding companies are forced to register or allowed to deregister with the SEC.

Most savings and loan holding companies are organized very similarly to bank holding companies and are subject to similar regulatory oversight. Because this is the case, it is appropriate now for us to correct this technical oversight in the law and streamline the registration and deregistration thresholds of savings and loan and bank holding companies.

I will end now where I began, and that is to thank the leadership for bringing up this very important legislation, and the sponsors as well for working in a bipartisan manner. I ask that all Members support this commonsense legislation and the Senate consider it without any delay.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I, once again, thank Chairman GARRETT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, for his support and leadership on this bill. I particularly thank my cosponsors on this bill: Mr. WOMACK, with whom I have worked before; Mrs. WAGNER; and Mr. DELANEY. Additional cosponsors of the bill are Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. RENACCI. I thank them for their hard work.

This is a rare example of a wise bipartisan bill that will achieve some-

thing important, which is to basically undertake a technical fix to the JOBS Act, passed into law in April of 2012, which allowed banks to put off becoming public until they reached a threshold of 2,000 shareholders. That sounds like a small and technical point, but it put a tremendous burden on banks that perhaps were not ready to go public with more than 500 shareholders at the time.

The legislation did not directly specify that savings and loans would also receive the same treatment. It was, I believe, the intent of Congress that that be the case. So H.R. 801 goes back to seek to remedy this issue.

The Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act, a rather awkward name for H.R. 801, extends the shareholder registration thresholds to savings and loan holding companies. This bill will ensure that savings and loan institutions operate under the same rules as banks, trying to create a more uniform and simple regulatory apparatus.

This will help these institutions raise capital so that they have the resources to make the loans which drive the economic growth—the businesses, the colleges, the mortgages, the purchases that drive the economic growth of this country.

Madam Speaker, again, I thank Mr. GARRETT for his support. As we seek creative solutions to the Nation's job crisis, we should do everything we can to stimulate the consumer demand that we know drives so much of this economy. This bill is one small, commonsense step we can take in that direction.

Again, I thank Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. DELANEY for their leadership.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. I, too, thank the gentleman from Connecticut.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), the prime sponsor of the bill.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, my thanks to the subcommittee chairman and to Chairman HENSARLING for shepherding this bill through committee and bringing it to the House floor. I, too, would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly Representative HIMES, with whom I worked in the previous Congress on similar legislation that has already been articulated, and Representative DELANEY and Mrs. WAGNER for working with me on this bipartisan measure.

As you know, Madam Speaker, we have been talking about jobs. The House has passed bill after bill to create a better environment for private sector growth and job creation. These conservative solutions would help create new jobs today, would make life for families better across the country, and would expand opportunity for everyone without expanding government. That is

exactly what this bill, H.R. 801, does as well, and I am proud to rise and urge support for its passage.

Small financial institutions are essential to the communities they serve. Their boards are made up of community leaders. Their employees are our neighbors. They sponsor Little League teams and softball leagues and support the United Way. On Friday nights, you see their logos on the scoreboards at high school football games.

These institutions have a deep and abiding love for the towns that they serve, and our constituents—small business owners, farmers, and hard-working Americans—rely on them to meet payroll, to purchase equipment, or to buy a car or a home.

Unfortunately, these institutions are coming under increased pressure from Washington, forcing them to spend more and more of their resources not to put capital into the community but to comply with onerous new regulations and requirements—requirements intended for larger banks—instead of serving the needs of the communities. Our small community banks and savings and loan holding companies were not the cause of the financial crisis, and they should not be treated as though they were.

That is why in the last Congress the House and Senate acted to eliminate some of these unnecessary burdens by passing the JOBS Act. Among other things, the bill raised the registration threshold for bank holdings companies from 500 to 2,000 shareholders and increased the deregistration threshold from 300 to 1,200 shareholders, better positioning banks to increase their business lending and, in turn, promote economic growth in our communities.

Due to an oversight, the JOBS Act did not explicitly extend these new thresholds to savings and loan holding companies. As a sponsor of the original legislation, this wasn't our intent, and I supported report language in the House FY 2013 Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill clarifying that savings and loan holding companies should be treated in the same manner as bank and bank holding companies. Additionally, Representative HIMES and I wrote to SEC Chairman Schapiro to ask that the SEC use its authority to carry out our original intent.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, we are still without a successful resolution to the problem. At a time when our economy is struggling, Congress must address the issue and ease the burdens on these institutions to allow them to deploy more of their capital throughout the communities they serve. H.R. 801 does this by correcting this oversight and ensuring that savings and loan holding companies are treated in the same manner as bank and bank holding companies.

I urge my colleagues to support this job-creating legislation.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), my colleague.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 801, the Holding Company Registration Threshold Equalization Act. This simple, bipartisan measure ensures consumers and businesses—the drivers of our economy—have access to the capital they need.

The JOBS Act gave small community banks flexibility to raise capital without being required to comply with regulations specifically intended for the larger financial institutions that were responsible for the 2008 financial crisis. This was a positive change that injected much-needed capital into our local economies. However, the legislation did not specifically extend it to small savings and loans holding companies.

It is important that we now put the savings and loans on par with our banks, retaining the equity and diversity conducive to the health of our banking system. By putting additional capital in the hands of our local savings and loans, we are helping consumers who are looking for home loans, our neighbors who are starting small businesses, and small businesses that are continuing to invest in their future.

This may be a technical correction, but it remains a correction that has significant beneficial implications for our communities and for our continued economic recovery.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this measure.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), also a prime sponsor of the legislation before us and a leading and active member on the committee.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. WOMACK of Arkansas, as well as my Democrat colleagues, Mr. HIMES of Connecticut and Mr. DELANEY of Maryland, for their work on this important issue. I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his very hard work in getting this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the JOBS Act was a big win for the American economy. Since the law was passed a year and a half ago, a number of American businesses, including more than 40 biotechnology companies, as well as companies such as Kayak and Twitter, have gone public using provisions of the JOBS Act.

Additionally, dozens of community banks across the country have already taken advantage of the updated SEC registration thresholds which made up title VI of the JOBS Act.

Perhaps most encouraging is the frenzy of activity we have been seeing from entrepreneurs around the country, whether it is small technology startups lining up at the gate to begin crowdfunding or small businesses being able to share their story with more in-

vestors, now that they are allowed to advertise. We certainly see this kind of activity in the greater St. Louis region, which has become a major hub of innovation.

□ 1315

This is exactly what the JOBS Act was intended to do: allow entrepreneurs and small businesses to focus on innovating and creating jobs, not only complying with outdated government regulations.

Unfortunately, as we all know, Washington tends to move a little slower than the private sector, which is why this legislation is necessary. Title VI of the JOBS Act updates outdated SEC registration thresholds for community banks, and it will allow banks to focus more time on serving their customers than on complying with unnecessary red tape. And while Congress intended to include savings and loans as a part of these new registration thresholds, the SEC, to date, has not interpreted the law in this way.

Savings and loans perform essentially the same function as banks. They are overseen by the same regulators and are a pillar of many small towns and communities across this country.

Missouri is home to about 20 savings and loans that could one day benefit from the provisions in title VI. Many of them have under \$200 million in assets and are located in rural areas that rely on their savings and loans for credit. Increasing the ability of these institutions to lend will help increase economic activity in Missouri and all around our great country.

In order to put savings and loans on equal footing with community banks and to codify congressional intent, today we are considering H.R. 801, which will extend the updated threshold in the JOBS Act to savings and loans. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, because Congress must continue to take steps, no matter how incremental, to increase lending and investment in our economy.

As an added bonus, this legislation comes to the floor today with strong bipartisan support, and I want to again thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work and their support on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just close by thanking you for our partnership and our work on this bill. I hope we can do more of the same.

I thank Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. DELANEY, cosponsors of this bill, and Chairman GARRETT for pushing this through.

As we have said, H.R. 801 is a good idea, a bipartisan idea, and something that I hope we can see the Senate take up.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 801 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was just thinking as I was sitting here.

Speaker BOEHNER raised the question at the beginning of this administration, where are the jobs? And it is a question that I continue to get when I go home to my district, where are the jobs after all the years of this administration? And it is a question that I hear on the floor once in a while from Members who don't really follow the activity on the floor closely, where are the bills to help create jobs, as if we are not moving them.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, we have moved two more to the laundry list of other legislation out of this House to answer the question, how can we help facilitate and create more jobs for the American public? That is why I am so pleased to be here with the sponsors of this legislation in a bipartisan manner, H.R. 801, and to be able to get this through the House to answer the question, where are the jobs?

Well, the House of Representatives continues in its tradition of passing legislation to answer that question, to make more jobs for the American public, to streamline the regulatory process, and to reduce the number of Americans who are no longer in the workforce whatsoever.

So I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to not only pass the legislation today, but also to encourage the U.S. Senate, where some often say all good bills go to die, to pick up this legislation and pass it in a forthright manner.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 801.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. GARRETT. 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.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 106) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 106

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-46) is amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting "January 18, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 106.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very, very short-term continuing resolution to keep the government open and operating until January 18. The continuing resolution that ended the government shutdown in October provided funding only until January 15, which is, of course, tomorrow.

As you know, yesterday I posted the full fiscal year 2014 omnibus to fund the government for the rest of the year. We hope to pass this comprehensive legislation tomorrow and send it to the Senate in short order. However, in order to allow for the Senate and White House to process, pass, and then sign the omnibus, we simply needed a little extra time for the Senate to take up the matter and work it through their process. This legislation extends the deadline by 3 days and prevents a potential lapse in appropriations that would cause unnecessary problems for government operations.

I ask that my colleagues vote "yes" on this necessary bill.

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

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

I rise in support of this clean, short-term continuing resolution to ensure uninterrupted government services while we finish the omnibus bill.

Mr. Speaker, our work could not begin until passage of the Murray-Ryan budget agreement in December. The House and Senate budget resolutions were nearly \$92 billion apart. We had already suffered an unnecessary government shutdown.

The December budget agreement passed with bipartisan support, gave the Appropriations Committee a workable number, and allowed bipartisan, bicameral negotiations to occur, and we haven't wasted a moment. Our committee worked through the holidays to produce the fiscal year 2014 omnibus package. I am delighted to report that it contains all 12 spending bills and detailed direction in all areas of discretionary spending.

Reaching agreement on all 12 bills was not easy and required a tremendous level of cooperation and compromise. Nobody got everything they wanted. Last night, Chairman ROGERS

and Chairwoman MIKULSKI released the text of the omnibus bill, and Members will now have 2 days to review the details before the House votes.

Unfortunately, the current continuing resolution expires at midnight on Wednesday. To allow time for Senate consideration, we must now consider this short-term, interim CR extension. This clean 3-day CR will guarantee no lapse in funding while the legislative gears turn. It contains no policy provisions or other extraneous material. I support its quick passage.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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 Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 106.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2274 and H.R. 801, and approval of the Journal.

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

SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2274) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—422

Aderholt	Deutch	Kaptur
Amash	Diaz-Balart	Keating
Amodei	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Andrews	Doggett	Kelly (PA)
Bachmann	Doyle	Kennedy
Bachus	Duckworth	Kildee
Barber	Duffy	Kilmer
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Kind
Barr	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Barrow (GA)	Edwards	King (NY)
Barton	Ellison	Kingston
Bass	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Beatty	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Becerra	Enyart	Kline
Benishek	Eshoo	Kuster
Bentivolio	Esty	Labrador
Bera (CA)	Farenthold	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Farr	Lamborn
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Lance
Bishop (NY)	Fincher	Langevin
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	Lankford
Black	Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)
Blackburn	Fleming	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	Flores	Latham
Bonamici	Forbes	Latta
Boustany	Fortenberry	Lee (CA)
Brady (PA)	Foster	Levin
Brady (TX)	Fox	Lewis
Braley (IA)	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Bridenstine	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Brooks (AL)	Frelinghuysen	Loebsack
Brooks (IN)	Fudge	Loggren
Broun (GA)	Gallego	Long
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Garcia	Lowe
Bucshon	Gardner	Lucas
Burgess	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Bustos	Gerlach	Lujan Grisham
Butterfield	Gibbs	(NM)
Byrne	Gibson	Lujan, Ben Ray
Calvert	Gingrey (GA)	(NM)
Camp	Gohmert	Lummis
Campbell	Goodlatte	Lynch
Cantor	Gosar	Maffei
Capito	Gowdy	Maloney,
Capps	Granger	Carolyn
Capuano	Graves (GA)	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Carney	Grayson	Marino
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	Massie
Carter	Green, Gene	Matheson
Cartwright	Griffin (AR)	Matsui
Cassidy	Griffith (VA)	McAllister
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	McCarthy (CA)
Castro (TX)	Grimm	McCaul
Chabot	Guthrie	McClintock
Chaffetz	Gutiérrez	McCollum
Chu	Hahn	McDermott
Ciilline	Hall	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Hanabusa	McHenry
Clarke (NY)	Hanna	McIntyre
Clay	Harper	McKeon
Clyburn	Harris	McKinley
Coble	Hartzler	McMorris
Coffman	Hastings (FL)	Rodgers
Cohen	Hastings (WA)	McNerney
Cole	Heck (NV)	Meadows
Collins (GA)	Heck (WA)	Meehan
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Meeks
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Meng
Connolly	Higgins	Messer
Conyers	Himes	Mica
Cook	Hinojosa	Michaud
Cooper	Holding	Miller (FL)
Costa	Holt	Miller (MI)
Cotton	Honda	Miller, Gary
Courtney	Horsford	Miller, George
Cramer	Hoyer	Moore
Crawford	Hudson	Moran
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Mullin
Crowley	Huffman	Mulvaney
Cuellar	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)
Cummings	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Daines	Hunter	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Hurt	Napolitano
Davis, Danny	Israel	Neal
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Negrete McLeod
DeFazio	Jackson Lee	Neugebauer
DeGette	Jeffries	Noem
Delaney	Jenkins	Nolan
DeLauro	Johnson (GA)	Nugent
DelBene	Johnson (OH)	Nunes
Denham	Johnson, E. B.	Nunnelee
Dent	Johnson, Sam	O'Rourke
DeSantis	Jordan	Olson
DesJarlais	Joyce	Owens

Palazzo	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Pallone	Royce	Thompson (MS)
Pascarella	Ruiz	Thompson (PA)
Pastor (AZ)	Runyan	Thornberry
Paulsen	Ryan (OH)	Tiberi
Payne	Ryan (WI)	Tierney
Pearce	Salmon	Tipton
Pelosi	Sánchez, Linda	Titus
Perlmutter	T.	Tonko
Perry	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Peters (CA)	Sanford	Turner
Peters (MI)	Sarbanes	Upton
Peterson	Scalise	Valadao
Petri	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Pingree (ME)	Schiff	Vargas
Pittenger	Schneider	Veasey
Pitts	Schock	Vela
Pocan	Schrader	Velázquez
Poe (TX)	Schwartz	Visclosky
Polis	Schweikert	Wagner
Pompeo	Scott (VA)	Walberg
Posey	Scott, Austin	Walden
Price (GA)	Scott, David	Walorski
Price (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Walz
Quigley	Serrano	Wasserman
Radel	Sessions	Schultz
Rahall	Swell (AL)	Waters
Rangel	Shea-Porter	Waxman
Reed	Sherman	Weber (TX)
Reichert	Shimkus	Webster (FL)
Foster	Shuster	Welch
Ribble	Simpson	West
Rice (SC)	Sinema	Westmoreland
Richmond	Slaughter	Whitfield
Rigell	Smith (MO)	Williams
Rogers	Smith (NE)	Wilson (FL)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Rogers (MI)	Southerland	Womack
Rohrabacher	Speier	Woodall
Rokita	Stewart	Yarmuth
Rooney	Stivers	Yoder
Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman	Yoho
Roskam	Swailwell (CA)	Young (AK)
Ross	Takano	Young (IN)
Rothfus	Terry	

NOT VOTING—10

Buchanan	Jones	Sires
Cleaver	McCarthy (NY)	Stockman
Culberson	Ruppersberger	
Gabbard	Rush	

□ 1358

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOLDING COMPANY REGISTRATION THRESHOLD EQUALIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 801) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies, 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 New Jersey (Mr.

GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 4, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—417

Aderholt	Delaney	Hurt
Amash	DeLauro	Israel
Amodei	DelBene	Issa
Andrews	Denham	Jackson Lee
Bachmann	Dent	Jeffries
Bachus	DeSantis	Jenkins
Barber	DesJarlais	Johnson (GA)
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Barr	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Barrow (GA)	Doyle	Johnson, Sam
Barton	Duckworth	Jordan
Bass	Duffy	Joyce
Beatty	Duncan (SC)	Kaptur
Becerra	Duncan (TN)	Keating
Benishek	Edwards	Kelly (IL)
Bentivolio	Ellison	Kelly (PA)
Bera (CA)	Ellmers	Kennedy
Bilirakis	Engel	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Enyart	Kilmer
Bishop (NY)	Eshoo	Kind
Bishop (UT)	Esty	King (IA)
Black	Farenthold	King (NY)
Blackburn	Farr	Kingston
Blumenauer	Fattah	Kinzinger (IL)
Bonamici	Fincher	Kirkpatrick
Boustany	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Brady (PA)	Fleischmann	Kuster
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Labrador
Braley (IA)	Flores	LaMalfa
Bridenstine	Forbes	Lamborn
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Lance
Brooks (IN)	Foster	Langevin
Broun (GA)	Fox	Lankford
Brown (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Burgess	Fudge	Latta
Butterfield	Gallego	Lee (CA)
Byrne	Garamendi	Levin
Calvert	Garcia	Lewis
Camp	Gardner	Lipinski
Campbell	Garrett	LoBiondo
Cantor	Gerlach	Loebsack
Capito	Gibbs	Loggren
Capps	Gibson	Long
Capuano	Gingrey (GA)	Lowenthal
Cárdenas	Gohmert	Lowe
Carney	Goodlatte	Lucas
Carson (IN)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Carter	Gowdy	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Granger	(NM)
Cassidy	Graves (GA)	Lujan, Ben Ray
Castor (FL)	Graves (MO)	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Grayson	Lummis
Chabot	Green, Al	Lynch
Chaffetz	Griffin (AR)	Maffei
Chu	Griffith (VA)	Maloney,
Ciilline	Grijalva	Carolyn
Clark (MA)	Grimm	Maloney, Sean
Clarke (NY)	Guthrie	Marchant
Clay	Gutiérrez	Marino
Clyburn	Hahn	Massie
Coble	Hall	Matheson
Coffman	Hanabusa	Matsui
Cohen	Hanna	McAllister
Cole	Harper	McCarthy (CA)
Collins (GA)	Harris	McCaul
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	McClintock
Conaway	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Connolly	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Conyers	Heck (NV)	McGovern
Cook	Heck (WA)	McHenry
Cooper	Hensarling	McIntyre
Costa	Herrera Beutler	McKeon
Cotton	Higgins	McKinley
Courtney	Himes	McMorris
Cramer	Hinojosa	Rodgers
Crawford	Holding	McNerney
Crenshaw	Holt	Meadows
Crowley	Honda	Meehan
Cuellar	Horsford	Meeks
Cummings	Hoyer	Meng
Daines	Hudson	Messer
Davis (CA)	Huelskamp	Mica
Davis, Danny	Huffman	Michaud
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)
DeFazio	Hultgren	Miller (MI)
DeGette	Hunter	Miller, Gary

Miller, George
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
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson (CA)
Peterson (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)

Richmond
Rigell
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)

Southerland
Speier
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
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
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)

NAYS—4

DeFazio
Dingell

NOT VOTING—11

Buchanan
Cleaver
Culberson
Deutch

□ 1408

Mr. DEFAZIO 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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 274, nays 138, answered "present" 3, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—274

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeke
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellison
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene

NAYS—138

Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Lance
Langevin
Lee (CA)
LoBiondo
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Gohmert
Owens
Weber (TX)

NOT VOTING—17

Buchanan
Cleaver
Culberson
Deutch
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard

□ 1414

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

OPM IG ACT

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2860) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2860

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "OPM IG Act".

SEC. 2. USE OF OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT REVOLVING FUND FOR AUDITS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES.

Subsection (e) of section 1304 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: “, and for the cost of audits, investigations, and oversight activities, conducted by the Inspector General of the Office, of the fund and the activities financed by the fund”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking “The Office” and inserting “(A) The Office”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) Such budget shall include an estimate from the Inspector General of the Office of the amount required to pay the expenses to audit, investigate, and provide other oversight activities with respect to the fund and the activities financed by the fund.

“(C) The amount requested by the Inspector General under subparagraph (B) shall not exceed .33 percent of the total budgetary authority requested by the Office under subparagraph (A).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2860 responds to the Office of Personnel Management Inspector General's call for increased oversight of the OPM's revolving fund by providing the IG access to a portion of that revolving fund moneys for oversight.

H.R. 2860 recognizes oversight as a legitimate business cost by using existing funds to help the IG respond to the increased referrals of alleged fraud within the OPM's revolving fund operations, including especially in the background investigation used to determine an individual's eligibility for a security clearance.

The Office of Personnel Management serves as the regulator for these rules affecting the management of Federal workers, but has also evolved into a fee-based service provider that provides billions of dollars in services each year to the very agencies governed by OPM's rules.

The revolving fund budget has grown significantly over the past 15 years, from \$191 million to more than \$2 billion today. OPM's revolving fund budget is almost 91 percent of OPM's budget; yet the resources available for the IG to audit these funds have not kept pace with the growing amounts.

For over 30 years, both the General Accountability Office and OPM Inspectors General have been concerned about the management of resources in the revolving fund. Each has issued a number of reports and audits exam-

ining various and, often recurring, problems.

Last year, OPM Inspector General McFarland informed the Committee on Government Oversight and Reform of what he described as a “serious problem” inhibiting his ability to perform the duties and responsibilities of his office. McFarland stated his office was at a point where it could not meet its statutory obligation to effectively oversee revolving fund activities. He noted that his office had been “inundated with requests from OPM to audit and/or investigate different parts of revolving fund programs,” from technical audit work to the continuing flow of allegations involving falsifications of background investigations and abuse of authority.

The OPM Inspector General has investigated a number of cases involving the falsification of background investigations, including reporting of investigations that never occurred, recording answers to questions that were never asked, and documents record checks that were never conducted. Within the military departments at 81 percent of OPM's customer base, these cases have serious national security implications.

Inspector General McFarland testified before the Federal Workforce Subcommittee in June, and he said the OPM's revolving fund programs “have been operating in the shadows for too long,” adding the often-cited phrase “sunshine is the best disinfectant.”

H.R. 2860 would allow the OPM IG to use a portion of the revolving fund moneys to pay for related audit and investigation work. The OPM IG's resources would be limited to one-third of 1 percent of the revolving fund budget, and the IG would be required to submit an annual budget request and report detailing its revolving fund oversight work.

H.R. 2860 provides resources for critical oversight that can be accomplished at relatively low cost, using existing funds.

I urge the adoption of this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2860, the OPM IG Act, which is a successful product of the bipartisan efforts of Federal Workforce Subcommittee Chairman Farenthold and Ranking Member LYNCH, and I applaud them for their efforts.

I thank my distinguished colleagues for their work and commitment in sponsoring legislation to provide the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management with critically needed funding to perform audits, investigations, and oversight of OPM's revolving fund activities.

Through the revolving fund, OPM provides approximately \$2 billion in services to agencies on a fee-for-service basis. These services include background investigations, leadership

training, and human resource management.

H.R. 2860 would fix the loophole in the current law which prevents this \$2 billion revolving fund from paying for the costs of the OPM Inspector General to properly oversee the fund's activities.

This legislation would allow the OPM Inspector General to use a very small portion of the revolving fund budget, up to a maximum of one-third of 1 percent of the fund, to pay for audit, investigative, and oversight work.

The recent Navy Yard shooting and the Edward Snowden leaks of classified information have highlighted the importance of comprehensive oversight of the Federal Government's background investigation and security clearance process.

During last June's Federal Workforce Subcommittee hearing on OPM's revolving fund, the OPM Inspector General expressed substantial concerns about the falsification of background investigations.

The OPM Inspector General plays a crucial part in ensuring that the background investigation process used by the government to determine whether individuals should be trusted with our Nation's classified and sensitive information is properly conducted.

This legislation would give the OPM Inspector General the funds and resources needed to conduct the necessary oversight activities to help safeguard our government against national security risks.

The Senate has already passed a substantially similar bill, and I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting H.R. 2860.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to thank Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. LYNCH for working together in such a bipartisan manner on this very important national security bill.

It is a commonsense, good government bill that is designed to use existing funds that are brought into the OPM to oversee the OPM. They have got a huge chunk of money here that is coming from the background checks, and they don't have the resources necessary to adequately make sure these background checks are going to be done.

Mr. CUMMINGS cited numerous examples of how the failures in the system have resulted in tragedies and have resulted in information getting out. We need to make sure these background checks are being done properly, we need to make sure this money is being administered properly, and this bipartisan bill does that.

I too urge my colleagues to pass the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), the cosponsor

of the bill and a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

First of all, I want to say that as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, I rise in strong support of Mr. FARENTHOLD's measure here, H.R. 2860, the OPM Inspector General Act, legislation that will enhance oversight of the background check process for the issuance of government security clearances.

At the outset as well, I would like to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. FARENTHOLD, for working in a bipartisan manner to sponsor H.R. 2860. I would also like to thank our full committee chairman, Mr. ISSA, and ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS, the gentleman from Maryland, for their hard work and their leadership on this legislation as well.

Recent events involving Edward Snowden and his leaking of classified information and as well Aaron Alexis and the tragic shooting at the Washington Navy Yard have called attention to the need to reexamine and improve the Federal Government's background investigation and security clearance process.

H.R. 2860 is a key component of our examinations. This legislation provides the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management with the resources that he needs to assist Congress in our review and oversight of a process that is critical within our national security framework.

We rely heavily on our Inspectors General. They are at the front lines of investigating fraud, waste, and abuse in government programs. We as Members of the legislature rely heavily on them in getting accurate information.

In particular, H.R. 2860 would give the Office of Personnel Management the authority to access a portion of OPM's revolving fund to pay for audits, investigations, and oversight of the agency's revolving fund program, which includes the Federal Government's background investigations process, their leadership training, and personnel management solutions.

I think OPM Inspector General Patrick McFarland did a great job on this in making us aware of the necessity for this legislation. During a June 2013 Federal Workforce Subcommittee hearing, as has been noted, Mr. McFarland stated that his office was handicapped in its ability to conduct proper oversight of the OPM's revolving fund activities.

Under existing law, the Inspector General's oversight costs cannot be charged to the revolving fund. As a result, for fiscal year 2013, the Inspector General had only available \$3 million to conduct oversight of OPM's program involving \$2 billion.

Because of these limited resources, the OPM Inspector General was not able to thoroughly investigate issues regarding falsification of background investigations, conduct audits of the

revolving fund, or examine the fund's high-risk areas.

However, H.R. 2860, if enacted, would allow the OPM Inspector General's oversight costs to be paid from the revolving fund up to a maximum of one-third of 1 percent of OPM's revolving fund budget. Assuming a revolving budget of \$2 billion, the Inspector General may be authorized to receive up to a maximum of \$6.6 million to fund oversight costs.

□ 1430

Common sense indicates that giving the OPM Inspector General authority for this funding is a sensible and prudent investment. Moreover, if national security is implicated, the importance of preventing or mitigating national security threats is, of course, immeasurable.

Let me also add that this proposal was included in the President's fiscal year 2014 budget request, and the Senate passed, by unanimous consent, substantially similar legislation last October. In addition, a provision granting the OPM Inspector General access to the revolving fund was included in the omnibus appropriation bill released just last night. I would note, however, that that provision expires after 1 year.

So Mr. FARENTHOLD's legislation, which I have cosponsored, is incredibly important and should be adopted. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with myself and Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire of the gentleman from Maryland if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We have no additional speakers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. At this point, I would like to wrap it up and close.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Maryland pointed out, this is a common-sense, good government bill that has strong national security implications and I am going to urge all my colleagues to support it.

Again, even though it was included in the omnibus that is coming through that is 1 year, this creates permanent law where we continue to do this necessary and appropriate oversight at a fraction of the percent of the cost of the budget, absolutely a phenomenal bill that we all need to get behind and support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume as I close.

Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to thank Mr. FARENTHOLD, to thank Mr. LYNCH and certainly our chairman, Chairman ISSA, for this bipartisan effort. It just makes sense. There are certain things that happen that we see in government that need correcting, and this is one of those things. The fact that we have now put a spotlight on it and, through a bipartisan effort, have put together legislation that should pass this House unanimously, it just shows what can be done.

So it is a great piece of legislation. It is a very practical piece of legislation, and it is one that is needed. With that, I would urge all of our colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. 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 Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2860.

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. CUMMINGS. 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.

PRESIDENTIAL AND FEDERAL RECORDS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2014

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1233) to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1233

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments of 2014".

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Presidential records.
- Sec. 3. National Archives and Records Administration.
- Sec. 4. Records management by Federal agencies.
- Sec. 5. Disposal of records.
- Sec. 6. Procedures to prevent unauthorized removal of classified records from National Archives.
- Sec. 7. Repeal of provisions related to the National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials.
- Sec. 8. Pronoun amendments.
- Sec. 9. Records management by the Archivist.
- Sec. 10. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging account.

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.

(a) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS OF CONSTITUTIONALLY BASED PRIVILEGE AGAINST DISCLOSURE.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§2208. Claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure

“(a)(1) When the Archivist determines under this chapter to make available to the

public any Presidential record that has not previously been made available to the public, the Archivist shall—

“(A) promptly provide notice of such determination to—

“(i) the former President during whose term of office the record was created; and

“(ii) the incumbent President; and

“(B) make the notice available to the public.

“(2) The notice under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be in writing; and

“(B) shall include such information as may be prescribed in regulations issued by the Archivist.

“(3)(A) Upon the expiration of the 60-day period (excepting Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) beginning on the date the Archivist provides notice under paragraph (1)(A), the Archivist shall make available to the public the Presidential record covered by the notice, except any record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) with respect to which the Archivist receives from a former President or the incumbent Presidential notification of a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure under subsection (b).

“(B) A former President or the incumbent President may extend the period under subparagraph (A) once for not more than 30 additional days (excepting Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) by filing with the Archivist a statement that such an extension is necessary to allow an adequate review of the record.

“(C) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), if the 60-day period under subparagraph (A), or any extension of that period under subparagraph (B), would otherwise expire during the 6-month period after the incumbent President first takes office, then that 60-day period or extension, respectively, shall expire at the end of that 6-month period.

“(b)(1) For purposes of this section, the decision to assert any claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) must be made personally by a former President or the incumbent President, as applicable.

“(2) A former President or the incumbent President shall notify the Archivist, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of a privilege claim under paragraph (1) on the same day that the claim is asserted under such paragraph.

“(c)(1) If a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) is asserted under subsection (b) by a former President, the Archivist shall consult with the incumbent President, as soon as practicable during the period specified in paragraph (2)(A), to determine whether the incumbent President will uphold the claim asserted by the former President.

“(2)(A) Not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date of which the Archivist receives notification from a former President of the assertion of a claim of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure, the Archivist shall provide notice to the former President and the public of the decision of the incumbent President under paragraph (1) regarding the claim.

“(B) If the incumbent President upholds the claim of privilege asserted by the former President, the Archivist shall not make the Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) subject to the claim publicly available unless—

“(i) the incumbent President withdraws the decision upholding the claim of privilege asserted by the former President; or

“(ii) the Archivist is otherwise directed by a final court order that is not subject to appeal.

“(C) If the incumbent President determines not to uphold the claim of privilege asserted by the former President, or fails to make the determination under paragraph (1) before the end of the period specified in subparagraph (A), the Archivist shall release the Presidential record subject to the claim at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the Archivist received notification of the claim, unless otherwise directed by a court order in an action initiated by the former President under section 2204(e) of this title or by a court order in another action in any Federal court.

“(d) The Archivist shall not make publicly available a Presidential record (or reasonably segregable part of a record) that is subject to a privilege claim asserted by the incumbent President unless—

“(1) the incumbent President withdraws the privilege claim; or

“(2) the Archivist is otherwise directed by a final court order that is not subject to appeal.

“(e) The Archivist shall adjust any otherwise applicable time period under this section as necessary to comply with the return date of any congressional subpoena, judicial subpoena, or judicial process.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 2204(d) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, except section 2208,” after “chapter”.

(B) Section 2205 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “section 2204” and inserting “sections 2204 and 2208 of this title”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “subpena” and inserting “subpoena”.

(C) Section 2207 of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the second sentence by inserting “, except section 2208,” after “chapter”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“2208. Claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure.”

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by paragraph (2)(C) shall be construed to—

(A) affect the requirement of section 2207 of title 44, United States Code, that Vice Presidential records shall be subject to chapter 22 of that title in the same manner as Presidential records; or

(B) affect any claim of constitutionally based privilege by a President or former President with respect to a Vice Presidential record.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2201 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “memorandums” and inserting “memoranda”;

(B) by striking “audio, audiovisual” and inserting “audio and visual records”; and

(C) by inserting “, whether in analog, digital, or any other form” after “mechanical recordings”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “advise and assist” and inserting “advise or assist”.

(c) MANAGEMENT AND CUSTODY OF PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—Section 2203 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “maintained” and inserting “preserved and maintained”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “advise and assist” and inserting “advise or assist”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g);

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

“(f) During a President’s term of office, the Archivist may maintain and preserve Presidential records on behalf of the President,

including records in digital or electronic form. The President shall remain exclusively responsible for custody, control, and access to such Presidential records. The Archivist may not disclose any such records, except under direction of the President, until the conclusion of a President’s term of office, if a President serves consecutive terms upon the conclusion of the last term, or such other period provided for under section 2204 of this title.”; and

(5) in subsection (g)(1), as so redesignated, by striking “Act” and inserting “chapter”.

(d) RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS.—Section 2204 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) The Archivist shall not make available any original Presidential records to any individual claiming access to any Presidential record as a designated representative under section 2205(3) of this title if that individual has been convicted of a crime relating to the review, retention, removal, or destruction of records of the Archives.”

(e) DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT FOR OFFICIAL BUSINESS CONDUCTED USING NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2209. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of an executive agency may not create or send a Presidential record using a non-official electronic messaging account unless such officer or employee—

“(1) copies an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee in the original creation or transmission of the Presidential record; or

“(2) forwards a complete copy of the Presidential record to an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee within five days after the original creation or transmission of the Presidential record.

“(b) ADVERSE ACTIONS.—The intentional violation of subsection (a) (including any rules, regulations, or other implementing guidelines), as determined by the appropriate supervisor, shall be a basis for disciplinary action in accordance with subchapter I, II, or V of chapter 75 of title 5, as the case may be.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—The term ‘electronic messages’ means electronic mail and other electronic messaging systems that are used for purposes of communicating between individuals.

“(2) ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—The term ‘electronic messaging account’ means any account that sends electronic messages.

“(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ‘executive agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(3), is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2209. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts.”

SEC. 3. NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ACCEPTANCE OF RECORDS FOR HISTORICAL PRESERVATION.—Section 2107 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2107. Acceptance of records for historical preservation

“(a) IN GENERAL.—When it appears to the Archivist to be in the public interest, the Archivist may—

“(1) accept for deposit with the National Archives of the United States the records of a Federal agency, the Congress, the Architect of the Capitol, or the Supreme Court determined by the Archivist to have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government;

“(2) direct and effect the transfer of records of a Federal agency determined by the Archivist to have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government to the National Archives of the United States, as soon as practicable, and at a time mutually agreed upon by the Archivist and the head of that Federal agency not later than thirty years after such records were created or received by that agency, unless the head of such agency has certified in writing to the Archivist that such records must be retained in the custody of such agency for use in the conduct of the regular business of the agency;

“(3) direct and effect, with the approval of the head of the originating Federal agency, or if the existence of the agency has been terminated, with the approval of the head of that agency’s successor in function, if any, the transfer of records, deposited or approved for deposit with the National Archives of the United States to public or educational institutions or associations; title to the records to remain vested in the United States unless otherwise authorized by Congress; and

“(4) transfer materials from private sources authorized to be received by the Archivist by section 2111 of this title.

“(b) EARLY TRANSFER OF RECORDS.—The Archivist—

“(1) in consultation with the head of the originating Federal agency, is authorized to accept a copy of the records described in subsection (a)(2) that have been in existence for less than thirty years; and

“(2) may not disclose any such records until the expiration of—

“(A) the thirty-year period described in paragraph (1);

“(B) any longer period established by the Archivist by order; or

“(C) any shorter period agreed to by the originating Federal agency.”

(b) MATERIAL ACCEPTED FOR DEPOSIT.—Section 2111 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2111. Material accepted for deposit

“(a) IN GENERAL.—When the Archivist considers it to be in the public interest the Archivist may accept for deposit—

“(1) the papers and other historical materials of a President or former President of the United States, or other official or former official of the Government, and other papers relating to and contemporary with a President or former President of the United States, subject to restrictions agreeable to the Archivist as to their use; and

“(2) recorded information (as such term is defined in section 3301(a)(2) of this title) from private sources that are appropriate for preservation by the Government as evidence of its organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and transactions.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply in the case of any Presidential records which are subject to the provisions of chapter 22 of this title.”

(c) PRESERVATION OF AUDIO AND VISUAL RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2114 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§2114. Preservation of audio and visual records

“The Archivist may make and preserve audio and visual records, including motion-picture films, still photographs, and sound recordings, in analog, digital, or any other form, pertaining to and illustrative of the historical development of the United States Government and its activities, and provide for preparing, editing, titling, scoring, processing, duplicating, reproducing, exhibiting, and releasing for non-profit educational purposes, motion-picture films, still photographs, and sound recordings in the Archivist’s custody.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 21 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the item for section 2114 and inserting the following:

“2114. Preservation of audio and visual records.”

(d) LEGAL STATUS OF REPRODUCTIONS; OFFICIAL SEAL; FEES FOR COPIES AND REPRODUCTIONS.—Section 2116(a) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting “digital,” after “microphotographic,” each place it appears.

SEC. 4. RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 3106 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§3106. Unlawful removal, destruction of records

“(a) FEDERAL AGENCY NOTIFICATION.—The head of each Federal agency shall notify the Archivist of any actual, impending, or threatened unlawful removal, defacing, alteration, corruption, deletion, erasure, or other destruction of records in the custody of the agency, and with the assistance of the Archivist shall initiate action through the Attorney General for the recovery of records the head of the Federal agency knows or has reason to believe have been unlawfully removed from that agency, or from another Federal agency whose records have been transferred to the legal custody of that Federal agency.

“(b) ARCHIVIST NOTIFICATION.—In any case in which the head of a Federal agency does not initiate an action for such recovery or other redress within a reasonable period of time after being notified of any such unlawful action described in subsection (a), or is participating in, or believed to be participating in any such unlawful action, the Archivist shall request the Attorney General to initiate such an action, and shall notify the Congress when such a request has been made.”

SEC. 5. DISPOSAL OF RECORDS.

(a) DEFINITION OF RECORDS.—Section 3301 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§3301. Definition of records

“(a) RECORDS DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As used in this chapter, the term ‘records’—

“(A) includes all recorded information, regardless of form or characteristics, made or received by a Federal agency under Federal law or in connection with the transaction of public business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that agency or its legitimate successor as evidence of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities of the United States Government or because of the informational value of data in them; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) library and museum material made or acquired and preserved solely for reference or exhibition purposes; or

“(ii) duplicate copies of records preserved only for convenience.

“(2) RECORDED INFORMATION DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘recorded information’ includes all traditional forms of records, regardless of physical form or characteristics, including information created, manipulated, communicated, or stored in digital or electronic form.

“(b) DETERMINATION OF DEFINITION.—The Archivist’s determination whether recorded information, regardless of whether it exists in physical, digital, or electronic form, is a record as defined in subsection (a) shall be binding on all Federal agencies.”

(b) REGULATIONS COVERING LISTS OF RECORDS FOR DISPOSAL, PROCEDURE FOR DISPOSAL, AND STANDARDS FOR REPRODUCTION.—Section 3302(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “photographic or microphotographic processes” and inserting “photographic, microphotographic, or digital processes”.

(c) LISTS AND SCHEDULES OF RECORDS TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE ARCHIVIST BY HEAD OF EACH GOVERNMENT AGENCY.—Section 3303(1) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “photographed or microphotographed” and inserting “photographed, microphotographed, or digitized”.

(d) EXAMINATION BY ARCHIVIST OF LISTS AND SCHEDULES OF RECORDS LACKING PRESERVATION VALUE; DISPOSAL OF RECORDS.—Section 3303a(c) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives” and inserting “the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate”.

(e) PHOTOGRAPHS OR MICROPHOTOGRAPHS OF RECORDS CONSIDERED AS ORIGINALS; CERTIFIED REPRODUCTIONS ADMISSIBLE IN EVIDENCE.—Section 3312 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “Photographs or microphotographs of records” and inserting “Photographs, microphotographs of records, or digitized records”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “photographs or microphotographs” and inserting “photographs, microphotographs, or digitized records”, each place it appears.

SEC. 6. PROCEDURES TO PREVENT UNAUTHORIZED REMOVAL OF CLASSIFIED RECORDS FROM NATIONAL ARCHIVES.

(a) CLASSIFIED RECORDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Archivist shall prescribe internal procedures to prevent the unauthorized removal of classified records from the National Archives and Records Administration or the destruction or damage of such records, including when such records are accessed or searched electronically. Such procedures shall include, at a minimum, the following prohibitions:

(1) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not view classified records in any room that is not secure, except in the presence of National Archives and Records Administration personnel or under video surveillance.

(2) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not be left alone with classified records, unless that individual is under video surveillance.

(3) An individual, other than covered personnel, may not review classified records while possessing any cellular phone, electronic personal communication device, or any other devices capable of photographing, recording, or transferring images or content.

(4) An individual seeking access to review classified records, as a precondition to such

access, must consent to a search of their belongings upon conclusion of their records review.

(5) All notes and other writings prepared by an individual, other than covered personnel, during the course of a review of classified records shall be retained by the National Archives and Records Administration in a secure facility until such notes and other writings are determined to be unclassified, are declassified, or are securely transferred to another secure facility.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED PERSONNEL.—The term “covered personnel” means any individual—

(A) who has an appropriate and necessary reason for accessing classified records, as determined by the Archivist; and

(B) who is either—

(i) an officer or employee of the United States Government with appropriate security clearances; or

(ii) any personnel with appropriate security clearances of a Federal contractor authorized in writing to act for purposes of this section by an officer or employee of the United States Government.

(2) RECORDS.—The term “records” has the meaning given that term under section 3301 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATED TO THE NATIONAL STUDY COMMISSION ON RECORDS AND DOCUMENTS OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 3315 through 3324 of title 44, United States Code, are repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 33 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 3315 through 3324.

SEC. 8. PRONOUN AMENDMENTS.

Title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2116(c), by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”;

(2) in section 2201(2), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”, each place it appears;

(3) in section 2203—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”; and

(II) by striking “those of his Presidential records” and inserting “those Presidential records of such President”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(D) in subsection (d), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(E) in subsection (e), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”; and

(F) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(4) in section 2204—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “his” and inserting “a President’s”; and

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “his” and inserting “the President’s”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking “his” the first place it appears and inserting “the Archivist’s”; and

(II) by striking “his designee” and inserting “the Archivist’s designee”;

(5) in section 2205—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “his”

and inserting “the incumbent President’s”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “his” and inserting “the former President’s”;

(6) in section 2901(11), by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”;

(7) in section 2904(c)(6), by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”;

(8) in section 2905(a)—

(A) by striking “He” and inserting “The Archivist”; and

(B) by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”;

(9) in section 3103, by striking “he” and inserting “the head of such agency”;

(10) in section 3104—

(A) by striking “his” the first place it appears and inserting “such official’s”; and

(B) by striking “him or his” and inserting “such official or such official’s”;

(11) in section 3105, by striking “he” and inserting “the head of such agency”;

(12) in section 3302(1), by striking “him” and inserting “the Archivist”; and

(13) in section 3303a—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “him” and inserting “the Archivist”, each place it appears; and

(ii) by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”;

(C) in subsection (e), by striking “his” and inserting “the Archivist’s”; and

(D) in subsection (f), by striking “he” and inserting “the Archivist”.

SEC. 9. RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY THE ARCHIVIST.

(a) OBJECTIVES OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Section 2902 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “creation and of records maintenance and use” and inserting “creation, maintenance, transfer, and use”;

(2) in paragraph (6), by inserting after “Federal paperwork” the following: “and the transfer of records from Federal agencies to the National Archives of the United States in digital or electronic form to the greatest extent possible”; and

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking “the Administrator or”.

(b) RECORDS CENTERS AND CENTRALIZED MICROFILMING SERVICES.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 2907 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the section heading by inserting “or digitization” after “microfilming”; and

(B) by inserting “or digitization” after “microfilming”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 2907 by inserting “or digitization” after “microfilming”.

(c) GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR RECORDS MANAGEMENT.—Section 2904 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Archivist”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “their” and inserting “the”;

(ii) by striking “subsection (a) or (b), respectively” and inserting “subsections (a) and (b)”;

(iii) by striking “and the Administrator”;

and

(iv) by striking “each”; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking “or the Administrator (as the case may be)”;

(3) subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) The Archivist shall promulgate regulations requiring all Federal agencies to transfer all digital or electronic records to the National Archives of the United States in digital or electronic form to the greatest extent possible.”.

(d) INSPECTION OF AGENCY RECORDS.—Section 2906 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “their respective” and inserting “the”;

(ii) by striking “the Administrator of General Services and”;

(iii) by striking “designee of either” and inserting “the Archivist’s designee”;

(iv) by striking “solely”; and

(v) by inserting after “for the improvement of records management practices and programs” the following: “and for determining whether the records of Federal agencies have sufficient value to warrant continued preservation or lack sufficient value to justify continued preservation”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “the Administrator and”;

and

(ii) by striking the second sentence; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “the Administrator or”; and

(II) by striking “designee of either” and inserting “Archivist’s designee”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the Administrator, the Archivist,” and inserting “the Archivist”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “the Administrator and”;

and

(B) by striking “designee of either” and inserting “Archivist’s designee”.

(e) REPORTS; CORRECTION OF VIOLATIONS.—Section 2115 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “their respective” and inserting “the”;

(B) by striking “and the Administrator”;

and

(C) by striking “each”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “either”;

(B) by striking “or the Administrator”, each place it appears; and

(C) by striking “inaugurated” and inserting “demonstrably commenced”.

(f) RECORDS MANAGEMENT BY THE ARCHIVIST.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—The heading for chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “AND BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters at the beginning of title 44, United States Code, is amended in the item related to chapter 29 by striking “and by the Administrator of General Services”.

(g) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM OF MANAGEMENT.—Section 3102(2) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Administrator of General Services and”.

SEC. 10. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT FOR OFFICIAL BUSINESS CONDUCTED USING NON-OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2911. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An officer or employee of an executive agency may not create or send a record using a non-official electronic messaging account unless such officer or employee—

“(1) copies an official electronic messaging account of the officer or employee in the original creation or transmission of the record; or

“(2) forwards a complete copy of the record to an official electronic messaging account

of the officer or employee within five days after the original creation or transmission of the record.

“(b) ADVERSE ACTIONS.—The intentional violation of subsection (a) (including any rules, regulations, or other implementing guidelines), as determined by the appropriate supervisor, shall be a basis for disciplinary action in accordance with subchapter I, II, or V of chapter 75 of title 5, as the case may be.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ELECTRONIC MESSAGES.—The term ‘electronic messages’ means electronic mail and other electronic messaging systems that are used for purposes of communicating between individuals.

“(2) ELECTRONIC MESSAGING ACCOUNT.—The term ‘electronic messaging account’ means any account that sends electronic messages.

“(3) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ‘executive agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2911. Disclosure requirement for official business conducted using non-official electronic messaging accounts”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1233 would codify the existing executive order that requires former Presidents to appeal to incumbent Presidents to keep certain Presidential documents privileged under the Presidential Records Act.

This bill would lock into statute a process established by President Ronald Reagan in 1989, restored by President Obama in 2009, and used without controversy by four of the last five Presidents.

The bill would ensure greater transparency for the privilege extension requests by former Presidents and help prevent abuses of the system.

The bill does not expand the limits of executive privilege, nor would it give former Presidents custodial rights over their administration's Presidential records. Let me say that again to make perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker. The bill does not expand the limits of the executive privilege, nor does it give former Presidents custodial rights over their administrations' Presidential records.

What the bill does is shift the focus from the technology used to capture and store information to the informa-

tion itself. Historically, Federal recordkeeping has taken a medium-focused approach to keeping records. In a world where technological advances rapidly and equipment and software become obsolete in months instead of years, making agencies focus their efforts on preserving all information rather than the information in certain forms ensures a more robust historical record, and does so without constant legislative updating.

H.R. 1233 would also create a framework to end the all-too-common practice of executive branch employees using personal email, IM, instant messages, and similar technologies to engage in official Federal business. Specifically, the bill requires official business done on personal accounts be forwarded to an official account within 5 days and authorizes negative personnel actions against individuals who intentionally violate this disclosure requirement.

The bill also phases out paper-focused relics of the current Federal recordkeeping law. The bill would change the so-called 30-year presumption, which lets Federal agencies hold on to their records for a 30-year period before turning them over to the National Archives, a rule which, in the current environment, all but guarantees the information will disappear as the technology used to store that information changes. Imagine delivering punch cards today to the National Archives. It would be a massive challenge to try to make that in a readable form today. Betamax tapes, we see technology change and the need for this to be updated. It would also make it much easier for agencies to turn over their records to the National Archives sooner.

This bill would also eliminate the so-called print-to-file rule, which actually encourages agencies to print out their electronic files and send the paper to the National Archives. Archaic rules like these actually stand in the way of effective recordkeeping.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, I want to begin by thanking Chairman ISSA for supporting this legislation and for making this a bipartisan effort. The Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments is aimed at giving the American people access to the records Presidents create while they are in office.

Under the Presidential Records Act, a President has discretion to restrict access to his records for up to 12 years after he leaves office. After that time, a President can continue to restrict access to his records by arguing that the records are protected by executive privilege.

The Presidential Records Act does not currently include guidelines for the consideration of Presidential privilege claims. This bill would amend the law by adding procedures to ensure the timely release of Presidential records.

Under the bill, current and former Presidents would have up to 90 days to object to release of records or those records would be released. The Presidential and Federal Records Act also would require that any assertion of privilege by a former President be affirmed by the incumbent President or through a court order.

The bill we are considering today also makes clear that the right to assert the privilege is personal to current and former Presidents, and that they not be bequeathed to assistants, relatives, or decedents. Putting this language into statute will ensure that future Presidents are held to the standard first set by President Reagan.

The chairman of the Oversight Committee, Representative DARRELL ISSA, added an amendment during the committee markup of the bill to address the use of personal email by Federal employees. There is nothing currently in the Presidential Records Act or the Federal Records Act that prohibits employees from using personal email accounts to conduct official business. These acts simply require preservation of these records. This bill will continue to allow employees to use their personal email account when necessary, but it would require employees to copy their official email account or forward their email to their official account.

This is a good government bill. Similar versions of this bill overwhelmingly passed the House in two previous Congresses. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1233 so the Senate can take it up quickly and so that it might be sent on to the President for his signature.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I stand with Mr. CUMMINGS in supporting this good government bill that continues to preserve information from the Federal Government for historians and future generations, adapts to modern technology and closes the loophole with respect to private email accounts.

I am a huge supporter, happy we are working together in a bipartisan manner on these and other good government bills.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank our chairman and the members of our committee for making this happen.

Again, there are situations where we find the law needs clarification. This is one of those clarifying opportunities, and we have taken advantage of it in a bipartisan way. Again, I would urge all of our Members to vote in favor of this legislation.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Maryland in urging my colleagues to support H.R. 1233, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1233, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 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. HOLDING) at 5 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. 2860, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1233, by the yeas and nays.

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

OPM IG ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2860) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, 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 Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—418

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Keating
Amash	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Amodei	Doggett	Kelly (PA)
Andrews	Doyle	Kennedy
Bachmann	Duckworth	Kildee
Bachus	Duffy	Kilmer
Barber	Duncan (SC)	Kind
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Barr	Edwards	King (NY)
Barrow (GA)	Ellison	Kinzinger (IL)
Barton	Ellmers	Kirkpatrick
Bass	Engel	Kline
Beatty	Enyart	Kuster
Becerra	Eshoo	Labrador
Benishke	Esty	LaMalfa
Bentivolio	Farenthold	Lamborn
Bera (CA)	Farr	Lance
Bilirakis	Fattah	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Fincher	Lankford
Bishop (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Larson (CT)
Black	Fleming	Latham
Blum	Flores	Latta
Blumener	Forbes	Lee (CA)
Bonamici	Fortenberry	Levin
Boustany	Foster	Lewis
Brady (PA)	Fox	Lipinski
Brady (TX)	Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo
Braley (IA)	Franks (AZ)	Loeb
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren
Brooks (AL)	Fudge	Long
Brooks (IN)	Gallego	Lowenthal
Broun (GA)	Garamendi	Lowey
Brown (FL)	Garcia	Lucas
Brownley (CA)	Gardner	Luetkemeyer
Bucshon	Garrett	Lujan Grisham
Burgess	Gerlach	(NM)
Bustos	Gibbs	Lujan, Ben Ray
Butterfield	Gibson	(NM)
Byrne	Gingrey (GA)	Lummis
Calvert	Gohmert	Lynch
Camp	Goodlatte	Maffei
Campbell	Gosar	Maloney,
Cantor	Gowdy	Carolyn
Capito	Granger	Maloney, Sean
Capps	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Capuano	Graves (MO)	Marino
Cárdenas	Grayson	Massie
Carney	Green, Al	Matheson
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	Matsui
Carter	Griffin (AR)	McAllister
Cartwright	Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)
Cassidy	Grijalva	McCaul
Castor (FL)	Grimm	McClintock
Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McCollum
Chabot	Gutiérrez	McDermott
Chaffetz	Hahn	McGovern
Chu	Hall	McHenry
Cicilline	Hanabusa	McIntyre
Clark (MA)	Hanna	McKeon
Clarke (NY)	Harper	McKinley
Clay	Harris	McMorris
Clyburn	Hartzler	Rodgers
Coble	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Coffman	Hastings (WA)	Meadows
Cohen	Heck (NV)	Meehan
Cole	Heck (WA)	Meeks
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Meng
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Messer
Conaway	Higgins	Mica
Connolly	Himes	Michaud
Cook	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)
Cooper	Holding	Miller (MI)
Costa	Holt	Miller, Gary
Cotton	Honda	Miller, George
Courtney	Horsford	Moore
Cramer	Hoyer	Moran
Crawford	Hudson	Mullin
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Crowley	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Cuellar	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Cummings	Hultgren	Nadler
Daines	Hunter	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Hurt	Neal
Davis, Danny	Israel	Negrete McLeod
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Neugebauer
DeFazio	Jackson Lee	Noem
DeGette	Jeffries	Nolan
Delaney	Jenkins	Nugent
DeLauro	Johnson (GA)	Nunes
DelBene	Johnson (OH)	Nunnelee
Denham	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Olson
DeSantis	Jordan	Owens
DesJarlais	Joyce	Palazzo
Deutch	Kaptur	Pascarell

Pastor (AZ)	Runyan	Thompson (PA)
Paulsen	Ryan (OH)	Thornberry
Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi
Pelosi	Salmon	Tierney
Perlmutter	Sánchez, Linda	Tipton
Perry	T.	Titus
Peters (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Peters (MI)	Sanford	Tsongas
Peterson	Sarbanes	Turner
Petri	Scalise	Upton
Pingree (ME)	Schakowsky	Valadao
Pittenger	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pitts	Schneider	Vargas
Pocan	Schock	Veasey
Poe (TX)	Schrader	Vela
Polis	Schwartz	Velázquez
Pompeo	Schweikert	Visclosky
Posey	Scott (VA)	Wagner
Price (GA)	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Price (NC)	Scott, David	Walden
Quigley	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Radel	Serrano	Walz
Rahall	Sessions	Wasserman
Rangel	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Reed	Shea-Porter	Waters
Reichert	Sherman	Waxman
Renacci	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Ribble	Shuster	Webster (FL)
Rice (SC)	Simpson	Weich
Richmond	Sinema	Wenstrup
Rigell	Slaughter	Westmoreland
Roby	Smith (MO)	Whitfield
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Williams
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (FL)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (WA)	Wittman
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Wolf
Rokita	Speier	Womack
Rooney	Stewart	Woodall
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Yarmuth
Roskam	Stutzman	Yoder
Ross	Swalwell (CA)	Yoho
Rothfus	Takano	Young (AK)
Roybal-Allard	Terry	Young (IN)
Royce	Thompson (CA)	
Ruiz	Thompson (MS)	

NOT VOTING—14

Buchanan	Jones	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kingston	Rush
Conyers	McCarthy (NY)	Sires
Culberson	Pallone	Stockman
Gabbard	Payne	

□ 1727

Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. GRIJALVA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

PRESIDENTIAL AND FEDERAL RECORDS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1233) to amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—420

Aderholt Denham Jeffries
 Amash Dent Jenkins
 Amodei DeSantis Johnson (GA)
 Andrews DesJarlais Johnson (OH)
 Bachmann Deutch Johnson, E. B.
 Bachus Diaz-Balart Johnson, Sam
 Barber Dingell Jordan
 Barletta Doggett Joyce
 Barr Doyle Kaptur
 Barrow (GA) Duckworth Keating
 Barton Duffy Kelly (IL)
 Bass Duncan (SC) Kelly (PA)
 Beatty Duncan (TN) Kennedy
 Becerra Edwards Kildee
 Benishek Ellison Kilmer
 Bentivolio Ellmers Kind
 Bera (CA) Engel King (IA)
 Bilirakis Enyart King (NY)
 Bishop (GA) Eshoo Kinzinger (IL)
 Bishop (NY) Esty Kirkpatrick
 Bishop (UT) Farenthold Kline
 Black Farr Kuster
 Blackburn Fattah Labrador
 Blumenauer Fincher LaMalfa
 Bonamici Fitzpatrick Lamborn
 Boustany Fleischmann Lance
 Brady (PA) Fleming Langevin
 Brady (TX) Flores Lankford
 Braley (IA) Forbes Larsen (WA)
 Bridenstine Fortenberry Larson (CT)
 Brooks (AL) Foster Latham
 Brooks (IN) Foxx Latta
 Broun (GA) Frankel (FL) Lee (CA)
 Brown (FL) Franks (AZ) Levin
 Brownley (CA) Frelinghuysen Lewis
 Bucshon Fudge Lipinski
 Burgess Gallego LoBiondo
 Bustos Garamendi Loebsack
 Butterfield Garcia Long
 Byrne Gardner Lowenthal
 Calvert Garrett Loney
 Camp Gerlach Lucas
 Campbell Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Cantor Gibson Lujan Grisham
 Capito Gingrey (GA) (NM)
 Capps Gohmert Lujan, Ben Ray
 Capuano Goodlatte (NM)
 Cárdenas Gosar Lummis
 Carney Gowdy Lynch
 Carson (IN) Granger Maloney
 Carter Graves (GA) Maffei
 Cartwright Graves (MO) Maloney,
 Cassidy Grayson Carolyn
 Castor (FL) Green, Al Maloney, Sean
 Castro (TX) Green, Gene Marchant
 Chabot Griffin (AR) Marino
 Chaffetz Griffith (VA) Massie
 Chu Grijalva Matheson
 Cicilline Grimm Matsui
 Clark (MA) Guthrie McAllister
 Clarke (NY) Gutiérrez McCarthy (CA)
 Clay Hahn McCaul
 Clyburn Hall McClintock
 Coble Hanabusa McCollum
 Coffman Hanna McDermott
 Cohen Harper McGovern
 Cole Harris McHenry
 Collins (GA) Hartzler McIntyre
 Collins (NY) Hastings (FL) McKeon
 Conaway Hastings (WA) McKinley
 Connolly Heck (NV) McMorris
 Conyers Heck (WA) Rodgers
 Cook Hensarling McNeerney
 Cooper Herrera Beutler Meadows
 Costa Higgins Meehan
 Cotton Himes Meeks
 Courtney Hinojosa Meng
 Cramer Holding Messer
 Crawford Holt Mica
 Crenshaw Honda Michaud
 Crowley Horsford Miller (FL)
 Cuellar Hoyer Miller (MI)
 Cummings Hudson Miller, Gary
 Daines Huelskamp Miller, George
 Davis (CA) Huffman Moore
 Davis, Danny Huizenga (MI) Moran
 Davis, Rodney Hultgren Mullin
 DeFazio Hunter Mulvaney
 DeGette Hurt Murphy (FL)
 Delaney Israel Murphy (PA)
 DeLauro Issa Nadler
 DelBene Jackson Lee Napolitano

Neal Rohrabacher Stutzman
 Negrete McLeod Rokita Swallow (CA)
 Neugebauer Rooney Takano
 Noem Ros-Lehtinen Terry
 Nolan Roskam Thompson (CA)
 Nugent Ross Thompson (MS)
 Nunes Rothfus Thompson (PA)
 Nunnelee Roybal-Allard Thornberry
 O'Rourke Royce Tiberi
 Olson Ruiz Tierney
 Owens Runyan Tipton
 Palazzo Ryan (OH) Titus
 Pallone Ryan (WI) Tonko
 Pascrell Salmon Tsongas
 Pastor (AZ) Sánchez, Linda Turner
 Paulsen T. Upton
 Pearce Sanchez, Loretta Valadao
 Pelosi Sanford Van Hollen
 Perlmutter Sarbanes Vargas
 Perry Scalise Veasey
 Peters (CA) Schakowsky Vela
 Peters (MI) Schiff Velázquez
 Peterson Schneider Visclosky
 Petri Schock Wagner
 Pingree (ME) Schrader Walberg
 Pittenger Schwartz Walden
 Pitts Schweikert Walorski
 Pocan Scott (VA) Walz
 Poe (TX) Scott, Austin Wasserman
 Polis Scott, David Schultz
 Pompeo Sensenbrenner Waters
 Posey Serrano Waxman
 Price (GA) Sessions Weber (TX)
 Price (NC) Sewell (AL) Webster (FL)
 Quigley Shea-Porter Welch
 Radel Sherman Wenstrup
 Rahall Shimkus Westmoreland
 Rangel Shuster Whitfield
 Reed Simpson Williams
 Reichert Sinema Wilson (FL)
 Renacci Slaughter Wilson (SC)
 Ribble Smith (MO) Wittman
 Rice (SC) Smith (NE) Wolf
 Richmond Smith (NJ) Womack
 Rigell Smith (TX) Woodall
 Roby Smith (WA) Yarmuth
 Roe (TN) Southerland Yoder
 Rogers (AL) Speier Yoho
 Rogers (KY) Stewart Young (AK)
 Rogers (MI) Stivers Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Buchanan Jones Ruppertsberger
 Cleaver Kingston Rush
 Culberson McCarthy (NY) Sires
 Gabbard Payne Stockman

□ 1735

Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3547, SPACE LAUNCH LIABILITY INDEMNIFICATION EXTENSION ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 17, 2014, THROUGH JANUARY 24, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-327) on the resolution (H. Res. 458) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014; providing for proceedings during the period from January 17, 2014, through January 24, 2014; and for other purposes, which was re-

ferred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SERVING THOSE WHO SERVED IN UNIFORM

(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, as a father of a Purple Heart wounded warrior and father-in-law of a recently discharged soldier, my promise is to serve and advocate for those who serve this country. Our troops have earned our support not just during their service, but after they return to civilian life.

I am proud to support the COLAs for medically retired Armed Forces personnel and survivors, particularly doing away with the 1 percent reduction that has been put in place. This will be considered in the House later this week under the Consolidated Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014.

Also included in this legislation is a 1 percent pay raise for our troops, as well as funding and guidance for the Department of Defense to support our warfighters overseas and our military and humanitarian missions around the globe.

Our military must remain strong to enforce the peace, and the soldiers, airmen, sailors, and marines that make this happen must always be the best trained and equipped force in the world.

Mr. Speaker, let's continue to serve those who serve in uniform. Our American heroes deserve as much.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, somewhere in America a young child will not be able to see their immigrant parents come home this evening. In every State in the Union, there are individuals that are undocumented that simply want an opportunity to work and dream here in America.

I am in the midst of a 1-day fast to encourage the passage of reasonable, sensible, comprehensive immigration reform. Yesterday, 119 Houstonians stood with me to commit to fasting until this bill of comprehensive immigration reform is passed: border security; earned access to citizenship; elements of paying fines; elements of doing charitable work; ensuring that the arts and businesses come together and have the resources and talent that they need; and creating jobs.

In Texas, there are 400,000 immigrants with some billion-plus dollars. Removing that would have a terrible impact on the economy. Passing comprehensive immigration reform is not only economically sound, but it is the

humane, dignified thing to do. This Congress must come together, Republicans and Democrats, and give dignity to those soldiers and others who simply want an opportunity to serve and be part of the American Dream.

□ 1745

CUIDADODESALUD.GOV OR
CAUTIONOFHEALTH.GOV

(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, a large number of Spanish-speaking Americans live in my congressional district. They recently brought to my attention the new 2-month-late Obama enrollment Web site: cuidadodesalud.gov. Here it is right here on the Web site. But in English that translates to: "cautionofhealth.gov." Sounds like a warning to me.

Only the government could be so incompetent to get the title of the Web site wrong. This site is riddled with embarrassing computerized English-to-Spanish translations. Some things are in Spanish, some things are in English, and some things are in Spanglish. This incompetence is insulting and confusing to Americans who speak only Spanish.

Ironically, the Web site does tell the truth: people should be cautious about government health care. The name of the Web site should be officially changed to "Caution:ObamaCare."

It is hard enough to sign up for ObamaCare. If the government decides to have a Spanish ObamaCare Web site, you would think the government and its vast resources could at least have a Spanish Web site in accurate Spanish.

And that's just the way it is.

IDENTITY THEFT PREVENTION

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tax Identity Theft Awareness Week, and I urge my colleagues to join me in working to reduce this invasive crime.

Floridians suffer from some of the highest rates of identity theft in the country, with over 70,000 people filing complaints of identity theft last year. Whether they shop at neighborhood mom-and-pop stores or large retailers, Americans deserve to buy what they need without living in fear of having given away private information or being compromised.

That is why I introduced the Safe ID Act, in order to address the growing problem of identity theft and tax fraud.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and other common-sense efforts to stop this heinous crime.

HONORING THE CAREER OF
DANIEL LEHMAN

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Mr. Daniel Lehman and his outstanding contributions to our Nation's scientific community.

By developing and implementing project peer review and evaluation processes for the Department of Energy's Office of Science, he has had a profound impact on many large-scale scientific construction projects, helping to complete them on time and on budget.

Known as "Lehman Reviews," his processes have been recognized and copied worldwide as a best practice for managing large and complex scientific construction projects.

During over 30 years of Federal service, until his retirement on January 3, 2014, his dedication to excellence and proactive approach shepherded many scientific facilities to successful construction and operation.

His passion, devotion, and commitment to improving the management culture of highly complex projects has made a tremendous impact on the vitality, perception, and future of the Office of Science programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Daniel Lehman for his inspiring leadership and outstanding contributions to our Nation's scientific programs.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back on the floor once again as we have for most every week to talk about jobs in America, to talk about the unemployed, to talk about those who are less fortunate and those who need a strong Federal program to create jobs.

I often start with this because it is kind of the compass, the touchstone of what, at least, I would like to think we ought to be doing.

This is from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This is actually on one of the marble slabs at his memorial here in Washington, D.C. It reads this way:

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

All across America today there are far too many that have too little. A couple of weeks ago, I did a jobs fair in Fairfield, California. It was about 38 degrees outside that day, and we had just under 1,000 people come to that

jobs fair—there were about 50 employers—and maybe 50–70 people actually got jobs.

This is a picture of the men and women that were lined up waiting to get in to have a very quick interview with one or more of those 50 potential employers.

I have used this photo before here on the floor to point out the need for a jobs program here in America. The President 2 years ago in his State of the Union put forth a proposal. It had several elements—and we will probably cover some of those today—but it has not been enacted. The Republican leadership in this House has refused to pass even one of those jobs programs. There was infrastructure, education, reeducation; there were programs to provide for the opportunity for men and women to get jobs here in the United States.

But I was looking at this photo just today and I said, I am going to use this again, because in this photo approximately half of the people lined up, 1,000, just under 1,000 were women. It caused me to think about another program that the Democratic minority here in the House has been working on for some time, that is, the issue of women in the American economy.

I know that in my own district there is this issue of equal pay for equal work. A woman doing stenography work next to a man doing stenography work would be paid 85 cents while the man is paid \$1. So it is 85 cents when a man would have the same job, same skill set, same tenure, would get \$1. That is wrong. It is one of the issues we want to address.

Also we know that many of the women that are searching for work here are going to be finding minimum-wage jobs. Now, California is different. We have already passed a minimum-wage law in California that in another year and a half will be \$10 plus a little. But the national is still at \$7-plus; way, way under what anybody working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year could possibly support a family on. So the minimum wage is another issue for women, as it is for men; but I dare say more so for women than for men.

There is a multitude of issues that we need to consider as we talk about jobs, employment, increasing the employment opportunities in the United States for these people; men and women, and particularly women, that are lined up wanting to get a job.

Joining me tonight is an extraordinary group of people who have been working on this issue of women and jobs, employment, equal employment opportunities, daycare, family care programs.

I would like to start with JAN SCHKOWSKY of Illinois, who has been one of the leaders throughout this entire Nation, often seen on television speaking to this issue and the issue of opportunity in America.

JAN, would you care to start us off on this 1-hour and talking about women and jobs.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for coming to the floor and talking about the community. And it really is “the economy stupid” for most Americans who feel a sense of growing insecurity. Wages haven’t gone up for decades.

But the leader, our leader, NANCY PELOSI of our leadership, has launched a campaign on behalf of women in America saying, when women win, America wins, and highlighting the issues that really affect women day to day, calling for things like affordable child care, an increase in the minimum wage, paid leave, which it turns out is a major priority of women.

I see you have got a sign there.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Would you like to have it?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. No. Why don’t we just turn our attention to that sign.

Ending the gender pay gap, which actually is 77 cents to the dollar that men earn; paid sick leave; permanent child tax credit; improve diagnosis and care for Alzheimer’s patients; and on and on.

But we have been bolstered by an incredible new effort that has turned into a remarkable book called: “The Shriver Report.” It is a co-effort, and it is a study by Maria Shriver and the Center for American Progress called: “A Woman’s Nation Pushes Back from the Brink.”

The idea here is to give a voice to women. It has got all the facts and figures one would want; but it also has the stories, the actual voice of women who feel so pressured by this economy, but also feel that their voices aren’t being heard.

It is a really important book. I wanted to read on the back there are kind of some of these “wow” facts that are there that everyone should keep in mind about the status of women in our economy:

One in three women in America is living in poverty or teetering on its brink. That’s 42 million women plus the 28 million children who depend on them.

The second bullet:

The American family has changed. Today, only one in five families has a homemaker mom and working dad. Two out of three families depend on the wages of working moms who are struggling to balance caregiving and breadwinning.

Three:

The average woman continues to be paid 77 cents for every dollar the average man earns. The average African American woman earns only 64 cents and the average Latina only 55 compared to White men.

The fourth bullet:

Closing the wage gap between men and women would cut the poverty rate in half for working women and their families and would add nearly half a trillion dollars to the national economy.

Five:

Women are nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers, and a vast majority of these workers receive no paid sick days. Not one.

When they did a survey of what is the number one thing that you want,

women said: sick days for themselves and to go home and take care of their children.

Six:

More than half of the babies born to women under the age of 30 are born to unmarried mothers, most of them White.

Seven:

Nearly two-thirds of Americans and 85 percent of millennials believe that government should adapt to the reality of single-parent families and use its resources to help children and mothers succeed, regardless of family status.

So the American people, two-thirds say government does, in fact, have a role.

Eight:

An overwhelming 96 percent of single mothers say paid leave is a workplace policy that would help them most, and nearly 80 percent of all Americans say the government should expand access to high-quality, affordable child care.

That is a worry that so many mothers have every single day.

□ 1800

Nine, women living on the brink overwhelmingly regret not making education a bigger priority.

Ten, the trauma and chronic stress of poverty are toxic to children, making them two-and-a-half times more likely to suffer as adults from COPD, hepatitis, and depression.

So actually, poverty is dangerous to the health of children as they grow into adulthood in very dramatic and particular ways.

And so when we think about poverty in America, when we think about extending unemployment benefits, when we talk about the SNAP program, and when we push to raise the minimum wage, one of the important lenses to look through is how is it affecting the women, one-third of whom are on the brink or actually living in poverty.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Those statistics are a wake-up call for America. More than half the population are female, and yet our policies are not women-friendly policies. Our laws are not women-friendly laws, and we need to change that.

I would like now to yield to my colleague from California, JANICE HAHN, a longtime city councilwoman in the City of Los Angeles, a woman who knows these issues from her experience representing the communities in that area and now an outstanding Member of the Congress.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you. I appreciate you taking this first hour tonight to focus on women and jobs. It is certainly an issue that we women are very aware of and have worked on a lot in our jobs, in our districts, in our homes, but it is nice when our men are enlightened.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might interrupt for a moment.

I am highly motivated. My wife of almost 48 years now and my five daughters keep my constantly abreast of this issue.

Ms. HAHN. Good for them.

I think, as JAN SCHAKOWSKY talked about, NANCY PELOSI and ROSA DELAUNO, we have had this incredible campaign called When Women Succeed, America Succeeds. The point is it is good to help women in this country because this will really help America to succeed. And we no longer have the kind of families that many of us watched on television in the fifties. In fact, the American family has permanently changed, and women head up more families on their own. More than half of the babies born to women ages 30 and younger are born to unmarried women—by the way, most of them White.

We have got women who are heading their families. We have got women who are trying to take care of their families. They are now the sole breadwinners in their family. They are not necessarily the second income or the income that helps out with the man having the major income.

The statistic, I think, out of the Shriver Report that was really eye-opening for me, when we talk about the minimum wage, is that two-thirds of the workers who earned a minimum wage in this country are women. And if we could raise this minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour, how many more women that would lift out of poverty. And not just the women, their families. We have too many families, children, who are living on the brink, and this is so important.

To talk about women wanting sick days, it is unbelievable to me how many women who work in these minimum wage jobs don’t get sick days. Do you know how many women have the painful choice of either putting their sick child on the bus to go to school or staying home and losing a day’s wages to take care of their sick child because we don’t have the kind of child care in this country that can accommodate children who are not well enough to go to school? We have women choosing between missing a day’s work—possibly if they have too many of those, they are going to lose their job—or putting a sick child on the bus to go to school.

We need to raise the minimum wage. We need to have affordable child care. We need to make sure that women have sick days that they can use either for themselves—mostly it is never for yourself when you are a mother. You forgo being sick as a mother and you spend those days for your children.

How many women are taking care of their parents? Even though many women have brothers in the family, it usually falls to the woman to take care of her parents when they become ill or need help being taken care of. We have got to really focus on women making sure they have good jobs.

By the way, our women veterans—our women veterans in this country—have the highest unemployment rate. That is terrible to think that our women who have put their lives on the line for this country come home and

cannot find good jobs to take care of themselves or their families.

I am glad we are doing this tonight. I think it is an important message. I think the Shriver Report that was just released really sheds light on how many women in this country are near or on the brink of living in poverty.

Thank you for doing this tonight.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative HAHN, thank you so very, very much.

This chart here, When Women Succeed, America Succeeds, picks up a handful of the bills that have been introduced by the Democratic Caucus, many of these bills by women, a few men along the way. These are the kinds of things that we really ought to be dealing with here as we move—or, unfortunately, fail to move—legislation.

Paycheck fairness, this is the issue of that 77 percent in California, my district being about 85 percent.

The minimum wage, which we talked about here. The issue you raised Representative HAHN about paid sick leave and the problems that occur. Make permanent the child tax credit, which is exceedingly important in providing that income necessary to support the kid. The education issues, and I notice one of my colleagues, MIKE HONDA, will talk about that in a few moments.

I would like now—and we will pick up the rest. This one down here is one really at the bottom, Alzheimer's, and you mentioned this. The children are now taking care of their parents. Of course, the children are now in their fifties, sixties, and the parents are in their seventies and eighties and beyond. And this issue of Alzheimer's, an overwhelming tidal wave is coming on us.

I know in our own home, the last 2 years of my wife's mother's life was spent in our home. She and I, my wife had night care taking care of her. Fortunately, we were able to have day care come in. This is a huge, growing issue, one in which we need to find ways to support the children taking care of their parents in their homes.

I would like now to turn to another colleague from Ohio, one who has often joined me here on the floor. And thank you so very, very much, MARCY, for joining us, MARCY KAPTUR, who has a great deal to do with the appropriations process. Congratulations on the omnibus bill just coming up.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI. Thank you for bringing us together as you so often do. We are so fortunate that you are here and bringing us together as voices from the heart of America here in our Nation's Capital to talk about what is on the minds of the vast majority of the American people, and that relates to their family life, how they are going to survive in this economy.

In listening to the statistics that Congresswomen SCHAKOWSKY and HAHN were relating, what has happened to family life in this country, because many times if you read articles, you

see families can't hold it together. Why? Because of money, because of their inability to hold the household together because the jobs just vaporized. And when you have trade deficits for 30 years in our country, and we have an average of 15 factories closing every day, jobs vaporize. It doesn't matter where you live—whether it is Ohio, California, Florida, New York—American people have felt directly the impact of this global economy, and many times they can't hold the social unit of the family together.

Many, many of the women who are supporting their children now have done so because of fallout in the economy. What you say about the gender pay gap is absolutely there.

I was very surprised to learn in Ohio, as a result of a study done by Progress Ohio, that, in fact, one of the major companies, I think the largest company in our country, Walmart, employs about 4,500 people in Ohio. And of their employees, those employees that work for minimum wage, or probably less if they are part-time, they apply for food stamps, for SNAP assistance. So they are trying to support their families. Just those in Ohio are using \$23 million in Federal food support because they can't earn enough to feed their families. And this type of corporate behavior is repeated over and over and over again, so essentially what is happening is the Federal Government ends up subsidizing low wages because the workers can't earn enough to support their families.

I am fortunate enough to come from a working class family. Our mother worked; our grandmother worked. Thank God for Franklin Roosevelt, because I think what our family has lived represents the story of a vast numbers of Americans.

Our grandmother could hardly speak English. She worked in hotels, in kitchens, peeling carrots and potatoes and so forth, washing dishes, paid the immigrant workers the very least. And then her husband always out of work, taking in tenants in their home. And they lived in 13 different places because they could never manage to own anything, trying to just hold it together with a sick daughter and a husband who often lost his job. So that was Grandma on one side of the family.

Then our mother, who became the sole support of her parents—and five children in that family—working at age 13, going across town to clean homes and so forth, it wasn't until the Democrats under Roosevelt passed the minimum wage that she began earning something more than she earned before.

Do you know what happened in the first place she worked, which was a little luncheonette on Broadway in Toledo, Ohio? When the minimum wage was passed initially, her boss, who wasn't such a nice guy, would cash her check and then pocket the difference between what she used to earn and what she then earned in the workplace.

That was before we had the Department of Labor fully developed and we had inspectors on the job and so forth.

This is what American working women have dealt with for generations. And so I have to say, I am so proud I am standing on the shoulders of families like my own to be a voice for these women and these families whose economic struggle is excruciating. It is excruciating. Many of them don't have cars.

Our own mother, she was brilliant. She should be here, not me. She never got her high school equivalency until after she went on Social Security. And there were two things she had in her billfold when she died. One was her library card because she was brilliant, but the other one was her Social Security and Medicare card—because of Democrats. Because of Democrats, she could die with dignity.

I think about the families across this country, and I am so proud to be a voice for them here. I want to thank you very much for standing up for a raise in the minimum wage so that people who are struggling out there don't have to be on food stamps and EBT coupons because they are trying to earn their way forward. They should earn a decent wage, that working family life, paid sick leave.

I took care of our mother when she was ill. I know how hard it was to try to work and to care for someone who was so ill.

I just left a funeral home over the weekend in Ohio where a former county engineer, George Wilson, lost his beautiful wife, Pat, to Alzheimer's. And what were you saying, Congressman GARAMENDI, what this took for that family and that working daughter to try to hold everything together. It is such a cruel illness. So any help for caregivers across this country, for making caregiving a profession where you earn a decent wage, however we figure out how to do that, we are going to need it in the coming years.

□ 1815

So I support my colleagues in their efforts to raise the minimum wage, to close the gender pay gap, to make sure that there is paid leave, to make sure that we work as a society to find ways to care for those who are ill. I know that with men such as yourself and those who are on the floor this evening, and with women who have now been educated and able to fully participate in this society and to express the needs from coast-to-coast, we will change this country for the better.

Thank you so very much for coming down here this evening. I agree with you that when women succeed, America succeeds, but we can't do it without our men.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much for your work on the appropriations and pushing these issues along.

Representative MIKE HONDA from California has been working on the issues of education for many, many

years and has some insights into how this issue of women and equality are taken up in the educational area.

Mr. HONDA, if you would like to proceed.

Mr. HONDA. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, for putting these evening discussions on the board here.

I want to also rise to join you and other colleagues of mine in commemorating the 50th anniversary of President Lyndon Johnson's declaration of the war on poverty, and, as you had mentioned, President Franklin Roosevelt's effort to close the income gap. The inequities that we have faced and we are still facing are growing even larger today because of the gender pay gap, because of the unpaid portions where people have to leave their work in order to take care of their children or their families. Also, to be able to address the child care issues that became very prominent in the seventies, when both parents started to work and wondered how they were going to be addressing child care.

Also, we have the caregiver support, where adult children are taking care of their parents. We are seeing that this is a necessity that has crept up on our society and our community, almost very quietly, and become an issue because of different kinds of situations our parents are facing, not only because of the physical illness but because of the mental health illness that they have faced.

So all these things play a part in drawing down the resources of middle-income families trying to take care of their own responsibilities, raising their own family, and also the responsibility of their parents who are aging.

In the area of universal pre-K education and early childhood education, both President Roosevelt and Johnson knew that education is an important tool in this war on poverty and closing the income inequity gap.

Last week, I read an article in the Lexington-Herald Leader about two schools in east Kentucky, just hours apart from each other—Anchorage and Barbourville, two communities of about 3,000 in population.

The median household income in Anchorage is more than 3.5 times larger than the median income of that of Barbourville. Yet Barbourville spends only \$8,000 per student, while Anchorage spends approximately \$20,000 per student. Equal size population, only a couple hours apart.

The question comes up: Why is it that this country, our communities, continue to refuse to recognize the inequities in funding in our public schools? Why is that?

The quality of education that our children receive should not be dependent on or determined by the ZIP Code in which they live or in which they were born. Each and every child should receive support according to their needs, not according to the ZIP Code in which they reside—each and every child.

In the fifties, when we realized that the States were responsible for education, we interpreted it as the States' constitutional responsibility to move forward on education, and we found that some States had a principle of separate but equal. In the fifties, we realized that that was not supportable, not constitutional, and this became an issue in our current time when we were able to bring this issue to the living rooms of our country through technology—television. Upon this country and the States becoming more aware of what was going on, on a Federal level we moved the communities to correct this inequity, the unconstitutionality of separate but equal in our education systems and other policies in our different communities and different States.

Today, we have come to a point where we understand that equal opportunity for all children is a necessary principle, but I think, having studied education a little bit more, we should refine that principle into another principle, to wit: each and every child should receive support according to their needs, not according to the ZIP Codes or the median income of their parents.

One of the more important steps to accomplish this and achieve equity in funding for our youngsters in the pre-school and early childhood education arena is to fully fund Head Start for each and every child. So we must encourage States to adopt a more equitable funding formula to ensure that each and every child receives the necessary financial and human resources required.

President Obama declared that he has an initiative that addresses universal preschool education. The Governor of California, Jerry Brown, passed a bond that said that we want more equitable funding for children in the State of California. We passed a bond that increased the funding for education to achieve more equitable funding for each and every child. It is the first step. It is the right direction, but we have miles and miles to go.

This journey for equitable funding for each and every child is a journey that we must continue and start now, in order to achieve the civil rights of each and every child in this country.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative HONDA, thank you so very much.

Among the many pieces of legislation that the Democratic Caucus has put forward on this issue of when women succeed, America succeeds is the issue of universal pre-K. Head Start is one part of that. There are many other kinds of programs, but it is absolutely clear that if we have universal educational opportunities before kindergarten and beyond that the chance of a kid making it in this economy is going to be substantially greater.

This is just part of the agenda over the next several months. We will be talking about the remaining portions of the agenda that we are putting forth.

We know that if this Nation is to succeed, we better make sure that the majority of our population, the women in our society—girls young and old—have every opportunity to succeed. There are barriers, some legal, some historic, and some custom, that make it very difficult for women to have an equal chance in our economy.

So we are going to address those. We would like to have the Republican side of the House work with us on those issues. We know that one of the major parts of that is the minimum wage issue. That is front and center.

I would like now to turn to my colleague from New York, who has joined me all so often, but never quite enough, on the floor.

Representative TONKO, you have been on this issue of economic development for so long. I think it is almost 4 years now we have been dealing with this, not every week, but often talking about jobs in America, economic growth, and what we can do.

Why don't you pick it up and carry the ball for a while, and then we will see where we are.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you to the gentleman from California for yielding.

I want to thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for leading us in an hour of very important discussion which highlights the efforts of the Democratic Caucus within the House of Representatives. I, for one, am very proud to serve with a group of leaders, women and men, within that Democratic Caucus who have a vision of where they want to take this Nation, how we can address the inequality, how we can empower our economy by reaching to individuals and families across this Nation with an order of economic justice. That, I think, is the moral compass that guides us in that Caucus. I believe that many of these ills within our economy can be resolved.

I, with great interest, listened to the opening of this hour of Special Order, where discussion on the economy began with your quoting President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As you cited within that quote the contrast between those who have an abundance and those who have little, we know that in that historic time President Roosevelt guided this Nation with a program, and we had reference to his administration being that of a New Deal.

Today, many of the workers, many working families, women, those who struggle in our economy, are given a bad deal. The bad deal is intolerable. The bad deal needs to be discontinued.

So we work, in very progressive format, here on the House floor offering a Democratic agenda, making certain that all people are embraced, are brought into an inclusive sort of politics where we engage in the ills of the past and correcting those ills of the past, studying them, understanding where the empowerment is required.

Certainly, when you look at some of the issues today, there is this greater impact on women in many measurable

ways. We have the minimum wage issue, with two-thirds of those working in minimum wage being in a category of women.

So we need to address that minimum wage. America stands behind that concept. They understand that if you work hard and are trying to raise a family, you need to do it with great remuneration, with social and economic justice, again, and the appropriateness of enabling people to have just pay for the work that is done.

We can address that with a minimum wage agenda here in the House. I believe that those dollars are recirculated into the economy. People earning a minimum wage are going to spend on the basic essentials of life for themselves and for their family members. So it, I believe, is a way to strengthen regional economies, State economies, and this national economy, by being fair to workers and working families.

There was also talk about the efforts to provide for family leave time, for sick leave, and the worthiness of providing for that and removing of the stress factor within families. It is critical. It is important to quality of life, and it is the right thing, the fair thing to do.

Also, I find very incredibly important the discussion routinely on this House floor about the extension of emergency unemployment insurance. Well, that is something that has received a lot of attention of late, but the leadership of the House is rigid in not addressing the extension of emergency unemployment insurance.

Well, let me tell you that that denial of unemployment insurance has impacted women particularly hard, but both women and men, and families in general.

Let me tell you about two discussions I had this weekend. I gathered with some folks from my district who are communicating with us about the need to have this done. Two individuals—they happen to be women—Laurie, Lisa, and I, and others, had met, along with a local assembly member, Pat Fahey, from the Albany region of New York. We heard their stories.

They have been without work for nearly a year. They have been actively pursuing work, sending out resumes, indicating wherever a job is possible that may fit their skill set, and they are not getting the response they require.

So they have talked about it. We wanted to get a personal saga here, a story. We wanted to relate really well so we could be a stronger voice here on the House floor.

Both Laurie and Lisa brought to my attention the fact that their children are watching this. They are watching this whole episode, and they can't understand the insensitivity, the callousness, the cold-heartedness. They thought that government would be there at a time when their parents were struggling for work. They want to

work. Unemployment insurance means people have paid into that concept. So when you stumble across hard times, somebody will be there to assist you. They are not getting that assistance.

You look at the discrimination, with many that are calling my office, women and men, who may have been 45, 50, 55 years of age, if not 60-some. They are feeling age discrimination as they go to these interviews. They are being bypassed, they believe, because of their age.

So the work out there that they require, where three people are chasing every available job, we need in this post-recession to continue to be there on their behalf. We have never not chosen to reauthorize and provide for the unemployment insurance opportunities.

□ 1830

In the seven recessions that have followed since 1958, we have always extended that unemployment insurance. Why now? Why now do we say no?

We need to be sensitive. We need to understand that many people, a great number of women, require this reauthorization. A number of people are feeling age-discriminated against, and so the right thing to do is to empower these families.

The dollars come right back into the economy. In fact, it has been stated that for every dollar of unemployment insurance that is paid to individuals out there, \$1.52 is realized in the local economy, and so it more than pays for itself.

And when the theories out there, when the many institutes, the economic policy institutes, measure the impact of not doing this, we understand full well that it sets back the economy. Some 400,000 jobs are lost. \$400 million was lost in the early stages of not doing the unemployment insurance reauthorization.

So there are many ills that come with a lack of action here. There are many ills that need to be undone that have been decades long, generations long in their impact on women, making certain that, as we empower women, as we empower them, we empower families, we empower this Nation.

There are many things that need to be done, and I, again, am so proud to work with the Caucus that understands it, that gets it, that is trying to be out there speaking the progressive voice of policy reform that will strengthen this economy, grow the economy.

There is no more important issue today than growing our economy, and we do it by a sense of inclusion. With those inclusive politics, women and men, younger workers just entering the workforce, senior workforce members, everyone is empowered when we do the progressive order of reform that enables us to grow this economy.

So Representative GARAMENDI, I am certainly pleased that you are leading us in this discussion on growing the economy, on doing an order of fairness,

social and economic justice that speaks to individuals out there, in many cases, the ills that are borne upon women because of a lack of fine tuning to our policy that needs to be addressed. So I am pleased that you are leading us in this discussion here this evening on the House floor so that we can express the contrast, the difference.

It is not everyone just holding back on progress. There are those who have an agenda that speaks to the common folk, the workers out there, the individuals, the families, the children that are empowered by quality daycare, child care services, that are empowered by a minimum wage increase, empowered by the extension of emergency unemployment insurance, by skills development programs.

There is a package out there, Making It In America, that has been addressed by this Caucus, by the Democratic Caucus in the House, that will grow the economy and strengthen the future and provide a sense of hope.

It has been done. We need to replicate history. We saw what happened when we engaged in issues like Social Security, Medicare, workers' rights, standing up for the individuals out there in order to provide for the remuneration that they require and deserve. That is respect, and that is providing hope for America's working families.

So let's hope we can move forward with a progressive agenda for this Nation's working families.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, I knew that I would enjoy listening to you. The passion, the knowledge, the intensity that you bring to this issue is critically important. You have worked at these issues for a long time, and I want to talk, just wrap up the unemployment insurance issue with going back to where I started here some time ago.

Again, in early December, a jobs fair in Fairfield, California, nearly 1,000 people came to it, 50 employers. More than half of the people in this line are women. I could probably go down through this line. I remember a conversation with a couple of the women here, and they were on unemployment insurance.

Now, unemployment insurance actually started with the New Deal. It was part of the effort to deal with poverty in America, and it was an insurance program, a program into which the employer and the employee pay for insurance for the employee should there be a layoff, should they be unemployed, should that individual be unemployed. It is an insurance program. It is not a welfare program. It is an insurance program.

But if I were to go back down this line and talk to each one of these individuals, probably, maybe, 15 percent of them have lost their unemployment insurance because the House of Representatives has refused to extend the long-term unemployment insurance.

So where are they today?

They are without a job because, as you said, Mr. TONKO, for every job available in America today, there are three people looking for that job. So two are going to go without the employment.

Minimum wage doesn't count because they yet don't have a job. We need to develop a jobs program, and we need to extend that unemployment because these women are mothers of children that now have a family with no income, no unemployment insurance.

The food stamps, the proposal on this floor by our colleagues was to cut the food stamp program by \$40 billion. So where will the food come from? Not from SNAP, which is the new name for the food stamp program, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. That is going to be cut.

Hunger in America among children—one in four children go hungry, and we are adding to it. We are adding to that number today by the refusal to extend the unemployment insurance.

Some 72,000 people will lose their long-term unemployment insurance each month as this rolls along—each week.

Thank you, Mr. TONKO. You are welcome to interrupt me whenever, and we can have a dialogue here. So thanks for the lipreading.

Each week 72,000 people. At the end of the year, another 3½ million will have lost their unemployment insurance. Will they have a job? They could have a better opportunity for a job if we carried out the President's jobs program.

I think we have got about 10 minutes or so. Let's spend some time on that.

I am going to put up one of my favorite and often-used charts here. Mr. TONKO, you will recognize this.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is the Make It in America chart. It is the revitalization of manufacturing in the United States. And I could probably give your speech on the industrialization of the State of New York. I will let you do it, however.

But these are the issues that we think are critical. We have spent most of this night talking about this one—labor. Last week I said we would pick this up, and we are, and particularly focused on women in the labor force. But here it is, trade policies, international trade.

I gave a speech this morning on the maritime industry, the decline of the maritime industry, the necessity of maintaining it. We are a maritime Nation. We have oceans surrounding us, whether it is the Arctic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean, the Caribbean, or the Atlantic Ocean.

So it is trade issues.

Tax policies, why do we continue to subsidize the wealthiest industries in this world? The oil industry, why do we continue to subsidize the oil industry? Energy policy. Fortunately, we are having a good run on the energy issues, and we will come back and talk about that.

Mr. HONDA talked about educational policy, research and infrastructure. These are the elements of the Make It In America agenda. And when we use our tax money to buy American-made equipment, really good things happen. Americans go to work.

In my district, or just on the edge of my district, in Sacramento, Siemens, that huge German manufacturing company, opened a manufacturing plant to build 100 percent American-made locomotives for the first time in generations because, in the stimulus bill, a sentence was added to the support for Amtrak, and that sentence said these locomotives will be 100 percent American-made.

A German company said, oh, \$600, \$700 million contract, we will make them in America. And so all across this Nation, manufacturing companies are now participating in the construction of 100 percent American-made locomotives using American taxpayer money.

That is the key here. Mr. TONKO, I know you get really excited about this issue, as you were about poverty and equality in America just a moment ago. Why don't you pick this up and carry it for a while?

Mr. TONKO. Sure. And I thank, again, the gentleman from California for yielding.

The Make It In America program, the concept of that, is a very strong domestic agenda. In and of itself, it has great merit. But let's put that into the context of the bigger picture, and that is the international sweepstakes for the economy, for landing jobs.

Many of us can recall the global race on space in the sixties, and it was critical to win that race. We had come off a failing moment with Sputnik, dusted off our backside and said never again.

So this Nation committed, with passionate resolve, that we would win that global race on space. That was just two nations, U.S. vs. USSR. Who would land on that Moon, stake their flag first? We were determined it was going to be the United States. And a rather youthful President led the Nation, again, with passionate resolve, so that we had dollars for training, for research, for education, for equipment, and we were going to win that race, and we did.

In my first year in Congress, in 2009, we celebrated the 40th anniversary. Neil Armstrong was here to shake the hands of many Members of Congress, thanking him for the poetry of the moment in that July of 1969. It was more than the one small step for man, one giant step for mankind, the poetry of the moment. It was the unleashing of untold amounts of technology that impacted communications, energy generation, health care. Across the gamut of job creation, technology entered in.

Fast-forward to today. A rather youthful President is asking again that we embrace, with passion, our entry into a global race, this time on innovation and clean energy and high tech. But this time, dozens of competitors.

So Make It In America is noble in and of its own right, but it is critical when we place it into the bigger picture of a global race on innovation. And it is not our choice to determine if we are going to enter the race. Our choice ought to be how prepared, how strong, how competitive will we be as we enter that race.

That requires education, higher education, skills development, energy costs, innovation of all sorts. That comes with the passion of reform. So we need an agenda like that presented with Make It In America that addresses the needs of the workers, that speaks to the empowerment that comes with research which equals jobs. For us to have that pioneer spirit, which I believe is in the DNA of America and her workers, we need to embrace that pioneer spirit and move forward.

Now, Representative GARAMENDI is going to joke that I always talk about the donor area that the 20th Congressional District of New York is and was to the development of the Industrial Revolution in this Nation. But the Erie Canal made a port out of a little town called New York, and then developed into the birthing of a necklace of communities called mill towns that became the epicenters of invention and innovation.

We need that same spirit to be embraced today with this out-of-the-box thinking, where we can bring about the best of America and provide hope for workers, for families across this Nation, and do it in a way that allows us to win this given race, this global race on innovation.

Whoever wins this race, as the President, President Obama, has been quoted oftentimes, will be the kingpin of the international economy. That is an important assignment to this House, the House of Representatives. It is an important assignment to Congress. It is an important challenge to all of us, as Americans, to commit to that agenda of investing, investing in America so that our best days lie ahead. I am convinced that with this sort of progressive thinking, our best days lie ahead, and that we deliver hope to the doorsteps of individuals and families across this Nation with a vision of how we can win this next quarter of global competition.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative TONKO, once again, you have laid it out very, very clearly, the challenge that we have. There are 435 of us here in the House of Representatives. I think we are a little lower than that because of some retirements, but let's just say 435, and 100 Members of Congress. Together with the President, we set the national policy. We set the national agenda. And frankly, at the moment, the agenda is one that has stalled out. Really, we have been prevented from pushing forward an aggressive agenda such as you have described. Those elements, research, education, manufacturing, infrastructure, the role of labor, particularly the role of women

in the labor force, those issues are roadblocked.

□ 1845

There is a stop sign that has been put up here in the House of Representatives that basically says we shouldn't do any of that, that government has no role in any of those issues. I would challenge that philosophy. I would challenge that philosophy with the Founding Fathers.

Our colleagues on the right often talk about we ought to do what the Founding Fathers did. Well, one of the things that George Washington, one of the Founding Fathers, did was to turn to Alexander Hamilton and say, Develop a strategy for American manufacturing, for building the American economy. So Hamilton went off, probably talked to a few people, and came back with a lengthy report, which you would never see nowadays, which was like 30 pages. And in that document, he laid out a strategy for building the American economy.

Interestingly, guess what he talked about. He talked about trade. He talked about infrastructure. Among the infrastructure that was specifically in the plan that Hamilton presented to George Washington, who then presented it to the Congress, was canals. And shortly thereafter, about 30 years later, the Erie Canal.

Here in Washington, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, the canal on the Potomac River. It also talked about roads. It talked about ports. Those were the infrastructure projects of the day. The Constitution, by the way, says that the Federal Government must maintain and build postal roads. Infrastructure, we talk about that nearly all the time we are here.

Research. At that period of time, Thomas Jefferson—not exactly in league with the representatives from New England, but nonetheless—was pushing forward the research agenda and the education agenda. Go back to the Founding Fathers, pick up those elements of economic growth that they put on the American agenda in the very earliest days of this Nation, and carry those forward.

We are not a shy country; but if one would look at the policies emanating from the Congress today, you would think that we are a country that does not envision the necessity of grabbing the strength of the past and using those elements that have created the economic growth and pushing them forward.

We can, and we must, do this. And as we do it, I want to go back to where we started today's discussion, and that is, we started this discussion with the role of women in our economy. 77 cents. Equal pay? No, no. A man will earn \$1; and a woman at the same job, same skill sets, same tenure on the job will earn 77 cents across this Nation. In my own district, it is 85 cents.

A woman working full time at minimum wage cannot earn enough money

in this Nation to feed her child and pay the rent. A woman in this Nation with a child, she has a job, the child gets sick: she is faced with a dilemma.

We need to address these issues; and we must keep in mind the Make It In America agenda, the jobs agenda that we push forward; and we must always remember that when women succeed, America will succeed.

And with that, I thank my colleagues Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, the three women that joined us earlier, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for bringing this message to the American people and to our colleagues here on the floor.

And I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) to wrap up.

Mr. TONKO. I will just indicate that not far from the 20th Congressional District in upstate New York is the Women's Hall of Fame. And just recently, our leader, Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI, was inducted into that hall of fame. We think of the stories of women in the chronicles of American history, the women who embraced sacrifice and struggled to make a difference. Think of what happens when we empower the inexorable outcomes that they have journeyed through over the course of our history. Think of the empowerment that comes. So with the vision of progressive orders of reform, our best days lie ahead; and we can deliver that hope that we are challenged to deliver.

So it has been tremendous speaking with you and our colleagues on the floor here this evening. Let's move forward and provide that hope to America's working families.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the hour, and I yield back the balance of my time.

CALIFORNIA'S HIGH-SPEED RAIL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, our subject here tonight is about California's high-speed rail project, a project that was voted in in 2008 by the voters of California with approximately \$9 billion worth of bonds to help fund what would be a project that would seek outside private investment as well, a project that would link San Francisco to Los Angeles with possible additional spurs to Sacramento and San Diego. It has run into large funding problems and such. So the subject of our time tonight is that we see that there are huge problems with the funding and where will the funding come from.

I have my colleagues here from California, as well, who would like to speak on this subject. First of all, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from the north San Joaquin Valley, Congressman JEFF DENHAM, who has been a leader on this issue

here in Congress as well as chairs the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which deals directly with rail and this issue. So, Congressman DENHAM, I would love to hear from you tonight.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman from California.

I, as many other Californians at one time, supported the California high-speed rail project. It was initially supposed to be a \$33 billion project with equal amounts coming not only from the California taxpayers, in the form of a bond, but also private investors and the Federal Government.

Yet this \$33 billion project has ballooned up to \$100 billion. So what do they do for cost controls? They cut off the very legs that Mr. LAMALFA talked about, the section going to Sacramento, the section going to San Diego; but, still, it is a \$68 billion project with a more than \$26 billion hole just in the first initial operating segment alone.

Tomorrow, as chair of the Subcommittee on Railroads, we will be discussing a review of the challenges facing California's high-speed rail.

I want to reiterate I believe that high-speed rail is our future. I believe that as a growing economy, with more trucks and goods movement on the road, with more goods movement on rail that we have to look at alternative opportunities to move people. High-speed rail is one of those opportunities.

But in Florida, a project that is being done by private investors will have no ongoing subsidy. They need no Federal dollars. Texas will have its own high-speed rail system, again, with private dollars, no ongoing subsidy. Yet here in California, you have a \$68 billion project with no private investor, with huge subsidies and overruns, and a project that cannot even get out of the initial gate.

So where we are today: California has no money to meet its Federal obligation. On November 14, we had a court decision that came back and said that they cannot spend the \$9.95 billion that was approved by voters because they had failed to complete a full business plan. So with no dollars available, the Governor came out this week and said that we are going to use \$250 million of the cap-and-trade dollars, cap-and-trade dollars that were supposed to be used for environmentally friendly projects. Yet this project is going to be a net polluter, a net polluter for at least the next 30 years. So how he could come up with a legality of using these cap-and-trade dollars I think is in question.

But I think a bigger issue is a timing issue: \$180 million is due April 1. The Antideficiency Act says that the State has to have its first set of matches, and that 50/50 match is due April 1. Yet the legislature is not even going to vote on this new budget and this theoretical \$250 million in funds until, at the earliest, late June. California budgets usually come in in August, and I think it

is a real question on whether liberals and conservatives can agree on whether or not this environmental money will be used on high-speed rail.

But specifically on the operating segment, itself, the judge has said not only that they need to come up with the money on this initial construction segment, which stops in Bakersfield—so now we are going to have two sets of rail that stop in Bakersfield, and then you have to get on a bus to get across the Tehachapis. But they don't even have the funding for the initial operating section, which goes all the way to Palmdale. You won't be able to get the speed that they need going around, instead of through, the Tehachapis; and they have a \$20 billion funding gap in that first segment.

So some real questions: Are they going to meet the timeline of April 1? Is using the cap-and-trade dollars actually legal? And, third, this huge funding gap, where does that money come from? I think the Federal taxpayers across the Nation need to be asking the question, If you are going to subsidize all of California's high-speed rail projects, where do the matching dollars come from? If they could use the \$9.95 billion, it is still not enough money. So if California can't come up with the Federal match, what are the teeth that the Federal Government has to be able to hold California up to that Federal obligation?

We have some real questions that are going to be coming out tomorrow. The FRA has altered its approach. Once they realized that they couldn't do a 50/50 match, they went to a tapered match. That means that the Federal Government is going to come in with their money first, and then, hopefully, someday the State will come up with its matching dollars in a tapered manner. That tapered manner is coming through April 1. That is when that first \$180 million is obligated.

But I think the real question is, Who is making these decisions? Did this go all the way up to the President? Was the past Department of Transportation Secretary or the new Department of Transportation Secretary involved in this decision? And if California can't come up with this tapered match, will they, once again, adjust this outside of Congress a second time?

So we have some real questions on what those legalities are. The next question would be the contingencies. What are the contingencies for the Federal Government to recoup its taxpayer dollars if California defaults on its obligations?

We have some real priorities in California. And as the Central Valley continues to suffer with a drought, as our schools continue to lag behind, as our public safety dollars continue to get robbed, is this the best use of our money? And should we be investing in something that, unlike Texas and Florida, has no private investors, has no State match, has a lot of funding questions that need to be answered before we move forward?

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Congressman DENHAM.

Indeed, the more time that goes by on this issue, the more problems and flaws are exposed in this. This is a measure that passed in 2008, was put in front of the voters, known as "Prop 1(a)" at the time that passed by a 52-48 margin. I think the voters were sold something completely different than what we are actually seeing as Californians in the project.

Congressman DENHAM mentioned that the price has ballooned from approximately what people saw on the ballot, \$33 billion for that initial San Francisco to L.A. segment; and just 1 year later, it was revised up after the voters had voted on it to \$42 billion. And then we saw that the Sacramento segments, the San Diego segments were dropped off as even options.

Interestingly, we have all been in the State legislature—Congressman DENHAM and myself and another gentleman who will be speaking here in a moment—and we saw these numbers go past us at a time. And at a hearing that was held in the California State Senate in November of 2011, it was finally exposed that their numbers were way off, and they admitted that the project that voters expected would be right near \$100 billion to do the San Francisco to Los Angeles segment if it was going to be truly a high-speed rail from port to port. And also during that time, in order to build up and say what an economic boom it would be, they were advertising that 1 million jobs would be created by this.

□ 1900

We pinned them down in that Senate hearing that it wasn't really 1 million jobs. It was a term called 1 million job years, which really translates out to perhaps 20,000 jobs of building the entire system. So we have seen a lot of very creative—I would say phony—numbers on costs, on benefits, and even some of the very highly optimistic ridership numbers as well.

So, Congressman DENHAM, what does that mean in your district here as far as what you really think the jobs would translate out to? And then what are some of the impacts on the property involved, as well?

Mr. DENHAM. Well, certainly, one of the big concerns right now is where are these jobs? These were stimulus dollars that were supposed to be ready for shovel-ready projects 5 years ago—5 years ago—and still not one shovel is in the ground. Not one job is created. Now, unlike Texas and Florida that are creating jobs, that are putting the infrastructure in, certainly in California they could come up with a better plan. They could go along the I-5 corridor. They could use the existing rail corridor that has been abandoned. There are other opportunities if they truly want to cut costs. But if they don't want to change, they don't want to revise their budget and they have no private investor, the question still re-

mains, what obligation do you have to go back to the California taxpayer? You are obligating the California taxpayer for nearly \$10 billion, and you are not fulfilling the Prop 1A guarantee that they voted on.

So, at a certain point, I believe that we have to force the California High-Speed Rail Authority to go back to the voters and seek approval. Change your plans. Go back to the voters and let the voters decide.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed, I attempted that in 2012 with legislation at the time called SB 95 in California to place that back in front of the voters, give people the option, now that they have more information, to say do they really want to go through with this with California's other issues. You mentioned, Mr. DENHAM, the challenges we have had with water supply. Even our Governor is saying that this is a huge priority and a huge problem for California to face in 2014, and yet we have a very difficult time allocating a few billion dollars to enhance our water storage in California and instead are faced with this.

What would that mean for jobs in the valley if we are able to turn the water, turn the tap back on to agriculture at a fraction of the price of high-speed rail?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DENHAM. It would be a fraction of the price, tens of thousands of jobs that would be lost of seeing farmland that goes by without being planted this year.

We have a huge drought. There are huge issues. And what everybody is trying to say is a high-speed rail—keep in mind, this initial segment, this initial operating segment which has a \$20 billion funding gap, is not going to be electrified. It will not be high-speed. By their numbers, by their plan, this is another set of track that will not be electrified, that will run as it is being run today, with a \$20 billion gap. So even if you came up with the entire \$32 billion of this initial segment, we are still stuck in the same situation that we are. We are just that much further in the hole.

Now, I know some of my colleagues would say, well, just spend the money as quickly as you can. Let's just spend some of it, and like other projects, once you have started it, some day the money will come. I don't think we can deal with that type of pie-in-the-sky rhetoric. I believe we have got to have a full funding plan that makes sense, one that has a private investor that was promised to us.

We have heard several times that, if you just write the legislation, we will have a private investor; if you just put it on the ballot and approve it by the legislature before it actually goes to the voters, we will have private investors that will sign on to this. Then it was right after the ballot passed, we have nearly \$10 billion committed to by the taxpayers, for sure we are going to have a private investor now.

Five years later, after the Federal Government has come up with several billion dollars, after the voters are now on the hook for \$10 billion, and still today there is no private investor. You would be a fool to invest in this. This isn't Florida's project. This isn't Texas' project. This is a project with a huge funding gap that still is not going to be electrified—by their plan.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed, when we look at the project in totality here, what ended up being \$100 billion to be legal under Proposition 1A, to have a true high-speed rail—which is required—to go from San Francisco to L.A. at a high speed, 2 hours and 40 minutes, a \$100 billion project was revised now down to a \$68 billion project, which does not include high-speed all the way to San Francisco in the north. It would stop at the San Jose area, and then you are required to use local transportation, local light rail, what have you, to get all the way up to San Francisco. And at the southern end, you have, in L.A. County, it doesn't go to downtown Los Angeles under the new plan. It would stop somewhere in the north, remote north L.A. County portion. So it isn't truly high-speed rail anymore.

As you mentioned, too, Mr. DENHAM, on that, if they take the Palmdale route, they probably can't even sustain those speeds. So it is illegal on that count that it probably can't make a 2-hour-and-40-minute ride. And with that, you have three different segments. So if you have to buy three different tickets, I don't know how the customers are being suited by three different stops like that, as well.

We were told back in the day that the price of a ticket would somehow be tied to 85 percent of what an airline ticket was to go from north to south or south to north; and a real estimate, if this were self-sustaining, it would be somewhere maybe triple of that.

So the impacts of that, again, California agriculturally with water supply is struggling this year. So for a fraction of the amount of money it would take to bolster California's storage, we are going to spend perhaps what would have been \$100 billion—in the revised number, \$68 billion—to do an illegal Prop 1A version from south San Jose to north Los Angeles. That is a \$55 billion gap on the entire project right there.

We can only point to \$13 billion worth of funding, the 9.9 from the bond. Bonds have consequences. They have to be paid back by an already financially strapped State. As well, the 3.5 billion or so that is promised from the Federal Government under the 2009 stimulus has strings, too. It has an expiration period.

Please embellish on that a little bit, Mr. DENHAM, because we know there are some very important deadlines coming on that as well, if we can.

Mr. DENHAM. There are important deadlines. Again, this is part of the Antideficiency Act that says the 50/50 match now is coming due for the State. So April 1, \$180 million is due. The

question for the Governor is: Where is that money going to come from? We can't just continue to change deadlines. And the question to the administration is: Are you going to continue to allow California not to guarantee its matching funds? It is going against the Antideficiency Act, the reason that is put into law.

Mr. LAMALFA. California just passed a recent tax known as Prop 30 last year, 2012, that was going to pay for a whole lot of things, go for a lot of different measures with perhaps schools and other infrastructure. We had talked about cap-and-trade. You can even point to truck fees, that they are all now trying to be shifted towards high-speed rail instead of other priorities. I wonder if that is what the voters' intentions were on Prop 30 or on their truck fees or weight fees, et cetera.

So I think there has been a lot of deception around this, again, on cost and on ridership. As I mentioned a minute ago, if it has been revised down to a \$68 billion plan, we can only point to, for sure, approximately \$13 billion from Fed stimulus and the State bond. Where does the other \$55 billion go to build what is really an illegal plan? Where is it going to come from?

Mr. DENHAM, you mentioned we haven't seen the private-sector money from anywhere, yet you can point to, recently, a proposal came out for an east coast plan to build a maglev, magnetic levitation train, that would link east coast urban centers, and there are already interested investors from Japan on that with much more modern technology. You can say that rail isn't new technology because it is wheels still running on a steel rail. And in California, which is supposed to lead the way in technology and innovation, we are really not leading on this at all.

So what do you see as far as the problems with that bigger funding gap? And then, bringing that back, what is that going to do for our economy?

Mr. DENHAM. Well, certainly, we are falling way behind the rest of the world. Other technologies are starting to flourish in other parts of the world, yet here this project will take at least 30 years but, more likely, 50 to 60 based on where they are currently standing on the project. So this is something that will be far outdated technology if it ever gets completed.

But the real question is on the funding. Where is the commitment? This President certainly could look for or come up with other money. He could propose other money to fulfill this project. Not even Democrats will support that. That is not a Republican issue. This is an issue across the Nation saying, why would we come up with money, when we are starved across the Nation, to throw at a project in California that is being mismanaged?

I think that there are real questions there not only for the administration but private investors that are not will-

ing to sink money into a failing project. They don't know what they are on the hook for. They don't know how long of a commute this will be or what the ridership numbers will ever be.

Even by this entire plan, there are too many stops. Whether you talk to the Rail Authority or whether you talk to investors around the world, with that many stops in those locations, you will never get to the 220-miles-per-hour speed, and you will never get to 2 hours and 40 minutes.

This thing is full of holes. It makes no sense for voters, and voters should have a say-so on whether or not they are going to commit any initial money or any further money as we move forward. This is about our future, not yours and mine, but our kids, our grandkids, and the type of debt that we saddle them with. At a certain point, I think that not only Californians, but Americans, need to wake up and say whether or not this is a project that deserves an investment.

Can we do things smarter? Can we do things like Florida and Texas? I don't think Florida and Texas are going to be alone. I think there will be other States that step up and find ways to do high-speed rail and find ways to make a commonsense solution in their States.

But in this State, this project is flawed. It is initially flawed by \$20 billion, but certainly by more than \$55 billion if we decide to move forward. At a certain point, you have to ask, how much is enough? I would say that now is enough.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed, when the stimulus money first started coming available, there were other States that applied for high-speed rail money, such as Florida, Ohio, and Wisconsin. I believe that after they looked at their numbers, ran the figures on projects that were eligible for that stimulus money, they turned that money back and went back into this pool. Of course, California said it wants it; but interestingly, it would have been a much smaller portion had California been sharing with those other States what Federal money would have come to the State. So the other ones said, We have looked at the numbers, and we are turning that money back in.

I think we ought to apply some of the same logic as the other States looked at when they had Federal money available, eligible funds, that they indeed turned back.

So I really appreciate your leadership on this, Congressman DENHAM, and we will be doing a lot more to make sure this is held accountable to the public here. I look forward to your hearing tomorrow on this matter.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LAMALFA. We are also joined by a colleague from the lower San Joaquin Valley area of the State for whom this issue is very important, very key to his district as well, on the impact of the

rail route as well as the economy, as well as what it means for the taxpayers of the State and the entire country. Indeed, this has an effect on national taxpayers and the budget as well. So people in other 49 States are looking at what is going on here and saying, Why is our Federal money going into something that can't possibly work out?

And so I know we are all willing to help people in other States with sensible infrastructure projects. That is the way it works in this country with our interstate system that President Eisenhower had the vision for back in the day. And yes, there might have been naysayers there, but you could actually point to positive results in something that works long term and other infrastructure projects that were invested in, but this one here, the numbers just don't run.

So my colleague, DAVID VALADAO from the valley, has got very great concerns and has been very strong in leading in his area too, as well, on what are the impacts going to be, what are the costs.

I would like to yield to Congressman DAVID VALADAO.

Mr. VALADAO. I thank the gentleman rice farmer from northern California for the opportunity to speak here today.

Where do you start with something like this? I grew up a dairy farmer in Kings County and continue to be a dairy farmer in Kings County to this day. I spent my first 2 years in elected office in the California State Legislature on a budget subcommittee and watched as this project moved along; and right before election when this was passed back in '08 and up until my election in 2010, the project didn't seem that bad. It seemed like something that was just voted on and put on the shelf and they would continue to build on it. Then, at the last minute, some money showed up and it basically put this project in high gear, and the project wasn't ready for it.

As the Congressman from the northern part of the valley mentioned earlier, there is no real plan. When you show up at the last minute and say, "Here. Here is some money. Start building right away," as if it is shovel ready, it set this project up for a really, really tough time.

□ 1915

What we are facing now today, we see a train system being built, a high-speed rail, and like was mentioned earlier, older technology. Forty years ago, rail with wheels was the technology. Now maglev is the new technology. So to see a project that is starting today with technology that is already 40 years old that probably won't be running for another 30 years, I think we are setting ourselves up for failure.

When you look at what else has been going on with this project, as far as what the opportunities are, when you look at my district specifically, California District 21, you have got com-

munities like Hanford, Corcoran, Wasco, who all rely on a system that we have today, Amtrak. Amtrak doesn't really pay its bills, but it gets people from A to B, and it serves its purpose. You have got a system there where people who live in those communities are able to get to the doctor in Fresno or get to the doctor in Bakersfield or get to work, but a small, commuter train that gets them where they need to be for relatively low cost.

You look at high-speed rail, and as the map that was up on the screen earlier showed, what we have there is a track that will basically pass from Hanford, if Hanford ever gets built, but for sure Fresno to Bakersfield, and it leaves all of the people in California 21 basically out to dry. That is sad. I mean, when you see a project that was supposed to help those less fortunate, or those people who need it the most, you have a project now that is actually going to hurt them and put potentially at risk what they have today, Amtrak, their mode of transportation.

Because this project lacks so much money, that is why it puts us in that position. We have a system in place that is built on someone else's train tracks. It is on Burlington Northern's train tracks in my area, and I am sure it is on other tracks in other parts of the State, but if the project that they have today starts to move forward and they run out of money like we expect them to do, part of the plan is to move Amtrak over there. So what happens to those stations in my district? That is just one of the issues I see.

In California 21, like I mentioned earlier, and a good portion of the valley, we face a water shortage, a drought. Some of that is natural, but a lot of that is regulatory. We have also got a severe lack of infrastructure to deliver water. We have Tempered Flats and we have Pikes Reservoir, we have a lot of infrastructure that needs to be built, and that is infrastructure that would benefit not just California but the whole State in general.

When you look at a project like high-speed rail, if that project was to go forward and be built, you would have a high-speed rail that most people couldn't afford to ride.

If you build water infrastructure, you now have water to grow products, water to feed families, water for our communities, and once you have that, you start to grow crops and produce product. You start to improve an economy and produce a product that you actually can sell and bring dollars back into your community. That, in my opinion, makes a lot more sense.

Education. California has struggled with funding for education for years. We have seen plenty of programs that were cut out or cut back or just flat out gotten rid of. If you have a project like high-speed rail spending money when they are not prepared for it, when we should be investing in our future, education, making sure our kids have the best opportunities, the best founda-

tion to bring, to improve our economy, to be good, productive members of our society and to make a real difference—I think education should be our first priority.

You look at everything we could be spending money on. Right now in California, we have been letting prisoners out of prisons because we don't have enough money to build facilities for them and to keep some of the community correctional facilities open. There is a lot going on, and we have to be spending money on a project like this when we should be focusing on something that helps keep our communities safe.

Those are all things that we should be paying attention to that we are not because of this project. They are in a hurry to build this project right now because they say it creates jobs, but, like was pointed out earlier, those numbers are all bogus. They were pushed up. They were not honest numbers. We are starting to see this project that will put our children and grandchildren into debt for a long time for a small amount of jobs that we really can't account for and we can't ensure will be our own community jobs.

So this is something that has had me concerned my whole time in the legislature, and I have talked about it for a long time. It is something that I am going to continue to fight. It needs to be talked about and pushed out there.

The more people who get involved—you take groups like my Kings County group of residents who have sued the State and sued the Federal Government over this project. When they first got involved, they looked at this project and said this is going to affect our families and homes, let's fight it. Once they started getting into the details and saw where the funding was coming from, or the lack of funding, the amount of deceit that goes into this project just to get it rammed down our throats, they decided to keep fighting no matter what, even though the alignment was moved off their property across town to another part of town. The high-speed rail people thought all of these people will back off now because it doesn't affect them personally, but once they knew what was really in this project, they thought there is no way we can let this fight go. So the group actually grew.

Now that the new constituents were affected by the new alignment, the new guys joined with the old guys and the group grew. Now they have moved the alignment back. The first group is continuing to fight, and the second group is in it as well. It is just amazing how the more you get to know about this project and how it is being pushed and how it is being run, the more you want to fight it, and the more you want to shut this thing down.

Just to close, California high-speed rail comes at a tremendous cost to taxpayers while delivering no benefit to my constituents. This project will destroy homes and businesses throughout

California's 21st Congressional District and divert precious tax dollars away from water infrastructure, public safety, and education.

I will continue to uphold my promise to my constituents and do whatever I have in my power to stop this project as fast as possible.

Mr. LAMALFA. One question: a commission, a board in California, recently moved to the three-person board to authorize the rail authority to start condemning property under eminent domain. Of course, there is going to be a lot of resistance. Kings County is a hot bed of resistance to this project. The eminent domain procedures are not easy or cheap to get through a court process. They are already moved to condemn two pieces of property, I believe, in Fresno County, and I believe there are at least 380 that may have to go through this process. How do your constituents feel about the forced taking of land and an alignment that doesn't make a lot of sense and some of the infrastructure that might be lost in these communities?

Mr. VALADAO. Over the years, there have been a lot of things built in the valley—freeways, just different things that obviously needed to be built for the good of the State. Farmers, and constituents in general, if they understand why it is being taken and it makes sense for the State, usually it is an easy deal.

But once they get involved in the details of this project and start to see how they are being treated themselves and how the project is going to end up looking, because it is pretty apparent with the lack of funding and with the rest of the Federal Government looking at this project and understanding that it is pretty much ruined now because of the management, they are not happy. They are fighting this thing tooth and nail.

When it comes down to their own personal property, obviously they are offended with some of the prices and some of the numbers they are seeing. If they owned the property or if their family owned it, if it is a generational thing, or just in general an eyesore running alongside their home, affecting how they drive to work or how they move around the district in general, it is just offensive to many of them, depending on the different route or how you want to approach it.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed. Let me ask you, too: How easy is to relocate a rendering plant? A rendering plant, that is a facility that processes dead agricultural animals, which happens, and so they need to be taken to be processed, and one of those is right in your district, I understand.

Mr. VALADAO. We have a rendering plant that is right in the middle of the alignment as the alignment is today. Obviously, the alignment moves on a weekly basis, but the rendering plant has been in the alignment twice now. The first time, and we are back in there again.

As far as permitting for a new rendering plant, back in 2006 during the heat wave, we struggled in the Central Valley to handle the amount of animals that were needing to be processed at that time. Permitting for a new facility was nearly impossible, and we were never able to upgrade or expand the facilities. So to actually build a new one today I would say is nearly impossible.

Mr. LAMALFA. Is the high-speed rail authority guaranteeing to help or see through as part of the environmental documents to help make sure this is replaced or other infrastructure is replaced? There are dairies in line. Again, in California, securing a permit for a new dairy has become nearly an impossibility, as my colleague in the dairy industry would probably report. So there are a lot of people weighing in on that. Relocating the dairy, these are facilities and lands that have been for generations of families that have been there. Is anything being taken into account on the authority helping with these processes as part of the impact they are having?

Mr. VALADAO. We have no guarantees on any of that. Some of the things that affect some of our constituents, somebody that has a restaurant and the high-speed rail goes through their property, they go in and give them what they assume is the value of that, but no one takes into account replacement value. Or they bought their first home when prices were high, and now prices have come down, and now it is an opportunity for high-speed rail to come in and offer them market price, which basically leaves that person homeless and in debt. So there are a lot of situations.

We have farmers with long-term leases on property who do not own the property, but own the permanent crop on top of that. High-speed rail hasn't taken into account the value of that crop on top. People will invest \$10,000 to \$15,000 an acre to get trees planted, and if they are only buying the land for the value of the land but not what is on top of that land, that obviously will put a lot of people upside down in a really bad position and affect a lot of jobs.

One of the biggest economic drivers in the valley, and in California, we export a lot of agricultural products. That brings a lot of dollars in. That will have an impact on our economy as well.

Mr. LAMALFA. Indeed. We are both from long time farming families. I think when you are a farmer, or any business that is multi-generational, but especially on the land, you develop a bond. You develop a love of the land that you don't really put a price on. I think most farmers will farm until they can't farm any more, either due to age or regulations taking it away from them, or whatever. So how do you put a price on my family, raising the fifth generation, and you and your neighbors, you have multi-generations

as well. How do you put a market price on your legacy? Someone is coming in from Sacramento or Washington saying we think it is worth that. It may be worth infinitely more to you and your family and the generations behind you. How do you quantify that?

Mr. VALADAO. Well, you can't. When it is a project necessary for the benefit of the country, benefit of the State, one that actually makes sense with a good plan behind it, it is a little easier to swallow, but when you see this project in general and how big of a disaster it has been and how little information has been out to the public, how they plan on funding it, how they plan on moving forward, if people are going to be able to actually afford to ride this thing, it makes it that much worse. This is important. I mean, when you look at how hard some people have worked to build their homes and build their farms and companies, we have restaurants and we have a little bit of everything that is being affected by this. When you see their blood, sweat and tears, you can't put a price on that.

Mr. LAMALFA. Certainly. Eminent domain is something that governments should use very reluctantly, very rarely, and only when there is no other option available. My farm has been affected by that as well with the large towers, the power lines that move basically from hydroelectric projects in the northeast part of the State down to the San Francisco Bay area. It is something that affects our fields, but it is part of the greater good. Our tractors have to drive around those now and figure out how to still keep straight lines going through towers running at an angle, and you have ag aircraft that have to tangle with avoiding wires and flying over the towers at 200 feet and trying to drop seed or fertilizer, things like that. So we get some pretty strange streaks in our fields because of that infrastructure, but it is important. We want the folks in the Bay area to have that.

Eminent domain isn't always very fair. What I am seeing here is the promises, if there are any promises made by the high-speed rail authority, to truly keep people whole on this and give them options, and as you mentioned, the alignment changes frequently. We are not even sure if they have a full 520-mile alignment decided yet. They could have gone for a more low-impact route, perhaps putting it down the middle of Interstate 5 or adjacent to it, using parts of 99, perhaps.

Mr. VALADAO. Or maybe fill in gaps where Amtrak doesn't serve today. Currently, if you want to go from Bakersfield to L.A., you get on a bus. There is no connection there. That would have been a great place to start this project.

□ 1930

That is one of the arguments we have. When you have got a project of this size and such a percentage of the

money that is needed to build this project, you can see the failure coming. But you have to make sure that whatever resources are spent are spent in a way that benefits the overall majority of the people.

Right now, if you are riding Amtrak from Fresno to L.A. and you get off at Bakersfield and you get on that Greyhound bus and ride over the hill, I am sure Greyhound does a great job, but that would be a great place to fill in the hole and build a rail, and build it up to today's standards and put something in place that we can build on in the future that makes sense.

Mr. LAMALFA. Certainly you can make an argument that the first places you should look are the urban areas where you can have the potential ridership. Here on the east coast, you have a lot of ridership between Washington, D.C., on up all the way to Boston. I don't know about the financial viability of that, but at least you can make a case there. Here, as was reported just a couple of years ago, they wanted to start in the Valley because, as was quoted, they had the least amount of resistance to building the rail starting in the rural Valley as opposed to what it was going to take to run through the South Bay area, places like Palo Alto and others, that some people are feverishly opposed to what that would do and what that infrastructure tends to bring to high-value communities like that as well.

But, again, the promise lies in the Central Valley for us in what we do well already. My portion in northern Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin Valley, these are strong agricultural areas.

I am wondering—and maybe you can touch on this as well—we have had different ideas for water projects that for a fraction of the money we are talking about with the high-speed rail system, how far could we go to do one or two water storage projects and what would that mean for especially communities like you have down there that have seen a huge economic impact with the cutoff of water due to the delta smelt and those other problems? What would that mean in real jobs for the people that have the skills and education level that likely aren't going to be working on a high-speed rail project, but have a strong background in agriculture? What do you see that doing to help your area?

Mr. VALADAO. Well, when we look at a company that wants to invest in the Valley, if they are in agriculture, obviously they are attracted to the area for those reasons. But if they are looking for an affordable place that makes sense between L.A. and San Francisco because of access to larger populations, they look at the Central Valley, but they also want to make sure that there is security there. If you are going to build a company, you are going to make sure it is in a great place for your employees.

I think the focus should be right now making sure that people have afford-

able energy to live there because obviously it gets hot in the summer, and the water situation. Are you going to move your family into an area where the water isn't safe to drink, which is commonplace in some of those communities that we have been fighting for funding for some of the water treatment facilities that are so necessary.

Then when you get into the infrastructure itself, if you are going to build a plant or anything or a processing facility for the type of commodities we grow, water is a necessity. It starts from growing the crop, to cleaning the crop, to making sure that the facilities are up to code and that we've got some treatment in place and that we have a product that we can sell and bring dollars to those communities.

That is how you create jobs, that is the right way to do it, and that is something that we should be focusing on and investing our limited resources on today. Obviously, we have been making some really tough decisions in the last few months over spending and budgets and everything else that we have got going on. Not just on the national level, but at the State level there are going to be some tough decisions as well.

Those decisions should be based on priorities, and those priorities should be making sure we have the resources, and resources today means water. Water is the number one priority, and that is where it should be focused at.

Mr. LAMALFA. I think everybody in California in the midst of this drought probably find agreement with that. Our own Governor was underlying that in a speech the other day, and yet still so wedded to this high-speed rail project, which the funding for is highly questionable. Indeed, a judge handed down a decision the other day ordering California not to spend any of the State bond money because it wouldn't be legal to do so under the lack of a plan they have.

We both served in the State legislature. And is California's financial situation such that it can get out there on its own somehow with new funding? If the Federal money falls short or no private investment comes out, where will it come from?

Mr. VALADAO. Well, we have got a lot of priorities here in Washington, D.C. The different Members from different parts of the State are not looking at California's high-speed rail project the way it is being rolled out today and thinking that is a good place to invest the resources that the taxpayers in their district want to see them spend the money on.

It is not going to be an easy lift. As this project seems to move forward and the press gets worse and worse, and when you've got judges involved saying that they are not following the letter of the law, what was asked of the voters when they voted for it, it just makes it that much harder to come up with the rest of the money they are going to need to finish this project.

So to get it started, just to build a big berm, or maybe even a berm with some metal on top to hopefully throw some older-style Amtrak trains on top, doesn't make a lot of sense, especially when you are going to cut off communities that need it today, need what we have got in place today and not put that in jeopardy.

Mr. LAMALFA. What doesn't get talked about much are different impacts like the high-speed rail. In order to sustain a high-speed, you have got to build a very long elliptical form in order to make turns with a train going 220 miles per hour. It is kind of like the angled towers running at angled lines on my property that we farm. It doesn't fit in real well with a grid that is set up on straight lines and squares like that.

So when an elliptical-shaped rail comes through your community through agricultural zones, as well as high-speed rail having to cut off all the crossings, can you build enough overpasses to not stop the flow of traffic, whether that is cars or trucks or even a farmer on a tractor who now may have to drive his tractor instead of just across 6 miles down the road and back up to get around. I mean, there are a lot of impacts that are really not meeting the eye here when you line them out.

Mr. VALADAO. Like I mentioned earlier, when this project was started, it was started as a long-term project; but then \$3 billion showed up from the Federal Government and the project managers basically said put this thing in high gear, start breaking ground.

You have got a project of this type that affects so many people in so many different communities—how they travel around their homes to work, around their farms, around their businesses, transporting products between warehouses and processing facilities. You have so much going on, and you have got this project now that is going to disrupt all of that just because they have got a timeline that they have got to spend.

The timeline is really on a small portion of it. We are talking a couple percentages of the total cost of the project. It is not worth risking a project of this size over such a small amount of money.

That is probably one of the worst things that has happened to this project since its inception. It could have been something great. It could have been a project that could have made a big difference if it was given the time to be designed and planned in a way that benefited the State, didn't burden the State with debt forever, and actually helped the constituents of that State.

It is too bad this project has gone down the path it has; but, again, we are going to try to stop this thing so that this doesn't happen and doesn't affect our communities.

Mr. LAMALFA. Well, indeed, it does appear that they are hell-bent on

spending that approximately \$3.5 billion that has Federal deadlines on it in order to get the project started; and then at that point, well, we are invested in the project, we can't stop now, even though the judge ruled it is illegal to spend the State dollars because it is not fulfilling the plan. So, indeed, big impact on the Valley and on taxpayers.

Mr. VALADAO, I really appreciate your time and your leadership on this here tonight. Let's keep putting the message out that there are better ways. Most anything might be better than investing in this at this point. So I thank you for your help here tonight.

Mr. VALADAO. Thank you.

Mr. LAMALFA. So, indeed, the investors that were supposed to come in, private investment for what had been billed to voters as a \$33 billion project, up to \$45 billion if you built the San Diego and Sacramento link, they have not materialized. When you see that the price for a time went up to \$98.5 billion—hence California's Senate bill 985—it scared everybody away from this.

You see, in a Baltimore to Washington proposal to do a maglev project here locally that has outside investors that want to come in on that, nobody is touching California's high-speed rail.

So in the absence of this outside investment, California has moved in many different ways to try and find other pots of money. The Governor plans on diverting truck weight fees that are collected from commercial truckers away from repairing California's aging roads.

Just try and drive in the right-hand lane of any freeway—I get to enjoy Interstate 5 a lot—and see what the condition of that road is. Some areas have been repaired. Caltrans had a pretty good year last year. Other areas it is still pretty rough. Interstate 80, near Sacramento, they are doing repairs now; but the potholes on that were pretty bad.

Yet we are seeing the effort by the State to shift funding away from repairing roads that everybody uses versus a project that maybe few can afford to actually use. My colleagues from the Valley here would probably tell you that there is not going to be a whole lot of people that jump on high-speed rail to ride from Bakersfield to Fresno because it doesn't make any sense for them.

The promise of a low-cost ticket being 85 percent initially of an airline ticket from L.A. to San Francisco or vice versa, how can that be met without having the tickets subsidized at these costs? \$85 we were told, \$90. It was revised later maybe \$120 when we had a hearing about it. Try \$300 if it is not going to be underwritten by the taxpayers for ridership on this.

How many people are going to spend \$300 on that trip? Other than those that might do it for the novelty of the train ride from north to south or south to north. We saw pie-in-the-sky numbers

on what the amount of ridership would be, numbers that at one time were greater than the entirety of Amtrak across the 48 continental States. They have had to revise them down to some other vague number.

So there is not a lot of trust in anything being put forward by the California High-Speed Rail Authority on costs, on ridership, on impact, promises made or not made to those that are impacted in the line of many different proposals of where the route is. Yet they are still trying to move forward and start condemning people's property, at who-knows-what price of reimbursement, in order to spend as quickly as they can this \$3 billion-plus of Federal stimulus money put in place almost 5 years ago.

It is really looking more like a fraudulent enterprise from what the voters saw in 2008 to now. Indeed, polling out there shows that now that people have heard about this the last couple of years and what it really means and the other choices they have to make on schools, on water, on their actual highways, that they have a whole lot of different opinion on it. A lot of editorial pages around the State are saying at the very least if you are not going to stop it, you should put it back on the ballot.

I attempted that in 2012. The mood wasn't there in the State legislature to do that. My former colleague there that I served with, Assemblyman Jeff Gorell from the Santa Barbara area, he is putting forward legislation to put it back on the ballot and re-vote the rail. So I hope that catches fire and that the legislature will look at this project and decide maybe that would be worth a vote of the people of California to decide if this is still a priority at these prices.

So Assemblyman Gorell has got a pretty big task to put that in front of the legislature and achieve the votes. But interestingly—still talking State politics here—but in the State Senate, to put forward the first segment of funding in late 2012, it received the bare majority of votes to fund that. In our California State Senate, there are 40 Members. They have got a vote of 21–19. All the Republicans voted “no” and four of the Democrats, who up to that point had been pretty favorable on high-speed rail. It barely got out of the State Senate floor.

I think that is saying a lot, that the opinions have changed, certainly amongst the voters. Now we just have to put the State legislature in a figurative headlock and get them to think about it and do that.

So I hope Assemblyman Gorell is successful in this measure because it would be proper to put this back in front of the voters and ask them again: would you rather have this or water projects, highway projects, school projects, any number of things that could be done to help move California forward instead of this boondoggle that has no way of paying for itself or sustaining itself?

We see, again, with the court handing down a ruling, that the plan is diverted so far from what was initially voted on and approved by the voters that it is now illegal. Why should State government be doing things that are illegal? Because they are right now in such a hurry to get the money spent, the Federal money. If the Federal money was to stop, the State money also has to. They both have to have a match with each other; but if there is not the match happening, then there are giant legal problems.

□ 1945

Congressman DENHAM mentioned a while ago: What is the payback procedure if Federal money is misspent, improperly spent? Because California had the capacity to do that if it doesn't meet its timelines, it doesn't meet the goals, it doesn't meet the tenets laid out in proposition 1(a). It would be in a true high-speed rail system all the way from San Francisco to Los Angeles, which so far that plan is not. You have to ride three different train types to accomplish that under this current plan.

Now we know the folks in the Bay Area and parts of Los Angeles are interested in seeing some of their tracks electrified as beneficiaries of some of the money that will be coming from this. I get that, I understand that. That probably would be a benefit for them, some upgrades in their local infrastructure. I don't know why you could not support that separately from this. If it helps to get Caltrain in the Bay Area electrified, then that should be a separate question, a separate set of funding, because right now this is illegal.

The people in the Bay Area do not want to be part of an illegal project, likely, and maybe perhaps lose that funding they are depending on to electrify and upgrade their system. I don't think so. That is a lot of money when it gets around to doing that above what is going on in the valley, with the condemnation of the land, and building in an area where they said would have the least amount of resistance for the project, let alone the Bay Area and perhaps parts of north L.A. County.

So it is very problematic. It is really time, as I proposed back in my senate days, to slow down the project and really get some real numbers. That was my first bill in the State Senate, SB 22. It was a no spending, no doing anything, until we have fully vetted and thought out a plan.

Honestly, this reminds me of ObamaCare. I have been calling this around my neighbors ObamaCare, Jr., because it is so poorly thought out; and the plan for funding it looks largely the same, pie in the sky. Investors won't touch it. Federal Government, are they going to come in and bridge the gap of the other \$55 billion that is missing, if we believe a \$68 billion plan, or on up to the approximately 100, let alone the inflation things that might drive a real project all the way to \$150 billion? All for what?

What could really be seen as an outdated technology and something that a lot of people can't afford to assess, nor even make sense for them to use in short segments within the valley. Yes, it may make sense possibly if you had a fast train that could go all the way from San Francisco to L.A. and complete that.

One of the things brought up is that in order for the project to be technically legal, they would only have to send one train per day in each direction at full, nonstop length. They would have other trains perhaps that are making all these stops, stopping at every little burg along the way. That is not high-speed rail. That is glorified Amtrak, glorified local commuters. That is not the intent of voters or anybody on this measure, or for that funding which is scarce money these days in California. The huge problems we have in trying to get a budget done and move eventually towards the balance in our Federal budget, it isn't a priority that we should be doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to note that again Congressman DENHAM will be having a hearing tomorrow in his Transportation and Infrastructure subcommittee on rail that will be at 10 a.m. in Washington time, developing more on this situation. So I would invite you to participate, or watch that, and expose what really needs to happen with Federal funding as well as maybe perhaps the people in California have an opportunity to weigh in on Assemblyman Gorell's proposal to have this back on the ballot and maybe perhaps shift our scarce funds to other things.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time here tonight, and 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.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

Washington, DC, January 14, 2014.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Office of the Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to division A of House Joint Resolution 59 (113th Congress), the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record the aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels for the Committee on Appropriations set forth pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, which establishes a budget resolution for fiscal year 2014.

These aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels are provided for bills, joint resolutions, and amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, considered by the

House subsequent to this filing, as applicable.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget is also permitted to adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from technical assumptions in the most recent baseline published by the Congressional Budget Office.

An associated table is attached. These aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels are made for the purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

If there are any questions on these aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014, please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. RYAN of Wisconsin,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	02014
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,012,237
OT	1,154,816
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA	91,938
OT	45,207
Disaster Designated Funds:	
BA	5,626
OT	281
Program Integrity:	
BA	924
OT	832
Total Discretionary:	
BA	1,110,725
OT	1,201,136
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	749,400
OT	738,140

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S. 230. An act to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 15, 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:

4469. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Apricots From Continental Spain [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0132] (RIN: 0579-AD62) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4470. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final

rule — Importation of Avocados From Continental Spain [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0002] (RIN: 0579-AD63) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4471. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule — Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures (RIN: 3052-AC76) January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4472. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C): Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4473. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Truth in Lending (Regulation Z): Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4474. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRA, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket ID: OCC-2013-0024] (RIN: 1557-AD77) December 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4475. A letter from the President, ParlAmericas, transmitting a report of the 10th Plenary Assembly of ParlAmericas held from the 21st to 24th of August 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4476. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XD029) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4477. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trawl Rationalization Program; Coast Recovery [Docket No.: 110708376-3995-02] (RIN: 0648-BB17) received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4478. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2013 Accountability Measure and Closure for Hogfish in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 100217097-1757-02] (RIN: 0648-XC981) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4479. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XD013) received January 7, 2014,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4480. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Virginia [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XD004) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4481. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan for Guided Sport and Commercial Fisheries in Alaska [Docket No.: 101027534-3999-02] (RIN: 0648-BA37) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4482. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties in Alaska [Docket No.: 101027534-3999-02] (RIN: 0648-BA37) received January 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4483. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Motion Picture Stunt Work and Filming; Chicago, IL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0868] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4484. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Reporting Requirements for Barges Loaded With Certain Dangerous Cargoes, Inland Rivers, Eighth Coast Guard District; Extension of Stay (Suspension) [USCG-2013-0760] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4485. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Willamette River, Oregon City, OR [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0623] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4486. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Old Mormon Slough, Stockton, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0196] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 801. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies (Rept. 113-325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2274. A bill to amend the

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers; with amendments (Rept. 113-326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 458. A resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014; providing for proceedings during the period from January 17, 2014, through January 24, 2014; and for other purposes (Rept. 113-327). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3862. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to assist municipalities and regional sewer authorities that would experience a significant hardship raising the revenue necessary to finance projects and activities for the construction of wastewater treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 3863. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish uniform requirements for thorough economic analysis of regulations by Federal agencies based on sound principles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 3864. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Social Security Act relating to demonstration projects designed to promote the reemployment of unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3865. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from modifying the standard for determining whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3866. A bill to prohibit an increase in the number of flag and general officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3867. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3868. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit assistance to the Palestinian Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3869. A bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 3870. A bill to provide for the use of funds in the Hazardous Substance Superfund for the purposes for which they were collected, to ensure adequate resources for the cleanup of hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow increased contributions to health savings accounts, to allow Medicare and VA healthcare participants to contribute to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Ms. HAHN):

H.R. 3872. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reauthorize the State infrastructure bank program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 3873. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to support the community schools model; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 3874. A bill to provide for the periodic review of the efficiency and public need for Federal agencies, to establish a commission for the purpose of reviewing the efficiency and public need of such agencies, and to provide for the abolishment of agencies for which a public need does not exist; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to reform the telephone metadata program; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 3876. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a grant program to provide burials for homeless veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA:

H. Res. 459. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3372) to provide a process for ensuring the United States does not default on its obligations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

169. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 88 urging the Congress to adopt House Concurrent Resolution No. 50; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

170. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 19 urging the Congress to oppose any legislation containing provisions that require Ohio's public employees who are members of a state retirement system to participate in Social Security or any federal pension program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. LATTA:

H.R. 3862.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 3863.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution which outlines Congress' authority "to regulate commerce . . . among the several states." This is where Congress derives its regulatory powers.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 3864.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, whereby Congress shall have the power "[t]o provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

As affirmed by Justice Benjamin Cardozo in *Steward Machine Company v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 548 (1937), upholding the constitutionality of unemployment benefits.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3865.

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

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3866.

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

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

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3867.

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

Article I, Section 8. "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;"

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3868.

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

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 3869.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3870.

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

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3871.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3872.

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

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is enumerated in Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3873.

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

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 3874.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution.

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

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3875.

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

The Telephone Metadata Reform Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 3876.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 15: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 26: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 164: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 176: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 199: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 223: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 337: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 494: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 630: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 631: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 645: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 689: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 715: Mr. TURNER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 755: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 855: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 871: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 872: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 904: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 920: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 997: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1010: Mr. MAFFEI and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1091: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 1179: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1354: Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1423: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1466: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1507: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1563: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1629: Ms. CHU and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1658: Mr. HANNA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1661: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1692: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 1699: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1726: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1728: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1798: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1861: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1921: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2001: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 2285: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2288: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2309: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2364: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2424: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2502: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2536: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2753: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2807: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2835: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 2893: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2901: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2998: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3015: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3040: Mr. TONKO and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3135: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 3179: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3279: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 3303: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3335: Mr. LONG, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3344: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 3370: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3377: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 3408: Mr. YODER and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 3429: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 3464: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3488: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 3529: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3541: Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 3543: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 3571: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 3573: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3594: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3600: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3635: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. AMASH, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. AMODEI.

- H.R. 3643: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3663: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 3665: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 3683: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 3658: Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 3717: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 3722: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 3724: Mr. ROSS
H.R. 3726: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 3757: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 3762: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 3763: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 3764: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. MICA.
- H.R. 3776: Mr. STUTZMAN and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 3787: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3824: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SIRES, Sires, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3852: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3855: Mr. AMASH, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr.
- YOHO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 36: Mr. MCALLISTER and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H. Res. 72: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H. Res. 109: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 231: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 365: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 401: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 418: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 440: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 113TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, prior to sine die adjournment of the 1st Session, 113th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

July 25, 2013:

H.R. 2289. An Act to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.

August 9, 2013:

H.R. 267. An Act to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

H.R. 678. An Act to authorize all Bureau of Reclamation conduit facilities for hydro-power development under Federal Reclamation law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1092. An Act to designate the air route traffic control center located in Nashua, New Hampshire, as the "Patricia Clark Boston Air Route Traffic Control Center".

H.R. 1171. An Act to amend title 40, United States Code, to improve veterans service organizations access to Federal surplus personal property.

H.R. 1344. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to provide expedited air passenger screening to severely injured or disabled members of the Armed Forces and severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1911. An Act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

H.R. 2576. An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2611. An Act to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the "Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building", and for other purposes.

September 30, 2013:

H.R. 1412. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3092. An Act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3210. An Act making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

October 2, 2013:

H.R. 527. An Act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

October 4, 2013:

H.R. 3233. An Act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas.

October 10, 2013:

H.J. Res. 91. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

October 15, 2013:

H.R. 3095. An Act to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes.

October 17, 2013:

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

October 31, 2013:

H.R. 3190. An Act to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

November 13, 2013:

H.R. 2094. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the preference given, in awarding certain asthma-related grants, to certain States (those allowing trained school personnel to administer epinephrine and meeting other related requirements).

H.R. 3302. An Act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Bay Pines, Florida, as the "C.W. Bill Young Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

November 21, 2013:

H.R. 2747. An Act to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the Processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

November 27, 2013:

H.R. 1848. An Act to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3204. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes.

December 9, 2013:

H.R. 3626. An Act to extend the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years.

December 20, 2013:

H.R. 185. An Act to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan

Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse".

H.R. 1402. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring provisions of law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2251. An Act to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

H.R. 2871. An Act to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the composition of the southern judicial district of Mississippi to improve judicial efficiency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2922. An Act to extend the authority of the Supreme Court Police to protect court officials away from the Supreme Court grounds.

H.R. 3458. An Act to treat payments by charitable organizations with respect to certain firefighters as exempt payments.

H.R. 3588. An Act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to exempt fire hydrants from the prohibition on the use of lead pipes, fittings, fixtures, solder, and flux.

December 26, 2013:

H.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

H.R. 623. An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium.

H.R. 767. An Act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project.

H.R. 2319. An Act to clarify certain provisions of the Native American Veterans' Memorial Establishment Act of 1994.

H.R. 3304. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3343. An Act to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to clarify the rules regarding the determination of the compensation of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3487. An Act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act to extend through 2018 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission, to expand such authority to certain other violations, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, prior to sine die adjournment of the 1st Session, 113th Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

September 18, 2013:

S. 130. An Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An Act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An Act to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

S. 304. An Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 459. An Act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic

Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

October 2, 2013:

S. 793. An Act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes.

October 4, 2013:

S. 1348. An Act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

November 21, 2013:

S. 330. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

S. 893. An Act to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of depend-

ency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

November 27, 2013:

S. 252. An Act to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity, and for other purposes.

December 2, 2013:

S. 1545. An Act to extend authorities related to global HIV/AIDS and to promote oversight of United States programs.

December 20, 2013:

S. 1471. An Act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Army to reconsider decisions to inter or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, and for other purposes.