United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2014 No. 38

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

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

We come to the end of a short week. For many, the winter has outlived its welcome and the longing for spring and its warmth is palpable. May the longing for comity and good will in the fashioning of policies benefiting our Nation be equally manifest in the actions marking these days.

Now we approach a weekend during which many Members of this assembly will gather to remember a historic event in Selma, Alabama. Forty-nine years ago, brave men and women, Americans of all races, colors, and faiths, walked together to help guarantee freedom still denied the descendants of those who were slaves.

Bless the Members of this assembly and us all, that we would be worthy of the call we have been given as Americans, to nurture and guarantee democratic freedoms to all who dwell in our great Nation. Help us all to be truly thankful and appropriately generous in our response.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

AMERICAN-ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE POLICY CONFERENCE

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, this week in Washington we welcome representatives from across the country attending the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee Policy Conference, the largest gathering in our Nation of friends of the Jewish State. Representatives come to the Nation's Capital to highlight the importance of the partnership between the United States and Israel and work together toward common interests and goals.

I have the honor of serving as cochair of the House Republican Israel Caucus, where protecting, strengthening, and promoting the U.S.-Israel relationship is the top priority.

Just this week, under the leadership of Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the House passed legislation designating Israel as a major strategic partner of the United States. I commend Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN on her leadership in expanding U.S.-Israel cooperation in defense, energy, and science.

As the Iranian regime continues to advance its nuclear ambitions and current events continually demonstrate that we live in a dangerous world, it is important that Congress reaffirm our support for and commitment to our close friend and ally, Israel.

OLNEYVILLE NEW YORK SYSTEM

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I stand to congratulate Olneyville New York System, an iconic Rhode Island restaurant which last week received the James Beard Foundation's America's Classics award—a prestigious national award.

The America's Classics award honors ''restaurants that have timeless appeal and are beloved for quality food that reflects the character of their community.''

Despite its name, this restaurant is a uniquely Rhode Island culinary treasure and is beloved by Rhode Islanders and visitors alike.

This national recognition confirms what Rhode Islanders already knew: we have some of the best food and restaurants in the country, and Olneyville New York System is a classic.

Every Rhode Islander knows the distinctive smells and sights of this local business. As mayor of Providence, I was proud Olneyville New York System played a leading role in my Main Street initiative to improve Providence's commercial districts.

Indeed, for nearly 70 years, three generations of the Stevens family have run this local establishment at the same location in Providence. Although the neighborhood has changed over time,

Printed on recycled paper.

only the Olneyville New York System has remained an iconic part of this community.

So I am saying congratulations to Greg Stevens and his sister, Stephanie Stevens Turini, on the well-deserved honor. I know that their dad is looking down on them very proudly today. Congratulations.

IMMIGRATION COVERAGE BIASED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the issue of immigration continues to simmer, but it is not because of any substantive news in Congress. It is driven by the media and the coverage is slanted.

In the last 3 months, the three Capitol Hill publications have run over 30 stories about immigration. By a 10 to 1 ratio, they promoted amnesty for illegal immigrants over the need for border security.

Articles in The Washington Post and The Wall Street Journal reflect the same media agenda. These publications also published over 30 pro-amnesty articles, but not a single pro-enforcement article.

The national media should give the American people the facts, not tell them what to think. We need more objective news stories and fewer opinion pieces masquerading as news reports.

TEAM 26'S RIDE ON WASHINGTON

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Team 26 for continuing the call for commonsense gun violence prevention.

This Saturday, Team 26 begins their second Ride on Washington. This courageous group of men and women will be biking 400 miles from Newtown, Connecticut, in my district, to Washington, D.C.

Team 26 is made up of parents whose children attend or attended Sandy Hook Elementary School and folks who have lost loved ones to gun violence. They ride to honor the victims of gun violence from Newtown and from across the country, and they ride to urge Congress to act.

Team 26 rides to bring the message of peace, hope, and love. Let's listen to Team 26 and put politics aside.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote to enact meaningful gun violence prevention legislation this year.

NATIONAL FROZEN FOOD MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge National Frozen Food Month, and in doing so, one of my home State's own frozen food companies, Better Baked Foods.

Headquartered in North East, Pennsylvania, in the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, with facilities in Erie, Pennsylvania, and New York, Better Baked Foods is currently celebrating its 50th anniversary.

Over the years, Better Baked has built a reputation as an affordable option for nutritious snack foods. Today, the company proudly employs over 300 associates who produce over 325,000 pieces of frozen French bread pizzas, flatbreads, and breakfast sandwiches.

By devoting the necessary resources to its people, equipment, and facilities, Better Baked is continually working to ensure that it meets consumer demand and grows its operation.

I am proud to honor a company that is constantly innovating to improve its products while also recognizing the hard work and the efforts of its employees.

Mr. Speaker, in celebration of National Frozen Food Month, I wish to applaud Better Baked Foods and the entire frozen food industry for their hard work and continued contributions to strong local economies, through jobs and quality, affordable meals for our Nation's consumers.

BOYS 2 MEN

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Obama's new initiative, My Brother's Keeper, and to highlight one organization in our district doing outstanding work to mentor young men.

Boys 2 Men was created in November 2002 by Clayton Muhammad, with the mission of bringing young Black and Latino men together to build a bond of brotherhood and to redefine manhood. The organization has been a phenomenal success.

The members of Boys 2 Men are graduating from high school, going to college, and serving our country in the military.

Boys 2 Men has produced outstanding young men like Gilberto Chaidez, a graduate of West Aurora High School and a senior at the University of Illinois majoring in civil engineering. Gilberto was named the National Star Student of the Year by the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers.

Jamario Taylor is a graduate of East Aurora High School and a senior at Western Illinois University. Jamario is a record-holder in the high jump and a top-ranked NCAA athlete.

Alexander Sewell is a graduate of Roosevelt University in Chicago. Alex went on to work in the office of Leader PELOSI; for the Secretary of Energy, Steven Chu; and now in the office of Senator LANDRIEU.

Initiatives like Boys 2 Men and My Brother's Keeper are invaluable resources to help young men get their lives on the right track, even if, despite everyone's best efforts, some of them end up working for the United States Congress.

LET'S RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, once again, to call for this body to bring H.R. 1010 to the floor and raise the Federal minimum wage.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will falsely claim that this will kill jobs. They misrepresent the findings of a recent CBO report. The important takeaway from that CBO report is that raising the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour will raise the wages of more than 16 million Americans and bring nearly 1 million Americans out of poverty.

In the 1990s, when the Clinton administration raised the minimum wage, the Republicans also argued that doing so would kill jobs, but the exact opposite happened. What we saw following the minimum wage increase in the 1990s was the greatest number of jobs created in a 4-year period.

A rising tide lifts all boats, Mr. Speaker. Let's raise the minimum wage. Let's grow our economy, and let's put people back to work.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2824, PREVENTING GOVERNMENT WASTE AND PROTECTING COAL MINING JOBS IN AMERICA; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2641, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 501 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 501

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2824) to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to stop the ongoing waste by the Department of the Interior of taxpayer resources and implement the final rule on excess spoil, mining waste, and buffers for perennial and intermittent streams, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on

Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–41 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–39. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 6, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure addressing loan guarantees to Ukraine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 0915

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bills.

House Resolution 501 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2641, the Responsibility of Professionally Invigorating Development Act, known as the RAPID Act. The resolution also provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2824, Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America.

Lastly, the resolution provides suspension authority for legislation to provide much-needed financial relief to the government of Ukraine.

The resolution makes in order all of the amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules regarding the RAPID Act. It makes in order half of the amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules regarding the coal jobs bill.

Of the amendments made in order, more than half are sponsored by my colleagues across the aisle. The resolution provides for a robust debate in the House of Representatives.

In July, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law held a hearing on H.R. 2641. The subcommittee reported the bill favorably, without amendment, by voice vote. On July 31, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 2641 favorably reported without amendment.

In August, the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held hearings on H.R. 2824. In November, the Committee on Natural Resources, by a bipartisan vote, voted favorably for the bill and reported it out.

Mr. Speaker, the bills before us today garnered majority support and bipartisan support for one simple reason: they ensure the regulatory process works for Americans, as intended by Congress.

Across the Nation, energy and infrastructure projects are being significantly delayed. In some cases, the environmental reviews have continued on for a decade or more. According to a study by the Chamber of Commerce, current delays are costing more than $1 trillion in economic development; and those delays are also prohibiting the creation of 1.9 million jobs.

As our country continues to struggle through a lackluster recovery, ensuring these beleaguered studies are completed would help generate jobs and create economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, in 2011, President Obama's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness recommended action to simplify regulatory review and streamline project approvals to accelerate jobs and growth.

Just this year, in his State of the Union, President Obama called for permit streamlining. He said action must be taken to ''slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process for key projects so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.''

News reports like to highlight our disagreements. In fact, it often seems that there is nothing that we can agree on. That is not true. Earlier this term, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. That bill passed by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 417–3.

The RAPID Act is nearly identical legislation to streamlining provisions contained in H.R. 3080 and the streamlining proposals from the President.

The House-passed WRRDA provided a process for Army Corps of Engineers-led studies to be concurrently reviewed in more of a parallel, as opposed to a linear fashion by multiple agencies. The President initiated a similar proposal, where studies had to be completed within 3 years.

The President and each Member of Congress who supported WRRDA should support this bill. The RAPID Act is simple. It allows multiple agencies to study the environmental impacts of a project at the same time. Because the agencies will have a better process by which to study a project, the RAPID Act establishes a reasonable and efficient timeline for completion of the study.

That is it. The RAPID Act provides a better process and a better timeline. The RAPID Act does not alter or weaken any of our environmental laws. The RAPID Act does not require that environmentally sensitive areas be developed.

The RAPID Act does not force agencies to approve projects. It simply reforms our permitting and regulatory

process to allow our Nation's most important infrastructure projects to move forward in a timely manner.

The President has asked for this to happen. 417 House Democrats and Republicans have supported this already. The bill should pass the House overwhelmingly with bipartisan support. This bill will get Washington out of the way of our economic growth and put unemployed Americans on a pathway back to work.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2824, Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America. H.R. 2824 stabilizes the out-of-control regulatory scheme involving the Department of the Interior.

In 2008, after a 5-year exhaustive process, the Office of Surface Mining finalized a rule to protect our streams from excessive coal waste. The rule was supposed to go into effect on January 12, 2009.

However, the process was sidelined by a sue-and-settle gambit that the OSM, under President Obama's administration, used to attempt to rewrite the already finalized rule.

Since that settlement, the administration has spent 5 additional years and billed hardworking American taxpayers an additional $10 million attempting to rewrite the rule.

H.R. 2824 is simple. It tells OSM to put in place the 2008 rule, study the results, and report to Congress. If the study reveals a need to draft a new rule, then a new rule should be drafted. By putting in place the already finalized 2008 rule, H.R. 2824 ensures that our streams are safe while further study is conducted.

It is easy to see why these underlying bills should garner strong bipartisan support. They are measured and balanced in their approach to our project study and regulatory processes. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Florida, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Just last week, I found myself standing here, managing a rule for two very similar bills. At the time, I thought we were on a merry-go-round, aimlessly moving in useless circles. I will stand by that analogy again today.

When similar bills came before Congress last session, the Senate didn't pass them. The President said he would not sign them, as he has this particular legislation. It seems to me that these measures are a foregone conclusion.

Ultimately, the same tired talking points might be a fun ride for some, but they will never actually take you anywhere. This kind of spinning in circles is a favorite tactic, it seems, of my friends on the other side of the aisle.

For example, this Congress has already taken 109 antienvironmental votes. Last Congress, it was 247. These were votes against clear air, against clean water, and to destroy our planet for future generations.

Under Republican leadership, we have also voted to repeal, as we did a day or so ago, the Affordable Care Act 50 different times, a law that, in many respects, has led to millions of Americans signing up for health insurance that didn't have it before.

And I will continue to ask my colleagues: If you don't like that particular measure, where is yours that would replace it? And apparently, nothing is forthcoming, at least until this time.

Based on the frequency of these quixotic votes, it is obvious that my friends across the aisle have given up or are not interested in governing or addressing any of the issues that are most pressing to this Nation.

Consider, for instance, that there are 2 million Americans relying on Congress to extend unemployment insurance, with close to 200,000 of them being unemployed veterans who have sacrificed time and again for our country.

Last week, I said the following:

> We should be spending the House's time on extending unemployment insurance, working on comprehensive immigration reform, and raising the minimum wage.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have continued to ignore the plight of middle class and working poor Americans, immigrants hoping for a better life for their families, and denying the undeniable impact of climate change, just to name a few.

We should be raising the minimum wage in order to give millions of hardworking Americans the pay they have earned. Nearly 5 years have passed since the last increase in the Federal minimum wage. Currently, a full-time minimum wage worker makes less than $16,000 per year, which is below the poverty line for a family of two or more.

My friends did not take my suggestions last week, and I doubt they will take them this week. Instead, we are considering two more pointless bills that will go nowhere. One of them, the acronym for it is RAPID. That is correct. Rapidly and fastly, it will go nowhere.

The first of today's bills, H.R. 2641, ignores the fact that, for more than 40 years, the National Environmental Policy Act has provided an effective framework for all types of proposed actions that require Federal approval pursuant to a Federal law, such as the Clean Water Act.

□ 0930

H.R. 2641 is based on the assumption that the NEPA environmental review and permitting process results in project delays.

However, when we considered this measure last Congress, the Congressional Research Service reported that delays in construction project approvals ''are more often tied to local, State, and project-specific factors.'' These factors include ''primarily local/State agency priorities, project funding levels, local opposition to a project, project complexity, or late changes in project scope,'' not to mention the litigation that goes on surrounding these measures.

CRS goes even further, reporting that even most environmental project delays are not the result of NEPA, but actually due to ''laws other than NEPA.'' The measure undermines current regulatory protections and could jeopardize public health and safety by prioritizing speed over meaningful analysis.

Now, turning to H.R. 2824, the other measure included in today's rule, which, like the 50 times that we voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, my Republican friends have done that, they have also offered 50 rules which are not open rules in spite of the fact that we began this session by the Speaker of the House saying that this would be the most open House that we have had.

H.R. 2824 included in this rule is no more productive than the previous legislation offered. The legislation would overturn a court decision in order to block a buffer requirement designed to prevent damage to waterways from surface coal mining operations. These are protections that President Ronald Reagan put in place.

The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that over 500 mountains have been destroyed by the practice of mountaintop removal mining, more than 1.2 million acres of forest has been eliminated, and nearly 2,000 miles of streams have been buried or polluted by these mining projects. I wonder what part of knocking a mountaintop off do people not understand as destruction, and if it is to be, that it should be done carefully.

These are protections for all of us in our society. As many as 60,000 additional cases of cancer in central Appalachia are directly linked to mountaintop removal, and more than 700 additional deaths from heart disease occur each year.

Last month, West Virginia University scientists published a study confirming high air pollution levels around mountaintop removal coal mines, suggesting a link to the higher rates of cardiovascular disease, birth defects, and cancer that is seen in these communities.

Instead of addressing these issues, H.R. 2824 would reinstate a George W. Bush administration rule that essentially prohibits the United States Department of the Interior from implementing any protections for streams against mountaintop removal and coal mining.

Let me lift the comment of Judge Charles Haden in a case called Bragg v. Robertson. The judge says:

When valley fills are permitted in intermittent and perennial streams, they destroy those stream segments. The normal flow and gradient of the stream is now buried under millions of cubic yards of excess spoil waste material, an extremely adverse effect. If there are fish, they cannot migrate. If there is any life form that cannot acclimate to life deep in a rubble pile, it is eliminated. No effect on related environmental values is more adverse than obliteration. Under a valley fill, the water quality of the stream becomes zero. Because there is no stream, there is no water quality.

The Bush rule in '08 was vacated by the District of Columbia District Court on February 20, 2014. The Obama administration started to draft new stream protections upon taking office, into which the minority has conducted a long, fruitless investigation. Indeed, the years of investigation have uncovered no misconduct. The only results of the investigation are wasted time and taxpayer money, sending over 13,500 pages of documents, 25 hours of audio recordings, 19,000 staff hours, and costing the United States Department of the Interior and Office of Surface Mining approximately $1.5 million.

We saw an example yesterday in one of our committees investigating the Internal Revenue Service for something that just simply has not occurred in any partisan fashion. And I can demonstrate that because, if one believes that the IRS only went after conservative organizations within the time period that was being investigated by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, then it was not during that period that my church, Mt. Hermon AME Church in Fort Lauderdale, received the same kind of notices that are being complained about; and what we did was what everybody has every right to do, which is make the necessary appeal, and we were successful in that regard.

All of these partisan witch hunts need to stop. We are a better people than this, and we should be about the business of the people of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, today's measure exists as partisan talking points, bumper sticker talk by my Republican colleagues, rather than serious legislation to move this country forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support for this rule which will govern debate on important legislation that my colleague, DOUG LAMBORN, and I have introduced.

This legislation, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America, would stop the administration from destroying thousands of direct and indirect coal mining jobs and stop the price of electricity in places like Ohio from skyrocketing.

Since the early days of this administration, Mr. Speaker, the Office of Surface Mining at the Department of the Interior has been trying to rewrite a 2008 coal mining rule. This rewrite has been fraught with mismanagement, waste of taxpayer dollars, intimidation of contractors by OSM employees towards the contractors working on the rule, and even the Director of OSM demanding that the contractors change the job loss estimates because it would look bad politically for the administration. But, look, don't take my word for it. You can go out and read the Department's own inspector general's report that highlights the administration's problems rewriting this rule.

This legislation would put an end to this nonsense and implement the 2008 rule. It would save taxpayers millions of dollars that are being wasted on this frivolous rewrite. It also would protect the thousands of direct jobs that the administration admitted would be destroyed by this rule and thousands more indirect jobs that would also be lost.

In eastern and southeastern Ohio, my constituents are the ones mining the coal that powers the economic engine in the Midwest, not to mention that America gets over 40 percent of its energy from coal, the State of Ohio gets over 80 percent of its energy from coal. This rule would put not only those jobs at risk, but also cause electricity prices to skyrocket and endanger the low electricity rates that manufacturing in this country relies on to keep moving forward.

The rule from the Department must be stopped in order to protect hardworking coal miners across America and to stop the waste of taxpayer dollars by the Department of the Interior. I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule today and to support this legislation when it comes to the floor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my good friend from Florida that I have no additional speakers at this time and would be prepared to close. So I reserve the balance of my time if you have additional speakers.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the sages of America who is often quoted is Will Rogers. One of the things that I paraphrase that he said was: Buy land, because we are not making any more of that. And I use it as an analogy for mountaintop mining, knocking off the tops of these mountains. We ain't making no more mountains. Although I guess we can because in Florida we have what we call trash mountains. So I guess we can build something up, but I doubt very seriously that the quality of it will be of the kind that we see with the mountain ranges of this great America.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are about protecting special interests that happen to be near and dear to some of my friends across the aisle. We are here voting on tired, discredited, and destructive policies that have absolutely no chance of becoming law. This is a failure of leadership by my Republican colleagues and, quite frankly, a waste of time. We should not be considering measures that will help destroy this planet for our children and grandchildren. We need strong environmental protections to ensure that we have clean air, clean water, and clean food.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3546, Mr. LEVIN's bill to extend emergency unemployment insurance for the long-term unemployed across this country for whom it has run out.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a very sad thing that we continue to let people languish without fulfilling our responsibility to them with reference to unemployment insurance. It is a detriment to this Nation, and it serves us no useful purpose to continue delaying this particular effort.

While I do have the floor for a moment, I do wish to address legislation that I hope does come here with reference to our offering assistance to the people in Ukraine who should have an opportunity to make their own determination regarding their future and that we should stand with and, I am sure, are prepared to do so in an effort to assist them.

Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune of being the president of the Parliamentary Assembly for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. During that time, I went to Ukraine on three different occasions, and during that time, I had the good fortune to be the lead monitor after the Orange Revolution; so it is not that I don't have a clear understanding of much that is going on. But what I hope my colleagues here will do is recognize that the Baltics, the Balkans, and the near abroad of Russia and Europe are in need of clarity with reference to matters and not simpleminded, noncomplex answers to very difficult problems that Ukraine is now faced with. It is a nationwide, continuing problem for us.

Mr. Speaker, apparently, we do have some other speaker en route, so I am required to reserve the balance of my time, as I anticipated I might be.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we had someone show up, and so the gentleman from Florida has allowed the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) to speak.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of the gentlemen for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we just need to adopt H.R. 2824 and the rule supporting it. This is a good piece of legislation.

Unfortunately, this administration is waging what appears to many of us to be a war on coal. The stream buffer zone rule that has been proposed by OSM, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation, is a very troubling rule. It would have adverse effects on all kinds of coal mining way beyond what the stated intention is.

□ 0945

The stated intention is to protect the quality of streams in the Appalachian area, but this rule goes way beyond that. This would have the effect of closing down much of the coal mining in that part of the country. So it is overkill. It is way beyond what is necessary.

The whole rulemaking process, Mr. Speaker, is flawed. We had a very good rewrite of the rules that was done in the last administration. That went through millions of dollars of effort, many years of rulemaking, taking comments, and the end result was a very satisfactory rewrite of the older rule. Yet, without even letting that fully take effect, this administration is throwing that rule out and wanting to go to an overly stringent and unrealistic rule. Let's go back to the last rule that was done through the proper procedures.

So H.R. 2824 is a good piece of legislation. I commend Representative JOHNSON for carrying this piece of legislation. We have looked at this in detail in our full committee and in the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, and this is a much better approach. So I urge the full House to adopt H.R. 2824 and the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and will. I will close with what I said yesterday. When I was a child, Tennessee Ernie Ford sang a song about coal mining. It was that you load 16 tons and what do you get? Another day older and deeper in debt.

I have been in Appalachia, as have many of my friends. I went to school in Tennessee, and often had an opportunity to travel to Kentucky and other areas during that period of time, and I have been in West Virginia. I have seen the conditions that many people work in.

I would only hope that they know that there are voices here who believe, just like throughout the rest of this Nation, in spite of the awesomeness of the work that they do in coal mining—and I might add as a footnote, there has been no deterioration in the job market with reference to coal mining—all that is being sought is that coal mining be done in a safe manner, and that the people living in those surroundings have the same kind of quality air, quality water, and quality food that is desperately needed by everybody.

We need look no further than West Virginia and accidents that have occurred there. Nobody wanted that to happen. Indeed, what we saw were corporate dodges of people who had taken advantage of smaller communities. That needs to stop.

I believe my colleagues here want to see to it that we have a situation where those who are working in these environments have an opportunity for safety and have an opportunity for clean air in their regions as well as water and food.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, and to vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This rule provides for ample and open debate. It makes in order amendments from both sides of the aisle. Further, it advances bills that were favorably reported out of committee and will receive bipartisan support.

The RAPID Act is good for our infrastructure needs. It puts in place a good process that helps our agencies conduct quality and timely environmental reviews.

This bill should receive overwhelming bipartisan support. Republicans and Democrats have supported these same provisions already in this Congress.

The Florida delegation knows all too well the impact that delayed studies have on moving our critical projects forward. Port Everglades, which is in the district of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), has been under review for 17 years. That is too long. It is too much. It needs to be completed. The study of the project at Port Everglades is a prime example of Washington bureaucracy crushing America's jobs and America's future.

The RAPID Act would make it possible to move projects forward while protecting our environment. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed a similar solution. The House passed a similar solution in the WRDA bill. We should pass this bill and give our infrastructure projects a good review process.

Our Nation's economy is sagging under an inefficient government. Our unemployed friends and neighbors are being hurt by our stagnant regulatory review system. The RAPID Act provides a better process and a better timeline. It does not change our environmental standards. It does not require agency approval of projects. It simply reforms our permitting process.

The coal jobs bill puts in place an already approved rule. It ends the regulatory limbo that has existed since 2009. It gives certainty to those who work in the coal industry.

Let's reform our review methods. Let's give our government the tools and the incentives to move America's infrastructure projects forward. When we do, we will release economic activity. We will strengthen our economy, and we will put Americans to work.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bills are good. I urge Members of this House to vote for the rule, vote for the bills, and move our country forward.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule for H.R. 2641, the "Responsible and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, or as some have termed it, the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

If the RAPID Act were to become law in its present form, a permit or license for project would be "deemed" approved if the reviewing agency does not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

Mr. Speaker, I share some of the frustrations expressed by many members of the House Judiciary Committee, which marked up this bill last summer, with the NEPA process.

There is something odd about a system in which it can take half a year or more to approve the siting plan for a wind farm but fracking operations regulations can be approved and conducted a few hundred feet from somebody's home with no community oversight process in just a few months.

Something is wrong with this picture.

But I strongly believe that this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

The bill in its current form is an example of a medicine that is worse than a disease.

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, namely automatic approval of projects with the need for positive agency action.

I expect to speak on my amendment shortly but suffice it-to-say, this bill goes out of its way to ensure that some projects might be prematurely approved.

That's because under H.R. 2641, if a federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the termination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved, deemed approved by such agency.

This creates a set of perverse incentives. First, as an agency is up against that deadline and legitimate work is yet to be completed, it is likely to disapprove the project simply because the issues have not been vetted.

Second, frequently there are times when it is the case that the complexity of issues that need to be resolved necessitates a longer review period, rather than an arbitrary limit.

So if H.R. 2641 were to become law the most likely outcome is that federal agencies would be required to make decisions based on incomplete information, or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

Mr. Speaker, the new requirements contained in H.R. 2641 amend the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), even though the bill is drafted as an amendment to the APA.

The bill ignores the fact that NEPA has for more than 40 years provided an effective framework for all types of projects (not just construction projects) that require federal approval pursuant to a federal law, such as the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to reject this Rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 501 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3546) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3546.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—191

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George

Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Diaz-Balart
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (IA)
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1018

Messrs. SCHRADER and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 99 I was not present due to unavoidable air travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—225

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

NAYS—190

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

NOT VOTING—15

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Roskam
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1028

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 497 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3826.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1030

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 5, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–373, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–373 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for each electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—230

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

NOES—184

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

NOT VOTING—16

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Nugent
Pastor (AZ)
Rangel
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1034

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 228, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

AYES—184

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

NOES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

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

NOT VOTING—18

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Ellison
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Pitts
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1038

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SCHAKOWSKY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 221, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

AYES—190

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

NOES—221

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

NOT VOTING—19

Cárdenas
Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1042

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 231, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

AYES—178

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

NOES—231

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

NOT VOTING—21

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gerlach
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kuster
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Price (GA)
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1046

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 104 I was detained while meeting with a constituent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 497, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3826 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Redesignate section 5 as section 6 and insert after section 4 the following:

SEC. 5. SAVING CONSUMERS MONEY ON THEIR ELECTRICITY BILLS.

This Act shall not apply with respect to rules that save consumers money on electricity bills, including rules that allow for or encourage energy efficiency, demand response, and other approaches to lower the cost of electricity for consumers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 3826, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward improvement that I believe both sides of the aisle can agree is absolutely necessary, and would be overwhelmingly supported by the American people.

If my amendment passes, it will ensure that the American people and American businesses throughout our country will be protected from avoidable energy price increases.

Specifically, my amendment ensures that nothing in this act would limit

the ability of regulators to issue rules that save consumers money on their electricity bills, including rules that allow for or encourage energy efficiency, demand response, and other approaches to lower the cost of electricity for consumers.

Making our homes and businesses more energy-efficient will save Americans trillions of dollars and, simultaneously, fight climate change by reducing our country's carbon footprint.

Energy efficiency standards have already saved Americans $40 billion, and we are on track to save $1.7 trillion in energy costs by 2035. Proven Federal programs, like Energy Star, boost energy efficiency and have conserved energy by helping consumers and businesses find energy-efficient appliances and products.

In fact, commercial buildings which used Energy Star technology show an average of 7 percent energy savings. Progress in energy efficiency is a win/win that is good for our pocketbooks and good for our environment. We can do more.

If just 1 in 10 households used current technology to upgrade their home heating systems, we could keep 17 billion pounds of pollution out of our air.

A vote for my amendment is a vote to ensure that we keep every tool available to conserve energy and help consumers avoid needless energy costs.

Mr. Speaker, price increases in the energy sector are a very real and very serious problem. It hurts working families struggling to make ends meet. It hurts homeowners who struggle every month to pay their mortgage and utility bills, including many of my hard-working families in Ventura County.

It hurts small and large businesses, driving up the price of doing business and impacting their ability to invest in new equipment and hire new workers.

It hurts our military and impacts military readiness, including Naval Base Ventura County, costing more to keep the lights on and operate critical facilities at Point Mugu and Port Hueneme.

It hurts our seniors who live on fixed incomes and cannot afford an increase in their utility bills.

It hurts the specialty crop growers in Ventura County, our lemon, strawberry, avocado, and lettuce growers, as well as our cut flower producers, whose bottom line is so closely tied to the price of energy.

It also hurts our overall national economy and threatens to slow job creation and the recovery of our very fragile economy.

This is why it is so important that we allow regulators, like the EPA, to move forward with rules that can save consumers money on their electricity bills, encourage energy efficiency, and lower the cost of electricity for all of our consumers.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit to ensure a better and cleaner America for our children, our grandchildren, and many, many more generations to come.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a motion to recommit that we don't need, it is this one. The entire purpose of the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, H.R. 3826, is to ensure that America remains competitive in the global marketplace by lowering electricity costs.

The Energy Information Agency reported recently that 41 out of 50 States have higher electricity rates today than they did 4 years ago. Primarily, these electricity rates are going up because of the policies of the Obama administration.

This act specifically allows in the future the opportunity to build a new coal-powered plant in America the way coal-powered plants are being built around the world. We don't anticipate one to be built as long as natural gas prices are low, but if they go up, as they have in Europe, we want the flexibility to build a coal-powered plant in America.

The President talks frequently about an all-of-the-above energy policy, and yet, his policies, his regulations, his executive orders do not allow us to use as much coal. We simply want that flexibility. We are not mandating it, but it gives us additional flexibility.

For that reason, I would ask us to defeat the motion to recommit and adopt H.R. 3826.

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

PARTNERSHIP FOR A
BETTER ENERGY FUTURE,
February 28, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Partnership for a Better Energy Future (the Partnership), a coalition of more than 100 organizations representing over 80 percent of the U.S. economy, urges your support for H.R. 3826, the ''Electricity Security and Affordability Act,'' which is expected to receive a vote in the House next week. H.R. 3826 provides a more reasonable path forward in relation to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) greenhouse gas (GHG) regulations, while also protecting jobs, economic growth and international competitiveness.

The Partnership's fundamental mission is to promote an ''all-of-the-above'' energy strategy that ensures the continued availability of reliable and affordable energy for American families and businesses while also protecting the environment. Unfortunately, the EPA's proposed GHG regulations on new power plants fail to meet this test.

The EPA has begun implementing a suite of new regulations designed to address GHG emissions from the electric power sector. By law, these regulations are supposed to be flexible and take into account cost and commercial availability; however, in practice the EPA's proposed GHG regulations have been the exact opposite. The very first regulation the EPA unveiled, which applies to new power plants, mandates technologies that are not yet commercially available—effectively banning the construction of coal-fired power plants going forward. With similar regulations on existing power plants due in June, followed immediately by regulations on other energy-intensive industries, the EPA's heavy-handed approach is not an encouraging sign for the regulated community.

H.R. 3826 provides a reasonable path forward for the EPA's power plant GHG regulations, allowing the agency to regulate while also protecting a diverse energy mix. For new power plants, the bill requires separate standards for coal and gas, with the coal standard subcategorized for coal types and aligned with the best-performing commercially available generation technologies. It provides a reasonable path forward for carbon dioxide capture and sequestration (CCS), prohibiting the EPA from mandating its use until the technology has been deployed by at least six units located at different commercial power plants in the United States—in other words, until it is truly ready. Finally, it allows the EPA to craft rules or guidelines for existing power plants, but requires Congress to review them and set a start date before they can take effect.

The members of the Partnership support regulations that are cost-effective, technologically achievable and allow for a robust ''all-of-the-above'' energy strategy. H.R. 3826 would achieve these goals by allowing the EPA to regulate in a balanced, reasonable fashion. The Partnership urges your support for H.R. 3826.

Sincerely,

Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute; Alabama Automotive Manufacturer's Association; Alaska Chamber of Commerce; American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers; American Knife Manufacturers Association; American Petroleum Institute; American Road and Transportation Builders Association; Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce; Associated Industries of Florida; Associated Industries of Missouri; Association of American Railroads; Automotive Recyclers Association; Balanced Energy for Texas; Baltimore Washington Corridor Chamber; Bettisworth North Architects and Planners; Bismarck-Mandan Chamber of Commerce; Brick Industry Association; Buckeye Power, Inc.

California Cotton Ginners Association; California Cotton Growers Association; California Manufacturers & Technology Association; Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry; Consumer Energy Alliance; CropLife America; Dallas Regional Chamber; Electric Reliability Coordinating Council; Florida State Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; Forging Industry Association; Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce; Georgia Association of Manufacturers; Georgia Chamber of Commerce; Greater Houston Partnership; Greater North Dakota Chamber; Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce; Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce; Gulf Coast Lignite Coalition; Illinois Coal Association; Illinois Manufacturers' Association.

Independent Petroleum Association of America; Indiana Chamber of Commerce; Indiana Manufacturers Association; Industrial Minerals Association—North America; Institute for 21st Century Energy; Iowa Association of Business and Industry; Kansas Chamber of Commerce; Kentucky Coal Association; Kerrville Area Chamber of Commerce; Longview Chamber of Commerce; Louisiana Association of Business and Industry; Lubbock Chamber of Commerce; Metals Service Center Institute; Michigan Manufacturers Association; Michigan Railroads Association; Midwest Food Processors Association Inc.; Minnesota Chamber of Commerce; Mississippi Manufacturers Association; Missouri

Chamber of Commerce; Montana Chamber of Commerce.

Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Manufacturers; National Cattlemen's Beef Association; National Marine Manufacturers Association; National Mining Association; National Oilseed Processors; Association; National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Natural Gas Supply Association; Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry; Non-Ferrous Founders' Society; North Carolina Chamber of Commerce; Oklahoma Railroad Association; Ohio Chamber of Commerce; Ohio Coal Association; Ohio Manufacturers' Association; Ohio Rural Electric Cooperatives, Inc.; Partnership for Affordable Clean Energy; Pennsylvania Coal Alliance; Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association.

Portland Cement Association; Printing Industries of America; Railway Supply Industry, Inc.; Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council; South Carolina Chamber of Commerce; Southwest Louisiana Economic Development Alliance; SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association; Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry; Texas Association of Business; Texas Cotton Ginners' Association; Texas Railroad Association; The Chamber of Sparks, Reno & Northern Nevada; The Fertilizer Institute; The Vinyl Institute; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; United Transportation Union; Valve Manufacturers Association of America; Virginia Chamber of Commerce; West Virginia Chamber of Commerce; Western Agricultural Processors Association; Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group Inc.; Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce; Wyoming Chamber Partnership.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Triangle, VA, March 4, 2014.

DEAR MEMBER: On behalf of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) and our members I want to ask you to vote for H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act introduced by Representative Ed Whitfield.

The UMWA is gravely concerned that the EPA has proposed an emission rate limit for new coal electric generation plants that requires carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) that has not been adequately demonstrated nor is commercially available at this time. Furthermore, EPA has based this requirement on federally-subsidized coal generation plants still under construction and that have yet to produce one kilowatt of electricity.

EPA has estimated that the CCS requirement will increase the cost of new coal generation by 30 to 80 percent. Adding this increased cost to building new coal generation clearly demonstrates that coal is not part of the Administration's ''All of the Above'' energy policy. Myself, along with five other Union Presidents, wrote President Obama last year with our recommendations on ways to build new efficient coal generation that would reduce carbon emissions without requiring CCS.

The Edison Electric Institute estimates that over 60 gigawatts of coal generation will close between now and 2015 as a result of EPA's final Mercury regulation and lower natural gas prices. It is important to point out that most of these plants were required to run to meet demand during the recent polar vortex.

The UMWA is very concerned about the impact the proposed NSPS regulation for existing coal plants scheduled to be released in June will have on the remaining fleet of coal plants and on UMWA members and other jobs in our rural communities. The EPA and the Administration consistently ignore the impact the loss of jobs in coal mining, utility and transportation sectors will have on rural coalfield communities.

As these well paying jobs disappear, how do we continue to provide wages, pensions, and health care benefits that miners and others have worked a lifetime to earn? How will the loss of these jobs impact the local tax base, school systems and health care facilities in these rural communities? UMWA contracts alone pump billions of dollars annually into these communities through our wages, pensions and health care. If that disappears, there will be nothing to replace it.

The UMWA urges you to vote for H.R. 3826, the Electricity and Affordability Act.

Sincerely yours,

CECIL E. ROBERTS,
International President.

AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE,
March 5, 2014

To: Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, House staff assigned to steel and/or energy issues.

SUPPORT H.R. 3826—THE ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

BACKGROUND

As the production of steel is energy-intensive, the availability and reliability of energy is essential to the international competitiveness of the domestic steel industry. In order to reduce costs and improve its competitiveness, the industry in the U.S. has reduced its energy-intensity by 27% since 1990. In fact, a recent Department of Energy-sponsored report concluded that the steel industry in the U.S. is the most energy efficient of any major steel producing country.

The steel industry in the U.S. is subject to substantial international competition, often from nations such as China, where the industry is largely state-owned, controlled, and subsidized. In fact, in two recent cases, the Department of Commerce determined that Chinese steel producers were receiving below market rates for electricity, which constitutes a subsidy. Given these challenges, policies enacted in the U.S. that raise energy costs on domestic companies threaten the industry's ability to remain competitive internationally.

SITUATION

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has undertaken a two-pronged approach to regulate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from electric generating utilities. It has proposed a rule to limit GHGs from new power plants that will likely be finalized soon, while the Agency plans to issue a draft rule on GHG emissions from existing power plants later this year. Although these regulations are placed directly on the utility sector, electricity customers will bear the costs associated with compliance. The rules will likely raise the cost of electricity to large industrial customers like steel producers, while potentially lessening the quality and reliability of our nation's electricity supply. H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, directs EPA to use achievable and realistic standards when setting GHG limits for new power plants and would ensure a role for Congress in determining when the GHG rule for existing plants goes into effect.

REQUEST

AISI urges all members of the House to support H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, when it is considered by the full House. Doing so will help uphold the international competitiveness of the domestic steel industry by maintaining an affordable and reliable supply of electricity.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. GIBSON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 223, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—184

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

NAYS—223

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)

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

NOT VOTING—23

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
DesJarlais
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kennedy
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Mullin
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Quigley
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1104

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 105 I was not able to participate in this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 105 Motion to Recommit, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 183, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

AYES—229

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

NOES—183

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

NOT VOTING—18

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Pearce
Price (GA)
Ros-Lehtinen
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1111

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PRICE of George. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 106 I was not able to participate in this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 2014 I was inadvertently recorded as a ''no'' vote on

rollcall 106—H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act. I support H.R. 3826 and fully intended on voting in favor of the legislation.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas on March 5, 2014, during a hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Chairman Darrell E. Issa gave a statement and then posed ten questions to former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner, who stated that she was invoking her Fifth Amendment right not to testify;

Whereas the Committee's Ranking Member, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, clearly sought recognition to take his turn for questions under Committee and House Rules;

Whereas, Chairman Issa then quickly adjourned the hearing and refused to allow him to make any statement or ask any questions;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings protested immediately, stating: ''Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a Committee like this. You just cannot do this. This is, we are better than that as a country, we are better than that as a Committee.''

Whereas, Chairman Issa then returned and allowed Ranking Member Cummings to begin his statement, but when it became clear that Chairman Issa did not want to hear what Ranking Member Cummings was saying, turned off Ranking Member Cummings' microphone, ordered Republican staff to ''close it down,'' and repeatedly signaled to end the hearing with his hand across his neck;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings objected again, stating: ''You cannot have a one-sided investigation. There is absolutely something wrong with that'';

Whereas Chairman Issa made a statement of his own and posed questions during the hearing, but refused to allow other members of the Committee, and in particular the Ranking Member who had sought recognition, to make statements under the five-minute rule in violation of House Rule XI;

Whereas Chairman Issa instructed the microphones to be turned off and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement in violation of Rule XVI because he did not want to permit Ranking Member Cummings to speak;

Whereas Chairman Issa's abusive behavior on March 5 is part of a continuing pattern in which he has routinely excluded members of the Committee from investigative meetings, and has routinely provided information to the press before sharing it with Committee members;

Whereas Chairman Issa has violated Clause 1 of Rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct which states that ''A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives strongly condemns the offensive and disrespectful manner in which Chairman Darrell E. Issa conducted the hearing of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on March 5, 2014, during which he turned off the microphones of the Ranking Member while he was speaking and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from Ohio will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion 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.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

PROVISION OF COSTS OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR UKRAINE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4152) to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4152

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

SECTION 1. PROVISION OF COSTS OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR UKRAINE.

From amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under ''Economic Support Fund'' in division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76), and prior Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, funding from unobligated balances shall be made available for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of loan guarantees for Ukraine, which are authorized to be provided in an appropriations Act, in accordance with section 504 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided*, That amounts made available for the costs of such guarantees shall not be considered ''assistance'' for the purpose of provisions of law limiting assistance to such country: *Provided further*, That none of the funds may be made available from amounts designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman 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 on the consideration of H.R. 4152.

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.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor H.R. 4152, a bill providing the authority for loan guarantees for Ukraine.

As we all sadly know, Ukraine is facing an extraordinarily difficult time. As a valued partner and friend of the United States, our Nation has a duty to provide the people of Ukraine with help when they now need it most.

This bill will provide some stability for the government and the people of Ukraine as they navigate through these troubled waters. The legislation before us will allow funds to be used to guarantee loans for the Government of Ukraine, in support of the Secretary of State's $1 billion pledge this week. This bill does not appropriate new funds, but simply allows funds to be used from existing State Department resources.

Ukraine's economy has been in a difficult position for years, but now the country faces, of course, real risks. Russia has punished Ukraine for leaning toward the West and has suspended the assistance they planned to provide.

This bill will not solve all of Ukraine's problems, obviously, but it is an important first step that will allow the country to shore up its finances and begin to make its economy more efficient.

With this legislation, Congress—and the United States—will show that we stand by those that oppose authoritarian rule. It will show that, as a nation, we will step up to help the people of Ukraine not only with our words, but with our deeds.

Ukraine is facing an uncertain economic future, Mr. Speaker, but they are choosing the right path of democracy and reform. The American people will stand with the Ukrainian people as they chart this new course, and today we will take a first step to quickly respond to their present need.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critically important bill and one that should pass the House and the Senate and be enacted into law without delay. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We must come together today on a bipartisan basis to support the people

of Ukraine and take a stand against Russia's aggression and illegal violation of Ukraine's sovereign and territorial integrity.

Since last November, the world has watched with growing alarm as the hopes and democratic aspirations of the Ukrainian people were met with violent crackdowns against activists, harassment of journalists, and restrictive legislation limiting basic democratic freedoms. The bloody images from the city square and rising death toll are horrific.

Last month, the Ukrainian Parliament, the democratically elected institution, responsibly exercised its mandate and took action on behalf of the people of Ukraine. Within days, hope returned as the Parliament ousted the reckless and dangerous former President Yanukovych, began discussions with the IMF on a financial support package, and formed a transitional government with early elections scheduled for May.

But Russia, through its dangerous and illegal military occupation of Crimea, has imperiled this progress and unnecessarily escalated this crisis. Russia has violated international law and its own treaty obligations with Ukraine. Ukraine now teeters on the brink of disaster and bloodshed, and I urgently call upon President Putin to work with Kiev and the international community to deescalate the situation immediately.

Now is the time for us to support the people of Ukraine. I strongly support President Obama's comprehensive aid package to support Ukraine, which includes $1 billion in loan guarantees, technical assistance on trade, and recovery of stolen assets.

The IMF is working with the transitional government in Kiev and is instrumental in stabilizing the Ukrainian economy. This crisis illustrates the importance of the IMF to our national and global security interests, and I hope the final assistance package we enact for Ukraine will include support for the IMF.

In addition, I urge my colleagues in Congress to support the IMF quota reforms in the President's budget request, which would expand the IMF's capacity to respond to these kinds of crises and maintain U.S. leadership, instead of continuing to pursue shortsighted, isolationist attacks on the IMF.

In the meantime, however, we should not let the perfect stand as the enemy of the good. In the bipartisan spirit of this bill, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to stand beside the people of Ukraine in their hour of darkness.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the committee's chairman of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4152 and strongly support this bipartisan legislation before us today to provide economic assistance to Ukraine during her hour of need. This loan guarantee will help stabilize the Ukrainian economy during a time of political transition and when this country's sovereignty is being tested by Russia. Now, more than ever, the United States needs to demonstrate bold leadership and stand up for those who choose democracy over tyranny.

This bill does not mean the end of Ukraine's serious challenges, but it is an important first step that will allow the government to begin to repair the economic damage caused by the former leadership and will help bring stability back to a nation that values freedom.

This legislation also sends a clear signal to Ukraine and the world that the United States stands by our friends. The Ukrainian people want democracy, justice, reform, and peace. The American people will stand with Ukraine as they chart a new course forward.

I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for their immediate, bipartisan response to this crisis in Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation at a very important time. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' so we can send this bill to the President's desk for his signature without delay.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4152, legislation that would provide the Government of Ukraine with urgently needed funds to address pressing needs at a critical moment. The Ukrainian people bravely confronted a brutal and corrupt regime and stood up for democracy and justice. They need our help now. This bill is a first step in answering their call.

The bill authorizes the United States to provide repayment guarantees for bonds that the Ukrainian Government plans to issue to raise cash. These guarantees will make it easier for Ukraine to sell the bonds at the lowest possible price and at the longest term. Our guarantees would be backed up by reserves, using existing appropriated funds that the Congress provided for exactly this type of emergency.

This bill is the initial contribution to sustaining Ukraine's new government as it seeks to restore stability and return Ukraine to political and economic health. It is part of a larger financial commitment from the EU and other states, and will also help Ukraine's efforts to reach agreement with the IMF and to implement needed reforms.

Without this support, Ukraine's progress could stall in the face of unrelenting pressure from Russia, which has illegally occupied the Crimea, is encouraging separatism and conflict, and which has substantial leverage on the Ukrainian economy.

Our country has a long history of answering the call of people who have chosen freedom and democracy. Ukraine is now making that call as its people are seeking to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity and build a more democratic, prosperous, and just future for themselves and their country. We must answer. This bill is our first step.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4152.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the distinguished chairman of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations.

□ 1130

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to provide critical loan guarantees to Ukraine as it struggles against Russian oppression.

A large and proud Ukrainian community has been part of my congressional district for well over a century. Initially, Ukrainians came to New Jersey in waves of immigration because of persecution under the czars, then later after the Soviet Union crushed an independent Ukraine in the 1920s.

Yes, from the days of my youth I have come to understand that Ukrainians have always cherished freedom almost more than any descendants of other Nations, peoples, and cultures. Even after living in America for decades, they remain devoted to their homeland, to independence.

Fiercely proud of their independent Nation, my constituents are now watching history repeat itself as Vladimir Putin occupies Crimea, and seems to be threatening other parts of eastern and southern Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, the people have the right and obligation to decide what they feel is best for their Nation—either closer ties to the EU, the European Community, and the West, or shift back to Russia. That is their choice, and it cannot and must not be decided through the force of arms.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am pleased that the President has proposed and the House will soon approve these loan guarantees for Ukraine. This measure is not enough. The Ukrainian people need strong leadership from the United States.

This bill sends the right message, it sends the needed loan guarantees, and I urge strong support for its passage.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I stand today with the people of Ukraine and in strong support of this legislation, which will provide the administration with additional and immediate flexibility to assist Ukraine. I look forward

to working with the gentleman from Kentucky and my good friend from New York on further ways to assist Ukraine in the appropriations process.

This effort cannot be just about helping Ukraine. It must also be about reversing Russian aggression, curbing Vladimir Putin's revanchist policies in Russia's ''Near Abroad.'' President Obama's action this morning to cut off access to assets and place travel restrictions on those involved in the violation of Ukraine's sovereign is a positive first step. The pressure must be increased in the coming days if Russia fails to reverse course.

I support a slate of economic sanctions led by the United States and Europe to isolate Russia's economy and its leadership, so that Putin is made to understand that his violation of international law and the sovereignty of his neighbors will not be tolerated.

The collapse of the Soviet Union was one of the seminal events of the 20th century. The Cold War is over. Territorial aggression by Russia will not resurrect its empire but only diminish its standing in the world and the future of its people.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me time to speak on this bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Ukraine is important to all of us, but for me it has a personal aspect. My mother, now 90 years old, escaped from Ukraine and the Communists after World War II. She understood firsthand how Joseph Stalin suppressed freedoms and liberties in Ukraine—much as Mr. Putin desires to do likewise now.

We are faced with a situation in which a new Government of Ukraine is being threatened with Russian expansion into its sovereign territories. It is as if the Budapest agreement of 1994, which involved both Russia and the United States, had not guaranteed Ukraine safe borders from invasion. It is as if the Cold War never ended. Perhaps to Mr. Putin and other Russian nationalists it never has.

Ukraine, situated between Russia and the rest of Europe, is of obvious strategic and economic importance, not only to Russia but to the United States and Western Europe.

That is why this bill is so important. It allows Ukraine to be allowed access to ESF funding. The ESF was established to, ''provide assistance to allies and countries in the transition to democracy.''

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the situation in which Ukraine finds itself today—in need of our help to advance democracy and resist the invasion, economically and physically, from Russia, attempting to relitigate the Cold War. We can't let that happen. They desperately need these loan guarantees. For the sake of freedom, democracy, and international justice, I urge passage of this bipartisan effort to help our friends in Ukraine.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in fervent support of this legislation. This bills comes at a clearly crucial time. The people of Ukraine need to be able to preserve their Nation. We need to help.

The people of Ukraine fought for their long-desired independence. We need to help them keep it. In my capacity as cochair of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, I have had many chances to dialogue with the Ukrainian American community and members of the current Ukraine Parliament.

They have outlined in detail their determination to maintain and sustain one Ukraine against Russian aggression and any other force. The President has taken strong steps to support that endeavor.

We today should join together in unison with the President, and with, I believe, the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4152, which provides loan guarantees for Ukraine. I am deeply concerned about the crisis in Ukraine. Vladimir Putin is clearly the aggressor, but the United States and our European allies have not done enough to support freedom, self determination, and human rights in Ukraine. When America does not provide strong and reliable leadership, bad things are more likely to happen.

Unfortunately, President Obama's foreign policy of leading from behind is a failure. Even the liberal Washington Post this week said that, ''President Obama's foreign policy is based on fantasy.''

We in Congress must do all we can to restore missing American leadership on foreign policy, and that starts with Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine should not be pawns in Vladimir Putin's hands. We must stand with our European and our other allies and do all we can to support freedom, self determination, and human rights in Ukraine. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 4152.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for bringing this bill to the floor in a very timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is coming together today to support loan guarantee authority for Ukraine that will be instrumental in stabilizing its economy and showing Ukraine's people that the United States stands with them.

I view this as a first step in what, hopefully, will be a series of actions to support the people of Ukraine, including IMF ratification authority.

I also support, Mr. Speaker, President Obama's action this morning to impose sanctions again Russian and Crimean officials who are exacerbating the crisis and put in place visa restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I chaired the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe from 1985 to 1995. The final act says that borders cannot be changed other than by political means. The Russians need to comply with that admonition. I commend the administration's efforts to broker a diplomatic process that can resolve this dangerous situation in Ukraine.

The steps taken today are integral to that effort. We will stand hopefully as one in this Congress on behalf of this bill.

Russia has violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine in its unlawful and unwarranted military occupation of Crimea and its threats against the government in Kiev.

I do not purport to say this is a simple situation that we confront. I would commend to my colleagues an article by Henry Kissinger in today's Washington Post.

The complexities of this situation are real, but the actions of the Russians are an unacceptable response and we must take action. As a former chairman of the Helsinki Commission during the waning days of the Cold War, I have seen firsthand the yearning for freedom by the people of the former Soviet Union.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. There are deep linguistic and political divisions within Ukraine. Frankly, that is true of many other countries as well. Democracy by its nature provides an avenue to overcome those differences through peaceful cooperation and dialogue. That is what must prevail in Ukraine, and what must guide all parties forward. Not force, not intimidation, and not separatism. The United States remains committed, Mr. Speaker, to standing with all of the people of Ukraine as they seek the better future they deserve.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly support this resolution and again thank Mr. ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY for bringing this to the floor so quickly and decisively.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Rules Committee and the ranking member of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support

of this legislation, which is a beginning step, and which I hope we will follow with all that we can to assist those Ukrainians who are courageous and forward leaning to be about the business of determining their own fate. I had the good fortune of being an election monitor immediately after the Orange Revolution, and I spent a lot of time talking to the people there. What I learned, if nothing more, is that they do have the courage of their convictions.

What I want us to do, and what I beg my colleagues that speak about this matter to understand, is that it is extremely complex. It is nothing that you can put on a bumper sticker, and it is unfair to President Obama for people to take to this floor and allow that he is ''leading from behind,'' as I just heard a Member say. What that Member needs to understand is that it is not easy to make a determination in these kinds of matters. Whereas Putin is a dictator, Obama is in a democracy.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the full committee, Mrs. LOWEY, for yielding me this time.

I am very proud of the Appropriations Committee at this moment for bringing the first bill to the floor that stands with freedom-lovers in Ukraine and around our world. We know a threat to liberty anywhere is a threat to liberty everywhere, and I rise in heartfelt support of this loan guarantee legislation to allow Ukraine time to stabilize and secure its liberty.

This money will be repaid, and I commend the bipartisan leadership of this House in acting with dispatch. President Obama and Secretary Kerry have been working overtime on Ukraine's crisis to exert every effort to bring the nations of the free world together in their mutual self-interest, and that interest is liberty.

There are some Russian violations of international law in treaties that are so abhorrent they demand the strongest action. Russia's invasion of its undefended neighbor, Ukraine, cannot be allowed to stand. The now-20-year-old Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurance, signed in 1994 by the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, and Ukraine, set the path for Ukraine to give up thousands of nuclear weapons, and she remains undefended because of it.

□ 1145

The Budapest Accords welcomed the accession of Ukraine to the treaty of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons as a nonnuclear weapons state, so her inability to defend herself against such a powerful neighbor is very clear.

This week, in a joint statement, leaders from Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, and our country said:

> We join together today to condemn the Russian Federation's clear violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, in contravention of Russia's obligations under the UN Charter and its 1997 basing agreement with Ukraine.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 3 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. This diverse group of nations from throughout the world coming together further illustrates the isolation Russia is certain to face if she does not relent and fall back from its aggressive push into Crimea.

In summarizing my remarks today, let me place on the RECORD, from the last century, no place in the world suffered more than the land of Ukraine, no place had more people forcibly starved, murdered, brutally beaten, buried alive, imprisoned, arrested into forced labor, including some of my ancestors.

I know, having traveled to Ukraine, how much the people of that great country want liberty. This is a moment that history will record in our new century the 21st. Joining with nations around the world, let us give Ukraine a bit of a lift to get her over this critical period she is facing.

I also wish to place into the RECORD information about what the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe has done in Ukraine to date. I will tell the body today that journalists are not being allowed to report from Crimea. They are being blocked and beaten by the government of Russia, from the reports we are getting on the ground. How is the world community to know the full truth of what is occurring?

Russia is moving the world backwards, not forwards. This bill is an important step in helping Ukraine to transition as we join with countries from throughout the world to condemn the violation of Ukraine's sovereign borders and to help give her the courage to stand up to those who would take her liberty away.

This will be the first time in modern history that that country has a chance to become the truly borderland great nation that she is meant to be, reaching west and north and east and south.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, which is a loan guarantee to help lift that country over this most trying time and difficult crisis in its recent history.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time.

[From Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Secretary General, March 6, 2014]

OSCE TO SEND MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL TO UKRAINE

Update at 12:00, 6 March: As of now, twenty-two OSCE participating States are participating in the activity, having sent up to two representatives each. Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States. One representative from the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre is also participating.

Vienna, 5 March 2014.—Eighteen OSCE participating States decided to send 35 unarmed military personnel to Ukraine in response to its request.

The matter was discussed at a joint meeting of the Permanent Council and the Forum for Security Co-operation (FSC) in Vienna on 4 March 2014.

The visit is taking place under Chapter III of the Vienna Document 2011, which allows for voluntary hosting of visits to dispel concerns about unusual military activities. Ukraine has requested all OSCE participating States to send military representatives from 5 to 12 March 2014, starting in Odessa. This is the first time this mechanism has been activated.

As of now, eighteen OSCE participating States have responded positively to the request sending up to two representatives each. Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States. One representative from the OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre will also be participating. The military visit participants are on their way to Ukraine now.

OSCE Secretary General Lamberto Zannier said: ''It Is my hope that this military visit will help to de-escalate tensions in Ukraine. By providing an objective assessment of the facts on the ground, the OSCE will be better placed to foster a political solution to the current crisis through dialogue.''

''Confidence-building and transparency are key elements of the OSCE approach to security, which seeks to foster openness and dialogue as the best way to resolve conflicts in our region,'' he added.

The Vienna Document 2011 is one of the main confidence-building measures developed by the OSCE. Under this document, all participating States are required to share information on their military forces, equipment and defence planning. The Document also provides for inspections and evaluation visits that can be conducted on the territory of any participating State that has armed forces.

Note to editors: Chapter III of the Vienna Document 2011 (full text see at http://www.osce.org/fsc/86597)

VOLUNTARY HOSTING OF VISITS TO DISPEL CONCERNS ABOUT MILITARY ACTIVITIES

(18) In order to help to dispel concerns about military activities in the zone of application for CSBMs, participating States are encouraged to invite other participating States to take part in visits to areas on the territory of the host State in which there may be cause for such concerns. Such invitations will be without prejudice to any action taken under paragraphs (16) to (16.3).

(18.1) States invited to participate in such visits will include those which are understood to have concerns. At the time invitations are issued, the host State will communicate to all other participating States its intention to conduct the visit, indicating the reasons for the visit, the area to be visited, the States invited and the general arrangements to be adopted.

(18.2) Arrangements for such visits, including the number of the representatives from other participating States to be invited, will be at the discretion of the host State, which will bear the in-country costs. However, the

host State should take appropriate account of the need to ensure the effectiveness of the visit, the maximum amount of openness and transparency and the safety and security of the invited representatives. It should also take account, as far as practicable, of the wishes of visiting representatives as regards the itinerary of the visit. The host State and the States which provide visiting personnel may circulate joint or individual comments on the visit to all other participating States.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

[For Immediate Release—March 6, 2014]

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES: Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the ''order'') declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Ukraine.

The order does not target the country of Ukraine, but rather is aimed at persons—including persons who have asserted governmental authority in the Crimean region without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine—who undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets. The order blocks the property and interests in property and suspends entry into the United States of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following:

actions or policies that undermine democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine;

actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine; or

misappropriation of state assets of Ukraine or of an economically significant entity in Ukraine;

to have asserted governmental authority over any part or region of Ukraine without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine;

to be a leader of an entity that has, or whose members have, engaged in any activity described above or of an entity whose property and interest in property are blocked;

to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 6, 2014.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of my colleague if she has further speakers?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, it doesn't seem to me that we have additional speakers. We may have an additional speaker on the way.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As we wait for the additional speaker, I want to thank the chairman again. I think it is very important that we have been able to act so expeditiously in a bipartisan way to send a very strong message to Russia and to the people of Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine, as was explained so eloquently by my colleague, Ms. KAPTUR, who has been there many times, are standing up for freedom.

There are many challenges they have, the challenge of adequate housing, the challenge of adequate food, the challenge of strengthening an economy; yet the fact that we must respond as our great democracy to a situation that has been imposed by Putin is very, very troubling, when there are so many real issues to which our resources can be extended.

My grandparents came from Kiev a long time ago at the turn of the century. They escaped from the pogroms; they escaped from the lack of democracy and the impact of intolerance and brutality that existed there. When you look back upon these years and you look at the struggles that the Ukrainian people have endured, to see the unnecessary brutality that has occurred is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, again, I want to thank you that we are working together in a bipartisan way to stand up for freedom, to stand up for democracy, to stand up for the people who are seeking a good future for their families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentlelady for cosponsoring this legislation and working in a bipartisan fashion to be sure that it is brought up in the quickest possible manner, which this is. Like you and the others who have spoken, I am proud of our committee for acting expeditiously and doing the right thing at the right time.

It is really a sad, sad, sad state of affairs that we find in Ukraine. I remember going there many years before when it was still a part of the Soviet Union under Communist rule and visiting the wonderful church where the Eastern Orthodox Church was born in Kiev and going through the labyrinth, the catacombs; and today, to realize that that peaceful, wonderful place, the home of Christianity, really, in that part of the world, is being torn apart by people of no faith is doubly troubling.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4152. This critical legislation will make Ukraine eligible for U.S. loan guarantees, helping to bolster Ukraine's struggling economy. Strong financial aid for Ukraine will send a message that the United States and the international community are backing the Ukrainian people with more than words. This step will help free Ukraine from Russia's economic coercion.

Russia's aggressive campaign to seize Ukrainian territory in the Crimean Peninsula and beyond presents a grave threat to Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. This is a crucial moment for Ukraine—any misstep from either side at this moment could lead to all-out war. It is critical that the United States and the international community act decisively to support the Ukrainian people and isolate Russia for its transgressions.

I appreciate the work that the Obama Administration has already undertaken to suspend trade talks and military cooperation with Russia—as well as to assemble an economic aid package for Ukraine. It is fitting that the United States has quickly recognized the legitimacy of Ukraine's new government, reflecting the right of the Ukrainian people to choose their own future.

However, we must recognize that tough talk alone will not persuade Russia to change its course. Russia needs to feel tangible consequences for deploying troops in Ukraine. Our partners in Europe, particularly Germany, are positioned to have a large economic impact on Russia through sanctions. It will be critical to bring them along in our efforts. Russia should also be stripped of its current G8 presidency and suspended from the G8. G8 members should boycott the 40th G8 Summit, scheduled for June 4 and 5, 2014 in Sochi.

I represent New Jersey's Ninth Congressional District, which is home to a large and active community of Ukrainian Americans. I am proud to have a productive and longstanding relationship with New Jersey's Ukrainian Americans. Since this crisis emerged, I have hosted meetings in my office and listened to the advice of those with close ties to Ukraine. The Ukrainian American community has proven to be an invaluable resource, and I am grateful for their guidance.

The people of Ukraine need support to realize a peaceful, democratic solution to this crisis. That's why it is so fitting that the United States act to support Ukraine. Once again, I urge my colleagues to support this vital measure for Ukraine in its time of need.

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 bill, H.R. 4152.

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. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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.

RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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 materials on H.R. 2641.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 501 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2641.

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

□ 1155

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

5½ years after the financial crisis struck in 2008, America remains in a jobs recession. Millions of Americans would call it a jobs depression.

The RAPID Act responds to America's urgent need for new jobs with critical help. According to testimony received by the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee, the RAPID Act would help to stimulate the creation of 3 million jobs.

In an economy in which the labor force participation rate has reached record lows, there is little more urgent jobs legislation that Congress could pass than the RAPID Act.

The jobs the RAPID Act would create, moreover, are high-wage, highly-skilled construction jobs. This is not just sure-fire legislation to create millions of jobs; it is sure-fire legislation to create higher wages for hardworking Americans.

Why do we need legislation to create these jobs? The reason is simple. Since before the financial crisis began and up to this day, the Federal Government's outdated and overly burdensome environmental review process has kept legions of jobs and workers waiting too long for approval from Federal bureaucrats.

The United States now ranks a dismal 34th in the world in the procedures, time, and costs needed to obtain governmental approval of new construction permits.

The heart of the problem lies with delay in the completion of reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act, commonly known as NEPA. When NEPA was first implemented, neither Congress nor the executive branch contemplated that the NEPA process would bog down responsible Federal permitting.

On the contrary, when Congress debated the issue, it talked about timeframes like 90 days to complete review. In 1981, the Council on Environmental Quality, or CEQ, thought all review could be done in a year.

A recent study, however, found that the average length of time to complete just one part of the process, the preparation of an environmental impact statement, was 3.4 years and growing. Examples abound of cases in which it takes far longer.

The port of Savannah, Georgia, for example, has seen a potential dredging project mired in review for over 13 years, with no end to review in sight. Cape Wind, a significant wind energy project in Massachusetts, took 12 years to reach the end of review.

Making matters worse, many projects that finally emerge from the administrative review process only become bogged down again in lengthy litigation challenging agencies' permitting decisions.

Clearly, the system needs to be reformed. Vice President BIDEN summed it up dramatically during a visit to the Savannah port in 2013 when he said:

> What are we doing? We're arguing about whether or not to deepen this port. It's time we get moving. I'm sick of this. Folks, this isn't a partisan issue. It's an economic issue.

How do we get moving? The key is to find the right balance between economic progress and the proper level of analysis. The RAPID Act strikes this balance. It does not force agencies to approve or deny any projects. It simply ensures that the process agencies use to make permitting decisions, and the timeline for subsequent litigation, are transparent, logical, and efficient.

To do that, the RAPID Act draws upon established definitions and concepts from existing NEPA regulations. It also draws upon commonsense suggestions from across the political spectrum, including from the President's Jobs Council and the administration's Council on Environmental Quality.

Most significantly, the RAPID Act sets hard deadlines, including an 18-month maximum deadline for an environmental assessment and a 36-month maximum deadline for an environmental impact statement.

□ 1200

It cracks down on prolonged lawsuits by establishing a 180-day statute of limitations for lawsuits challenging permitting decisions and limiting claims to those presented during the permit's public notice-and-comment process, and it consolidates who manages the process by empowering lead agencies to manage environmental reviews efficiently from start to finish in order to avoid waste and duplication of effort among bureaucratic agencies.

In many respects, the bill is modeled on the permit streamlining sections of Congress' SAFETEA-LU and MAP–21 transportation legislation, which commanded bipartisan support. A study by the Federal Highway Administration found that this legislation has cut the time for completing an environmental impact statement nearly in half.

President Obama, himself, moreover, strongly supports permit streamlining consistent with the recommendations of his Jobs Council. In his 2014 State of the Union Address, the President expressed his desire ''to slash bureaucracy and to streamline the permitting process for key projects so that we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.''

Congress should transform the President's rhetoric into action and enact this legislation to streamline permitting on all federally funded and federally permitted construction projects.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this critical legislation and cut down the time it takes America's workers to see a real jobs recovery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 2641, the Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, as ordered reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on July 31, 2013. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not alter or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding and acknowledging our jurisdictional interest, and would request that you insert our exchange of letters on this matter into the committee report on H.R. 2641 and the Congressional Record during any consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2641, the ''Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013,'' which was ordered reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary on July 31, 2013.

It is my understanding that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has Rule X jurisdiction over portions of H.R. 2641. I am, therefore, most appreciative of your decision to forego consideration of the bill so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include your letter and this reply letter memorializing our mutual understanding in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 2641.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2641, the so-called Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013.

Contrary to the bill's short title, H.R. 2641 would result in confusion and delay in the review and permitting process for certain construction projects. Most importantly, it would pose serious threats to public health and safety. By carving out a separate environmental review process for construction projects, which this bill doesn't even define, by the way, this bill would effectively create two different environmental review processes for the same project: one that applies to the construction phase of the project, whatever that means under the bill, and one that applies to every other phase of the project.

For instance, the bill's requirements would apply to building a nuclear reactor but not to decommissioning the reactor or transporting or storing the reactor's spent fuel after it has been decommissioned. Worse yet, this measure could jeopardize public health and safety by prioritizing project approval over meaningful analysis. It does this by restricting the opportunity for meaningful public participation, and it imposes deadlines that may be unrealistic under certain circumstances. In doing so, H.R. 2641 forecloses potentially critical input from Federal, State, and local agencies and other interested parties for construction projects that are federally funded or that require Federal approval.

This is why I have offered an amendment ensuring that the public's right to participate in the review process is not cut off by this measure, and if an agency fails to meet the unrealistic deadlines mandated by H.R. 2641, the bill would automatically green-light a project regardless of whether the agency has thoroughly reviewed the project's risks.

These failings of the bill, along with many others, explain why the President's Council on Environmental Quality and more than 20 respected environmental groups vigorously oppose this bill. It is also the reason, yesterday, the administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy, whereby the recommendation to the President, in noting that these new rules would actually cause more confusion, would be to veto the bill if passed by this House and the Senate and once it arrives at his desk.

Last but not least, H.R. 2641 fails to address the real problem with construction projects. The RAPID Act is clearly intended to apply to infrastructure projects. Yet this bill does nothing to address the actual causes of construction delays, which is the lack of funding.

Insofar as the Savannah River port dredging is concerned, the Corps of Engineers approved that project back in 2012. Of course, since 2012, in addition to shutting down the government for 16 days, we have been cutting funds for these kinds of projects. So, today, for politicians to clamor for a spotlight and then denounce the lack of funding for these very important and crucial projects for the Nation's economic well-being, it is really ridiculous that we would stand here and act like it is regulations that are holding things back. No. It is the money.

For example, there is currently a $60 billion backlog of projects authorized under the Water Resources Act. Although every single one of these projects has been successfully approved using existing review procedures under NEPA, not a single one of these projects has begun construction. Why? Because the most recent appropriations for the Corps' construction budget was only $1.2 billion. That is $60 billion in approved projects that would improve the Nation's infrastructure had they not been delayed.

Clearing this backlog would be a force multiplier in creating jobs, spurring innovation, and growing the economy. That is a jobs bill, Mr. Chairman. What is more, the Obama administration is doing everything that it can to improve the performance of Federal permitting and the review of infrastructure projects.

In March 2012, the administration issued Executive Order 13604 to modernize the Federal infrastructure permitting process and cut in half the timeline for approving infrastructure projects. This order incentivized better outcomes for communities and the environment while cutting red tape. Since implementing this order, agencies have expedited permits for over 50 major projects. In one instance, agencies shaved up to 3 years off the timeline of the Tappan Zee Bridge replacement project in New York. That is a multibillion-dollar project that is putting Americans back to work. The President then issued another memorandum in June of 2013, further directing Federal agencies to develop an integrated interagency pre-application process for significant offshore electric transmission projects requiring Federal approval.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues often claim to want to get Americans back to work, so I have to ask:

Why do we need legislation that does not create a single job—a bill that will pick winners and losers and a bill that makes the process less clear and less protective of public health and safety? Why do we need that legislation? Why must we continue to waste this Chamber's precious time on bills that do nothing?

Mr. Chairman, we should work together to address the real causes for delay in the NEPA process instead of debating this dangerous bill. In light of the bill's many serious flaws, I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to the gentleman from Georgia that the provisions on the projects that he mentioned are exactly why we need this legislation. It is because this legislation incorporates those ideas which started, by the way, in this House with the work of the Transportation Committee, in the transportation bills, and that now needs to be codified and put into law so that it can be made available not just in those projects but in every project in which the Federal Government has a regulatory role.

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

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that I think we all, Republicans and Democrats, agree on is that you can't have a world-class economy with a third world infrastructure, and in many cases, that is what we have today. Putting money into highways, bridges, and other infrastructure improvements is one of the best investments that the Federal Government can make. The gentleman from Georgia said that, that it is a great investment, but when we put the money in for the projects, we need to get those projects underway.

Each infrastructure project in our country creates jobs—high-paying jobs—and they modernize our transportation system. Not only does it create jobs, but it increases fuel efficiency because it increases velocity. It saves fuel, which is good for our economy, and it makes us less dependent on foreign oil. It improves safety, which not only reduces costs but saves lives. Unfortunately, there is a major roadblock

out there in completing all of the work that we desperately need to do, and that is the excruciatingly slow process imposed by Washington on the permitting of new construction projects. Now, that is where, I think, the gentleman from Georgia and I disagree. He says there is not a problem.

Let me quote President Obama:

One of the problems we've had in the past is that sometimes it takes too long to get projects off the ground.

That is not I. That is President Obama.

There are all these permits and red tape and planning and this and that, and some of it's important to do, but we could do it faster.

That is the essence of this bill. We can do it faster. We both acknowledge it creates jobs. We both acknowledge it helps our economy, our fuel efficiency, and it saves lives. We can do that faster. That means less fuel wasted, less time wasted, jobs created. Boy, we need those jobs now. Let me tell you how difficult it is on projects.

The Northern Beltline, which is part of the loop around Birmingham, was first added to the National Highway System in 1995. Only this month, 19 years later, did we commence that project when a Federal judge finally said enough is enough—enough delays, enough court challenges, enough roadblocks—and he ordered the project to begin. During that period of time, there were four environmental studies done. Look, our tax dollars are limited. There were four environmental studies that had to be redone from start to finish because they became too old. They became outdated. That is money that is wasted. We can't afford to waste money or time or lives in making this economy better and in creating jobs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute. If I have time left, I would be glad to.

Mr. Chairman, imagine. This project in 1998 began to receive authorization and funding, but it just started this month. These were people, constituents—and not only those people living in central and north Alabama—whose commutes were longer. They were people traveling through Alabama.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARINO. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

□ 1215

Mr. BACHUS. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) for introducing this legislation. It will reduce the time it takes to review new construction projects and ensure that the permitting process is not endlessly held up in courts.

That is what the judge said in the case of the Northern Beltline. He said that this has been before the courts. Sometimes it takes people years to get their case to court. We don't need these unnecessary delays, legal expenses, and added environmental expenses.

We have done these same things in bipartisan SAFETEA-LU and MAP–21. Why are we all of a sudden saying this is a bad thing when earlier, in a bipartisan way, we approved very similar provisions?

Why in this Congress are we suddenly out here calling things dangerous that used to be bipartisan? I don't understand that. I don't think the American people understand this dysfunction.

I thank the Judiciary Committee, its members, Chairman GOODLATTE, and Mr. MARINO. This was too late for the people along the Northern Beltline, but it won't be too late the next time.

You cannot have a first-world economy with a third-world infrastructure. Putting money into highway, bridge, and other infrastructure improvements is one of the best investments that the federal government—or state governments—can make. Each infrastructure project in our Country creates jobs—high-paying jobs. And modernizing our transportation and infrastructure system not only creates jobs—high-paying jobs. It increases fuel efficiency, which is good for the environment. It improves safety, reduces costs, and saves time.

Unfortunately, there is a major roadblock out there to completing all of the work that we desperately need to get done, and that is the excruciatingly slow process imposed by Washington on the permitting of new construction projects.

President Obama has even said, "one of the problems we've had in the past is, is that sometimes it takes too long to get projects off the ground. There are all these permits and red tape and planning, and this and that, and some of it's important to do, but we could do it faster."

Today, it sometimes seems incredibly difficult to get permission in a timely manner for even a small project. And when it comes to large projects—such as the construction of the Northern Beltline in the Birmingham area that I represent—the challenges are even greater. While construction on the Northern Beltline has finally begun this month, it took too long to get there, almost two decades from first being added to the National Highway System and over ten years since funding was authorized, and that has delayed the economic benefits that the project will generate for the region.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I point out to my friend from Alabama that you cannot do construction projects without Federal funding. If there is no funding that has been appropriated, then the projects don't get done. That is what we have had here in this Congress.

Currently, we have a $60 billion backlog of projects authorized under the Water Resources Development Act. Each and every one of those projects has great importance. All of the regulatory work has been done. The projects are cleared. We just simply do not fund them here because this Congress does not want it to be said by the American people that the current administration is responsible for an economic turnaround.

Despite their best efforts and most insistent efforts, the economy continues to move along favorably, though not at the rate that we need it to. So we really need to have legislation that we are considering and debating on this floor that will create jobs and economic prosperity for Americans, as opposed to these anti-regulatory bills that come forth—it looks like about five or six every week are coming by—plus, we have to pepper in a dose of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act every once in awhile. Fifty times we have done that. Not one job created.

That is the problem that we have.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the American historical record has always been ''the worse the recession, the stronger the recovery.'' However, although the National Bureau of Economic Research states the recession ended 5 years ago, we can agree the recovery has been anything but strong.

Facts are something this administration fights with vehement opposition. Nevertheless, the simple fact is this is the slowest ''recovery'' our country has witnessed since the Truman Presidency.

After the deep recession that began in December of 2007, employment has risen sluggishly, at best, and has risen much more slowly than in the last four recoveries, for certain. According to the CBO, employment at the end of 2013 was about 6 million jobs short of where it would be if the unemployment rate had returned to its pre-recession level.

This is why I have introduced H.R. 2641, the Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, also known as the RAPID Act.

The RAPID Act creates a streamlined Federal environmental review and permitting process that establishes transparency and certainty for job creators. Furthermore, this bill would empower lead agencies to manage environmental reviews from start to finish, as well as establish time constraints on the review process and period in which a claim can be filed.

A recent study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce identified 351 State-level projects that, if approved for construction, could have created 1.9 million jobs annually during the projected 7 years of construction. While these numbers help put the issue in perspective, I don't need to see a study to know that bureaucracy is holding up projects and preventing job growth. I see it every day in my district.

For example, one of my constituents, PPL Corporation, filed an application with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a license to build and operate a state-of-the-art nuclear plant near the company's existing two-unit Susquehanna nuclear power plant. The plant would produce 1,600 megawatts of electricity, enough to power more than 1 million homes. PPL predicted this one project would create 400 construction jobs and 400 permanent jobs.

In addition, early estimates by PPL were that the project would cost $15 billion to construct. These estimates include escalation, financing costs, initial nuclear fuel, and contingencies and reserves.

Imagine for a moment, if you will, the positive impact of a $15 billion investment in my district in Pennsylvania, the 10th Congressional District.

However, Washington bureaucrats have prevented this project from creating jobs, and it has yet to break ground. Six years after the application was first filed in 2008, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission claims they are still reviewing the company's request for a combined operating license. If these individuals that are reviewing this after 6 years were working in private industry, they would have been fired in the first year. In fact, PPL says, realistically, a final decision on the project is still several years away.

This is ridiculous.

Let me be clear. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 serves worthy goals, which should be preserved. I live out in the country. I get my water from a well. I love to see the deer and the bear come through my land. I raised my children there. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that I would do anything to hurt my children, whether it is water, air, or the environment in general, they really should think again.

Federal agencies should be able to evaluate new projects to ensure that they don't pose a threat to the environment or to the public. However, over time, NEPA regulations have turned into an outdated, burdensome, and convoluted Federal permitting process that must be reined in.

The good news is that a bipartisan consensus exists on the need to reform the permitting process. In fact, the administration, the President's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness, and legislation adopted by a strong bipartisan majority in the 109th and 112th Congresses all recognize that an overly burdensome and lengthy environmental review and permitting process undermines economic growth.

The time for these reforms is now, because Americans are ready to get back to work. The RAPID Act of 2013 will remove the red tape and allow job creators to take projects off the drawing board and onto the worksite.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense reform, and I reserve the balance of my time.

MARCH 5, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The undersigned groups strongly support H.R. 2641, the ''Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development (RAPID) Act of 2013,'' which would provide a streamlined process for developers, builders, and designers to obtain environmental permits and approvals for their projects in a timely and efficient manner, allowing jobs to be created and the economy to grow.

Every year that major projects are stalled or cancelled because of a dysfunctional permitting process and a system that allows limitless challenges by opponents of development, millions of jobs are not created. For example, 351 stalled energy projects reviewed in one 2010 study (Project No Project) had a total economic value of over $1 trillion and represented 1.9 American jobs not created. Project No Project showed that in the energy sector alone, one year of delay translates into millions of jobs not created.

The Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013 would improve the environmental review and permitting process by:

Coordinating responsibilities among multiple agencies involved in environmental reviews to ensure that ''the trains run on time;''

Providing for concurrent reviews by agencies, rather than serial reviews;

Allowing state-level environmental reviews to be used where the state has done a competent job, thereby avoiding needless duplication of state work by federal reviewers;

Requiring that agencies involve themselves in the process early and comment early, avoiding eleventh-hour objections that can restart the entire review timetable;

Establishing a reasonable process for determining the scope of project alternatives, so that the environmental review does not devolve into an endless quest to evaluate infeasible alternatives;

Consolidating the process into a single Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and single Environmental Assessment (EA) for a project, except as otherwise provided by law;

Imposing reasonable fixed deadlines for completion of an EIS or EA; and

Reducing the statute of limitations to challenge a final EIS or EA from six years to 180 days.

The RAPID Act is a practical, industry-wide approach that builds on successful provisions for environmental review management found in the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21), Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), and Section 1609 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The RAPID Act also embodies the procedural improvements to ''cut red tape'' as called for by the Obama administration, including, most recently, in his January 28, 2014, State of the Union Address.

The RAPID Act addresses the problem far too many shovel-ready projects face today: lengthy project delays from endless environmental reviews and challenges result in lost opportunities to create jobs and grow the economy. Every year of delay results in millions of jobs not created. The creation of millions of jobs is worth ensuring that our governinent works faster and more efficiently.

The undersigned groups strongly support H.R. 2641. The RAPID Act would be the strong action needed to speed up the permitting process and let important projects move forward, allowing millions of workers to get back to work. We urge you to support this important bill.

Sincerely,

American Architectural Manufacturers Association, American Bakers Association, American Chemistry Council, American Coating Association, American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Forest & Paper Association, American Foundry Society, American Highway Users Alliance, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Rental Association, American Road & Transportation Builders Association.

American Supply Association, Associated Builders & Contractors, Associated Builders & Contractors—Rhode Island Chapter, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors, Associated Wire Rope Fabricators, Association of American Railroads, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Construction Industry Round Table, Edison Electric Institute, Electronic Security Association, Forging Industry Association, Foundry Association of Michigan, Independent Electrical Contractors, Industrial Energy Consumers of America, Industrial Fasteners Institute, Industrial Minerals Association—North America, Metals Service Center Institute.

Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, National Association of Electrical Distributors, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, National Federation of Independent Business, National Industrial Sand Association, National Mining Association, National Oilseed Processors Association, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Shippers Strategic Transportation Council.

National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association, Non-Ferrous Founders' Society, North American Equipment Dealers Association, Nuclear Energy Institute, Ohio Cast Metals Association, Pacific-West Fastener Association, Pennsylvania Foundry Association, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council, South Carolina Timber Producers Association, Texas Cast Metals Association, Textile Rental Services Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington Retail Association, Wisconsin Cast Metals Association, Wisconsin Grocers Association.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out in the Rules Committee last night that it was the approval process that was holding up the dredging project for the Port of Savannah.

Just yesterday, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution refuted this claim. In reality, this project—and countless others like it—are held up by a lack of funding.

To quote the article:

In the old days, a Congress that didn't agree with White House priorities simply loaded its own projects into the budget, in a bit of horse-trading.

But Republicans, particularly in the House, have placed such bargaining out of bounds—a self-imposed restriction on their own influence.

Because, under the House rules, this is an earmark.

The Savannah River Port dredging would be an earmark.

And so for us to place something in the budget which is not in the budget already—it's not allowed.

That is quoting from my colleague, Representative KINGSTON. Because it is an earmark, in other words, Congress or its representatives would be barred by our own rules from placing funding in the budget for a project.

It is unfortunate that my colleagues from Georgia on the other side of the aisle, aided and abetted by their colleagues on the other side of the aisle from across the country, can't seem to adjust their legislative actions to suit the people that they represent.

This Savannah River Port dredging is very important to Georgia's economy. It is the most important economic development project on the table, and it is ready to go, but the bond between these legislators and the big, bad Tea Party has them afraid to do what is in the best interest of their States. That is a shame.

I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the manager, my friend, Congressman JOHNSON, Mr. MARINO, our colleagues on the floor of the House, and as well on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Chair, I rise to accept the fact that there are opportunities for discussion on streamlining and effectively expediting processes in a collaborative way in the Federal Government to continue to move forward the Federal Government, as it is responsible to the American people. Unfortunately, I believe that we are not at that place today with H.R. 2641.

President Obama has been cited repeatedly. I believe that his words at that time and today are accurate. No one would want the Federal Government to stall moving projects forward.

I might ask my colleagues, however, if they would join me in fully funding infrastructure and rebuilding this country, which we have not been able to do for almost 5 years.

By reading the Statement of Administration Policy, the administration strongly rejects the legislation's premise in H.R. 2641 that public input and responsible agency decisionmaking under current law hinders job creation. The administration believes that H.R. 2641, if enacted, will lead to more confusion and delay, limit public participation in the permitting process, and ultimately hamper economic growth.

There lies, Mr. Chairman, the underpinnings of the President's veto threat.

□ 1230

Where is this bill going?

I will, at the appropriate time, place the administration's statement into the RECORD.

So what are we talking about with this legislation? One, this legislation would narrow the scope of judicial review. In addition, this legislation would narrow the review by one Federal agency, who would allegedly coordinate other Federal and State agencies.

Let me tell you what the problem with that is, Mr. Chairman; that is that each of the agencies have their own extra expertise, so you are snuffing their expertise. You are quashing their expertise. You are forcing one agency to be the giant understander of all the nuances of the other agencies which have a responsibility to their constituency and to the American people.

Then you have a set of circumstances that suggests, as my amendment will hope to correct, that you are going to deem up. If you don't get the job done, we are going to deem you up. Beam you up. We are going to just assume that everything has been done and you can go forward. It doesn't matter whether you trample on farmland in Texas or whether or not you are, in essence, leveling suburban homes in Pennsylvania or whether or not you are in the mountains of Georgia and cause havoc.

So I would make the argument that this is not an act that is answering the question. It is a solution searching for a problem. Frankly, the argument made by many of us is the principal causes of unjustified delay in implementing the NEPA review process are inadequate agency resources. And the Bush administration noted that NEPA was not a cause for delay.

I would ask my colleagues, how can we work together?

I think for a moment I will just pause and say that yesterday was an unfortunate incident in the House Oversight Committee. It did not reflect well on this institution or chairmen who lead committees.

I pause to say that because I believe it is an important statement to make on the Floor of the House, that we should never have a setting in a committee where a ranking member is silenced, or that a hand is used across one's neck to make a comment about an individual not being able to speak. All of us are equal.

I raise that here because we are talking about process and procedure. And even though one might argue that there was a regular process of this particular legislation, we could have been more collaborative, because I am empathetic and I am sympathetic that we all want to make sure that projects move quickly, that jobs are created.

But the administration has made an assessment that NEPA is not the delay; the Bush administration has done so. And what we need is to fully fund the government with adequate resources so that our agencies with the appropriate staff can move forward.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am from the region of the oil spill of 2010, and that oil spill, at that time voices that were Republican and Democrat from the gulf region were raising their voices about the process of review.

What happened with BOMA? Why wasn't there some understanding that there were some cracks in the system? Even the industry recognized that we must work on best practices, not less regulation—not bad practices, but best practices.

And what did we do? We have put in regulations that would enhance oversight of the issues of drilling.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I rise to oppose this legislation. We could do it more collaboratively, and we need to treat each other with the dignity and the respect that this particular institution deserves, both in committees and on the Floor of the House.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2641, the "Responsible and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, or as some have termed it, the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

If the RAPID Act were to become law in its present form, a permit or license for project would be "deemed" approved if the reviewing agency does not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

Mr. Chair, I share some of the frustrations expressed by many members of the House Judiciary Committee, which marked up this bill last summer, with the NEPA process.

Why are we wasting time with this bill when we could be passing H.R. 3546, a bill introduced by my colleague SANDY LEVIN, the distinguished Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee which amends the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to extend emergency unemployment compensation (EUC) payments for eligible individuals to weeks of employment ending on or before January 1, 2015.

Or we could bring up and pass H.R. 3888, "The New Chance For a New Start in Life Act," a bill I introduced which provides grants for training to those out of work—who are merely seeking to pull themselves up by their bootstraps—the American way.

But here we are on the Floor of the House of Representatives voting and speaking on the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

There is something odd about a system in which it can take half a year or more to approve the siting plan for a wind farm but fracking operations regulations can be approved and conducted a few hundred feet from somebody's home with no community oversight process in just a few months.

Something is wrong with this picture.

But I strongly believe that this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

The bill in its current form is an example of a medicine that is worse than a disease.

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, namely automatic approval of projects with the need for positive agency action.

I expect to speak on my amendment shortly but suffice it-to-say, this bill goes out of its way to ensure that some projects might be prematurely. approved.

That's because under H.R. 2641, if a federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the termination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved, deemed approved by such agency.

This creates a set of perverse incentives. First, as an agency is up against that deadline and legitimate work is yet to be completed, it is likely to disapprove the project simply because the issues have not been vetted.

Second, frequently there are times when it is the case that the complexity of issues that need to be resolved necessitates a longer review period, rather than an arbitrary limit.

So if H.R. 2641 were to become law the most likely outcome is that federal agencies

would be required to make decisions based on incomplete information, or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

Mr. Chair, the new requirements contained in H.R. 2641 amend the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), even though the bill is drafted as an amendment to the APA.

The bill ignores the fact that NEPA has for more than 40 years provided an effective framework for all types of projects (not just construction projects) that require federal approval pursuant to a federal law, such as the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to reject this flawed and jaded legislation.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2641—RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

(Rep. Marino, R-Pennsylvania, and 10 cosponsors, Mar. 5, 2014)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 2641, which would undercut responsible decision-making and public involvement in the Federal environmental review and permitting processes. As the Administration said when this legislation was considered previously, H.R. 2641 will increase litigation, regulatory delays, and potentially force agencies to approve a project if the review and analysis cannot be completed before the proposed arbitrary deadlines. This legislation complicates the regulatory process and creates two sets of standards for Federal agencies to follow to review projects—one for ''construction projects'' and one for all other Federal actions, such as rulemakings or management plans.

The Administration strongly rejects the legislation's premise that public input and responsible agency decision-making under current law hinders job creation. The Administration believes that H.R. 2641, if enacted, will lead to more confusion and delay, limit public participation in the permitting process, and ultimately hamper economic growth. The Administration supports efforts to improve the efficiency of the environmental review processes without diminishing requirements for rigorous analyses, agency consultation, and public participation. This includes an Interagency Steering Committee that will publish a plan with 15 reforms and over 80 actions to modernize the Federal permitting and review of major infrastructure projects.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2641, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the RAPID Act. It is hard enough for working middle class wage earners, many of whom haven't seen a raise in years, to get by. With record low temperatures, polar vortexes, and damaging snowstorms, this brutal winter has created even bigger problems for America's families.

For too many, just paying the monthly heating bill has become a real challenge. A few weeks ago, my hometown paper, the Richmond Times-Dispatch, reported on record-high propane prices and the impact it has had on the 135,000 Virginia families who heat their homes with propane.

Unfortunately, cost increases are affecting families, whether they use propane, natural gas, or electricity to heat their homes. Right now, moms and dads all across America are sitting at their kitchen table looking at one of the largest home heating bills they have ever seen.

We in Congress can't do much about the cold weather, but we can enact sensible policies that expand energy supplies and reduce costs, and that is exactly what we are doing in the House this week.

If you heat your home with propane, our bills tackle the infrastructure problems that have led to record price increases. If you heat your home with natural gas, we are trying to make it easier to move the natural gas that is being developed throughout the country to your home. If you heat your home with electricity, we are halting excessive and unnecessary regulations that are expected to drive up the costs of electricity.

The bottom line? We are reducing energy costs for America's families. Middle class families in Virginia and throughout America have enough to focus on without having to worry about Washington making it more expensive for them to heat their homes.

This is an opportunity for Members of the House to stand together and to offer some relief to struggling Americans who are simply trying to pay their energy bills and provide for their families.

I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Representative MARINO, and the rest of the Judiciary Committee for their hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I would also like to thank Chairmen UPTON and WHITFIELD, Chairman SHUSTER and Congressman MCKINLEY for their work on all the legislation dealing with energy costs this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the full Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. JOHNSON, for the leadership that he has exercised here in bringing this discussion forward on a bill that is very disappointing to me.

This bill imposes hard-and-fast deadlines that will be unrealistic in certain circumstances and would undercut responsible decisionmaking and public involvement in the Federal review and permitting processes.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2641 for various reasons.

Let's begin with the very misleading short title of this bill, namely, the ''Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act.''

Rather than effectuating real reforms to the process by which federal agencies undertake environmental impact reviews as required by the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, this legislation will actually result in making this process less responsible, less professional, and less accountable.

Worse yet, this measure could jeopardize public health and safety by prioritizing project approval over meaningful analysis.

To begin with, the bill—under the guise of streamlining the approval process—forecloses potentially critical input from federal, state, and local agencies as well as from members of the public to comment on environmentally-sensitive construction projects that are federally-funded or that require federal approval.

The bill also imposes hard and fast deadlines that may be unrealistic under certain circumstances.

Moreover, if an agency fails to meet these unrealistic deadlines, the bill simply declares that a project must be deemed approved, regardless of whether the agency has thoroughly assessed risks.

As a result, this measure could allow projects to proceed that put public health and safety at risk.

For example, as the Minority's witness astutely noted at the Committee's hearing on this bill, H.R. 2641 could effectively prevent the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from exercising its licensing authority pertaining to nuclear power reactors, waste management sites, and nuclear waste disposal facilities.

And, the bill could allow such projects to be approved before the safety review is completed.

This failing of the bill, along with many others, explains why the Administration and the President's Council on Environmental Quality, along with more than 20 respected environmental groups vigorously oppose this legislation.

These organizations include the Audubon Society, League of Conservation Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, and The Wilderness Society.

In issuing its veto threat, the Administration warns that the bill ''would undercut responsible decision-making and public involvement in the Federal review and permitting processes.''

In addition, the Administration observes that the bill will ''increase litigation, regulatory delays, and potentially force agencies to approve a project if the review and analysis cannot be completed before the proposed arbitrary deadlines.''

Another concern that I have with this bill—like other measures that we have considered—is that it is a flawed solution in search of an imaginary problem.

And, that is not just my opinion. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service issued a report last year stating that the primary source of approval delays for construction projects ''are more often tied to local/state and project-specific factors, primarily local/state agency priorities, project funding levels, local opposition to a project, project complexity, or late changes in project scope.''

CRS further notes that project delays based on environmental requirements stem not from NEPA, but from ''laws other than NEPA.''

So I have to ask, why do we need a measure like the so-called RAPID Act that will undoubtedly make the process less clear and less protective of public health and safety?

My final major concern with this bill is that—rather than streamlining the environmental review process—it will sow utter confusion.

H.R. 2641 does this by creating a separate, but only partly parallel environmental review process for construction projects that will only cause confusion, delay, and litigation.

As I noted at the outset, the changes to the NEPA review process contemplated by this measure apply only to certain construction projects.

NEPA, however, applies to a broad panoply of federal actions, including fishing, hunting, and grazing permits, land management plans, Base Realignment and Closure activities, and treaties.

As a result of the bill, there could potentially be 2 different environmental review processes for the same project. For instance, the bill's requirements would apply to the construction of a nuclear reactor, but not to its decommissioning or to the transportation and storage of its spent fuel.

Rather than improving the environmental review process, this bill will complicate it and generate litigation.

But, more importantly, this bill is yet another effort by my friends on the other side of the aisle to undermine regulatory protections.

As with all the other regulatory bills, this measure is a thinly disguised effort to hobble the ability of federal agencies to do the work that Congress requires them to do.

Accordingly, I strenuously oppose this seriously flawed bill.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, a good friend and great colleague, for bringing this RAPID Act forward because I strongly support it.

I want to just reflect. Go out of these hallowed Chambers and go into the private sector, and think about going through a permitting process and think about the longer you delay, the more you have to pay. It is just that simple.

You can drag these things out and drag these things out and drag these things out. And when you ask people: What is it that I have to do? I have already done everything you required me to do. It is just a little bit more. So the answer is: How long is a piece of string? We don't know.

What we are doing by not getting this done, and we have talked about the number of jobs that are waiting. If we are talking about improving the economy—and these are not Republican jobs or Democrat jobs. These are American jobs. And what are we doing? American projects to help the American economy.

So today to even have a debate—and this is a bipartisan effort; there is no question about it. We both feel the same way. We both know what the problems are in our country right now. We have too many people unemployed. In fact, we have too many people who have given up even looking for a job. That is the unreported number that we never reflect.

But in this case we know that delaying only increases what we have to pay. And who is picking up the tab on this? It is hardworking American taxpayers. It is just not that much-maligned 1 percent that doesn't want to pay their fair share. This is every single American woman and man that is out there. It affects how they live their lives. It affects how they pay their bills. It affects the future of our economy.

So I know we have to have debates, and this is not a debate that is heated, but it is about heat in a way. This week we have talked about: let's heat American homes; let's make sure that we have a sustainable path; let's make sure that we are not putting on the backs of these folks too much.

There is an old saying where I come from. It is: Don't worry about the mule, just load the wagon.

Gentlemen, I have got to tell you, right now, the mule is about ready to unhook himself from the wagon and say: You have asked me to pull too much for far too long.

So, with Mr. MARINO and what he has brought forth today, a commonsense approach to creating jobs and getting improvements in our country, not improvements for just Republicans but improvements for every single American, isn't that why we are all here?

I know I represent 705,687 western Pennsylvanians. I don't know how they are registered; I don't know how they vote; I don't know how they worship; but I do know this: they sent me to Washington to represent their best interests and, in a larger sense, the State of Pennsylvania and the whole country. If we cannot agree on things like this, my goodness, where do we go from here?

So I would just ask my colleagues—and this is a truly a bipartisan effort. Mr. MARINO, thank you so much for what you have done. This just makes sense. And Lord, in a town where common sense is found in so few places, let's look at this and understand the uplift for the American people and for our economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, to blame the lack of job creation on the inefficiency of regulations is kind of like—it reminds me of when you are downstairs in the bathroom and something is leaking from the upstairs bathroom and then someone tells you that it is raining. It just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my good friend and ranking member on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I am a bit confused. If you are listening to the debate, you have got to be confused about what this bill is really about. Now, it is apparently about rapid siting of nuclear plants or about constructing of pipelines through your backyard without you being allowed to comment or any environmental review, and somehow this is going to lead to job creation in America.

At the beginning of the debate, they were talking about transportation and infrastructure. I happen to be on that committee also. First off, we already did some streamlining in the last highway reauthorization. There is pending streamlining in the Water Resources Development Act. But let's drill down a little. What is the real problem?

The real problem is that this side of the aisle, the Republicans, don't want to make the investments necessary to put people back to work. The highway trust fund is going broke on October 1. Not a word from that side, except the brave chairman of the Ways and Means Committee who proposed to fund it with some tax reform. But nothing else from that side. No proposal on how we are going to continue to fund transportation and infrastructure in this country.

Water Resources Development Act, we have got a bill pending with some streamlining, but guess what? There are 60 billion—''b,'' billion—dollars of backlogged authorized water resources development projects that have gone through the full NEPA process and been approved, but the annual construction budget, thanks to my friends on the other side of the aisle, is $1.2 billion a year. Let's see. I guess that figures out to a 50-year backlog, so it really isn't going to matter how much you eliminate NEPA review here, which is, essentially, what this bill is about, which cuts out the public and other small things like that. A 50-year backlog.

□ 1245

But this will solve that problem. We will be building those—well, no, we won't, really, because we don't have the money. Well, how about roads, bridges, highways, transit? There is an $80 billion backlog in transit. NEPA? No, not NEPA. No money.

Federal highways. We have 140,000 bridges on the Federal system that need replacement or substantial rehabilitation or repair. No money. It isn't a NEPA review that is stopping that. It is a lack of funding. We are not making the necessary investments.

So you are not addressing jobs here. Don't pretend you are addressing jobs, don't pretend you are addressing utility rates, and don't even pretend that this bill is going anywhere.

You know, the Republican majority repeals NEPA every other day in the Natural Resources Committee. It hasn't happened yet; and now, this is a new way to come at it, through the Judiciary Committee.

I guess they get tired. I mean, we have had a lot of bills on the floor to repeal NEPA that have been passed and have gone to the Senate, and nothing has happened. So let's try to fool them. We will cloak it in a Judiciary bill, instead of in a Resources bill, and we will pretend that it is not really about NEPA or that it is about something else.

Actually, this bill is really bizarre because it creates an entirely new

process for reviewing projects by amending the Administrative Procedures Act. It doesn't repeal NEPA.

So, wow, how are those conflicts going to work out? What are the agencies really going to do? I mean, it is gobbledygook legislation on top of making a number of false assertions about what it will accomplish.

What it is accomplishing is it has got a great name. It sounds good. RAPID, I love that name. That is good. We are really good at names around here, but we are not really good at getting things done.

There should be a bipartisan consensus, and there has been during my long tenure in Congress on building things and rebuilding things and building an infrastructure.

You know, it is embarrassing. The United States of America is investing less money in its infrastructure—which is falling apart—than many third-world countries, and I talked about how we are developing a third-world infrastructure.

I had a colleague who is very knowledgeable on the issue who has come up and said to me: You know, that is insulting. I said: Do you know how bad the state of our infrastructure is? He said: No, it is insulting to third-world countries because they are investing a larger percentage of their gross domestic product in infrastructure than the United States of America is investing.

It is plain and simple. You can dodge. You can weave. You can come up with great names. You can make unbelievable assertions on the floor. The bottom line facts, we need to invest in rebuilding America; and for every billion dollars we spend on infrastructure, it is somewhere between 15,000 and 20,000 jobs that are created, and these are private sector jobs.

Private sector jobs, they do the work when the government provides the money to the States, which goes out and competitively bids projects; and they build them, but without money, they aren't going to build them. It doesn't matter what the environmental review process is. No money, no projects.

Drop it, guys. Come on. Let's do something real around here for a change.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

It is almost amusing to hear my colleagues from the other side say how much they want to work together, how much they want to get this country moving, how much they want to create jobs.

Since I have been here—this is my second term, fourth year—I have seen virtually no cooperation from the other side in creating jobs. They get up, and they give a good speech about names, but there is no substance to it. There is no substance to it at all.

As a matter of fact, this is a bipartisan piece of legislation. Both sides support this.

You know, my colleagues had control of the House prior to the Republicans controlling it 4 years ago. They touched none of these issues.

And I want to ask the American people—not my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—how has this Federal regulation system been going over the last 5 years?

Virtually no jobs created, agencies stopping everything they can under this administration, but yet they stand up and give a good speech about cooperation. I have rarely seen it here.

I have seen obstructionists because it is a power play. You know, when someone comes up with a good idea—and I blame both sides over the years for this—it is not what is in the best interests of the American people. It is who is in power that wants to keep it and who is not in power that wants to take it away. And you know something? The American people are completely forgotten about.

Well, one of the reasons—the main reason I came to Washington was to work for the American people, not to preserve my job, not to keep power, not to take power; but it was to do what is right. And if you would listen to what has taken place in some of the hearings over the past 3.5 years that I have been involved in, you don't hear cooperation. You don't hear it at all.

So now, I ask my colleagues on the other side: How is that Federal system going? How is that permitting system going—that regulating system going?

It is not going well at all. Just ask industry how much it has been slowed down because of regulation, and thousands and thousands of more regulations have been implemented by this administration than ever before. So let's get serious, okay? Let's be honest with the American people about what this is about.

The Federal government doesn't create jobs. Private sector creates jobs. The responsibility of the Federal Government is to remove obstacles that allow private industry to do what they do best—better than the Federal Government.

And as I said before, I have met a lot of good people here in Congress. I have met a lot of good people in the Federal system. But there is a fair number of people in the Federal system, in these agencies, that go out and say ''no,'' just for the sake of saying ''no,'' that if they had to go to work in private industry and operated under the same premise that they did in the Federal Government, they would be fired.

It is about time we start standing up for the American people and create jobs; and I hear from this administration constantly, but there are always obstacles. There are 40-some pieces of legislation sitting on HARRY REID's desk, the leader of the Senate, the Democrat who won't even bring it to the floor for a vote.

That is a disgrace. Bring it to the floor for a vote. Vote it up or down, but let the American people know what is being voted on; and it should be brought to the floor, so they know what is going on here.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, the Federal Government does not create a single job. I don't know exactly how many jobs we are talking about cutting in the Federal Government from the drawdown of the defense, but there will certainly be less federally employed Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine personnel and those who work in the Department of Defense to support their efforts to defend this Nation to keep us strong.

The Federal Government does not create a single job. Delivering our mail provides good-paying jobs, middle class.

But I must rise in opposition to this legislation, Mr. Chair, because it would just sow utter confusion. H.R. 2641 does that by creating a separate, but only partly parallel environmental review process for construction projects that will only cause confusion, delay, and litigation.

As a result of this bill, there could potentially be two different environmental review processes for the same project. Rather than improving the environmental review process, this bill will complicate it and generate litigation.

But more importantly, the bill is yet another effort by my friends on the other side of the aisle to gum up the regulatory process and, thus, undermine regulatory protections.

As with all other anti-regulatory bills that this Congress has considered over the last few weeks, this measure is simply another thinly disguised effort to hobble the ability of Federal agencies to do the work that Congress requires them to do.

Accordingly, I strenuously oppose this seriously flawed bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. I yield myself the remainder of the time, Mr. Chairman.

You know, Mr. Chairman, to bring about real and durable job recovery, there can be only one conclusion about what the House can do today, and it should vote to pass the RAPID Act.

My friend on the other side talks about the post office, and I support them. My mother worked for the post office. But you know something? The post office is self-funded, okay?

Where is the $1 trillion that this administration put into the so-called stimulus? It did nothing. It wasn't applied properly. It wasn't utilized.

This doesn't cut regulations, this legislation. It doesn't cut regulations. It cuts making a decision from 15 years down to 4.5 years. Just think in our households, how many of us would have delayed by years making decisions, were it be.

This is bipartisan legislation that would transform into immediate action

the recommendations of the President's Jobs Council, the exhortations of Vice President BIDEN, and the promises President Obama made.

The President's Jobs Council stated that our system for permitting and approving job-creating projects leads to delays and litigation and recommended in 2011 that the process be streamlined. The RAPID Act does that.

President Obama, in his 2014 State of the Union Address, promised action to slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process, so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible. The RAPID Act delivers that.

Let's come together, Republicans and Democrats, for the hardworking Americans desperate for new and high-paying jobs. The RAPID Act allows that to happen.

On average, it takes the Federal Government 10 to 15 years to approve permitting. If private industry operated in such an irresponsible manner, it would be bankrupt.

Instead of talking the talk, it is time to walk the walk and pass this legislation that will create excellent-paying jobs.

My legislation reduces permitting down to 4.5 years, and it doesn't take any authority away. It appoints a single entity, a Federal agency that has a major hand in this for oversight.

And if my colleagues are saying: well, it is not the Federal Government, it is the State and local governments.

Then that agency can light the fire under that local or State government and tell them: you must get your approvals in or, by a certain time, your opportunity to do that will be waived.

So still, in an effort to reach across the aisle and work with my colleagues and create hundreds of thousands of jobs, let's cut the red tape. Ask the people in my district about red tape—those from the VA, those from Social Security—what they have to go through with agencies—those from EPA, those from OSHA. It is a disaster.

So let's come together, Republicans and Democrats, for the hardworking Americans. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, today, the House will pass yet another bill that weakens important environmental laws. I will vote against this legislation—H.R. 2641—which if enacted would gut the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The NEPA process requires federal agencies to go through a public assessment of the environmental impacts of certain proposed federal actions. As part of this, it mandates the consideration of alternatives to those actions. The process can identify alternatives that are often less costly with fewer impacts to the environment.

H.R. 2641 undermines this important process, by placing restrictions on alternatives that can be considered, and allowing parties with vested interests in projects to prepare environmental review documents, creating potential conflicts of interest. It could also force agencies to approve projects if review and analysis cannot be completed before arbitrary deadlines.

The claimed goal of this bill is to help projects—including infrastructure projects—to move forward more quickly. The NEPA process, however, is not the reason for project delays. The reason is a lack of investment from the federal government. At the Army Corps of Engineers, there is a $60 billion backlog of authorized water resources projects that were successfully approved under NEPA, but have not been built due to lack of funding. At the same time, our roads and bridges are in disrepair, not due to NEPA, but because the federal government is short of resources, with the Highway Trust Fund projected to need $100 billion in additional revenue over the next six years just to stay solvent.

NEPA's positive impact has been unquestionable—it has been one of the nation's most important environmental laws, ensuring careful decision making and the right of the public to participate in planning efforts that would directly impact their communities. I will be disappointed to see H.R. 2641 pass, which will only limit the public's participation, increase confusion, and undermine responsible agency reviews.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–39. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2641

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 ''Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013'' or as the ''RAPID Act''.

SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FOR EFFICIENT DECISIONMAKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of part 1 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subchapter II the following:

''SUBCHAPTER IIA—INTERAGENCY COORDINATION REGARDING PERMITTING

''§ 560. Coordination of agency administrative operations for efficient decisionmaking

''(a) CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—The purpose of this subchapter is to establish a framework and procedures to streamline, increase the efficiency of, and enhance coordination of agency administration of the regulatory review, environmental decisionmaking, and permitting process for projects undertaken, reviewed, or funded by Federal agencies. This subchapter will ensure that agencies administer the regulatory process in a manner that is efficient so that citizens are not burdened with regulatory excuses and time delays.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subchapter, the term—

''(1) 'agency' means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or Indian tribal government;

''(2) 'category of projects' means 2 or more projects related by project type, potential environmental impacts, geographic location, or another similar project feature or characteristic;

''(3) 'environmental assessment' means a concise public document for which a Federal agency is responsible that serves to—

''(A) briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or a finding of no significant impact;

''(B) aid an agency's compliance with NEPA when no environmental impact statement is necessary; and

''(C) facilitate preparation of an environmental impact statement when one is necessary;

''(4) 'environmental impact statement' means the detailed statement of significant environmental impacts required to be prepared under NEPA;

''(5) 'environmental review' means the Federal agency procedures for preparing an environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, categorical exclusion, or other document under NEPA;

''(6) 'environmental decisionmaking process' means the Federal agency procedures for undertaking and completion of any environmental permit, decision, approval, review, or study under any Federal law other than NEPA for a project subject to an environmental review;

''(7) 'environmental document' means an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement, and includes any supplemental document or document prepared pursuant to a court order;

''(8) 'finding of no significant impact' means a document by a Federal agency briefly presenting the reasons why a project, not otherwise subject to a categorical exclusion, will not have a significant effect on the human environment and for which an environmental impact statement therefore will not be prepared;

''(9) 'lead agency' means the Federal agency preparing or responsible for preparing the environmental document;

''(10) 'NEPA' means the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

''(11) 'project' means major Federal actions that are construction activities undertaken with Federal funds or that are construction activities that require approval by a permit or regulatory decision issued by a Federal agency;

''(12) 'project sponsor' means the agency or other entity, including any private or public-private entity, that seeks approval for a project or is otherwise responsible for undertaking a project; and

''(13) 'record of decision' means a document prepared by a lead agency under NEPA following an environmental impact statement that states the lead agency's decision, identifies the alternatives considered by the agency in reaching its decision and states whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why they were not adopted.

''(c) PREPARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—Upon the request of the lead agency, the project sponsor shall be authorized to prepare any document for purposes of an environmental review required in support of any project or approval by the lead agency if the lead agency furnishes oversight in such preparation and independently evaluates such document and the document is approved and adopted by the lead agency prior to taking any action or making any approval based on such document.

''(d) ADOPTION AND USE OF DOCUMENTS.—

''(1) DOCUMENTS PREPARED UNDER NEPA.—

''(A) Not more than 1 environmental impact statement and 1 environmental assessment shall be prepared under NEPA for a project (except for supplemental environmental documents prepared under NEPA or environmental documents prepared pursuant to a court order), and, except as otherwise provided by law, the lead agency shall prepare the environmental impact statement or environmental assessment. After the

lead agency issues a record of decision, no Federal agency responsible for making any approval for that project may rely on a document other than the environmental document prepared by the lead agency.

''(B) Upon the request of a project sponsor, a lead agency may adopt, use, or rely upon secondary and cumulative impact analyses included in any environmental document prepared under NEPA for projects in the same geographic area where the secondary and cumulative impact analyses provide information and data that pertains to the NEPA decision for the project under review.

''(2) STATE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS; SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS.—

''(A) Upon the request of a project sponsor, a lead agency may adopt a document that has been prepared for a project under State laws and procedures as the environmental impact statement or environmental assessment for the project, provided that the State laws and procedures under which the document was prepared provide environmental protection and opportunities for public involvement that are substantially equivalent to NEPA.

''(B) An environmental document adopted under subparagraph (A) is deemed to satisfy the lead agency's obligation under NEPA to prepare an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment.

''(C) In the case of a document described in subparagraph (A), during the period after preparation of the document but before its adoption by the lead agency, the lead agency shall prepare and publish a supplement to that document if the lead agency determines that—

''(i) a significant change has been made to the project that is relevant for purposes of environmental review of the project; or

''(ii) there have been significant changes in circumstances or availability of information relevant to the environmental review for the project.

''(D) If the agency prepares and publishes a supplemental document under subparagraph (C), the lead agency may solicit comments from agencies and the public on the supplemental document for a period of not more than 45 days beginning on the date of the publication of the supplement.

''(E) A lead agency shall issue its record of decision or finding of no significant impact, as appropriate, based upon the document adopted under subparagraph (A), and any supplements thereto.

''(3) CONTEMPORANEOUS PROJECTS.—If the lead agency determines that there is a reasonable likelihood that the project will have similar environmental impacts as a similar project in geographical proximity to the project, and that similar project was subject to environmental review or similar State procedures within the 5-year period immediately preceding the date that the lead agency makes that determination, the lead agency may adopt the environmental document that resulted from that environmental review or similar State procedure. The lead agency may adopt such an environmental document, if it is prepared under State laws and procedures only upon making a favorable determination on such environmental document pursuant to paragraph (2)(A).

''(e) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall be responsible for inviting and designating participating agencies in accordance with this subsection. The lead agency shall provide the invitation or notice of the designation in writing.

''(2) FEDERAL PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—Any Federal agency that is required to adopt the environmental document of the lead agency for a project shall be designated as a participating agency and shall collaborate on the preparation of the environmental document, unless the Federal agency informs the lead agency, in writing, by a time specified by the lead agency in the designation of the Federal agency that the Federal agency—

''(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project;

''(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the project; and

''(C) does not intend to submit comments on the project.

''(3) INVITATION.—The lead agency shall identify, as early as practicable in the environmental review for a project, any agencies other than an agency described in paragraph (2) that may have an interest in the project, including, where appropriate, Governors of affected States, and heads of appropriate tribal and local (including county) governments, and shall invite such identified agencies and officials to become participating agencies in the environmental review for the project. The invitation shall set a deadline of 30 days for responses to be submitted, which may only be extended by the lead agency for good cause shown. Any agency that fails to respond prior to the deadline shall be deemed to have declined the invitation.

''(4) EFFECT OF DECLINING PARTICIPATING AGENCY INVITATION.—Any agency that declines a designation or invitation by the lead agency to be a participating agency shall be precluded from submitting comments on any document prepared under NEPA for that project or taking any measures to oppose, based on the environmental review, any permit, license, or approval related to that project.

''(5) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—Designation as a participating agency under this subsection does not imply that the participating agency—

''(A) supports a proposed project; or

''(B) has any jurisdiction over, or special expertise with respect to evaluation of, the project.

''(6) COOPERATING AGENCY.—A participating agency may also be designated by a lead agency as a 'cooperating agency' under the regulations contained in part 1500 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2011. Designation as a cooperating agency shall have no effect on designation as participating agency. No agency that is not a participating agency may be designated as a cooperating agency.

''(7) CONCURRENT REVIEWS.—Each Federal agency shall—

''(A) carry out obligations of the Federal agency under other applicable law concurrently and in conjunction with the review required under NEPA; and

''(B) in accordance with the rules made by the Council on Environmental Quality pursuant to subsection (n)(1), make and carry out such rules, policies, and procedures as may be reasonably necessary to enable the agency to ensure completion of the environmental review and environmental decisionmaking process in a timely, coordinated, and environmentally responsible manner.

''(8) COMMENTS.—Each participating agency shall limit its comments on a project to areas that are within the authority and expertise of such participating agency. Each participating agency shall identify in such comments the statutory authority of the participating agency pertaining to the subject matter of its comments. The lead agency shall not act upon, respond to or include in any document prepared under NEPA, any comment submitted by a participating agency that concerns matters that are outside of the authority and expertise of the commenting participating agency.

''(f) PROJECT INITIATION REQUEST.—

''(1) NOTICE.—A project sponsor shall provide the Federal agency responsible for undertaking a project with notice of the initiation of the project by providing a description of the proposed project, the general location of the proposed project, and a statement of any Federal approvals anticipated to be necessary for the proposed project, for the purpose of informing the Federal agency that the environmental review should be initiated.

''(2) LEAD AGENCY INITIATION.—The agency receiving a project initiation notice under paragraph (1) shall promptly identify the lead agency for the project, and the lead agency shall initiate the environmental review within a period of 45 days after receiving the notice required by paragraph (1) by inviting or designating agencies to become participating agencies, or, where the lead agency determines that no participating agencies are required for the project, by taking such other actions that are reasonable and necessary to initiate the environmental review.

''(g) ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS.—

''(1) PARTICIPATION.—As early as practicable during the environmental review, but no later than during scoping for a project requiring the preparation of an environmental impact statement, the lead agency shall provide an opportunity for involvement by cooperating agencies in determining the range of alternatives to be considered for a project.

''(2) RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES.—Following participation under paragraph (1), the lead agency shall determine the range of alternatives for consideration in any document which the lead agency is responsible for preparing for the project, subject to the following limitations:

''(A) NO EVALUATION OF CERTAIN ALTERNATIVES.—No Federal agency shall evaluate any alternative that was identified but not carried forward for detailed evaluation in an environmental document or evaluated and not selected in any environmental document prepared under NEPA for the same project.

''(B) ONLY FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED.—Where a project is being constructed, managed, funded, or undertaken by a project sponsor that is not a Federal agency, Federal agencies shall only be required to evaluate alternatives that the project sponsor could feasibly undertake, consistent with the purpose of and the need for the project, including alternatives that can be undertaken by the project sponsor and that are technically and economically feasible.

''(3) METHODOLOGIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall determine, in collaboration with cooperating agencies at appropriate times during the environmental review, the methodologies to be used and the level of detail required in the analysis of each alternative for a project. The lead agency shall include in the environmental document a description of the methodologies used and how the methodologies were selected.

''(B) NO EVALUATION OF INAPPROPRIATE ALTERNATIVES.—When a lead agency determines that an alternative does not meet the purpose and need for a project, that alternative is not required to be evaluated in detail in an environmental document.

''(4) PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.—At the discretion of the lead agency, the preferred alternative for a project, after being identified, may be developed to a higher level of detail than other alternatives in order to facilitate the development of mitigation measures or concurrent compliance with other applicable laws if the lead agency determines that the development of such higher level of detail will not prevent the lead agency from making an impartial decision as to whether to accept another alternative which is being considered in the environmental review.

''(5) EMPLOYMENT ANALYSIS.—The evaluation of each alternative in an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment shall identify the potential effects of the alternative on employment, including potential short-term and long-term employment increases and reductions and shifts in employment.

''(h) COORDINATION AND SCHEDULING.—

''(1) COORDINATION PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall establish and implement a plan for coordinating public and agency participation in and comment on the environmental review for a project or category of projects to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review.

''(B) SCHEDULE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency shall establish as part of the coordination plan for a project, after consultation with each participating agency and, where applicable, the project sponsor, a schedule for completion of the environmental review. The schedule shall include deadlines, consistent with subsection (i), for decisions under any other Federal laws (including the issuance or denial of a permit or license) relating to the project that is covered by the schedule.

''(ii) FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION.—In establishing the schedule, the lead agency shall consider factors such as—

''(I) the responsibilities of participating agencies under applicable laws;

''(II) resources available to the participating agencies;

''(III) overall size and complexity of the project;

''(IV) overall schedule for and cost of the project;

''(V) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that could be affected by the project; and

''(VI) the extent to which similar projects in geographic proximity were recently subject to environmental review or similar State procedures.

''(iii) COMPLIANCE WITH THE SCHEDULE.—

''(I) All participating agencies shall comply with the time periods established in the schedule or with any modified time periods, where the lead agency modifies the schedule pursuant to subparagraph (D).

''(II) The lead agency shall disregard and shall not respond to or include in any document prepared under NEPA, any comment or information submitted or any finding made by a participating agency that is outside of the time period established in the schedule or modification pursuant to subparagraph (D) for that agency's comment, submission or finding.

''(III) If a participating agency fails to object in writing to a lead agency decision, finding or request for concurrence within the time period established under law or by the lead agency, the agency shall be deemed to have concurred in the decision, finding or request.

''(C) CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER TIME PERIODS.—A schedule under subparagraph (B) shall be consistent with any other relevant time periods established under Federal law.

''(D) MODIFICATION.—The lead agency may—

''(i) lengthen a schedule established under subparagraph (B) for good cause; and

''(ii) shorten a schedule only with the concurrence of the cooperating agencies.

''(E) DISSEMINATION.—A copy of a schedule under subparagraph (B), and of any modifications to the schedule, shall be—

''(i) provided within 15 days of completion or modification of such schedule to all participating agencies and to the project sponsor; and

''(ii) made available to the public.

''(F) ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITY OF LEAD AGENCY.—With respect to the environmental review for any project, the lead agency shall have authority and responsibility to take such actions as are necessary and proper, within the authority of the lead agency, to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review for the project.

''(i) DEADLINES.—The following deadlines shall apply to any project subject to review under NEPA and any decision under any Federal law relating to such project (including the issuance or denial of a permit or license or any required finding):

''(1) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DEADLINES.—The lead agency shall complete the environmental review within the following deadlines:

''(A) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PROJECTS.—For projects requiring preparation of an environmental impact statement—

''(i) the lead agency shall issue an environmental impact statement within 2 years after the earlier of the date the lead agency receives the project initiation request or a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement is published in the Federal Register; and

''(ii) in circumstances where the lead agency has prepared an environmental assessment and determined that an environmental impact statement will be required, the lead agency shall issue the environmental impact statement within 2 years after the date of publication of the Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in the Federal Register.

''(B) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROJECTS.—For projects requiring preparation of an environmental assessment, the lead agency shall issue a finding of no significant impact or publish a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in the Federal Register within 1 year after the earlier of the date the lead agency receives the project initiation request, makes a decision to prepare an environmental assessment, or sends out participating agency invitations.

''(2) EXTENSIONS.—

''(A) REQUIREMENTS.—The environmental review deadlines may be extended only if—

''(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency, the project sponsor, and all participating agencies; or

''(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The environmental review shall not be extended by more than 1 year for a project requiring preparation of an environmental impact statement or by more than 180 days for a project requiring preparation of an environmental assessment.

''(3) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS.—

''(A) COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—For comments by agencies and the public on a draft environmental impact statement, the lead agency shall establish a comment period of not more than 60 days after publication in the Federal Register of notice of the date of public availability of such document, unless—

''(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency, the project sponsor, and all participating agencies; or

''(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

''(B) OTHER COMMENTS.—For all other comment periods for agency or public comments in the environmental review process, the lead agency shall establish a comment period of no more than 30 days from availability of the materials on which comment is requested, unless—

''(i) a different deadline is established by agreement of the lead agency, the project sponsor, and all participating agencies; or

''(ii) the deadline is extended by the lead agency for good cause.

''(4) DEADLINES FOR DECISIONS UNDER OTHER LAWS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which a decision under any other Federal law relating to the undertaking of a project being reviewed under NEPA (including the issuance or denial of a permit or license) is required to be made, the following deadlines shall apply:

''(A) DECISIONS PRIOR TO RECORD OF DECISION OR FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.—If a Federal agency is required to approve, or otherwise to act upon, a permit, license, or other similar application for approval related to a project prior to the record of decision or finding of no significant impact, such Federal agency shall approve or otherwise act not later than the end of a 90-day period beginning—

''(i) after all other relevant agency review related to the project is complete; and

''(ii) after the lead agency publishes a notice of the availability of the final environmental impact statement or issuance of other final environmental documents, or no later than such other date that is otherwise required by law, whichever event occurs first.

''(B) OTHER DECISIONS.—With regard to any approval or other action related to a project by a Federal agency that is not subject to subparagraph (A), each Federal agency shall approve or otherwise act not later than the end of a period of 180 days beginning—

''(i) after all other relevant agency review related to the project is complete; and

''(ii) after the lead agency issues the record of decision or finding of no significant impact, unless a different deadline is established by agreement of the Federal agency, lead agency, and the project sponsor, where applicable, or the deadline is extended by the Federal agency for good cause, provided that such extension shall not extend beyond a period that is 1 year after the lead agency issues the record of decision or finding of no significant impact.

''(C) FAILURE TO ACT.—In the event that any Federal agency fails to approve, or otherwise to act upon, a permit, license, or other similar application for approval related to a project within the applicable deadline described in subparagraph (A) or (B), the permit, license, or other similar application shall be deemed approved by such agency and the agency shall take action in accordance with such approval within 30 days of the applicable deadline described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(D) FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—Any approval under subparagraph (C) is deemed to be final agency action, and may not be reversed by any agency. In any action under chapter 7 seeking review of such a final agency action, the court may not set aside such agency action by reason of that agency action having occurred under this paragraph.

''(j) ISSUE IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION.—

''(1) COOPERATION.—The lead agency and the participating agencies shall work cooperatively in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review or could result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

''(2) LEAD AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—The lead agency shall make information available to the participating agencies as early as practicable in the environmental review regarding the environmental, historic, and socioeconomic resources located within the project area and the general locations of the alternatives under consideration. Such information may be based on existing data sources, including geographic information systems mapping.

''(3) PARTICIPATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—Based on information received from the lead agency, participating agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environmental, historic, or socioeconomic impacts. In this paragraph, issues of concern include any issues that could substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the project.

''(4) ISSUE RESOLUTION.—

''(A) MEETING OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.—At any time upon request of a project sponsor, the lead agency shall promptly convene a meeting with the relevant participating agencies and the project sponsor, to resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review or could result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

''(B) NOTICE THAT RESOLUTION CANNOT BE ACHIEVED.—If a resolution cannot be achieved within 30 days following such a meeting and a determination by the lead agency that all information necessary to resolve the issue has been obtained, the lead agency shall notify the heads of all participating agencies, the project sponsor, and the Council on Environmental Quality for further proceedings in accordance with section 204 of NEPA, and shall publish such notification in the Federal Register.

''(k) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of each Federal agency shall report annually to Congress—

''(1) the projects for which the agency initiated preparation of an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment;

''(2) the projects for which the agency issued a record of decision or finding of no significant impact and the length of time it took the agency to complete the environmental review for each such project;

''(3) the filing of any lawsuits against the agency seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by the agency for an action subject to NEPA, including the date the complaint was filed, the court in which the complaint was filed, and a summary of the claims for which judicial review was sought; and

''(4) the resolution of any lawsuits against the agency that sought judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by the agency for an action subject to NEPA.

''(l) LIMITATIONS ON CLAIMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claim arising under Federal law seeking judicial review of a permit, license, or approval issued by a Federal agency for an action subject to NEPA shall be barred unless—

''(A) in the case of a claim pertaining to a project for which an environmental review was conducted and an opportunity for comment was provided, the claim is filed by a party that submitted a comment during the environmental review on the issue on which the party seeks judicial review, and such comment was sufficiently detailed to put the lead agency on notice of the issue upon which the party seeks judicial review; and

''(B) filed within 180 days after publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing that the permit, license, or approval is final pursuant to the law under which the agency action is taken, unless a shorter time is specified in the Federal law pursuant to which judicial review is allowed.

''(2) NEW INFORMATION.—The preparation of a supplemental environmental impact statement, when required, is deemed a separate final agency action and the deadline for filing a claim for judicial review of such action shall be 180 days after the date of publication of a notice in the Federal Register announcing the record of decision for such action. Any claim challenging agency action on the basis of information in a supplemental environmental impact statement shall be limited to challenges on the basis of that information.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to create a right to judicial review or place any limit on filing a claim that a person has violated the terms of a permit, license, or approval.

''(m) CATEGORIES OF PROJECTS.—The authorities granted under this subchapter may be exercised for an individual project or a category of projects.

''(n) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirements of this subchapter shall apply only to environmental reviews and environmental decision-making processes initiated after the date of enactment of this subchapter.

''(o) APPLICABILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (p), this subchapter applies, according to the provisions thereof, to all projects for which a Federal agency is required to undertake an environmental review or make a decision under an environmental law for a project for which a Federal agency is undertaking an environmental review.

''(p) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede, amend, or modify sections 134, 135, 139, 325, 326, and 327 of title 23, sections 5303 and 5304 of title 49, or subtitle C of title I of division A of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act and the amendments made by such subtitle (Public Law 112–141).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the items relating to subchapter II the following:

''SUBCHAPTER IIA—INTERAGENCY COORDINATION REGARDING PERMITTING

''560. Coordination of agency administrative operations for efficient decisionmaking.''.

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Council on Environmental Quality shall amend the regulations contained in part 1500 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to implement the provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title, and shall by rule designate States with laws and procedures that satisfy the criteria under section 560(d)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Not later than 120 days after the date that the Council on Environmental Quality amends the regulations contained in part 1500 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, to implement the provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title, each Federal agency with regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall amend such regulations to implement the provisions of this subchapter.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 113–374. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 25, strike lines 1 through 19.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1300

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the provision deeming approved any project in which the agency does not meet deadlines contained in the bill. As we have listened to the discussion, as I indicated in my earlier time on the floor, there is much that we can agree to on the issue of making more effective our Federal Government, making it work for the people. We all agree to that. In fact, I had suggested that we provide full funding for infrastructure rebuild.

But this bill ignores the value of oversight. The bill also ignores the fact that NEPA has, for more than 40 years, provided an effective framework for all types of projects—not just construction projects—that require Federal approval pursuant to a Federal law such as the Clean Air Act.

I want to read into the RECORD a comment that I made earlier, why this is a misdirected legislation. The CEQ, general counsel for 25 years during the Reagan, George H. W. Bush, Clinton, and George W. Bush administrations, who was intimately involved in the implementation of NEPA through the executive branch, observed most delays in the environmental review processes are caused by factors other than NEPA or justified by the nature of the project.

But yet this bill would indicate that if by the time that this bill designates the oversight has not been finished—that could be an oversight for a nuclear-fired plant; it could be an oversight dealing with some of the energy resources that we have that require that kind of oversight; it could be the oversight of building a major construction project through a heavily populated neighborhood; or it could be oversight on many aspects of America's business—then this bill says it is simply deemed up—deemed up, Mr. Chairman.

So how can one believe that problems will be solved by just ignoring—ignoring—the process?

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, and that is that automatic approval, that deeming up, that beaming up. And so I would ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment which relieves us of that burden of fearfully passing legislation that would, in fact, deem up.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, with all due respect to my colleague with whom we have worked closely on several matters on several committees, Mr. Chairman, the American people desperately need new jobs. Just this week, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that America's labor force participation rate is at a 35-year low. Over 92 million Americans who could work are outside of the workforce. That is more than the population of all but 14 of the world's 228 countries—and more than every country in the Western Hemisphere but Brazil and Mexico.

We face this historically low rate not because Americans don't want to work, but because so many Americans have despaired of any hope of finding a new full-time job and have abandoned the workforce. The RAPID Act offers strong help to reverse this tragedy, restore hope, and produce millions of new jobs.

We must pass the bill, not weaken it, to provide these new, high-wage jobs. But the gentlelady's amendment would weaken the bill in one of the worst possible ways. It would remove the clear consequence in the bill for agencies

that refuse to follow the bill's deadlines. That consequence is to deem permits approved if agencies refuse to approve or deny them within those deadlines.

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides 4½ years for agencies to complete their environmental reviews for new permit applications and reasonable additional time for agencies to wrap up final permit approvals or denials after that. 4½ years is more time than it took the United States to fight and win World War II.

If agencies can't wrap up their environmental reviews in that much time and then meet the bill's remaining deadlines, there is something terribly wrong with the agencies. The prospect of facing a default approval at the end of the substantial time the bill grants is an eminently responsible, reasonable way to assure that agencies will conduct full reviews and wrap their work up in time to make up-or-down decisions on their own.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me restate again what is in this legislation.

If a Federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the determination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved—deemed approved—by such agency.

Mr. Chairman, do the American people want something deemed approved that might be a dangerous and unsuitable project in their community?

And as it relates to the creation of jobs, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, but I will tell you that it is said by the Federal Highway Administration, the majority of the approved projects required limited documentation or analysis under NEPA. Further, when environmental requirements have caused project delays, requirements established under laws other than NEPA have generally been the fault. NEPA has not stopped the creation of jobs.

But what I can tell my good friend is that, if we could pass the unemployment insurance extension, we can give opportunity to Americans to keep looking for jobs; and if we pass an infrastructure bill, we would have jobs.

So my point is that my amendment is very simple. It is just to eliminate that provision that might dangerously put Americans in jeopardy by, in essence, allowing projects to be approved while there is a studious, conscientious review of that project that is to generate jobs but to provide for the safety, the security, the tranquility, and the peace of the American people. I can't imagine that we would want to throw into legislation on streamlining an absolute hatchet that says your neck is cut off if, in fact, you are not finished with your work; the heck with it, we are going on to produce this project.

I know that the American people believe in the spirit of my good friend from Pennsylvania's intentions. We can work together. We can put legislation forward that can be constructive. But a shortened time of 4 years is nothing to celebrate if, in essence, the time is needed for review.

I have cited some of the challenges that we face: oil spills; construction projects that have seen large numbers of deaths because of the way it was done; collapse of buildings, as we have seen in the tragedy of the building that was collapsed in Pennsylvania; and other terrible disasters that have occurred that require the rebuild of certain facilities in the United States.

I cannot imagine—again, I might say that the general counsel that was general counsel for the CEQ to all of the last four Presidents has indicated NEPA is not a problem.

I ask that my amendment, the Jackson Lee amendment, be supported and make this legislation a step better and a step in a direction to get it where it should be. I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, for this opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 2641, the "Responsible and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013."

If the RAPID Act were to become law in its present form, a permit or license for project would be "deemed" approved if the reviewing agency does not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

My amendment strikes the provision deeming approved any project for which agency does not meet deadlines contained in the bill.

Mr. Chair, I share some of the frustrations expressed by many members of this committee with the NEPA process.

There is something odd about a system in which it can take half a year or more to approve the siting plan for a wind farm but fracking operations regulations can be approved and conducted a few hundred feet from somebody's home with no community oversight process in just a few months.

Something is wrong with this picture.

But I strongly believe that this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

Mr. Chair, why are we wasting time with this bill when we could be passing H.R. 3546, a bill introduced by my colleague Sandy Levin, the distinguished Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee, which amends the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 to extend emergency unemployment compensation (EUC) payments for eligible individuals to weeks of employment ending on or before January 1, 2015.

Or we could bring up and pass H.R. 3888, "The New Chance For a New Start in Life Act," a bill I introduced which provides grants for training to those out of work—who are merely seeking to pull themselves up by their bootstraps—the American way.

But here we are on the Floor of the House of Representatives voting and speaking on the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

The bill in its current form is an example of a medicine that is worse than a disease.

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, namely automatic approval of projects with the need for positive agency action.

Under H.R. 2641, if a federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the termination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved, deemed approved by such agency.

This creates a set of perverse incentives. First, as an agency is up against that deadline and legitimate work is yet to be completed, it is likely to disapprove the project simply because the issues have not been vetted.

Second, frequently there are times when it is the case that the complexity of issues that need to be resolved necessitates a longer review period, rather than an arbitrary limit.

So if H.R. 2641 were to become law the most likely outcome is that federal agencies would be required to make decisions based on incomplete information, or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

The Jackson Lee Amendment sets up a trigger after a period of time for a process, which is not automatic approval, but is rather a convening of the stakeholders around figuring out what is standing in the way of the NEPA decision.

Mr. Chair, the new requirements contained in H.R. 2641 amend the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), even though the bill is drafted as an amendment to the APA.

The bill ignores the fact that NEPA has for more than 40 years provided an effective framework for all types of projects (not just construction projects) that require federal approval pursuant to a federal law, such as the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2641 and keep Americans working.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I am just going to close on this thought here. My colleague on the other side says that 4½ years is just simply not enough time to go through the permitting and licensing project. Just think about this: ask the people in the private sector when you see buildings going up, before they are going up when there is a statement on the land where the building is going to go up as to this project is going to take place in so much time, ask those people, get information to see how long it takes the private sector to do the same thing that the Federal Government is supposed to be doing. At most, a couple of years—not 10 years, not 12 years, not 15 years. Private industry can have this done in a couple of years with all the research, with all the permitting, with all the licensing, and with all the hearings.

I think one of my colleagues said this blocks out the public from hearing or making any statements. That is simply

not true. That is absolutely not true. The public still has the time and can do that.

So with that, I oppose my good friend's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 27, insert after line 17 the following, and redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly:

''(k) LIMITATION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON .—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any environmental review or environmental decision-making process, a lead agency may not use the social cost of carbon.

''(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'social cost of carbon' means the social cost of carbon as described in the technical support document entitled 'Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013, revised in November 2013, or any successor thereto or substantially related document, or any other estimate of the monetized damages associated with an incremental increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit agencies under this legislation from using the social cost of carbon that this administration implemented under executive order. Late on a Friday afternoon in June of 2013, this increase in the cost estimate for the social cost of carbon showed up in an obscure rule regarding microwave ovens. In typical fashion with this administration, there was no public debate, no stakeholder comment, and no vote in Congress for this estimate which increased the cost over 50 percent. But they didn't consider the social cost of mental anguish and health care for those that lose their job as a result.

Then again, this is the same administration who issued a de facto ban on new coal-fired powerhouses and refused to hold listening sessions in the areas most affected by fossil fuels. Coal production is down throughout Appalachia, and down by nearly half over the last 5 years under this administration.

Too many people in Washington just don't get it. When you shut down the fossil fuel industry in a community—in particular, a coal mine—you shut down an entire community. Railroad workers, machinists, timber and coal industries, pharmacists, and schoolteachers all are effected by these kinds of policies. Entire communities, the social fabric of our Nation, are on edge while this administration's ideologically driven policies are threatening hundreds of thousands of jobs all across America.

This is the same President who, in 2008, said he would bankrupt the coal industry. This has become personal to me, Mr. Chairman, and many people throughout the coalfields of America. The rest of the world is investing in coal, building new plants, and increasing their consumption of coal—but not here in America.

This President is gambling with our economy and risking America's future. For a President who likes to talk about fairness, Mr. Chairman, blaming our fossil fuels as a health risk isn't fair.

But then again, is it fair for the EPA to require standards that can't be achieved? Is it fair to blame man for climate change when naturally occurring CO_2 emissions represent 96 percent naturally, while U.S. coal emissions contributed only two-tenths? Let me say that again. Two-tenths of 1 percent of the emissions occur from coal-fired powerhouses.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would prohibit an agency from considering the social cost of carbon—social cost of carbon—in an agency's environmental review of a proposed construction project.

This amendment ignores the fundamental reality that climate change is real and we need to do something about it. The social cost of carbon, or SCC, is an estimate of the social and economic benefits of reducing carbon dioxide emissions that began under the Bush administration and has been upheld by the courts. For example, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ordered the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to include SCC in its light-truck fuel economy standards in 2007.

Thomas Sterner, an economist with the Environmental Defense Fund, cited the Obama administration's SCC estimates as ''a welcome step forward, reflecting the latest versions of the underlying models.'' Billy Pizer, a Duke University economist, notes that the ''key thing is we are recognizing the answer is not zero. We know there are negative consequences. And we are trying to put an accurate dollar value on it.''

Even William Bumpers, an attorney with Baker Botts, who typically represents manufacturers in pollution cases, acknowledged that the ''only real cost of carbon that I know is wrong is zero.''

□ 1315

Perhaps most importantly for purposes of this amendment is that there is overwhelming consensus that every ton of carbon dioxide emitted into the atmosphere has very real costs to human health, ecosystems, and the economy.

The SCC estimates involve extensive analysis of the best available peer-reviewed literature and climate economic assessment models. They include a broad range of costs associated with anticipated climate impacts on society, such as the property damage from increased flood risks, or the additional energy costs associated with climate oscillations.

Since 2009 alone, there have been a series of major climatic events that demonstrate the costly effects of climate change. How many so-called ''hundred-year storms'' have to hit a major city like New York before climate skeptics will wake up?

The 2011 Texas drought alone cost farmers and ranchers over $5 billion. How many farmer's crops must wither on the vine before we face up to the real costs inaction?

I ask my colleagues to oppose this very detrimental amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think we all can admit that CO_2 emissions have increased. In the last numbers of years, 200 years, CO_2 emissions have increased from 320 parts per million to 400 parts per million. During this same period of time, however, population has expanded by eight times. Life expectancy across the world has doubled. Human cancers and viral diseases have decreased. Do opponents of our fossil fuels truly believe our society will be developed on anything other than cheap, abundant, and reliable sources of energy such as coal and natural gas?

Fossil fuels have lifted billions of people out of poverty. CO_2 is essential to human life. In The New York Times, Bill Gates was quoted as saying:

If you could pick just one thing to reduce poverty, by far you would pick energy.

According to statistics from the EIA, in 2010, 80 percent of the world's GDP is attributed to fossil fuels. This represents $60 trillion.

However, the opponents of this amendment and fossil fuels in general turn a blind eye to the suffering of over 1.3 billion people across the world who have no access to electricity for heating, cooking, and water supplies. That is a social travesty.

To quote one climate scientist we spoke with:

Just so radical environmentalists can feel better about themselves, they prevent families and children living in poverty from having access to the most dependable and affordable energy resources.

That, Mr. Chairman, is immoral.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his staunch support of this amendment and his hard work on the underlying legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to accept this amendment and the legislation. Poverty is not just the number one threat to the environment and health in our society, but throughout the world in general.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

It is bad enough that agencies already take too much time to conclude construction permit reviews. It is even worse for them to draw out the process on the basis of junk science. And that is precisely what the Obama Administration's pronouncements on the "Social Cost of Carbon" appear to be.

To be specific, multiple commenters on the Administration's latest "findings" argue that "carbon's social cost is an unknown quantity; that [social-cost-of-carbon] analysts can get just about any result they desire by fiddling with non-validated climate parameters, made-up damage functions, and below-market discount rates; and that [social-cost-of-carbon] analysis is computer-aided sophistry, its political function being to make renewable energy look like a bargain at any price and fossil energy look unaffordable no matter how cheap."

Junk science and sophistry have no place standing between hardworking Americans and new, high-paying jobs. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 9, insert after "subchapter." the following: "In the case of a project for which an environmental review or environmental decisionmaking process was initiated prior to the date of enactment of this subchapter, the provisions of subsection (i) shall apply, except that, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in determining a deadline under such subsection, any applicable period of time shall be calculated as beginning from the date of enactment of this subchapter.".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Mr. MARINO for putting forth this bill, the RAPID Act. This bill is a giant step toward implementing an environmental review process that works. I offer an amendment today not to alter the process, but to ensure that projects that are currently languishing in current environmental review have an opportunity to access the tools provided in this bill.

Infrastructure projects are vital to my home State of Florida. From port infrastructure to airports to seaports, road projects, even the Everglades restoration projects, my State's economy is supported by wise in investment in infrastructure.

Two projects in my State have suffered greatly under the current environmental review process. Orlando International Airport has had plans to develop a piece of property for airport services for more than a decade. The expansion would create skilled, high-paying jobs, and would be a boost to central Florida's economy. The plans have been under environmental review since 2008. A simple environmental assessment should not take more than 6 years.

Another project in our State, Port Everglades, involves deepening an existing channel by a few feet. The deepening of the channel at Port Everglades will allow more exports to flow out of our State on Post Panamax ships. This project is vital to our State as a whole, but also important to central Florida due to the large amounts of citrus that ships out of our State through Port Everglades. The more citrus we can ship, the more jobs we create. However, the channel deepening has been under environmental review for more than 17 years. For nearly two decades, Port Everglades has been caught in an endless cycle of review. The Florida delegation is committed, both Republicans and Democrats, to getting this project complete.

My amendment today is offered with these projects in mind. This amendment simply applies the same timelines that the RAPID Act establishes for new projects to projects that are currently under review.

Does it mean that they would be automatically, if it is already 4½ years into the project? No, it just means that timeline would not go beyond another 4½ years.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make the so-called RAPID Act, which, by the way, I would rename, as our caucus has done, the Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act.

This RAPID Act will apply retroactively to construction projects that are currently under review. As a result, all of the bill's problematic provisions that we have cited, including its arbitrary deadlines for environmental review and restrictions on public comment, would apply to pending construction projects that require Federal approval or Federal permitting.

This amendment, like the RAPID Act, ignores the fact that NEPA is not the problem. According to the Congressional Research Service, which is nonpartisan, project approval delays based on environmental requirements are not caused by NEPA. Rather, CRS reports that these delays are caused by State and local factors like project funding levels, local opposition to a project, a project's complexity, or late changes in the project scope.

This amendment would do nothing to address the underlying problem, and that underlying problem is the lack of funding. So we need to address, Mr. Chairman, the root causes of the delays in the process, not threaten public health and safety by automatically approving projects when agencies fail to meet arbitrary deadlines.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure everyone understands what this does. It would limit to 4½ more years. So we have a project 17 years in. Now we are saying, all right, can you give us an answer in 4½ more years? Over two decades, and we can't get an answer? I don't know; maybe we won't. But if the answer is "no," say it. That is all they have to do. This doesn't automatically approve anything. What it says is, Give us an answer. Isn't 21 years long enough?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate that I utter this saying: Show me the money. When the money is there, projects can start being funded and work can begin. Workers can start working and getting paychecks. In that way, we will reinvigorate this economy. We have got to have—instead of anti-regulatory bills, we need job-creation bills.

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, just to highlight some construction that has taken place in the past before we had all this regulation: San Francisco Bay Bridge construction started July 9, 1933, and the bridge opened up on November 12, 1936. Chesapeake Bay Bridge construction started in January of 1949 and the

bridge opened up July 30, 1952. Empire State Building construction started January 22, 1930, and the building opened up May 1, 1931. The Chrysler Building construction began in 1926 and was completed in 1930. One of my favorites: the new Yankee Stadium groundbreaking was in August of 2006; opening day was April of 2009.

There are thousands of comedians out of business. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would get serious about following the premise that the American people want—less red tape—instead of trying to be funny, we would be in good shape.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman, and I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

The RAPID Act includes important reforms to assure that agencies wrap up their environmental reviews for construction permits within a generous four-and-one-half years. The current language of the bill applies these reforms to all "environmental reviews" and all "environmental decisionmaking processes" begun after the bill's enactment.

The amendment takes the next step and applies the bill to environmental reviews and environmental decisionmaking processes begun before enactment. But it also generously provides that the time remaining for agencies to conclude a review or decisionmaking process will be calculated as if the review or process had begun on the date of enactment—just as with a new permit application. Other deadlines in the bill will likewise be calculated as if the relevant timeframe began on the date of enactment, not before enactment.

The amendment thus represents a very reasonable balance between assuring that pending permit applications will at last be wrapped up and providing agencies with adequate time to wrap them up.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his support, and I urge Members to vote for this amendment. It is a good amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 30, line 23, insert after "112-141)." the following:

"(q) EXCEPTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of a project described in paragraph (2), or an environmental document pertaining to such a project.

"(2) PROJECT DESCRIBED.—A project described in this paragraph is any project that pertains to a nuclear facility in an area designated as an earthquake fault zone.".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment exempts from the bill any construction project for a nuclear facility planned in an area designated as an earthquake fault zone.

The RAPID Act would prevent meaningful input on complicated construction projects that have the potential to have disastrous impact on individuals living near them.

The meltdown of the nuclear reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi power plant in Japan in the aftermath of a devastating earthquake and tsunami highlights the dangers of regulatory failure when it comes to ensuring the safe operation of nuclear reactors. In particular, the Fukushima disaster illustrates the failure in planning a construction project in an area susceptible to earthquakes and tsunamis.

March 11, 2014, next week, marks the 3-year anniversary of the Fukushima meltdown. A recent reporter visiting the site described it like this:

The site of Fukushima nuclear disaster in Japan remains a post-apocalyptic landscape of abandoned towns, frozen in time.

□ 1330

Now, consider the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant, which is only 24 miles from New York City and, according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, could be at risk of reactor core damage from an earthquake. An estimated 17 million people live within a 50-mile radius of the Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant.

By imposing strict deadlines and limiting opportunities for agencies and the public to participate in the approval process, this bill could prevent the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from being able to protect the tens of millions who live in the greater New York Metropolitan area and millions of Americans who live near nuclear power plants from a catastrophe akin to what happened at Fukushima in Japan.

I want to point out that we have already had nuclear accidents right here in the United States. Just last month, night shift workers inhaled plutonium that was leaked from a nuclear waste burial site in Carlsbad, New Mexico.

Radioactive materials reached the surface and were inhaled by several workers. Those workers face the possibility of subatomic particles bombarding their internal organs for the rest of their lives.

Now, imagine the immense risk to human health that would result from a large-scale leak caused by an earthquake. It would be catastrophic. We cannot afford to water down nuclear regulations or restrict the ability of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from doing its job of protecting human health.

My amendment would ensure that the inclusive and prudential construction approval process that currently exists under the National Environmental Policy Act will continue to apply to any construction projects for a nuclear facility planned in an area designated as an earthquake fault zone.

The procedures in this bill that would short-circuit the NEPA procedures are just too dangerous when you are considering an application to construct a nuclear facility in an earthquake fault zone.

I urge everyone to support the amendment because, when it comes to constructing a nuclear facility in an earthquake fault zone, we really cannot be too careful.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is unnecessary and could needlessly block important energy construction projects from breaking ground.

The March 2011 "Project No Project" study identified 351 energy projects, including nuclear projects, that, if approved, could generate $1.1 trillion for the economy and create 1.9 million jobs annually.

I appreciate that my colleague is concerned about the safety of nuclear power, including in earthquake fault zones. The RAPID Act does not require agencies to approve or deny any particular project or permit application.

It simply ensures that the environmental review and permitting process is conducted by agencies in an efficient and transparent manner. It is consistent with the administration's own guidance, the President's Jobs Council's recommendations, prior, bipartisan legislation, and the all-of-the-above energy strategy that America needs.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that, no, the RAPID Act does not guarantee any nuclear power plant or anything else, but it does short-circuit the proper review.

It, for instance, says that if certain procedures are not completed within a certain period of time, the application is deemed approved. It means that the applicant can slow-walk information and get an approval automatically because the review is not complete within a period of time.

It is just too dangerous. The present procedures that we have have, in fact, allowed us to build the nuclear power plants, and other facilities have been built.

We should not play Russian roulette with the lives of millions of Americans

by short-circuiting the environmental review of nuclear power plants, especially in earthquake fault zones.

Yes, we need energy. Yes, we should have energy from all sorts of power sources, but we should do it safely and not risk Fukushimas galore.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part C of House Report 113–374.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 32, after line 2, insert the following:

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall have the effect of changing or limiting any law or regulation that requires or provides for public comment or public participation in an agency decision making process.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order and urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to protect the right of the public to comment on Federal projects under the NEPA review process.

The purpose of my amendment is simple. It protects the right of the public to comment. This amendment would ensure that H.R. 2641, the so-called RAPID Act of 2013, does not restrict the right of any member of the public to comment on construction projects that may have an environmental impact.

Like the administration and more than 20 well-respected environmental groups, I oppose the RAPID Act. This bill threatens public health and safety by putting a thumb on the scales in favor of private sector businesses in the project approval process.

It is yet another antiregulatory measure whose sole purpose is to grease the wheels of the approval process for projects that are environmentally sensitive.

Aside from creating duplicative and costly regulatory requirements that pertain to only certain types of projects, the RAPID Act would also limit the right of the public to comment on these projects.

The bill does that in two ways: First, by reducing opportunities for public input; and, second, by fast-tracking the approval process through arbitrary deadlines.

The NEPA approval process has protected the environment for more than 20 years, Mr. Chairman, and it is designed to be smart from the start.

Through an open, flexible, and timely process, NEPA empowers the public to weigh in on decisions. That means that the local farmer who owns land that would be affected by a Federal construction project has equal footing as the company that would stand to benefit from that project. My amendment is vital to ensuring that the RAPID Act doesn't shut the public out of this process.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join me in ensuring that the RAPID Act does not foreclose public participation.

Accordingly, I urge that this committee make my amendment in order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

The RAPID Act will create jobs by ensuring that the Federal environmental review and permitting process works like it should. The RAPID Act is drafted to make agencies operate efficiently and transparently; it does not prevent citizens from participating in this process.

In fact, the bill makes sure that agencies provide the public with reasonable public comment periods. It authorizes up to 60 days of public comment on Environmental Impact Statements, up to 30 days of comment on environmental assessments and other documents, and grants the lead agency authority to negotiate extensions or provide them on its own for good cause.

This is more than fair. By comparison, the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, regulations only require agencies to allow 45 days for public comment on draft Environmental Impact Statements and 30 days for public comments on final Environmental Impact Statements.

The RAPID Act also reasonably requires that a person comment on an environmental document before challenging it in court, and bring any suit within 6 months, as opposed to 6 years. Opponents should not be able to delay a project indefinitely by playing hide-the-ball with agencies or by resting on their rights.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution at the desk previously noticed under rule IX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on March 5, 2014, during a hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Chairman Darrell E. Issa gave a statement and then posed ten questions to former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner, who stated that she was invoking her Fifth Amendment right not to testify;

Whereas the Committee's Ranking Member, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, clearly sought recognition to take his turn for questions under Committee and House Rules;

Whereas, Chairman Issa then quickly adjourned the hearing and refused to allow him to make any statement or ask any questions;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings protested immediately, stating: ''Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a Committee like this. You just cannot do this. This is, we are better than that as a country, we are better than that as a Committee.''

Whereas, Chairman Issa then returned and allowed Ranking Member Cummings to begin his statement, but when it became clear that Chairman Issa did not want to hear what Ranking Member Cummings was saying, turned off Ranking Member Cummings' microphone, ordered Republican staff to ''close it down,'' and repeatedly signaled to end the hearing with his hand across his neck;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings objected again, stating: ''You cannot have a one-sided investigation. There is absolutely something wrong with that'';

Whereas Chairman Issa made a statement of his own and posed questions during the hearing, but refused to allow other members of the Committee, and in particular the Ranking Member who had sought recognition, to make statements under the five-minute rule in violation of House Rule XI;

Whereas Chairman Issa instructed the microphones to be turned off and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement in violation of Rule XVI because he did not want to permit Ranking Member Cummings to speak;

Whereas Chairman Issa's abusive behavior on March 5 is part of a continuing pattern in which he has routinely excluded members of the Committee from investigative meetings, and has routinely provided information to the press before sharing it with Committee members;

Whereas Chairman Issa has violated Clause 1 of Rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct which states that ''A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives strongly condemns the offensive and disrespectful manner in which Chairman Darrell E. Issa conducted the hearing of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on March 5, 2014, during which he turned off the microphones of the Ranking Member while he was speaking and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay the resolution on the table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—''ayes'' 211, ''noes'' 186, answered ''present'' 10, ''not voting'' 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—211

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

NAYS—186

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—10

Brooks (IN)
Capuano
Clarke (NY)
Conaway
Dent
Deutch
Gowdy
Issa
Meehan
Sánchez, Linda T.

NOT VOTING—23

Bachus
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Rooney
Schneider
Schwartz
Smith (NE)
Vargas

□1408

Messrs. CARNEY and SCHRADER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. NUNES, MULVANEY, PEARCE, DUNCAN of South Carolina, HARRIS, MEADOWS, GINGREY of Georgia, MILLER of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. MCKINLEY, CRAMER, BRADY of Texas, WALDEN, MCALLISTER, DUFFY, and AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mmes. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, CLARKE of New York, Messrs. CAPUANO and DEUTCH changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''present.''

Messrs. CONAWAY, GOWDY, DENT, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 107, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 501 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2641.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1410

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting CHAIR) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in part C of House Report 113–374, offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 113–374 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 228, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

AYES—180

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—228

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

NOT VOTING—22

Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Conyers
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1415

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 188, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

AYES—222

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble

Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—188

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

NOT VOTING—20

Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Schwartz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1420

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 220, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—187

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

NOES—220

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

NOT VOTING—23

Barber
Barton
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Schwartz
Stockman

□ 1424

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 217, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

AYES—192

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

NOES—217

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

NOT VOTING—21

Barton
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Hurt
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1429

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 501, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. DELBENE. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DelBene moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2641 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 30, line 23, insert after ''112-141).'' the following:

''(q) PROTECTING LOCAL COMMUNITIES, PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS AND TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of a project described in paragraph (2) , or an environmental document pertaining to such a project.

''(2) PROJECT DESCRIBED.—A project described in this paragraph is any project that—

''(A) affects the safe drinking water supply or air quality of local communities that are located near the project;

''(B) involves condemnation or infringing the private property rights of American citizens; or

''(C) affects the health, safety, or sovereignty of Native American tribes.

''(r) MAKING IT IN AMERICA AND PROVIDING JOBS FOR UNEMPLOYED WORKERS.—Any environmental document approved pursuant to this act shall assess whether a construction project—

''(1) will utilize equipment and materials manufactured in the United States; and

''(2) will result in the hiring of unemployed workers, including veterans, who are actively seeking work and for whom unemployment taxes were paid during prior employment.''.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Infrastructure improvements and construction projects are crucial not only for safety, but also for a robust and strong economy. Unfortunately, many of our roads and bridges are in a state of disrepair. This isn't the result of environmental review processes, but, unfortunately, a shortsighted failure to invest in our crumbling infrastructure.

We need to invest in safety improvements for our bridges and renovations along major highways, so that we don't experience tragedies like the Skagit Valley I–5 bridge collapse in my district last year.

For Washington State, moving forward on construction and infrastructure projects that efficiently move people and goods will improve connections to Washington's ports, support trade, help connect people to their jobs, and spur economic growth.

I understand that these projects are a valuable driver of job growth and can put people back to work; and I agree with supporters of this legislation, that Congress must do everything possible to remove barriers to our economic recovery and to job creation.

But we simply don't have data to suggest that regulatory red tape and overregulation through the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, are hampering construction projects or impeding job growth.

In fact, a 2012 Congressional Research Service report called into question the idea that NEPA compliance is a source of delay in Federal highway projects and found that delays in permitting for construction projects are more often tied to, among other things, a lack of project funding, whether from State, local, or Federal sources.

This is a real problem and one that Congress can help solve by making targeted investments in our Nation's infrastructure, whether by passing a final Water Resources Development Act reauthorization bill or by reforming the highway trust fund to provide more adequate funding for roads and bridge construction.

Instead, the RAPID Act, in its current form, is based on the flawed premise that our current laws—not only NEPA, but laws like the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act—impede economic growth. In fact, these laws serve important purposes, such as protecting private property owners, local communities, and tribal governments that may be impacted by Federal actions.

While this bill has a worthy goal—to prevent delays in the approval of proposed construction projects—this cannot come at the expense of our public health and safety, our environment, or the rights of private property owners.

My amendment would ensure that this bill does not override the current regulatory protections governing certain construction projects.

Just weeks after a hazardous chemical spill harmed the water supply for residents of West Virginia, we cannot afford to undermine regulatory protections that have been in place for decades as a result of the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts.

So my amendment excludes construction projects affecting our drinking water or air quality from the weaker regulatory procedures established by this legislation. This amendment will help ensure that Americans continue to have access to clean air and water.

My amendment also makes clear that, when a Federal construction project would condemn or infringe on the private property rights of any American, it could not sidestep the review process, as provided under this legislation.

Additionally, gutting the NEPA requirements under current law for construction projects could pose unique challenges for Indian country, which is why my amendment would continue the current NEPA process for construction projects that would impact health, safety, or tribal sovereignty of Native American tribes.

The RAPID Act, as currently drafted, fails to ensure meaningful tribal consultation on these types of projects.

Finally, my amendment ensures that we are prioritizing our investments effectively. There are too many Americans who continue to look for work, and my amendment would require that every construction project assess whether we will help long-term unemployed Americans, including veterans, get back to work.

This amendment is an opportunity for us to reduce unemployment and assist our veterans struggling to find civilian job opportunities.

The approval process should consider whether the project will utilize equipment and materials manufactured in the United States and whether it will result in the hiring of unemployed workers who are actively seeking work. We should always do our best to support American jobs and American products when spending taxpayer dollars.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. ''Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered,'' words of Representative DANIEL WEBSTER, right up there.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit isn't about improving legislation. It is about imposing roadblocks, erecting hurdles, pointing to excuses to keep us from doing what we were sent here to do, which is to set the wheels of progress turning to lift the American people out of crisis and economic calamity, to lift the American people into prosperity and high-paying jobs.

People have hungered for months and years for good, new high-paying jobs. Americans want to know that Washington hears them, Washington cares about them, and Washington knows how to get the red tape out of the way so they can get back to work.

The families that depend every day on their breadwinners, finding some way to make ends meet, want to know that we can deliver on the job we were sent here to do.

For 3 years, the President's Jobs Council recommended that we streamline the Federal permitting process. Vice President BIDEN's urgent words have been echoing:

> It's time we get moving. Folks, this isn't a partisan issue. It's an economic issue.

Less than 2 months ago, President Obama stood in the House and promised action to slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, this legislation does this. The RAPID Act is exactly what our private and public sector leaders have called for. It is what millions of American workers yearning for new work and hoping for higher wages need.

But what do we have before us now with this motion to recommit? It is the exact mirror image of everything that is wrong with the Federal permitting process and keeps jobs from the American people.

We have a trumped up argument, a procedural device, a tried and true tactic of delay—an excuse for Members of Congress to duck a vote and not make a needed decision that will bring millions of good, high-paying jobs to the American people.

It is time that the bureaucrats in D.C. and it is time that we, elected officials, clearly understand that we work for the American people and that the American people are the government of the United States.

It is time for we, the Members of the House and the Senate, to take the handcuffs off private industry, the job creators, and remove the boot of delay and procrastination from the throat of prosperity. Vote against this motion, and vote for the RAPID Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 2641, if ordered, and suspension of the rules with regard to H.R. 4152.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 217, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

AYES—190

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

NOES—217

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

NOT VOTING—23

Barton
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
McKeon
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Roskam
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1447

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 179, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

AYES—229

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

NOES—179

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps

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

NOT VOTING—22

Barton
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1454

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVISION OF COSTS OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4152) to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine, 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 Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 23, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—385

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
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
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (IN)

NAYS—23

Amash
Bentivolio
Broun (GA)
Campbell
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Gohmert
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Kingston
Massie
McAllister
Mulvaney
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Sanford
Stockman
Weber (TX)
Westmoreland
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Amodei
Barton
Chaffetz
Coble
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McHenry
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Poe (TX)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1501

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker on rollcall vote No. 114 on March 6, 2014, for H.R. 4152, to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine, I was recorded as voting "no" when I wanted to be recorded as voting "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unable to vote in Washington, DC and missed the following votes:

1) Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2641 and H.R. 2824. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

2) H. Res. 501—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2641 and H.R. 2824. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

3) Smith (TX)/Schweikert Amendment to H.R. 3826—Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment.

4) Capps/McNerney Amendment to H.R. 3826—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

5) Schakowsky/Lowenthal Amendment to H.R. 3826—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

6) Waxman Amendment to H.R. 3826—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

7) Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3826. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion to recommit.

8) Final Passage of H.R. 3826—Electricity Security and Affordability Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

9) Motion to Table the Fudge Privileged Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion to table.

10) Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

11) McKinley Amendment to H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment.

12) Nadler Amendment to H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

13) Johnson (GA) Amendment to H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

14) Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion to recommit.

15) Final Passage of H.R. 2641—Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

16) H.R. 4152—To Provide for the Cost of Loan Guarantees for Ukraine—Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House is not in session. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Today, in a strong bipartisan vote, the House passed a bill to provide the administration with the authority to extend loan guarantees to the government in Ukraine, and I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his support, along with Chairman HAL ROGERS and Ranking Member NITA LOWEY. I urge the Senate to act promptly on this bill and send it to the President for his signature.

Building upon this support, I expect the House to consider a resolution under suspension next week to express our support for the people of Ukraine and their territorial integrity.

In addition, the House will consider a number of bills to address the executive overreach of the Obama administration. Mr. Speaker, these bills are designed to restore the balance of power created by our Founders and require that this President faithfully execute our Nation's laws. The House will consider the following bills to reestablish the rule of law:

H.R. 3973, the Faithful Execution of Law Act, authored by Representative RON DESANTIS, to require Federal officials to report to Congress when the administration fails to faithfully enforce current law;

H.R. 4138, the ENFORCE Act, sponsored by Representative TREY GOWDY, to establish procedures under which the House, or the Senate, may authorize a lawsuit against the executive branch for failure to faithfully execute laws; and

H.R. 3189, the Water Rights Protection Act, authored by Representative SCOTT TIPTON, to ensure privately held water rights.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as you know, the patch for the Medicare sustainable growth rate expires at the end of the month. For this reason, I expect the House to consider H.R. 4015, the SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014, sponsored by Representative MICHAEL BURGESS, next week. This completely paid-for bill will replace the flawed SGR formula.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given to us.

Let me say that on Ukraine, I think the House acted properly. It acted in a timely fashion to express the views of this House with respect to the Russian violation of international law and the agreements that they have with Ukraine, and I am pleased we were able to join together to pass that through the House. Hopefully the Senate will pass it quickly.

I just make the observation that the Senate I know believes that the reform of IMF will be important to work with that extension. We will see what happens on that. I thank the gentleman and his side of the aisle for acting promptly. We were pleased to join in that action.

Let me ask the gentleman, the gentleman mentioned as we know that by March 31 the authorization for the sustainable growth rate payment will expire and the payment to physicians for Medicare services will be substantially reduced under present law. There is, I think, a strong feeling by many of us that this needs to be fixed. It needs to be fixed permanently, and it needs to be paid for.

It is my understanding that the bill H.R. 4015, a bipartisan agreement on the SGR payment policy, as the gentleman knows, does not have a pay-for in it. Is it my understanding that that will be amended before it is brought to the floor, or will there be an amendment on the floor to add the pay-for?

I yield to the gentleman

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We all are concerned about the SGR fix. We have seen this movie more than four, five, six times. Physicians were in town this week explaining to us exactly the impact of not getting this done on time, so that their billing systems and their cash flows are not interrupted. We have a keen interest in small businesses, which are most physician offices, so there is a keen interest to do that. That will be amended on the floor to include the pay-for that will offset the SGR.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Let me clarify, Mr. Speaker, this will be under a rule and there will be an amendment made in order to add the pay-for; is that correct?

Mr. CONAWAY. No, the pay-for will be added through the Rules Committee.

Mr. HOYER. So before it comes to the floor, it will be paid for.

I ask the gentleman, it is my understanding that the pay-for, I don't know if I am accurate on this, but my understanding is that the pay-for is the repeal of the individual mandate. If so, can the gentleman tell me whether he has any indication that the Senate would be in agreement on that, and I say that because obviously there hasn't been agreement in the past, and if we use that as a pay-for, it seems to me it puts at risk meeting the March 31 deadline.

Mr. CONAWAY. The specifics of the pay-for have not yet been finalized. There are lots of things under consideration. We, too, want this done in advance of the March 31 date so, like I said earlier, physician offices can continue their billing as is without the interruption that a failure to extend or fix the doc fix would cause. We are keen on making that work, and the specifics of what the pay-for will be are currently under discussion.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I would say I am hopeful in light of the fact that the bill itself is a bipartisan, or at least the two committees have agreed on it, and I think there is general agreement on the fix for the SGR, but the pay-fors have been contentious. I would hope that, as the bill has been a product of agreement, that the pay-for, which is essential, would also be a product of that. I would hope we would see a bill come to the floor that does have agreement of both sides of the aisle so we can, as the gentleman points out and we fully agree, ensure that the SGR is fixed and put on a sustainable path for our Medicare and for the provider community prior to March 31. I would hope that could happen.

Next, I don't know whether the gentleman has watched colloquies in the past, but the majority leader and I have had an ongoing discussion about immigration reform. Both of us believe

the immigration system is broken. Both of us believe it needs to be fixed. Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any likelihood of an immigration bill coming to the floor anytime soon? Again, we have a relatively short period of time left to go, and we believe this legislation is one of the most important pieces that are pending on the agenda, and I would be, as I told the majority leader, very inclined to try to work with the majority on behalf of the minority, and I know the minority would like to get an immigration reform bill that we can both agree on passed as soon as possible.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is nothing scheduled for next week, and I would tell the minority whip, beyond that I am not aware of any further scheduling other than I know it is not next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I hope if it is not next week, it will be soon. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2014

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 10, 2014, and that the order of the House of January 7, 2014, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that date.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY SERVICE IS NOT ENTITLEMENT TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, recently recorded in political dialogue was a statement about one of my colleagues somehow feeling that his military service ''entitled him to a seat in Congress.''

Mr. Speaker, no one in the military feels that their service entitles them to anything. I am deeply disappointed in the implication that because I served my country, I feel entitled to serve in this esteemed body—or, for that matter, to anything. My colleague didn't pledge an oath of service to God and country because he felt he would get something in return.

Mr. Speaker, this type of statement not only is regrettable, reprehensible, and offensive, but it diminishes the sanctity of military service and those who tirelessly and selflessly dedicate themselves to it.

□ 1515

VETERANS UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate for veterans is more than 10 percent. 900,000 veterans receive food stamps each month. Nearly $104 million in food stamps were redeemed at military commissaries in fiscal year 2013, yet the majority has repeatedly failed to bring the extension of unemployment insurance to a vote.

Since it expired last year, more than 2 million individuals, including 200,000 veterans, have been cut off from this vital lifeline.

I know firsthand how important this program is for hardworking veterans. After I completed flight school and returned home to Illinois, I relied on unemployment insurance to help me transition back to civilian life.

The unemployment rate for veterans recently separated from the military is now sitting at 10 percent. 246,000 veterans who served since 9/11 are now out of work.

For those coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan, this transition has been especially challenging. They have enough to worry about without suffering from cuts to unemployment insurance.

Taking an up-or-down vote on extending unemployment insurance is the right thing to do, Mr. Speaker. We need to renew this for those searching for jobs and those who are getting back on their feet.

Our veterans and unemployed have not given up on finding work, and we cannot give up on them.

MAKE COMMON SENSE CHANGES TO END HUNGER

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans, led by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, criticize our Nation's antipoverty programs. Some want to drastically change them, and others want to eliminate them altogether. Over the past 6 months, we have seen $19 billion in cuts to SNAP alone, our Nation's premier antihunger program.

Participation in SNAP reached an all-time high a few years ago because of the Great Recession, the worst economic period since the Great Depression. That is because people were either unemployed or underpaid.

If you want to reduce SNAP participation, it is simple: put more people back to work and better paying jobs. Yesterday, the Center for American Progress released a report showing how easy one step is. They found that increasing the minimum wage to $10.10 would move about 3.5 million people off of SNAP, simply because they wouldn't need it.

We shouldn't arbitrarily cut antipoverty programs like SNAP. We must make commonsense changes like increasing the minimum wage if we are truly going to end hunger in this country.

WELCOME HOME STAFF SERGEANT NICHOLAS LAVERY

(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 honor Staff Sergeant Nicholas Lavery from Medway, Massachusetts.

Nick graduated from UMass with a degree in criminal justice and enrolled in the Special Forces in 2007. After graduating as a distinguished honor graduate from the Special Forces Qualification Course, he became a Green Beret.

There is an excerpt from a letter that I wanted to share with you that Nick left his loved ones when he first deployed.

> If I should fall, do not let your heart fill with sadness. Know that I passed doing what I love to do, what I believe in, what brings me happiness, that is protecting those who cannot fend for themselves, protecting the United States of America, and all those who I love so dearly. Look back on me with kindness and happiness, be happy knowing that I could not have chosen a better way to go.
>
> With love filling my body for my friends and family, I tried to always be there for you all. Whether the shirt off my back or somebody's teeth, if you needed it, I would get it for you. Happiness was brought to me through the eyes of my loved ones. Seeing you all happy brought me such joy.
>
> I live for you. I never wanted money, accommodations, or even any sort of recognition. None was necessary. I hope I served you all well. I gave it my all. No need for thank you. The pleasure was all mine.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, Nick Lavery will be coming home, loved, alive, and a hero.

Since enlisting in 2007, Nick has been awarded three Purple Hearts. In the spring of 2013, Nick and his team were involved in a green-on-blue attack, which is a strike against coalition members by people dressed in their own uniform. Nick sustained injuries to his right leg during that attack and subsequently had it amputated below his knee.

He will receive a Silver Star with Valor and a Bronze Star with Valor at Fort Bragg on March 27.

After over a year in Walter Reed, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the town of Medway is proud to say to Nick: welcome home.

PLANT VOGTLE

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Department of Energy's recent loan guarantee for Plant Vogtle in Burke County, Georgia. Plant Vogtle is the first nuclear power plant built in the United

States in almost 3 decades, and I am proud to represent the district where our Nation's nuclear renaissance has begun.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have supported the expanded use of nuclear power as part of a comprehensive energy policy. Plant Vogtle will not only provide safe, reliable energy for Georgians, but it will also create the kind of good-paying jobs that we need.

The expansion of Plant Vogtle will create 5,000 jobs at the height of construction and 800 permanent jobs after construction is complete.

The Federal Government's guarantee is expected to save Georgia electric customers nearly a quarter of a billion dollars in interest expense—a direct dollar-for-dollar savings for Georgia customers, Georgia workers, and Georgia businesses.

This is exactly the sort of investment the Federal Government should be making. At virtually no risk to the Federal taxpayer, we save money for Georgia taxpayers as they pay for the infrastructure that will create good-paying jobs that support the lifestyles of virtually everyone else in the Georgia economy.

I commend all of the stakeholders for coming to this agreement, and I look forward to all of the good things that it will lead to.

HONORING REV. DR. LAFAYETTE FERNANDEZ CHANEY, SR.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, with great sympathy and sadness, I rise to pay tribute to the late Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., the extraordinary leader who touched the lives of many through his education and religious endeavors.

Under his leadership, Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston experienced tremendous growth, both spiritually and financially. The beloved Rev. Dr. Chaney was requested to join our Lord on Friday, February 28, 2014; and he was 96 years old.

He gained his bachelor of arts and his bachelor of divinity from Paul Quinn, got a master of arts degree from Texas Southern University, studied for his doctorate at Baylor, and received his doctorate from Texas Southern University.

He was a teacher. He taught mathematics and science at Moore High School. He taught it in Waco at the Oakwood Elementary School. He taught at Waltrip Senior High School. He loved children.

He was someone who was a builder. He had professional memberships in a lot of educational associations. He was pastor at a number of churches, but his greatest gift and his greatest cherished memory was the pastorship for 50 years at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church.

Even when the church was without a home and he had to hold the congregation together to help build the beautiful church that we have, he was there to support and grow that church.

He, as well, was someone who enjoyed leadership in a variety of organizations and was courageous enough to appoint the first female minister at the Damascus Missionary Baptist Church, Evangelist LaSandra Easter.

I enjoyed, Mr. Speaker, my time with Pastor Chaney and visiting him at his last church commemoration—his anniversary and the church anniversary. It was my pleasure to be with him to share in the glory of the celebration of his wonderful life. He has run a great race. He has finished the course. He has gone on to receive his great reward.

I ask this body to have a moment of silence in his honor.

Thank you, Reverend Chaney, for being a great Houstonian and a great Texan and, yes, a great American.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Rev. Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., the extraordinary leader who touched the lives of many through his educational and eccliastical endeavors. Under his leadership, Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston experienced tremendous growth, both spiritually and financially. The beloved Rev. Dr. Chaney was requested to join our Lord on Friday, February 28, 2014 as he departed this life at 9:30am. He was 96 years old.

Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr., was born March 27, 1917 in Waco, Texas to proud and loving parents, Adell and Tom W. Chaney. He was educated in the public schools of Waco and Le Vega Independent School District, graduating from Moore High School in Waco, Texas.

Rev. Dr. Chaney received both his Bachelors of Arts and Bachelors of Divinity Degrees from Paul Quinn College. He received his Master of Arts Degree from Texas Southern University and studied in the doctorate program at Baylor University from 1968 to 1975. In August 1982, he received his Doctorate Degree in Higher Education from Texas Southern University.

Rev. Dr. Chaney taught mathematics and science at Moore High School in Waco, Texas for twelve years and was principal of Oakwood Elementary School in Waco, Texas for eleven years. From 1972 to 1986, he taught mathematics and psychology at Waltrip Senior High School in Houston. During the same period, he was an adjunct professor of mathematics and psychology for Houston Community College.

Reverend Dr. Chaney's professional memberships and honors include: past president of Waco Classroom Teachers Association, Waco Administrators Association and the Central Texas District Teachers Association. In 1965, he was nominated for "Who's Who" amongst professional men in Texas. He was a member of the American Association of University Professors, Phi Delta Kappa and Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternities.

He was pastor of the following churches: Little Tehuacana Baptist Church in rural Waco, Texas; Sweethome Baptist Church in Mexia, Texas; First Baptist Church in Thornton, Texas; Second Baptist Church in Itasca, Texas, Shiloh Baptist Church in Madisonville, Texas and served as Senior Pastor for 50 plus years at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church in Houston, Texas.

He served as Senior Advisor of the Youth Convention of the General Baptist Convention of Texas, Teacher of the Youth Department of the National Baptist Convention of America, Director of the Ushers and Nurses of the Independent General Association of Texas, member of the Evangelical Board of the General Baptist Convention of Texas, and President of Union Bible College in Houston.

His crowning glory was completing his life as Senior Pastor of Damascus Missionary Baptist Church. During this time, he successfully held the congregation together during the homeless years from May 25, 2003 through September 2, 2007, while the church's new home at its current location was being constructed.

Rev. Dr. Chaney also made history by appointing the first female minister at Damascus Missionary Baptist Church, Evangelist LaSandra Easter.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Dr. Chaney lived a consequential life and made a difference. He has run the great race; he has finished the course. He has gone on to receive his great reward: a place in the Lord's loving arms.

I ask that a moment of silence be observed in memory of the Rev. Dr. Lafayette Fernandez Chaney, Sr.

PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION THANK YOU

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Barack Obama for signing the Presidential proclamation recognizing March 2014 as Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.

I would also like to give a special thanks to the 146 Members of Congress who signed onto the letter I authored and sent to the President requesting the issuance of this proclamation.

Finally, but more importantly, thank you to the colorectal cancer community who have given their time, sweat, and tears to raise awareness about prevention and early detection. Our efforts have not gone unnoticed.

This month, the highest office in the land, the President of the United States, brought national attention to our fight.

What better way to pay tribute by remembering those who have lost their battles to colon cancer, such as my late father, the honorable Congressman Donald Payne, Sr., who I followed into Congress, who lost his battle with cancer 2 years ago today.

This proclamation honors his memory and it honors those who are fighting the battle against colon cancer today.

MONEY AND POLITICS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of money

and politics. I address it knowing that many of my constituents and many Americans across the country are in a pretty bad mood about Washington, about politics as usual, about Congress.

They are angry because they feel like their voice can't be heard. They are frustrated because they feel like somebody else writes the rules, somebody else makes the policy, and their opinions on issues don't matter.

A big part of the reason for that frustration and that anger is they look out and they see these super-PACs and other Big Money campaign donors and PACs and special interests pouring money into Washington, pouring money into our political system.

They feel like those are the folks that call the shots here in Washington, that when it comes time for us to make public policy, too often the institution of Congress leans in the direction of the Big Money and the special interests and away from the priorities and the needs and the concerns and the demands of everyday citizens.

People are pretty smart. Americans are pretty smart. If they are feeling this way, there is probably a good reason for it. When you do the research, when you track the numbers, when you look at the amount of money that is pouring in here, it is no wonder that Americans have become cynical and angry and fed up and disillusioned. It is no wonder that the favorability rating—the approval rating of this institution is as low as it is.

Let's look at some of those numbers. In the 2012 election cycle, Big Energy—the big energy industry poured $140 million into Congressional campaigns. That is in one election cycle. They spent another $380 million on lobbying expenditures here in the city of Washington, here on Capitol Hill.

Wall Street, they were at the top of the list. Again, in one election cycle, in the 2012 election cycle, the financial industry contributed $660 million to Congressional campaigns and spent another $490 million—almost a half a billion dollars—on lobbying up here on Capitol Hill.

Sometimes, we ask ourselves—and I know my constituents ask me, and I know Americans raise this from time to time—how is it the case that an industry like the oil and gas industry in 2011 posted profits—the top five oil and gas companies posted profits of $132 billion?

How is it that an industry like that continues to get taxpayer subsidies every year to the tune of $5 billion? How are they able to preserve that loophole when they are making all those profits and they don't need that taxpayer subsidy? How does that come to pass?

Well, I just read you the numbers. If you are pouring $140 million into campaigns and you are spending another $380 million on lobbying, you can keep those loopholes in place.

Why can't we close some of these loopholes that Wall Street and the financial industry enjoys? The same answer applies. Look at how much influence is coming from the money that pours in from those industries.

When Americans feel in their gut that somehow their voice isn't being heard and it is the interests of Big Money that rules the roost around here, there is a factual basis for that, and it is something that we need to address.

□ 1530

Whatever the priority is that Americans care about—whether it is jobs and the budget, whether it is health care and education, whether it is protecting our environment, whether it is reining in the influence of Wall Street and making sure that important regulations are in place—whatever the priority is that Americans want to see, the fact of the matter is that Big Money gets in the way of those priorities. It pours into campaigns; it pours into lobbying shops; and it stops often coming out of the gate these priorities that everyday Americans put at the top of their lists. It is no wonder that so many Americans are fed up. In fact, when you talk to them, when you get them to start talking about how they really feel, the fact of the matter is that many are downright disgusted by the influence that Big Money has on our politics and on our government.

We have got figure out what to do about this. If we want to reclaim some of the trust of the American people, if we want Americans to have confidence that their government is actually working for them, we have got to address this problem. The first step to any recovery is to recognize the problem, and the fact of the matter is that the institution of Congress is too dependent upon Big Money and special interests. As a result, when it comes time to make public policy, it leans away from the public's interest and in the direction of the special interests.

So what can we do?

A month ago, joined by 128 original cosponsors, I introduced the Government by the People Act. This is a first step. This will not cure all of the ills that bedevil Congress and Washington, and it is not waving a magic wand, but it is an important first step in Americans' being able to say: We want to take our government back from the special interests and Big Money. We want our government to work for us.

The Government by the People Act is premised on the idea that we have to put ordinary Americans—everyday citizens—at the center of the funding of campaigns and take that away from the PACs and the special interests and the Big Money campaign donors. The fact that we had so many cosponsors on this bill at the point of introduction, I think, shows that Members of this institution are hearing from their constituents and understand the anger and frustration that is out there and recognize that they need to do something about it. Let me tell you about the Government by the People Act because it is really designed to make sure that the voices of everyday citizens are as powerful as the voices of the Big Money campaign donors.

The first thing it does is to provide a $25 tax credit, what we are calling the My Voice Tax Credit—a $25 refundable tax credit—to any American who makes a contribution to a congressional campaign in both of the 2 years of the election cycle.

Now, why did we do that?

If you look at the numbers right now, you will see that a very small percentage of Americans actually participates in the funding of campaigns. The funding is dominated by a small group that tends to be of the more wealthy citizens in society, and ordinary Americans out there are not getting into the role of helping to power campaigns on the funding side. We want to encourage them to do that. We want to say to those citizens who want to support a good candidate who is turning to them and listening to their concerns: If you are willing to put $15 or $20 or $25 behind that candidate who stands for the right thing, we will help you do that. We will provide this tax credit to make it a little bit easier for you to step up and be a part of the solution.

So the My Voice Tax Credit does exactly that. It gives a voice back to everyday citizens who feel right now like their voices can't be heard, like they are not empowered to participate in the system, to participate in the solution. That is why we created the My Voice Tax Credit, and that is the first important element of the Government by the People Act.

The second is that we want to make sure that the voice of the everyday citizen can be loud enough to compete with the big money out there, so we created something called the Freedom From Influence Matching Fund. This would provide matching dollars that would come in behind those grassroots donations and boost them up—amplify the voice of the grassroots—so that now those everyday citizens can get the attention of candidates or of Members of Congress who might otherwise be inclined to go spend their time on K Street or on raising money from Big Money campaign donors. Now they have an incentive to go do a house party back in their districts and raise small donations, knowing that those matching funds will come in behind it, and they will be able to raise sufficient dollars to run competitive campaigns.

So we combine those two elements to try to change the way campaigns are funded—the My Voice Tax Credit to promote those small donations, those grassroots donations, and the Freedom From Influence Matching Funds to come in behind it and amplify it so the voices of everyday people can actually be heard, can actually compete with the megaphone that Big Money has and special interests have. That is what the Government by the People Act is designed to do—to empower everyday

citizens to really have a voice again in their own democracy.

The third piece is just as critical. Over the last two election cycles, Americans have seen the spending by super-PACs and by outside groups go through the roof, and they have been turned off by it. They know that there are good candidates who run for office who make a strong case on issues that matter to the public but that they get into those last 60 days—the home stretch of a campaign—and suddenly a super-PAC comes in and pours money into negative advertising, and before you know it that candidate's voice is wiped off the playing field. So we said that, in that home stretch—in those 60 days—we wanted to make sure, of a candidate who chooses to participate in this system, who chooses to reach out to everyday citizens and lift their voices up, that that candidate's own voice would be able to stay in the mix, because that candidate's voice represents the voices of thousands of small donors and other supporters who have stepped up behind him. So, in the last 60 days, candidates who choose to participate in this system would get the benefit of some additional dollars to help them stay in the game, to help keep their voices in the mix, up to Election Day.

There is evidence, Mr. Speaker, to show that, of candidates who work hard to reach out and build relationships with their constituents, if they can get enough dollars in that final stage to stay in the game—to keep their voices there, to keep representing the interests of everyday citizens—then even if a super-PAC or some outside group comes in and throws a lot of money at them, they can still prevail. That is the way it ought to be. Candidates who are doing the right thing—Members of Congress who are trying to serve their constituents and lift up the voices of their constituents—ought to be able to survive the process where some outside group is coming in and trying to wipe them off the face of the map.

So those are the three pieces of the Government by the People Act—the My Voice Tax Credit to encourage and help everyday citizens participate on the funding side of campaigns, a Freedom From Influence Matching Fund that will come in behind that and provide matching dollars to amplify the voices of the grassroots and everyday citizens, and then some extra dollars in that final stretch for participating candidates who suddenly face an attack from a super-PAC or from some other outside group so that their voices and the voices of the people they represent, who have invested in them, can still be heard.

I have talked about why this is so important in terms of changing the perception that Americans have of Washington and Congress, the notion that if everyday citizens feel that Members of Congress can continue to represent them because they are the ones who powered their campaigns instead of the special interests and Big Money being the ones to underwrite their campaigns that that can begin to restore some confidence. It won't change it overnight—it won't cure all the ills of this place—but it will begin to restore some confidence on the part of everyday citizens that their voices can actually be heard here, that when the campaign is over and governing begins, this institution will continue to listen to them because they are the ones who helped to lift that candidate up on his shoulders.

I want to come at it from another angle for a moment. If you have a system like this that allows a good, strong candidate who knows how to reach out and network in his district to be competitive, you will see a different kind of person coming to Washington. Right now, more than half of the people who serve in Congress are millionaires. That is not surprising because, to run for office, you need a lot of money, and you need to know a lot of people who have a lot of money—that is the reality—but if you have a system where small donors and matching funds can lift up a candidate and power his campaign, you will get people running for Congress and being competitive who in the past would never have had a chance.

I was recently in Maine or in New Hampshire, and I sat on a panel with a legislator from Maine. In Maine, they have a system that helps candidates who reach out to the grassroots be able to assemble the funds to be competitive. This legislator said, but for that system, she would not be a member of the Maine State Legislature because she wouldn't have been able to raise the dollars she needed to run for office and represent the people in her district, but because a system like that existed, she is now in the Maine State Legislature.

I believe that we would see people competing for Congress and succeeding and being elected who right now have no way to access this place, and those are the kinds of people who represent the broad American constituency. Another way to begin restoring people's faith in this institution is if they look here and they say: Do you know what? There is somebody who is a community activist in my district. There is somebody who volunteered at my church who decided to get into politics, who decided to put his name in the ring. Because there is a system for funding campaigns now that combines small donations with matching funds, that person was able to run and compete and be elected. I think that that will lift up many Americans and make them believe that their voices actually make a difference here, that their voices can be heard.

I want to put this in another context as well. There are many things that we can do to try to address the influence of Big Money in our politics. We need more disclosure and transparency in terms of where these independent expenditures are coming from. I support the DISCLOSE Act, which is sponsored by my colleague, Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN of Maryland, because Americans deserve to know where this big money comes from and who is spending it so they can make a judgment about whether that is fair and whether the people to whom that money is going ought to be representing them here in Washington. We need that transparency and we need that disclosure. That is an important reform.

It is important also, I believe, to try to address the decisions of this Supreme Court, in particular the Citizens United decision, which basically took the lid off of outside campaign spending and expenditures by these super-PACs and other independent groups, and has resulted in this flood of negative campaign commercials and advertising to come in in the final weeks and months of the campaign cycle.

□ 1545

So we need to address that.

There are proposals that have been introduced in this body for a constitutional amendment that would rein in the spending of these outside groups. I think we need to address that, too. Those are important measures that we need to undertake. I also think it is critically important that there be something that is part of the reform agenda that has to do with empowering everyday citizens.

If you think about it, disclosure and putting limits on the spending of these outside groups and super PACs is about reining in the conduct and the behavior of the bad actors out there—the people who have kind of gone too far, but we also have to do something to empower and lift up the good actors—everyday citizens who just want to see their government do the right thing and who have commonsense solutions and want the people they elect to Congress to reflect that commonsense perspective.

That is why we need the Government by the People Act. It would create a system that would empower everyday citizens. It would allow them to feel that their voice is being heard and that they are not just standing back as observers watching the titans, the Big Money players, the super PACs sort of duking it out in the ring like two professional wrestlers, but that they can participate.

Everyday citizens could step in the ring and say, You know what? My voice is just as important as the voice of that big donor, and I demand to be heard. That is what that everyday citizen is saying. They want their voice to be heard, but we have got to give them a system that will allow for that.

We called this bill the Government by the People Act because when I, and others, listen to Americans across the country, we hear them saying, We are tired of a government that appears to be of, by, and for the special interests

and the Big Money. Put very simply, we want our government back. We want it back.

The Government by the People Act is an attempt to begin to change business as usual and to create a system that will give government back to the people that it is supposed to represent. That is our only path back to relevancy, in the eyes of the general public. That is our only path back to restoring a trust and confidence that we need as an institution in order to get things done, and let me tell you something: when it comes to relevancy and trust and confidence, we are hanging on by a thread right now.

When you look at the polls and the surveys in terms of what people think about Washington, and they feel that the priorities of this place have become Big Money and special interests, in the minds of most Americans, our relevancy is hanging by a thread.

We need to do something. The Government by the People Act is a reform that can begin to reclaim government and democracy and the political system back for everyday citizens out there that are so frustrated with what is going on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic. I am optimistic by nature. I think we can get this reform. When we introduced the bill, we had 128 cosponsors at the point of introduction. We have 140 as of today.

I think Members of this body themselves are at a point where they want to see something different. A lot of Members of Congress are exhausted by the current system. They wish they could raise money a different way. They wish they could run their campaigns and fund their campaigns by turning to the people they represent instead of having to chase the PAC money and the Big Money and the special interests all the time.

There is something wrong with an equation where people go into the voting booth, they pull the lever for you and send you to Washington to represent them, and the day you get to Washington, you have to start representing the Big Money and the special interests because that is the only way you can raise money to fund your campaign.

Let's think about it in those terms. What happens to the franchise when somebody gets here and they have to turn their back on the people who elected them because they have got to go raise the money from someplace else?

What if the place you went to power your campaigns was back to your constituents—everyday citizens—because you had a system that would match their small donations and be able to lift a candidate up and power them forward? That would change the way things operate around here.

I invite people listening to this to go back through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the statements of Members of the House and the Senate who announce their retirement and—sometimes within 24 hours—go to the floor of the Senate or the House and talk about the problem of money and politics and how corrosive it has become. Liberated finally from the current system by the fact that they have decided to move on, they are able to stand back and in a clear-eyed and candid way talk about this problem of influence that comes from Big Money and special interests and what it is doing to this place.

I want to read you a quote because I think this really goes right to the heart of the matter. People are fed up with the gridlock and dysfunction here. We can connect a lot of that to this issue of money and politics.

Let me read you a quote from 1982:

> When political action committees give money, they expect something in return other than good government. It is making it much more difficult to legislate. We may reach a point where if everybody is buying something with PAC money, we can't get anything done.

Do you know who said that in 1982? Robert Dole, the minority leader at that time and a Republican Member of the U.S. Senate. That was in 1982.

The influence of Big Money on our politics and on our governing has metastasized since then, but even then, on the front edge of this trend, Bob Dole could see what it would do to the institution, and he was lamenting it.

So a public that is upset about gridlock and dysfunction of this place needs a solution that will address the influence Big Money has here. Because that will help, I think, change the whole way in which we operate. Other Members have made similar comments, as I mentioned a moment ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am optimistic. I think we have a good piece of legislation. I think it goes to the heart and tries to address a lot of the cynicism that so many Americans have out there that their voice can't be heard.

I want to mention that we have at this stage over 40 national organizations who have gotten behind this legislation. This is a new development. We have had reform bills in the past—good ones—but they didn't have that kind of broad support from grassroots organizations across the country—civil rights groups like the NAACP; environmental groups like the Sierra Club and Green Peace; labor groups who have been out there trying to address the issues of working families, like CWA and others.

Why are they coming to this? Because they figured out what the American people have figured out. The good things they want to see when it comes to the environment or to creating jobs or to making sure people are treated fairly in this society, all those good things are being thwarted by the influence that Big Money has over the way this institution operates.

So they are coming to this fight now, saying, If we care about the environment, if we care about jobs, if we care about economic justice, we have to adopt reforming the way campaigns are funded as part of our own efforts.

Already, within the first 3 or 4 weeks since we introduced the bill, over 400,000 citizen cosponsors from across the country have signed petitions supporting the Government by the People Act because they understand that this reform is meaningful and will make a difference.

So I am optimistic that we can get this done. We are not going to get it done tomorrow. We are not going to get it done next week. But with the opportunity to channel in a constructive way some of this anger and cynicism and frustration that the American people are feeling right now that their voice is not heard, if we have a vehicle to channel that and organize it into a strong momentum, then when the opportunity presents itself to actually achieve this reform, I think we can do it.

I think that if we don't do it, Americans will finally turn away completely from this place and say, You can't help us any more.

That is what is at stake here: the relevancy of this institution and the relevancy of this, the people's House, to the people, and until we address the problem of the influence of Big Money over our system, we are not going to be able to reclaim the confidence and the trust of the American people.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I close, I wanted to tell the story of a person in my district. A couple of years ago, he came to one of my house parties. He is a longtime supporter of mine. He came up to me after the House party was over and said, Look, I would like to contribute $25 to your campaign.

He said, I can't do more than that. I can't afford more than that, but I would like to do it. I would be proud to do it. I just don't know if it will make a difference. Will it matter?

He was, I think, saying what many Americans are saying, which is, Do our voices count? Can we really compete with the Big Money out there? Is anybody listening to us?

That is what he was saying to me.

If we can pass legislation like the Government by the People Act and create a new way of funding our campaign that puts everyday citizens in the middle of the equation, make them the ones to sort of solve this problem for us, and empower them, then I will be able to say to constituents like that person who came up to me and was feeling marginalized by the current system, Not only are you relevant, not only is your voice important, your voice is the most important part of the way we power campaigns in this country.

That is the message we need to send. That is the outreach we need to do.

So we can move with this legislation from a system of politics, a democracy that is too often of, by, and for the Big

Money campaign donors and the special interests, to a government that truly is of, by, and for the people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF CERTAIN PERSONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE SITUATION IN UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–95)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the ''order'') declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Ukraine.

The order does not target the country of Ukraine, but rather is aimed at persons—including persons who have asserted governmental authority in the Crimean region without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine—who undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets. The order blocks the property and interests in property and suspends entry into the United States of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

- to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following:
  - actions or policies that undermine democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine;
  - actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine; or
  - misappropriation of state assets of Ukraine or of an economically significant entity in Ukraine;
- to have asserted governmental authority over any part or region of Ukraine without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine;
- to be a leader of an entity that has, or whose members have, engaged in any activity described above or of an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order;
- to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described above or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or
- to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 2014.*

□ 1600

MARCH 6 FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is March 6, and I want to talk about March 6 in a historical perspective, history that is very important that Americans know about.

Yesterday, on the House floor, I talked about the things that are going on in the Ukraine and compared Mr. Putin's aggressive actions toward Europe, similar to the actions of Adolf Hitler and the Nazis.

Before I do that today, I would like to yield some time to two of our Members who have discussions on other issues. First, I would like to yield as much time as he wishes to consume on a different issue to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

STUTTERING FOUNDATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss something very close to me. I want to talk about stuttering. I have been a lifelong stutterer, and when I was young I experienced some very difficult times, but that is a story really for another day.

More than 70 million people stutter. One in every 100 people in the world stutter. In the U.S., more than 3 million Americans stutter. You probably have a friend, a neighbor, a classmate, a coworker, or a family member who stutters. Most people do.

About 5 percent of all children go through a stuttering phase that lasts 6 months or more. Some will recover by late childhood, but one out of every 100 children will be left with long-term stuttering.

I would like to take this time to tell you a little bit more about stuttering, what it is and how family members and friends can help.

Stuttering is a disorder where the flow of speech is broken by repetition, prolongations, or abnormal stoppages of sounds and syllables. For some people, unusual facial and body movements may happen when they try to speak.

Stuttering is most likely caused by four factors:

One, Genetics;

Two, child development. For example, children with other speech and language problems or developmental delays are more likely to stutter;

Three, the makeup of the brain. An ongoing research study by Dr. Anne Smith with the Purdue University Stuttering Project shows that people who stutter seem to process speech and language differently than those who don't;

And four, lastly, family dynamics have an impact. High expectations and fast-paced lifestyles can also contribute to stuttering.

People who stutter are no different from those who do not stutter. In fact, studies by Dr. Ehud Yairi at the University of Illinois show that people who stutter are as intelligent and as well-adjusted as those who don't.

Contrary to what many people believe, stuttering can be treated. I want to let anyone know out there who stutters or who has a child who stutters, much can be done.

Speech-language pathologists, therapists trained to help deal with speech issues like stuttering often work in schools, clinics, at universities, and in private practice to help treat stuttering.

The most important thing, and many experts agree: early intervention is key. The earlier we can identify stuttering in our children and get them the help they need, the better chances we have at helping them to speak more fluently.

If you stutter, or if a child or loved one stutters, or if you even think they might be stuttering, get help immediately.

One of the best ways to help is by visiting the Stuttering Foundation. The foundation was started by Malcolm Fraser more than 70 years ago. His book, called ''Self-Therapy for the Stutterer,'' was originally published in 1978, and still is one of the best books on stuttering available.

You can visit the foundation's Web site at www.stutteringhelp.org. They have lots of well-trusted, expert information available for free, including Malcolm Fraser's book, as well as countless brochures and videos and other materials for parents and teachers.

Unfortunately, there is no instant miracle cure for stuttering, no surgery, no pills, no intensive weekend retreats. Stuttering takes time and effort and commitment to work through.

Some people outgrow it. Some people respond well to years of therapy and learn to speak fluently, with almost no trace of difficulty. For many others, stuttering becomes a lifelong struggle, as it has for me.

For those of us who stutter, and for the millions of parents with children who stutter, we all know stuttering becomes more challenging for teenagers. Kids can be tough on classmates who stutter and, for some, the teasing and the mocking can be too much.

We must help people who stutter understand that there are many people who know firsthand how difficult it is for someone who stutters, and that help is available.

We need to be patient, kind, understanding, and attentive. We need to know and show that we care.

If you stutter, let me just tell you something: Don't give up. So much can be done.

I thank the gentleman for giving me the time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, I believe history is something that we should remember and talk about.

Today, is March 6. It probably doesn't mean much to a lot of folks in the United States, but to those of us from the State of Texas, March 6 is an important day.

I want to put it in context. There are 3 important, very important days for those of us from Texas, March 2, March 6, and April 21, and I will get to the significance in just a moment.

Many, many years ago, parts of Texas, Mexico, Central America, and even South America, were controlled by the European country of Spain. It controlled all of that area.

The people of Mexico decided that they wanted to have their own independent country. It sounds familiar, does it not?

They rebelled against the Spanish, and they formed the Republic of Mexico. They established a Constitution. It was called the Constitution of 1824.

As sometimes happens with new democracies, the President takes over. His name was Santa Anna. Santa Anna, when he took power legally, constitutionally, under a democratic regime, did what some dictators, unfortunately, still do. He abolished the government. He abolished the Constitution of 1824. He created a centralist, authoritarian government.

But several areas, states, if you will, in Mexico dissented, objected, vocally objected, even rebelled. Those areas of Mexico were Coahuila y Tejas, the state of Coahuila and Texas; Durango; Jalisco; Nuevo Leon; Queretaro; San Luis Potosi; Tamaulipas; Yucatan; Zacatecas; and a couple of others.

Most of those areas, those states did nothing more than just object, dissent, and quickly Santa Anna moved in to quell any disruption or disturbances.

But there were three of those areas that actually formed their own republics, if you will. There was the Republic of the Rio Grande, the Republic of the Yucatan, and the Republic of Texas.

Santa Anna quickly, of course, moved to stop these new countries, if you will, areas, that were seeking independence from this totalitarian dictator named Santa Anna. As history has shown, they all failed—except the Republic of Texas.

That is what I would like to talk about this evening, Mr. Speaker. What happened in Texas was that the people objected, people of all races, both Tejanos—and Tejano is a uniquely Texan name; a Tejano is someone of Mexican or Spanish descent that is, or was, born in what is now Texas—and the Anglos as well dissented, objected to Santa Anna's imperialistic dictatorship.

It started over a cannon. In October of 1835, the Mexican government sent some military over to the little town of Gonzalez, Texas, and demanded that the colonists, the people there, give up their cannon, their arms, and they objected. They refused to do it, and so there was a skirmish between the Mexican regulars and the colonists who lived in Gonzalez.

Shots were fired on both sides. I don't know that anybody was really hurt too bad. A couple of folks were wounded. More importantly, the Mexican military left, and they did not get the cannon, and thus started the Texas War of Independence.

You may have heard of the flag, the Come and Take It flag. The Texians, as they called themselves, painted a cannon on a white background and wrote underneath it, ''Come and Take It,'' being defiant.

In any event, that started the battle. That started the Texas War of Independence against a dictator, a person who had abolished, remember, the Constitution of the Republic of Mexico.

Santa Anna then decided he would put down this rebellion, all of these rebellions that I talked about, and he successfully did so in other parts of Mexico, in those areas that I had mentioned. Then he moves across the Rio Grande River with three different armies coming into Texas to put down this so-called rebellion against his dictatorship.

So the first battles of Texas independence were successful, in 1835, October of 1835, and that brought us into 1836.

Success was not the norm in 1836. On March 2, 1836, 54 Texans, including Lorenzo De Zavala, Thomas Rusk, Antonio Navarro, and that famous person, Sam Houston, gathered not too far from San Antonio in a place called Washington-on-the-Brazos, declared their independence from Mexico, wrote a constitution, declaration of independence, rather, very similar to the American Declaration of Independence. It was signed by all of them on March 2, 1836.

Turned out March 2 also happens to be the birthday of Sam Houston. Imagine that. That is the first important date.

Meanwhile, assembled down the road from Texas, declaring independence at Washington-on-the-Brazos, were a group of volunteers. They were all together in this old, beat-up Spanish church that was 150 years old at the time. It was a town called Bear. We know it now as San Antonio.

The place that they assembled themselves to fight off the invasion of the dictator was the Alamo.

This is an artist sketch of the way the Alamo looked at the time that the 187 volunteers defended the place.

□ 1615

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, the flag that is flying over the Alamo was not what a lot of people think, the Lone Star flag, which was the flag of the Republic of Texas, the flag of Texas now. It is the flag of 1824. It is very similar to the Mexican flag.

But what the defenders had done was remove the Mexican eagle and put the number 1824. Why did they do that? Because when they went into the Alamo, what they were wanting—what they were trying to do was reestablish a constitutional government in Mexico, and they wanted the constitution of 1824. That is why that flag flew over the Alamo.

The people who entered the Alamo did so on February 23, 1826. They did so before March 2, before the declaration of independence, because they knew that the invaders were coming under the direction of the president, the dictator, and the general, Santa Anna.

It is interesting, these people who were in the Alamo, they were all volunteers, Mr. Speaker. They came from almost every State in the United States and 13 foreign countries, including Mexico; and I will just mention some of the States that they came from.

They came from Alabama, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, several from Massachusetts. They came from the State of Mississippi, Missouri, as far away as New Hampshire, New Jersey, several folks from New York, North Carolina, Ohio.

A great number came from Pennsylvania and, of course, South Carolina, even one from Rhode Island; and many, many came from the State of Tennessee. There were also native Texans in the Alamo, if you would refer to them as that; and they were the nine—at least nine Tejanos that fell in the Alamo. There may have been more. We don't know. There was also one from Vermont and several from Virginia.

They were also from foreign countries, Denmark, several from England, Ireland, Germany, Scotland, Wales, France, and some other countries as well.

Mr. Speaker, I will now place into the RECORD a list of the defenders who fell at the Alamo and the States or countries that they were from.

THE DEFENDERS OF THE ALAMO

1) Buchanan, James, Alabama; 2) Fishbaugh, William, Alabama; 3) Fuqua, Galba, Alabama; 4) White, Isaac, Alabama; 5) Baker, Isaac G., Arkansas; 6) Thompson, Jesse G., Arkansas; 7) Warnell, Henry, Arkansas; 8) Jennings, Gordon C., Connecticut; 9) Grimes, Albert (Alfred) Calvin, Georgia; 10) Melton, Eliel, Georgia; 11) Shied, Manson,

Georgia; 12) Wells, William, Georgia; 13) Wills, William, Georgia; 14) Lindley, Jonathan L., Illinois; 15) Bailey, Peter James III, Kentucky; 16) Bowie, James, Kentucky; 17) Cloud, Daniel William, Kentucky; 18) Darst, Jacob C., Kentucky; 19) Davis John, Kentucky; 20) Fauntleroy, William H., Kentucky.

21) Gaston, John E., Kentucky; 22) Harris, John, Kentucky; 23) Jackson, William Daniel, Kentucky; 24) Jameson, Green B., Kentucky; 25) Kellogg, John Benjamin, Kentucky; 26) Kent, Andrew, Kentucky; 27) Rutherford, Joseph, Kentucky; 28) Thomas, B. Archer M., Kentucky; 29) Washington, Joseph G., Kentucky; 30) Despallier, Charles, Louisiana; 31) Kerr, Joseph, Louisiana; 32) Ryan, Isaac, Louisiana; 33) Garrand, James W., Louisiana; 34) Smith, Charles S., Maryland; 35) Flanders, John, Mass.; 36) Howell, William D., Mass.; 37) Linn, William, Mass.; 38) Pollard, Amos. Mass.

39) Clark, M.B., Mississippi; 40) Millsaps, Isaac, Mississippi; 41) Moore, Willis A., Mississippi; 42) Pagan, George, Mississippi; 43) Parker, Christopher Adams, Mississippi; 44) Baker, William Charles M., Missouri; 45) Butler, George D., Missouri; 46) Clark, Charles Henry, Missouri; 47) Cottle, George Washington, Missouri; 48) Day, Jerry C., Missouri; 49) Tumlinson, George W., Missouri; 50) Cochran, Robert E., New Hampshire; 51) Stockton, Richard Lucius, New Jersey; 52) Cunningham, Robert W., New York; 53) Dewall, Lewis, New York; 54) Evans, Samuel B., New York; 55) Forsyth, John Hubbard, New York; 56) Jones, John, New York; 57) Tylee, James, New York.

58) Autry, Micajah, North Carolina; 59) Floyd, Dolphin Ward, North Carolina; 60) Parks, William, North Carolina; 61) Scurlock, Mial, North Carolina; 62) Smith, Joshua G., North Carolina; 63) Thomson, John W., North Carolina; 64) Wright, Claiborne, North Carolina; 65) Harrison, William B., Ohio; 66) Holland, Tapely, Ohio; 67) Musselman, Robert, Ohio; 68) Rose, James M., Ohio; 69) Ballentine, John J., Pennsylvania; 70) Brown, James Murry, Pennsylvania; 71) Cain (Cane), John, Pennsylvania; 72) Crossman, Robert, Pennsylvania; 73) Cummings, David P., Pennsylvania; 74) Hannum, James, Pennsylvania; 75) Holloway, Samuel, Pennsylvania; 76) Johnson, William, Pennsylvania; 77) Kimble (Kimbell), George C., Pennsylvania; 78) McDowell, William, Pennsylvania; 79) Reynolds, John Purdy, Pennsylvania; 80) Thurston, John M., Pennsylvania; 81) Williamson, Hiram James, Pennsylvania; 82) Wilson, John, Pennsylvania.

83) Martin, Albert, Rhode Island; 84) Bonham, James Butler, South Carolina; 85) Crawford, Lemuel, South Carolina; 86) Neggan, George, South Carolina; 87) Nelson, Edward, South Carolina; 88) Nelson, George, South Carolina; 89) Simmons, Cleveland Kinloch, South Carolina; 90) Travis, William Barret, South Carolina; 91) Bayliss, Joseph, Tennessee; 92) Blair, John, Tennessee; 93) Blair, Samuel C., Tennessee; 94) Bowman, Jesse B., Tennessee; 95) Campbell, James (Robert), Tennessee; 96) Crockett, David, Tennessee; 97) Daymon, Squire, Tennessee; 98) Dearduff, William, Tennessee; 99) Dickinson, Almeron, Tennessee; 100) Dillard, John Henry, Tennessee; 101) Ewing, James L., Tennessee; 102) Garrett, James Girard, Tennessee.

103) Harrison, Andrew Jackson, Tennessee; 104) Haskell, Charles, M., Tennessee; 105) Hays, John M., Tennessee; 106) Marshall, William, Tennessee; 107) McCoy, Jesse, Tennessee; 108) McKinney, Robert, Tennessee; 109) Miller, Thomas R., Tennessee; 110) Mills, William, Tennessee; 111) Nelson, Andrew M., Tennessee; 112) Robertson, James Waters, Tennessee; 113) Smith, Andrew H., Tennessee; 114) Summerlin, A. Spain, Tennessee; 115) Summers, William E., Tennessee; 116) Taylor, Edward, Tennessee; 117) Taylor, George, Tennessee; 118) Taylor, James, Tennessee; 119) Taylor, William, Tennessee; 120) Walker, Asa, Tennessee; 121) Walker, Jacob, Tennessee.

122) Abamillo, Juan, Texas; 123) Badillo, Juan Antonio, Texas; 124) Espalier, Carlos, Texas; 125) Esparza, Gregorio (Jose Maria), Texas; 126) Fuentes, Antonio, Texas; 127) Jimenez, Damacio, Texas; 128) King, William Phillip, Texas; 129) Lewis, William Irvine, Texas; 130) Lightfoot, William J., Texas; 131) Losoya, Jose Toribio, Texas; 132) Nava, Andres, Texas; 133) Perry, Richardson, Texas; 134) Andross, Miles Deforest, Vermont; 135) Allen, Robert, Virginia; 136) Baugh, John J., Virginia; 137) Carey, William R., Virginia; 138) Garnett, William, Virginia; 139) Goodrich, John Camp, Virginia; 140) Herndon, Patrick Henry, Virginia; 141) Kenny, James, Virginia; 142) Main, George Washington, Virginia; 143) Malone, William T., Virginia; 144) Mitchasson, Edward F., Virginia; 145) Moore, Robert B., Virginia; 146) Northcross, James, Virginia.

147) Zanco, Charles, Denmark; 148) Blazeby, William, England; 149) Bourne, Daniel, England; 150) Brown, George, England; 151) Dennison, Stephen (or Ireland), England; 152) Dimpkins, James R., England; 153) Gwynne, James C., England; 154) Hersee William Daniel, England; 155) Nowlan, James, England; 156) Sewell, Marcus L., England; 157) Starr, Richard, England; 158) Stewart, James E., England; 159) Waters, Thomas, England; 160) Wolfe, Anthony (Avram), England; 161) Wolfe, son age 12, England; 162) Wolfe, son age 11, England.

163) Burns, Samuel E., Ireland; 164) Duvalt, Andrew, Ireland; 165) Evans, Robert, Ireland; 166) Hawkins, Joseph M., Ireland; 167) Jackson, Thomas, Ireland; 168) McGee, James, Ireland; 169) Rusk, Jackson J., Ireland; 170) Rusk, Jackson J., Ireland; 171) Ward, William B., Ireland; 172) Courtman, Henry, Germany; 173) Thomas, Henry, Germany; 174) Ballentine, Richard W., Scotland; 175) McGregor, John, Scotland; Robinson, Isaac, Scotland; 177) Wilson, David L., Scotland; 178) Johnson, Lewis, Wales; 179) Brown, Robert, France.

180) Day, Freeman H.K.; 181) Garvin, John E.; 182) George, James; 183) McCafferty, Edward; 184) Mitchell, William T.; 185) Mitchell, Napoleon B.; 186) Roberts, Thomas H.; 187) Smith, William H.; 188) Sutherland, William Depriest; 189) White, Robert; 190) John (last name unknown).

As I mentioned, they were all volunteers. They did not look like an army. They were everything from lawyers, doctors, shopkeepers, frontiersmen, adventurers, people who had served in other armies. They were all, though, freedom fighters who volunteered to go into the Alamo on February 23.

Commanding the Alamo was my favorite person in all of history, William Barret Travis. William Barret Travis was a lawyer. That is one reason I like him. I am a lawyer. But he was a 27-year-old individual, first born in South Carolina, raised in Alabama, and found his way to Texas; and he was a revolutionary. He wanted independence for the State of Texas—or the Republic of Texas.

He took command of the Alamo, and he sent out ''scouts''—would be the term—asking that people who lived in the area come to the Alamo and help defend the Alamo, fight against this imperialistic dictator, and get Texas independence.

He sent his best friend, who also came from South Carolina, Jim Bonham, out as a scout, along with others—Juan Seguin was one—trying to get folks to come to help out at the Alamo.

Unfortunately, only one small town responded in the affirmative, and that was Gonzales, Texas, where it all began. There were 32 volunteers from Gonzalez, all men—young men—primarily the entire population of Gonzales, Texas, marched from Gonzalez to the Alamo. They were the only reinforcements that were there.

Now, if you would, Mr. Speaker, think about frontier life, the harsh frontier where the male population—basically the entire male population of a small town leaves. They headed to the Alamo where they figured that they were not going to be able to return.

The ones that were left were those strong-willed frontier women and their children, who later had to forge their own history, absent their spouses—remarkable women, remarkable men who went to the Alamo.

It is said, in history, that when these 32 defenders showed up at the Alamo, Travis looked down and said to his friend: They came here to die.

Now, William Barret Travis, in his plea for help to go and fight for liberty, independence—as I told you, most of the folks did not go. They were there already, the ones that were going to fight. He sent out many dispatches, and he sent a letter asking the people to go to the Alamo.

I have a copy of that letter, and I have another copy on my wall in my office. I have had that since the days I was a prosecutor and a judge in Texas, and many other Members from Texas have what I think is the most passionate plea for liberty written by anybody anywhere in the world.

So you see the surroundings, 186 men surrounded by thousands of other enemies, military. Here is what he said in that letter, Mr. Speaker. It is dated February 24, 1836, at the Alamo.

> To all the people of Texas, fellow citizens, and compatriots, I am besieged with 1,000 or more of the enemy under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continuous bombardment and cannon fire for over 24 hours, but I have not lost a man.
>
> The enemy has demanded surrender at its discretion. Otherwise, the fort will be put to the sword. I have answered that demand with a cannon shot, and the flag still waves proudly over the wall. I shall never surrender. I shall never retreat. I call upon you in the name of liberty, patriotism, and everything dear to our character to come to my aid with all dispatch.
>
> If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself for as long as possible and die like a soldier that never forgets what is due his honor and that of his country.
>
> Victory or death, William Barret Travis, commander of the Alamo.

We all know what happened later. He and his fellow freedom fighters were killed. Some historians say that before

it was impossible to leave the Alamo, William Barret Travis brought the whole group—garrison, 186 volunteers, drew a line in the sand and said: if you are with me, cross the line.

Everybody crossed. They had the opportunity to leave, but they did not.

After 13 days of glory, if you will, at the Alamo, Travis and his men sacrificed their lives on the altar of freedom. March 6, 1836, that is why I mention March 6, because today is March 6. It is an anniversary of those people who gave up their lives willingly to fight for freedom, similar to the history of the United States.

You know, America took 7 years to gain independence from the British. They lost a lot of lives, men and women, during that. It seems as though freedom always has a cost. Good things always do. Important things always do.

You see, some people in history have down in their soul, Mr. Speaker, that living free is more important than anything, including their own lives; and if they can't live as free people, they will fight and give up their lives in exchange for that belief. Those are remarkable people who have done that throughout history all over the world.

But today, we remember those 186 defenders of the Alamo, people like William Barret Travis, Davy Crockett from Tennessee, Jim Bowie from Louisiana, the 11 Tejanos that I have mentioned, because they were willing to do that.

Travis said, in the last letter that he sent from the Alamo, that victory will be worse for Santa Anna than defeat because of the losses. It turns out that was true. He was able to delay Santa Anna's march into Texas while a Texas Army was being built, surrounded by their commander, General Sam Houston, which I will get to in a minute.

Jim Bonham is another person of interest, I think. He was the scout, along with Juan Seguin, who went out to send the word: come to the Alamo for help.

As legend says, when he got to Washington-on-the-Brazos, where the Texas Republic was being formed, on March 2, 1836, drafting the declaration of independence, he asked for those men there to come to their Alamo.

They refused to do it. They said forming a government was more important than going to the Alamo. Bottom line, they didn't go.

So he gets on his horse, and he starts to ride back to the Alamo. The men there at Washington-on-the-Brazos tried to stop him: What are you doing? You will be killed.

And he said: My friends have the right to know that no one is coming.

I don't know if that happened or not. Some historians say it did. It just shows you the type of people that they were at the Alamo.

So after 13 days, Santa Anna did what he said he was going to do. He flew the red flag, blew the bugles. It was said that they would not offer any quarter to anyone unless they surrendered at a certain time.

They did not surrender. None of the men in the Alamo were given any quarter. They were all killed. Santa Anna then continued his march through Texas.

Remember, if you will, Mr. Speaker, he had already established his domain militarily over other peoples in Mexico that had the desire to object to his dictatorship and suppressed them militarily.

Now, he had moved that experienced army into Texas, one at the Alamo, and was moving towards Sam Houston, who was moving his army toward the eastern part of Texas, toward the United States. That time in history is called the ''Runaway Scrape.''

The colonists, everybody between San Antonio and the American/Texas border, was moving east. They were leaving their property. It was being burned. They left in what is called the Runaway Scrape, not only the volunteer army, but the families as well.

So Sam Houston kept moving toward the east. He did not pitch a battle right away. He formed the army, as I said, all volunteers. Juan Seguin and his band of scouts, cavalry, if you will, had ended up joining Sam Houston.

And then, in April 1836, on the plains of San Jacinto—most Americans don't even know where that is—but it is down there near Houston, Texas. You probably have heard of that place.

In the marsh, in the swamp, these same type of individuals who were at the Alamo were in Sam Houston's army. It was a little larger, almost 600, and these were individuals of all races.

They were people from the United States, foreign countries, from Mexico, Tejanos; and they finally decided, on April 20, that they were going to stop where they were on the plains of San Jacinto in the marsh and pitch a battle.

□ 1630

Now, the plan was to have the battle held April 22. What had happened was Santa Anna had already caught up with them. He had pitched his tents, he had his thousand or so soldiers. He had two other armies still in Texas moving in to reinforce him, and everyone expected this battle to take place on April 22.

But history and war determines when battles are to take place. Sam Houston talked to his commanders. They decided it was time on April 21 to do battle. Now, history has always shown that battles take place at dawn. They still do. Well, these Texans they didn't get around to it until the afternoon on April 21. And they decided that they would just attack the Mexican Army, Santa Anna, who was not prepared for an attack. And sure enough, in the middle of the afternoon, this outnumbered Texas Army attacked Santa Anna's army.

The battle lasted 18 minutes. Something that I thought was quite unique and clever, once again, as I have mentioned, his Tejanos, of course, were fighting for Texas' independence. They were pushing for Texas' independence against the dictator Santa Anna. But they weren't wearing uniforms, not like the Mexican Army. They wore whatever they had. They looked pretty rough and pretty tough.

So Sam Houston, to make sure that the Tejanos weren't mistaken for Santa Anna's army, he had all of them put a playing card in their hatband. In those days, playing cards weren't little like we have today; they were big. So they would stick a playing card in their hatbands so they could be recognized.

His cavalry protected the flanks. The Texas Army marched in one long column. They didn't have enough for two columns. They marched down and in 18 minutes defeated Santa Anna's army, caught them by surprise, and captured almost all of them. In fact, they captured more than were in Sam Houston's army. Casualties on the part of the Texans were minor. Sam Houston was wounded in the leg. And the rest, they say, was Texas history. It was American.

Texas quickly declared and set up its own government and claimed a lot of Texas. Things have changed. When Texas became a country in 1836, here is a map of what they claimed was Texas. I won't make any editorial comments about whether we think that still should be Texas or not, Mr. Speaker, but, anyway, you see what is now modern-day Texas over here. But Texas claimed part of New Mexico, part of Arizona, all of Oklahoma, Colorado, and up to Wyoming. And you may ask: Well, how did you lose that land? Well, when Texas became part of the Union, Texas sold that to the Federal Government to pay off its debts for the war.

So, anyway, that is the way Texas used to look. It doesn't look like that anymore. We have no plans to retake this territory, Mr. Speaker. I just thought I would mention it. Anyway, that was the Republic of Texas. And Texas was an independent country for 9 years. Some say we should have stayed an independent country. I don't know about that.

Texas wanted to join the Union. Finally, after several votes, Texas got into the Union. After one Louisiana Senator switched his vote, Texas joined the Union and became part of the United States. Because of the fact that Texas was a republic, Texas can divide into five States. I don't see that happening, not like California, who is thinking about it. I don't think that is going to happen in Texas. Texas flies the Texas flag even with the American flag because Texas was a republic.

I think Texans still have that independent spirit that our ancestors had. Things are different in Texas. It is a whole different country, and the reason is because our history is different. The reason, Mr. Speaker, is because the people of Texas of all races, backgrounds, and religions still have that

independent spirit about freedom, remembering our ancestors who gave their lives and gave their property so that we could have freedom and independence, and Texas could be an independent country even for 9 years.

That is why historically I think that we appreciate those people who want independence. We appreciate people who want liberty. Right now, it is those folks in Ukraine trying to keep out some dictator—I call him a dictator—President Putin of Russia.

So, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today and honor today, March 6, because it is one of those three important days: March 2, Texas' independence; March 6, 1836, the Alamo failed, we remember those people; and then April 21, 1836, is when Texas actually got independent and started its quest into being an independent entity.

In closing, I would like to read the lyrics of a song that Marty Robbins wrote a long time ago. Mr. Speaker, you are old enough to maybe even have heard of this song, but Marty Robbins wrote it in honor of the people at the Alamo. It goes like this. It says:

In the southern part of Texas in the town of San Antone,
There's a fortress all in ruin and the weeds have overgrown.
You may look in vain for crosses and you'll never see a one,
But sometime between the setting and the rising of the sun,
You can hear a ghostly bugle as men go marching by;
You can hear them as they answer to that roll call in the sky:
Colonel Travis, Davy Crockett, and 180 more;
Captain Dickinson, Jim Bowie, stand present and accounted for.
Back in 1836, Sam Houston said to Travis: ''Get some volunteers and go fortify the Alamo.''
Well, the men came from Texas and from old Tennessee and a lot of other places.
They joined up with Travis just to fight for the right to be free.
Indian scouts with squirrel guns, men with muzzle loaders,
Stood together heel and toe to defend the Alamo.
''You may never see your loved ones,'' Travis told them that day.
''Those who want to can leave now, those who fight to the death, let 'em stay.''
So in the sand he drew a line with his army sabre,
Out of 185, not a soldier crossed the line.
With his banners a-dancin' in the dawn's golden light,
Santa Anna came prancin' on a horse that was black as the night.
He sent an officer to tell Travis to surrender.
Travis answered with a shell and a rousin' yell.
Santa Anna turned scarlet: play Deguello, he roared.
''I will show them no quarter, every one will be put to our sword.''
185 holding back 5,000.
Five days, 6 days, 8 days, 10; Travis kept holding again and again.
Then Travis sent for replacements for his wounded and lame,
But the troops that were comin', never came, never came, never came.
So twice Santa Anna charged and then blew recall.
But on that fatal third time, Santa Anna breached the wall and he killed them one and all.
Now the bugles are silent and there is rust on each sword,
And the small band of soldiers lie asleep in the arms of the Lord.
In the southern part of Texas, near the town of San Antone,
Like a statue on his pinto rides a cowboy all alone.
He sees the cattle grazin' where a century before,
Santa Anna's guns were blazin' and the cannons used to roar.
His eyes turn a little misty, and his heart begins to glow,
And he takes his hat off slowly to those men of the Alamo,
To the 13 days of glory at the siege of Alamo.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

I yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 10, 2014, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4907. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Enhancement of Contractor Employee Whistleblower Protections (DFARS Case 2013-D010) (RIN: 0750-AH97) received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4908. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Acquisitions in Support of Operations in Afghanistan (DFARS Case 2013-D009) (RIN: 0750-AH98) received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4909. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Disclosure to Litigation Support Contractors (DFARS Case 2012-D029) (RIN: 0750-AH54) received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4910. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4911. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to TAAG Angola Airlines of Luanda, Angola; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4912. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the FY 2012 report on activities to preserve and promote minority ownership of insured financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4913. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alkyl Alcohol Alkoxylate Phosphate and Sulfate Derivatives; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0862; FRL-9906-24] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4914. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Affecting Visibility State Implementations Plan Revisions; Withdrawal of Federal Implementation Plan for American Electric Power/Public Service Company of Oklahoma [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0227; FRL-9906-81-OAR] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4915. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Oklahoma; Regional Haze and Interstate Transport Affecting Visibility; State Implementation Plan Revisions; Revised BART Determination for American Electric Power/Public Service Company of Oklahoma Northeastern Power Station Units 3 and 4 [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0227; FRL-9906-93-Region 6] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4916. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Nonattainment New Source Review; Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0927; FRL-9906-67-Region 3] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4917. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — GS-omega/kappa-Hxtx-Hv1a; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0389; FRL-9904-92] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4918. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — N-(n-octyl)-2-pyrrolidone; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0093; FRL-9906-17] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4919. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0775 and EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0008; FRL-9905-87] received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4920. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls for 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4921. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report including matters relating to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4922. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Agency Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2014-2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4923. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a Congressional Notification: Integrated Mission Management Committee and the National Intelligence Management Council; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

4924. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting a Congressional Notification: Appointment of National Intelligence Managers for Europe/Eurasia and Africa; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 311. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms (Rept. 113–375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BARTON, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HALL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 6. A bill to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 4156. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow advertisements and solicitations for passenger air transportation to state the base airfare of the transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 4157. A bill to protect the information of livestock producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BYRNE, and Ms. JENKINS):

H.R. 4158. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Monitoring the Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, the Judiciary, Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HOYER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 4159. A bill to provide for investment in innovation through research and development and STEM education, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4160. A bill to prohibit further action on the proposed rule regarding changes to Medicare prescription drug benefit programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 4161. A bill to encourage and further research on the engagement of underrepresented youth in the STEM fields; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 4162. A bill to establish a Financing Energy Efficient Manufacturing Program in the Department of Energy to provide financial assistance to promote energy efficiency and onsite renewable technologies in manufacturing and industrial facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 4163. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HURT (for himself and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 4164. A bill to exempt smaller public companies from requirements relating to the use of Extensible Business Reporting Language for periodic reporting to the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 4165. A bill to protect crime victims' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4166. A bill to transfer recreational management authority for Lake Berryessa in the State of California from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4167. A bill to amend section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, known as the Volcker Rule, to exclude certain debt securities of collateralized loan obligations from the prohibition against acquiring or retaining an ownership interest in a hedge fund or private equity fund; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4168. A bill to provide payment for patient navigator services under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 4169. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 4170. A bill to provide for a Youth Mental Health Research Network; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURGESS, Mr.

YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 4171. A bill to establish a commission to examine the processes used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to provide unemployment rates and to make recommendations to Congress for any changes in methodology or improvements to such processes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4172. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to clarify when certain academic assessments shall be administered; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 4173. A bill to establish the Brownfield Redevelopment and Economic Development Innovative Financing program to promote urban renewal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 4174. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to modernize and improve Alaska bypass freight mail transportation; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4175. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Victory for Veterans stamp, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 4176. A bill to establish a position of Science Laureate of the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Medicare beneficiaries participating in a Medicare Advantage MSA to contribute their own money to their MSA; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 4178. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for reforms to the EB-5 immigrant investor program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish requirements relating to marijuana impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit rollovers from health savings accounts to Medicare Advantage MSAs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4181. A bill to appropriate funds for carrying out certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to emergency care and trauma services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4182. A bill to provide that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways shall be administered in accordance with the general management plan for that unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 4183. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to empower the States to set the maximum annual percentage rates applicable to consumer credit transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. COOK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HONDA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the manner in which an advance payment of initial educational assistance paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is charged against the entitlement of a veteran to such assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution encouraging reunions of divided Korean American families; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H. Res. 504. A resolution raising a question of privileges of the House.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 505. A resolution strongly recommending that the United States renegotiate the return of the Iraqi Jewish Archive to Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H. Res. 506. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Václav Havel by directing the House of Representatives Fine Arts Board to provide for the display of a bust of Václav Havel in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARBER (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 507. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in support of a women's economic bill of rights; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 508. A resolution expressing support for designating October 6, 2014, through October 12, 2014, as "Naturopathic Medicine Week" to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe, effective, and affordable health care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H. Res. 509. A resolution expressing support for designation of August 23 as "Black Ribbon Day" to recognize the victims of Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

173. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to supporting Senate Bill 1926 to delay implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012; to the Committee on Financial Services.

174. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of South Carolina, relative to a Congressional Resolution consenting to the Health Care Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 6.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 4156.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States).

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4157.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8, which include the power to "regulate commerce . . . among the several States . . .".

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4158.

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

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

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

(c) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states that "No Money shall be drawn from

the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time''; and

(d) Article II, Section 2, Clause 2, which states that the President, ''by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States. . .''

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4159.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4160.

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

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 4161.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4162.

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

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4163.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 4164.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 4165.

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

Article I, Section 8 Clause 1, which reads: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which reads: The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4166.

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

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

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4167.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4168.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4169.

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

Congress is authorized to enact this legislation under the Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.'' Additionally, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to the Preamble of the Constitution, ''to promote the general welfare.''

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 4170.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4171.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 4172.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4173.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4174.

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

Article I, Section 8

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4175.

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

Clause 7, section 8, of article I to establish Post Offices and Post Roads, in combination with clause 18, section 8, article I 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 Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4176.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4177.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4178.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4179.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4180.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

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

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4181.

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

Article 1 Sec. 8 of the United States Constitution—

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

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4182.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the constitution states that: ''The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.''

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 4183.

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

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 4184.

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

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 32: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 118: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 148: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 411: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 460: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 515: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 522: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 533: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 647: Mr. MCALLISTER.

H.R. 688: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 689: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 778: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 795: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 808: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 822: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BASS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 863: Mr. WALZ, Ms. CHU, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr.

HANNA, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 956: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1084: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1201: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1249: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1252: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1263: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1310: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1331: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1354: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1386: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1427: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1475: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1507: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1528: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1551: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 1563: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1591: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1692: Mr. NADLER and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1701: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1726: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1751: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1832: Mr. NEAL and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1915: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1953: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1998: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2005: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2021: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 2235: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2291: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2315: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2364: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2377: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 2452: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 2453: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2456: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 2510: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2529: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2560: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2582: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2591: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2646: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2654: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COOK, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2707: Mr. JONES and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2772: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2825: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2847: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2901: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2921: Mr. HANNA, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2932: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2935: Ms. BASS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 2939: Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2996: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 3022: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 3043: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 3086: Mr. HIMES and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3116: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3118: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3155: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3211: Mr. HURT and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3240: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3305: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 3318: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3384: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3397: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3431: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3464: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3474: Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3482: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 3494: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 3505: Mr. Takano and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3508: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 3530: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 3600: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 3620: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3663: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3673: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3698: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3717: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 3725: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3732: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3740: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3749: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3829: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3873: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3929: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 3930: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3958: Mr. JONES, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3978: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3982: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 4015: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. REED, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 4026: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4031: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 4040: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 4041: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 4045: Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIND, Mr. OLSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MAFFEI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 4060: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BARR, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 4068: Mr. TERRY and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 4070: Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 4092: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4106: Mr. COFFMAN and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 4128: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4137: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 4138: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 4139: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 4140: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4152: Ms. GRANGER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. J. Res. 68: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res, 16: Mr. ENYART, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. BYRNE.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. SOUTHERLAND and Ms. DELBENE.

H. Res. 36: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 231: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Res. 418: Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 442: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HARPER.

H. Res. 476: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H. Res. 494: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 498: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 499: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 7 by Mr. BISHOP on the bill (H.R. 1010): Bobby L. Rush.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2014 No. 38

Senate

The Senate met at 9:33 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by His Holiness the Dalai Lama.

PRAYER

His Holiness the Dalai Lama offered the following prayer:

Firstly, as usual, I am a Buddhist monk—a simple Buddhist monk—so we pray to Buddha and all other Gods.

With our thoughts we make our world. Our mind is central and precedes our deeds. Speak or act with a pure mind, and happiness will follow you like a shadow that never leaves.

May there be joy in the world, with bountiful harvest and spiritual wealth. May every good fortune come to be, and may all our wishes be fulfilled. As long as space remains, and as long as sentient beings remain, until then, may I too remain and help dispel the misery of the world.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING HIS HOLINESS THE DALAI LAMA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to welcome to the Senate his Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama. I know I speak for the entire Senate family when I express our gratitude for the prayer to open the Senate and his words of encouragement and his blessing.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama is well known throughout the world as the spiritual leader of the Tibetan people and for spreading the gospel of peace, compassion, and love to our fellow human beings. But it is the tradition when the Senate welcomes a guest Chaplain to say a few words about the honored guest.

My friendship with His Holiness has roots from a good man from California by the name of Richard Blum who has done more, in my opinion, to help the Tibetan people and His Holiness than anyone else. His Holiness often says that he is only a simple monk born to a farming family in northeastern Tibet.

To millions of people in Tibet and across the globe, he is much more. He is a source of hope and inspiration in a world that can sometimes seem very dark. When he was only 2 years old, His Holiness was recognized as the reincarnation of the 13th Dalai Lama. Four years later, when he was a little boy, he began his monastic education. He studied logic, art, Tibetan culture, and Buddhist philosophy, among many other things.

At age 23 he passed his exam with honors and was awarded what would be an equivalent of a Ph.D., a doctorate of Buddhist philosophy. For more than half a century, the Dalai Lama has been traveling the world raising awareness about the concerns of 6 million fellow Tibetans—as he would say: Making new friends around the world.

In Tibetan Buddhist philosophy, the Dalai Lamas, all of them, are enlightened beings who have postponed their own nirvana, or liberation from the cycle of reincarnation, in order to serve humanity. This particular enlightened being has chosen to serve humanity by spreading a message of peace.

He motivates countless people around the world, people of every faith, to practice compassion toward one another. His Holiness urges us all: ''Be kind whenever possible. It is always possible.'' The Dalai Lama's teachings contain lessons from people around the world and certainly within this Chamber. His Holiness also advises us: ''The best way to resolve any problem in the human world is for all sides to sit down and talk.'' Pretty simple, but very true. It is advice that those of us fortunate enough to serve our country and our constituents in the Senate should take to heart and follow.

The presence of His Holiness in this Chamber today inspires me as I hope it does all of us to renew our commitment to speak and act with a pure mind and to help dispel the misery of the world.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 309, S. 1086.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1086) to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30, with Republicans controlling the first half and the majority the final half. Following morning business, the Senate will proceed to executive session. At 11:20, there will be up to three rollcall votes on executive nominations. Following those votes, there will be 2 hours of debate on the military sexual assault bills. At about 2 p.m., there will be a series of rollcall votes in relation to the military sexual assault bills. We also expect to consider additional executive nominations which may require votes later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Vermont.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent to be able to continue as in morning business for about 3 minutes.

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

WELCOMING THE DALAI LAMA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I feel honored to be a Member of the Senate and to be President pro tempore. But I cannot think of any greater honor than this morning, when I was able to introduce to the Senate an old and dear friend, His Holiness the Dalai Lama. Marcelle and I have been friends of His Holiness for decades. We count that as a great treasure, as does Senator FEINSTEIN, whom I saw earlier on the floor, another long-time friend of His Holiness, along with her husband.

I have watched him for so many years in his representation of the Tibetan people. He is joined on the floor by another Buddhist, Senator HIRONO of Hawaii. The gracious comments of Senator REID reflect how people feel about him. I think of the faith of his people and how they are moved. I told his Holiness of this story when I walked through the streets of Lhasa, Tibet, years ago, and a man holding a small child saw me and pointed to my camera and held up a picture of His Holiness.

He was risking being imprisoned for having that. But he insisted I take his picture. I did. I have given that photograph to His Holiness. I told him the story, that when we asked the man why he risked prison to show the picture of His Holiness, he said: Because people have to know. The world has to know the great faith of the Tibetan people longing for the autonomy they deserve to practice their faith.

Fortunately, they have as a symbol of that faith the Dalai Lama, a Nobel Peace Prize recipient, a man who touches everybody's conscience. He touches this Catholic every time I see him. It goes beyond whatever faith you are. He is a gift to the world. I am so honored to have been able to introduce him here today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, with His Holiness here in the Senate Chamber, there are a number of Senators who would like to say hello to him. So based on that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:44 a.m., recessed until 9:46 a.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that following action on S. 1917, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Nos. 504, 513, 640, and 547; that the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed; that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote, equally divided in the usual form, and that the votes be 10 minutes in length; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FLOOD INSURANCE AND VETERANS MEDICAL CLINICS

Mr. VITTER. I rise to talk about two very important issues for the country and for Louisiana. The first is fixing the national flood insurance system, getting it right. The good news is I think we are well on a path to doing that effectively. The second is veterans medical clinics, two of which are in Louisiana. They have been held up for completely bureaucratic reasons and aren't moving forward as they need to serve the veterans in Lafayette and Lake Charles, LA, and in about 25 other locations around the country.

First, flood insurance. Only a couple of days ago the House passed by a huge margin, over 300 votes, a strong bill to permanently fix the National Flood Insurance Program. Those aspects of the so-called Biggert-Waters act passed over 1 year ago but are unworkable, clearly creating problems on the ground.

This is great news, because unless we fix those very real problems, we would have major problems on our hands in the National Flood Insurance Program, not only in Louisiana, not only in Florida, and not only in the Superstorm Sandy area, but in every State in the country—every State. It is not a question of if these issues are coming to your State, it is a question of when and exactly to what extent.

Over 1 year ago, we passed the Biggert-Waters act. That was an important reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program. It also included reforms, and many of those reforms needed to happen to stabilize the financing of the program.

What no one understood adequately then, however, is that those well-intended reforms, in practice, in implementation by FEMA, would lead to unsustainable, completely unaffordable rate increases in a significant number of cases.

That only began to be understood in the months after the bill was passed as FEMA started to implement it, as FEMA came to homeowners, came to State authorities, came to Members of Congress, and began to lay out some of the rates we would see in certain areas.

I am not talking about modest rate increases. We need modest rate increases to stabilize the financing of the program. I am talking about completely unaffordable rate increases in some cases—flood insurance rates going from $300 a year to $11,000 a year or $19,000 a year or $26,000 a year on a modest middle-class home and on a middle-class family that followed the rules every step of the way. We can't allow that to stand.

First, it is fundamentally unfair. As I said, these middle-class families followed the rules every step of the way. They built to the right elevation when they built their homes, never let their premiums lapse, and never let their insurance lapse.

In that context, for them to be hit with truly unaffordable rate increases—increases that could literally cause them to have to walk away from their home in some significant number of cases and not be able to afford to stay there—is just plain wrong.

Secondly, it is completely counterproductive, because one of the ways we have stabilized the National Flood Insurance Program fiscally is to grow the program, to have more folks paying premiums, and to have more folks covered, not fewer. This aspect of Biggert-Waters, which would lead to truly unaffordable rate increases in a significant number of cases, is unworkable from the very vantage point of the goal of Biggert-Waters to stabilize the system. So we can't let that stand for that reason either.

The good news is, because of those very real problems, both the Senate, and now the House, have come together in a major bipartisan way to fix the issue. The Senate acted about 1 month ago passing meaningful legislation. I was an original coauthor and a strong supporter. As I said a few minutes ago, the House acted two nights ago—Mardi Gras night in Louisiana terms—to take strong action to fix this program.

The House bill is stronger and more significant in several respects, mostly because the reforms in the House bill are permanent. It is not a timeout, as the Senate bill was. It is a permanent fix that creates a much higher degree of certainty and permanence immediately.

Also, the House bill is fully paid for with a modest premium increase on everybody's premiums—very modest, completely affordable—to make sure that all of these changes are paid for. Because of these aspects of the House bill, because of the permanent nature of the fix, the fact that we create certainty and predictability immediately moving forward for homeowners and real estate markets is actually the preferable approach.

I urge all of us in the Senate to take up that bill at the soonest possible moment. Specifically, I urge the distinguished majority leader to put it on the floor, to create time on the floor, so we can deal with the House bill absolutely as soon as possible.

I know there will be some attempt to obtain unanimous consent to pass the House bill immediately. Of course, I will consent; I am all for that. But, realistically, I don't think that is going to happen on the Senate floor. The Senate bill had some objectors, the Senate bill had some opponents, and so does the House bill.

Realistically, I urge the majority leader to create the time on the Senate floor to take this up and move through the process absolutely as quickly and as expeditiously as possible. That is the way it is actually going to work and that is the way it is actually going to happen.

I hope we can do that as early as next week. I strongly support our consideration of this bill on the Senate floor as early as next week.

The second national and Louisiana issue I want to discuss has to do with veterans and veterans' health care, which we have been talking about on the Senate floor for some time, specifically the need to move forward with 27 fully approved, fully authorized, VA community-based clinics that have been stalled because of bureaucratic problems. Again, these clinics are around the country: two in Louisiana, one in Lafayette, one in Lake Charles. These clinics have been approved by the VA and have been in their plan for some time. They are fully authorized. We thought they were fully paid for until, first, the VA made some bureaucratic mistakes to delay the Lake Charles and Lafayette clinics in particular; and then, out of the blue, the CBO changed the way they score all of these clinics, all of these issues, and created another bureaucratic hurdle.

Again, the good news is we came together in a bipartisan way and have a solution to those purely bureaucratic hurdles so that all of these clinics can move forward expeditiously. The House specifically passed a bill that would take care of these bureaucratic hurdles. They passed it on the consent calendar by a whopping bipartisan margin.

So I come to the floor urging all of us to do the same. Specifically, I have an amendment to the bill that also makes it even more fiscally sustainable by having a pay-for for any conceivable cost to this bill, and that is what my amendment would do.

This VA clinic legislation was in the Sanders veterans bill last week and it was in the Burr alternative. It was in both the Democratic and the Republican veterans packages. Neither of those packages passed. The Sanders bill was defeated on a budget point of order, which I supported because I don't think it is properly paid for and is sustainable both in terms of our budget and, even more important for veterans, how the veterans system works and handles its current patient load. The Burr bill never even got a vote.

We have disagreements about those larger packages. Those are real, substantial disagreements, but in the midst of that I would hope we can agree to what we can agree on, and these VA clinics certainly fall into that category. We have cleared all objections to this VA clinic piece specifically. We have addressed all issues having to do with these VA clinics, in part through my amendment at the desk. The only possible objection I know of is the fact that a larger package is not passing.

I understand there are big arguments about that larger package. Those are legitimate differences of opinion. I don't think that should stand in the way of our agreeing to what we can agree to and moving forward with an important piece of the puzzle for veterans health care—these 27 community-based clinics around the country.

In that spirit I will be asking for a unanimous consent agreement whereby we would take up the House-passed bill. Again, this House-passed bill was actually on the consent calendar, passed with a whopping bipartisan majority. We would adopt my amendment at the desk, which addresses some fiscal concerns with the bill, and we would then pass it through the process. This would be our coming together and agreeing to what we can agree on. That is what the American people want us to do as we work on all other aspects of health care and veterans' benefits covered by both the Burr and the Sanders bill debated last week.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3521

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3521, which was received from the House; that my amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SANDERS. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank very much my colleague from Louisiana for bringing forth this very important issue. Senator MARY LANDRIEU from Louisiana has also raised this issue, as have many colleagues.

My friend from Louisiana is absolutely right; this is an important issue and this is an issue that should be passed. But I would say to my friend from Louisiana that last week we brought forth the most comprehensive piece of veterans legislation in the modern history of the United States of America, and that legislation dealt with many issues raised by veterans organizations that represent millions of men and women who have put their lives on the line to defend our country.

Let me very briefly—very briefly—touch on some of those issues included in this comprehensive piece of legislation that lacked three votes. We had 56 votes. One Senator was absent and would have voted, so we need three votes to pass this. This would have addressed some of the serious problems in the claims backlog that my friend from Louisiana is more than familiar with. It would have addressed the crisis of advanced appropriations to make sure if there is ever again another government shutdown that no veteran—disabled veteran and no veteran who is on a pension—would fail to get their check.

This legislation also included an enormously important provision expanding the caregivers program, so wives and sisters and brothers taking care of disabled vets finally get the attention they deserve.

That legislation would have addressed a terrible problem facing some 2,300 families, where men and women who were injured in Iraq and Afghanistan and can no longer have babies receive help through in vitro fertilization or other processes or adoption, if they want the help, in order to have families.

The legislation also addressed the very serious problem that many of our young men and women are not getting the education they need because States are not allowing them to get instate tuition.

That legislation addressed many other crises, which is why that legislation had the support of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, and in fact virtually every veterans organization in the country.

So let me say this to my friend from Louisiana, and I say this sincerely. What I will not do is dismember this piece of legislation. What I will do is work with my colleague and other Republicans who voted against this comprehensive piece of veterans legislation so we can bring to the floor a bill that reflects the needs of millions and millions of veterans who are hurting.

I look forward to working with my colleague from Louisiana on a comprehensive bill, but at this point I object to his proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, reclaiming the floor and my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. I find that very regretful. Of course I will continue to work with the Senator from Vermont. Of course I will continue to work on that larger package, which I have been actively involved in for some time. I will continue that. But basically the Senator from Vermont is holding a very tiny piece of this hostage—a tiny piece that will have no impact whether it is in or out in terms of passage of that broader bill.

What is happening is we have a piece that on its substance, on the substance of the clinics themselves, no one objects to; a piece that passed the House by a huge overwhelmingly bipartisan majority. Yet it is not going to pass here today or perhaps anytime soon because it is held hostage over larger fights.

I will continue to work on that broader veterans piece. I support a broader veterans bill, if it is styled the right way and if it is fiscally responsible. I support the Burr alternative. I will continue to look for common ground between that Burr alternative and the Sanders bill. But whether this clinic piece is in or out of that discussion will have zero impact on passing that piece. I honestly think it will have zero impact.

I find it very unfortunate we can't get this done in the meantime; that what my colleague considers the perfect is now the enemy of the very good, and we can't serve veterans by coming together on what we do agree on and acting in the meantime.

With that, I urge my distinguished colleague from Vermont to reconsider over time, as we work on this larger veterans bill, because we could pass this today. The House would pass the slightly modified version immediately, and we would be moving on with 27 community-based clinics around the country which veterans in all of those communities desperately need.

Additionally, I wish to thank Senator INHOFE for his active cooperation in moving these clinics forward.

Mr. President, my good friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, is in support of vital legislation that recently passed the House of Representatives, H.R. 3521 the Department of Veterans Affairs Major Medical Facility Lease Authorization Act of 2013. The legislation authorizes 27 Department of Veterans Affairs clinics across this country including much needed clinics in Lafayette and Lake Charles, LA.

Mr. INHOFE. I agree with my good friend from Louisiana that this legislation, H.R. 3521, is critical to providing the best treatment for our country's veterans, and I believe that it is the government's duty to honor the promises made to our veterans. In Oklahoma, roughly 340,000 veterans call our State home, attend our churches, and contribute to our communities. On behalf of Oklahoma, we are humbled by the immeasurable dedication of each and every one of them.

Therefore, this legislation also authorizes funds for an improved Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic in Tulsa, OK. The current building lacks the space to care adequately for the large number of veterans that receive their medical treatment at the facility. Due to the size of the facility, services such as the Behavioral Health services are located several miles away. Lastly, the parking lot capacity is not acceptable. This bill will improve this clinic to include primary care, women's health, imaging, specialty care, physical therapy, audiology, optometry, mental health, prosthetics, dentistry, and a pharmacy.

Mr. VITTER. Yes, it is absolutely critical for Louisiana veterans as well that both of the clinics in Lafayette and Lake Charles are authorized and finally built. To clarify, both of the Louisiana clinics are not new projects. They would actually be nearing completion, but because of bureaucratic mistakes committed by the Department of Veterans Affairs, they have faced significant delays. Two years ago, due to an unexpected change by the Congressional Budget Office—CBO—in how it estimates the cost of VA clinics, these two vital clinics were then stripped out of a VA authorization bill. Veterans in Louisiana have waited long enough. It is time for the United States Senate to act. This legislation makes it so veterans are not forced to drive a 100 miles to receive much needed services.

Mr. INHOFE. With the passage of this bill, there will be funding to improve and expand our VA clinics in 19 States across the United States, including Louisiana and Oklahoma. The facilities would then be able to provide the services that were promised to our men and women that were willing to make the personal sacrifices necessary to serve in the defense of our country. Many of our veterans have paid the price with scars, some visible while yet many go unseen such as post-traumatic stress disorder—PTSD, depression, and traumatic brain injuries—TBI. I urge our colleagues to remember that it is our Nation's duty to care for them in return.

Mr. VITTER. This legislation makes important reforms to the VA leasing process taking into account CBO concerns, and it has received vast bipartisan support in the House passing 346–1. I urge my colleagues to provide the same support for our veterans in the Senate and pass this legislation now by unanimous consent.

With that, I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me reiterate my hope that the Senator from Louisiana will in fact work with us. It is my intention to see this bill gets to the floor again before Memorial Day. I think we owe it to the men and women who have put their lives on the line to defend this country to address their serious needs.

The issue of these 27 medical facilities is one of those needs, but there are many more, and I look forward to working with the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators to do what the veterans communities want us to do and to go forward on what will be the most significant piece of legislation to take care of the needs of our veterans passed in several decades.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 12 minutes.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I, too, want to lend my voice—after listening to the discussion that just occurred on the floor—because I don't think there is any group of Americans who are more deserving of our support than the men and women who have worn the uniform of this country and so bravely and courageously defended America's freedom and our democracy. I hope, such as my colleagues who spoke just a minute ago, we can come to an agreement that would allow us to do the things on which we agree.

There are so many things on which we agree—I think 80 percent of the debate last week between what the Senator from Vermont proposed and the Senator from North Carolina proposed were the same—that we ought to be able at least to do those we agree on and address some of the very vital and urgent needs our veterans community has. So I would lend my voice to supporting efforts to get things moving.

There is a bill that has come over from the House of Representatives that addresses many of these issues, not as comprehensively as was proposed last week by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from North Carolina. Obviously, we have some issues that need to be addressed that will support and help those Americans who have borne the cost of battle for our country and defended America's freedoms, but we should work together to find that agreement and to move legislation forward that would address those needs.

THE BUDGET

Mr. President, I come to the floor, however, to talk about the pain that ObamaCare and the Obama economy are causing Americans.

CBS News/New York Times released a new poll last week finding there is widespread dissatisfaction with President Obama: 59 percent of the American people are disappointed in the President's Presidency, the poll found, while 63 percent think the country is on the wrong track.

Just 38 percent of the people in this country approve of the President's handling of the economy, and 39 percent approve of his handling of foreign policy.

When it comes to the President's signature law, ObamaCare, just 6 percent—6 percent—of the American people think the law is working well. A whopping 92 percent support changing the health care law or repealing it altogether.

In similar news, Gallup reported last month that its Economic Confidence Index was negative for every single State. In other words, the majority of Americans in every State have a generally negative view of the economy. Only in DC—in the District of Columbia, home of too many disconnected Democratic politicians—did Gallup find a net positive view of the economy.

Needless to say, the American people are, to put it mildly, dissatisfied. Why are they dissatisfied? Because they spent 5 years waiting for the relief they were promised and it hasn't arrived.

A Pew Research Center poll in September found that 63 percent of the American people believe the Nation's economic system is no more secure today than it was before the 2008 market crash. The same poll also found the majority of Americans report household incomes and the job situation have hardly recovered at all from the recession. President Obama may have inherited a difficult economic situation, but he has had 5 years to make it better. Instead, he is making things worse.

Over the past 5 years household income has declined by $3,600. Income inequality is at its highest point literally since the Great Depression. The number of Americans receiving food stamps has soared from over 32 million to now more than 47 million—almost 48 million Americans receiving food stamps. That means that one in five—literally one in five—American households is on food stamps. Ten million Americans are unemployed, almost 4 million of them for more than 6 months, and the labor force participation rate is at Jimmy Carter-era lows, thanks in part to literally thousands of Americans who have simply given up hope of ever finding a job and dropped out of the labor force altogether.

Then there is the President's health care law. The President promises a health care law with lower costs while allowing you to keep the plan and the doctor you like. In reality health care costs have skyrocketed and Americans have been losing their doctors and their health care plans in droves. Seniors are being hit hard by cuts in the Medicare Advantage Program and lower income seniors are being hit the hardest. Meanwhile, businesses are struggling with the law's burdensome taxes and regulations, while workers struggle with reduced hours and fewer opportunities.

A recent report from the Congressional Budget Office found that the President's health care law will reduce the number of full-time workers by up to 2.5 million over the next 10 years. Then there is last week's report from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services that found that 11 million small businesses are going to see workers have their premiums increased as a result of ObamaCare.

Yesterday, in an attempt to improve the Democrats' steadily worsening election prospects in November, the administration announced yet another—another—ObamaCare delay for selecting health plans, as well as a pardon for the administration's union friends. It is no wonder Americans are so unhappy.

Despite the abundance of evidence that their policies have failed, the Democrats and the President continue to dismiss Americans' stories. In fact, the Senate majority leader had the gall the other day to get up on the floor of the Senate and say every single ObamaCare horror story is untrue. That is right. Instead of looking at the overwhelming evidence that ObamaCare just isn't working, and maybe rethinking his support of that law, the majority leader decided to accuse every single American who has had a bad experience with ObamaCare of lying about his or her story. Now that is a lot of denial right there.

They say the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and hoping for a different result. Yet that is exactly what the Democrats and President are doing. Instead of looking at the evidence of the past 5 years and rethinking their policies, Democrats are piling on more of the same. For Americans hurting for jobs and opportunities, Democrats have recently taken to advocating a hike in the minimum wage—a policy, I might add, that the Congressional Budget Office said would result in up to 1 million fewer jobs and a policy that would hit the lowest income workers the hardest.

Then there is the President's budget. The President's budget proposal would have been a great opportunity for the President to rethink some of these failed strategies of the past 5 years and to focus on controlling spending and promoting economic growth. Instead the President produced a political document that panders to the far leftwing of his party and eschews any type of meaningful reform.

His budget won't control spending. Instead, it increases spending by 63 percent over the next 10 years and it adds another $8.3 trillion to our $17 trillion debt. To pay for some of that spending, the administration is proposing even more tax increases, over $1 trillion worth of new tax increases on top of the $1.7 trillion in tax increases the President has already gotten since he came to office.

The administration has even backed away from changes to our broken entitlement programs, such as gradually raising the eligibility age for Medicare, which would have helped put the Medicare Program on a stronger financial footing going forward.

And as for balancing the budget, well, that is a fantasy. The President's budget doesn't even pretend to balance. With 2 years left in his Presidency, it appears the President has given up on governing and resigned himself to playing election year politics. His lame-duck budget will further grow the Federal Government while the middle class continues to shrink.

If the President and Democrats really want to help Americans the way they claim, there are real steps they could take right now to start turning our economy around and putting Americans back to work. Instead of a job-killing minimum wage hike, they could support initiatives to reduce the cost of hiring and give businesses incentives to hire workers. Instead of perpetually extending unemployment benefits, they could support legislation, such as a bill I introduced to provide relocation resources to allow the long-term unemployed to move to areas where the job market is stronger, and strengthen Federal worker training programs. This would help give the unemployed what they really want—not months of meager government benefits but steady, good-paying jobs with the potential for growth.

Speaking of jobs, if the President wanted to create jobs immediately, he could easily do that today with a stroke of the pen that he talks about: Approve the bipartisan Keystone Pipeline and the 42,000-plus jobs it would support. All it would take is a stroke of the pen he keeps talking about.

Then there is trade promotion authority. The President did talk about trade promotion authority in his State of the Union Address, but he abandoned it shortly afterwards as a result of some Democrats' political concerns about pushing the policy in an election year. Trade promotion authority would help farmers, ranchers, entrepreneurs, and job creators gain access to 1 billion new consumers around the globe. If the President were serious about creating jobs for Americans, he would be urging the majority leader to take up this bipartisan legislation today.

Finally, the President should be supporting bipartisan efforts to repeal the costly medical device tax in his health care law, the tax on pacemakers and insulin pumps. According to a recent study, more than 30,000 jobs in the medical device industry have been affected by this burdensome provision in the law. If this tax isn't eliminated soon, even more jobs in the industry are going to be lost or sent overseas.

It is not surprising that the American people are unhappy. ObamaCare and the Obama economy have done nothing to ease the struggles Americans have faced since the recession, and instead of proposing new initiatives, the Democrats and the President continue to push for more of the same, and to double down on the same failed policies.

Well, 5 years is long enough. It is time for Democrats to abandon their failed economic experiments and to work with Republicans to pass legislation that will actually create jobs and opportunities and put Americans back to work. We can do that. We can do that today. The President can pick up the phone he talks about and call the majority leader. Ask him to bring up any one of these initiatives I have mentioned on which there is broad bipartisan support: the Keystone Pipeline, trade promotion authority—initiatives that would grow jobs—repealing the medical device tax. There were 79 votes in the Senate on amendments to the budget last year in support of appealing that onerous tax.

There are things we can do together, that we can do today to create jobs and grow and expand this economy, lower the cost of hiring people in this country, so we can get more Americans back to work with good-paying jobs that will help lift them higher in their economic circumstances and give them a better and a brighter future. I hope that is what the President will choose to do rather than following through on so many of these election year ploys, if you will, that are simply designed to help win elections come election day rather than doing something that is meaningful to help middle-class families and the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROSE EILENE GOTTEMOELLER TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ARMS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:20 a.m. will be equally divided between the majority leader and the Republican leader or their designees.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. It is always good to see my distinguished colleague from New Jersey presiding before the Senate.

I come to the floor to support the nomination of Rose Gottemoeller for Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security. She has been the Acting Under Secretary since February 2012. It has been 2 years now.

She is a distinguished public servant who over her long career has played a vital role in addressing the critical proliferation challenges the United States faces. In my mind, it would be difficult to find a person more appropriate to take on the variety of new and old proliferation threats we face.

Rose Gottemoeller was the chief U.S. negotiator of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with the Russian Federation. During the Clinton administration she served in the Department of Energy overseeing its nuclear proliferation portfolio. During the critical period of 1993 to 1994, she was at the National Security Council overseeing the denuclearization of Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus—a topic of some importance given the current crisis in the Ukraine.

As we consider this nomination, it is worthwhile reviewing the array of issues and nonproliferation threats we face.

In Syria, we are facing ridding the regime of its chemical weapons arsenal, seeking to keep the pressure on Assad to fulfill his commitments and verify that Syria is in full compliance with provisions to destroy its chemical weapons production, mixing, and filling. The United States, along with the rest of the international community, is engaged in the complex process to transport and safely destroy Syria's chemical weapons stockpile.

Second, on the issue of Iran's nuclear program, we are entering a critical stage in negotiations. As I noted in remarks on the floor last month, we must, in my view, maintain the pressure on Iran to dismantle its nuclear weapons program. As part of our negotiations, we must insist on the most stringent measures to verify whether Iran is in compliance with agreements it has signed. We need to ensure that any final deal that might be signed can be precisely monitored, providing us a warning signal at the first hint that Iran is seeking to achieve nuclear breakout.

Third, in terms of North Korea, the United States has stated that we will not accept North Korea as a nuclear weapons state, which would potentially unleash an arms race in the region and threaten our security and the security of our allies.

Fourth, we have to maintain and sharpen our efforts to prevent terrorists from getting their hands on and/or using nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons.

Finally, despite all of our recent difficulties with Russia, it is vital that we continue to implement and verify the arms control treaties we have with them, particularly the New START treaty. These treaties are not something we do as a favor to Russia; they are a vital measure for limiting the potential dangerous nuclear escalation that might occur in a crisis.

For all of these reasons and many others, we need to confirm the nomination of Rose Gottemoeller so she can fully assume her new responsibilities as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security. She has all the authority necessary to represent U.S. security interests in the international community.

Having said that, I know there are differences within the Senate about the question as to how we should approach nonproliferation issues, but regardless of those differences, I believe there are a number of issues on which we can all agree.

We can all agree that we face a new and more complex set of proliferation threats—the threat of terrorists getting their hands on nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons, the danger of regional armed nuclear adversaries, such as North Korea and Iran, using their nuclear capabilities to blackmail our partners and allies.

In response to these threats, we all agree we need a more modern and flexible nuclear enterprise and updated policies that can respond to these new threats as well as the old threats we face. I hope we can agree that we need to confirm this nominee to be in a position with authority to help update and implement those policies with the full authority of the position.

What I would say to the Senate is that at the end of the day there are some who may disagree on verification and compliance procedures or on the nature of the modernization of our program, but we cannot disagree on the significance of the threats we face and the need to have a team in place tasked with representing our security interests at the highest national level.

This is not a time to say no to confirming a qualified, experienced nonproliferation expert when so much is at stake in Syria, North Korea, and Iran, and negotiations with Russia—not when we imagine the consequences of what the spread of these weapons can bring. I urge my colleagues to confirm this nominee in the national security interest of the United States and look forward to a strong support of her nomination.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 7 minutes as if in morning business.

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

TRIBUTE TO JIM YOUNG

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart that I pay tribute to the life and legacy of a friend, Jim Young. Jim passed away on February 15 after a courageous battle with pancreatic cancer. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Shirley, his children, and his grandchildren during a very difficult time.

Even as we mourn his passing, though, we celebrate his deep love for his family, his tremendous commitment to his community, and his impressive example of leadership. Jim's family, friends, coworkers, and admirers from across Nebraska and our great Nation are mourning the loss of a life defined by great service and great leadership. It is my privilege today on the floor of the Senate to honor his legacy.

Jim knew the importance of hard work and commitment to purpose. That is how he climbed the ladder of success to become the president and chief executive officer and, later, chairman of the board of Union Pacific Corporation.

Jimmy's integrity was unquestioned. He loved his work. He carried his enthusiasm beyond UP as he led the American Association of Railroads and other professional organizations.

Jimmy's leadership spurred impressive reinvestment and growth in the railroad, but many would say his true accomplishment was his focus on a positive work environment and taking care of his coworkers. His concern for their well-being was genuine, and they knew it.

It would be difficult to categorize Jimmy's greatest contributions because beyond his tremendous impact on UP and the rail industry, Jim did everything. He loved our great State. He loved his hometown of Omaha. He set a shining example of what it means to give back to the community.

The list of boards on which he served and organizations for which he volunteered could literally fill a book. From the Greater Omaha Chamber of Commerce to the Joslyn Art Museum, from the University of Nebraska to the Salvation Army, Jimmy's commitment to serving and to improving the lives of others is just simply unmatched.

He did not take for granted his success, and he dedicated time and attention to assisting those who had less—those with fewer resources. Evidence of his generosity can be found in all corners of the community. It would range from the Jim and Shirley Young Scholarship Program at Jimmy's alma mater, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, to his involvement in the Knights of Ak-Sar-Ben and his service as a church elder and a youth sports coach.

I am so confident I speak for all Nebraskans when I say we have lost a great leader and a community partner. I feel as though I have lost a friend.

Jim gave of himself in all he did. From the boardroom to the ballfield, his presence is going to be so missed.

It is my sincere hope that Jimmy's wife Shirley, his children and his grandchildren, find comfort knowing that so many lives were made better because of his efforts.

Jim leaves a vibrant legacy of leading by example, inspiring others by believing in every single person's potential, and of dedicating both time and treasure to opening doors of opportunity for those who just needed a champion. It would be difficult to imagine a more meaningful life legacy.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Ex.]

YEAS—58

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

NAYS—42

Ayotte	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Tester
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Walsh
Fischer	Moran	Wicker

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF SUZANNE ELEANOR SPAULDING TO BE UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the Spaulding nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. REID. I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JOHN ROTH TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the Roth nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John Roth, of Michigan, to be Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. REID. I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, there is no further debate.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Roth, of Michigan, to be Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

MILITARY JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 1752, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1752) to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order with respect to the consideration of S. 1752 and S. 1917 be modified so the debate time is equally divided between Senators MCCASKILL and GILLIBRAND or their designees, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1752, a bill to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Barbara Boxer, John D. Rockefeller IV, Tammy Baldwin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Claire McCaskill, Jon Tester, Mark Begich, Barbara Mikulski, Maria Cantwell, Charles E. Schumer, Dianne Feinstein.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when American men and women decide to defend our freedoms as members of the U.S. Armed Forces, they do so with full knowledge that they could make the ultimate sacrifice—the ultimate sacrifice—on behalf of our county. These are very courageous men and women. While we can't protect every member of our military from harm at the hands of America's enemies, we should at least guarantee them protection from harm at the hands of their fellow servicemembers.

The need to address the problem of sexual assault is not lost on the military officers and officials with whom I have met. They acknowledge there is a problem. I believe they are working in good faith to fix it.

The vast majority of U.S. military personnel are appalled by sexual assault in their ranks, as are their commanders. I applaud their dedication to this Nation and their fellow servicemembers. I applaud the action of those who have zero tolerance for these crimes, but I am convinced that Congress must act aggressively to eliminate a military culture that not only allows sexual assault to happen but too often punishes the victims when it does.

We have already taken some action to combat the sexual assault in the Defense authorization bill. I am pleased today we will vote on two proposals for further action.

Congress cannot stand idly by while the blight of sexual assault continues. Every military leader has the responsibility to take a stand with us for a zero tolerance approach to military sexual assault, to stand by the victims of sexual assault, and to stand with the good men and women they command.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. We are going to have two votes at 2 o'clock. I ask unanimous consent that the additional time until 2 p.m. be equally divided and controlled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I rise today to speak about the need to strengthen our military and stand by our brave men and women in uniform by passing the bipartisan Military Justice Improvement Act.

I start by thanking all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the seriousness with which they have approached this issue and the effort they have put into looking at the solution survivors of sexual assault in the military are asking for. I specifically thank my friends from Missouri and New Hampshire for their determination and leadership in fighting for victims of sexual assaults in our military. I look forward to voting for their bill on the floor today.

I defer the colloquy to Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, when the majority leader said 1 minute ago that Congress cannot idly stand by and not do anything, I have to remind him that we have been doing so for quite some time. We have been working on the problem of sexual assault, and the reality is that Congress has been aggressive in instituting reforms to tackle sexual assault in the military since the fiscal year 2009 Defense Authorization Act. We have enacted 47 provisions, either directly addressing sexual assault or instituting reforms to the Uniform Code of Military Justice that will improve efforts to address allegations of misconduct.

These reforms have strengthened the protections and the care of the victims while preserving the rights of the accused. These historic reforms are vital to ensuring a sound, effective, and fair military justice system.

I look at the bill we are considering that will be coming up in a short while. The bill would modify the court-martial convening authority in a way that I believe creates very serious procedural problems.

In a January 28, 2014, letter to the Department, it cited—and I am going to cite some very technical problems:

Potentially irreconcilable and could result in long delays from bringing some cases to trial and, if a conviction ultimately results, could produce still more years of appellant litigation, perhaps ultimately culminating in the conviction's reversal.

To make matters even worse, the bill includes a requirement that the new military judge advocate billets required to perform these duties must be taken from existing billets. This is what we have been fighting and arguing about, the problems that we are having now in the overall military. No billet growth is authorized in this, so it will have to come from existing billets.

I received a personal letter from the Judge Advocate General of the Army, General Darpino.

He said:

The bill would not be cost neutral. According to initial estimates, the Army would require an additional 50 judge advocate colonels along with the increase of about 200 judge advocates of other ranks and about 150 legal support staff.

That is a quote. She went on to say:

. . . this is happening at a time when the services are attempting to reduce their personnel costs to accommodate shrinking budgets. And that is just the impact in the Army. On November 18, 2013, the Department of Defense provided an assessment of the devastating impact of the Gillibrand bill. The Defense office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation estimate a total cost of over $113 million per year—

That is every year—

to implement her bill in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines. Not only is her bill not executable in a cost-neutral basis, it is not possible to grow the total inventory of nearly 600 judge advocate officers and legal assistants required by the bill within the 180 days of enactment. The decision we make today will have significant consequences for the future of our military. More specifically, the bill we are debating this week threatens to tear apart what I strongly believe is the fabric of our Armed Forces: the chain of command.

I can't find people I can confide in and talk to personally, who have been in the military, who don't agree with this. I was in the Uniform Code of Military Justice when I was in the U.S. Army—not at the level of some of the Senators who have been there more recently, such as Senator GRAHAM, for example, and at a higher level. I was an enlisted man. But I was a reporter, and a lot of times the reporters, the enlisted personnel, really know more about the situation than some of the bosses. I was firmly convinced that—granted, this was years ago—you can't mess with the chain of command.

When you stop and think about what a commander has to do—he is required to take care of the physical and medical condition of our troops. He is required to oversee their training. He is required to have medical care if they are wounded, and he has to make the decision of sending our troops into combat. It is inconceivable to me, with all of these responsibilities, that he be taken out of this chain.

It is not just me. Others agree with this. I had conversation with Col. Ana Smythe of the Marine Corps. She said at a press conference:

What you don't understand if you're not in the military is that the fabric and the essence of the military is built around the chain of command. . . . If we dismantle or weaken the chain of command, we are lost.

The CMSgt Barbara Taylor said about the Gillibrand bill:

It would be devastating to the United States military. . . . A commander cannot be held responsible if he does not have the authority to act.

So I think those of us who have had military experience and who have been involved in the military understand the serious problems that would come from the adoption of this bill. I strongly recommend we defeat the Gillibrand bill.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I yield 10 minutes to Senator COLLINS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am relieved that legislation addressing the crisis of military assault has finally been brought to the Senate Floor, and I commend the Senator from New York, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and the Senator from Missouri, Mrs. MCCASKILL, for their leadership in bringing this important issue to the forefront.

I also acknowledge the courage and conviction of Jennifer Norris and Ruth Moore—two Mainers who were sexually assaulted while serving our country. They have made it their mission to change the broken system that has not put victims first. Through their advocacy they have helped to shine a light on this crisis, and they deserve our gratitude.

In fact, as Senator GILLIBRAND and I were coming on to the floor, we were stopped by a reporter who asked us: What has made the difference? I said it had been the leadership of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Missouri, but I also pointed to the survivors of military sexual assault who have come forward and been willing to tell their stories, painful though those stories are.

Since 2004, I have been sounding the alarm over the military's ineffective response to the growing crisis of sexual assault in the military, including the need to ensure appropriate punishment for the perpetrators of these crimes, to provide adequate care for the survivor, and to change the culture across the military so that sexual assault is unthinkable.

It was 10 years ago, during an Armed Services Committee hearing, that I first brought up the alarming increase in the number of sexual assaults in the military. Back then the attitude of the witness, GEN George Casey, Jr., then Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, testifying at that hearing was completely dismissive, even though these are serious crimes that traumatize survivors and erode the trust and discipline fundamental to every military unit. I was appalled at the reaction.

While the attitude today among the most senior military leaders is markedly different than the one that I encountered a decade ago, the work of translating the military's stated policy of zero tolerance into reality remains unfinished business. Fostering a culture of zero tolerance so that the number of assaults is greatly diminished remains a goal, not reality. Ensuring that survivors do not think twice about reporting an assault for fear of retaliation or damage to their careers is still not part of the military culture.

In 2011 I joined our former colleague, John Kerry, in introducing the Defense STRONG Act as an initial step to address this crisis. The provisions of that bill, which were signed into law as part of the fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act, provide survivors of sexual assault the assistance of advocates with genuine confidentiality, guaranteed access to an attorney, and expedited consideration for the victim to be transferred far away from the assailant.

These were helpful first steps. But more than anything, the victims of sexual assaults, the survivors, need to have the confidence the legal system in which they report a crime will produce a just and fair result. We need to encourage more reporting, and that is what Senator GILLIBRAND's bill will accomplish. This is a goal that I believe is shared by all Members of the Senate, despite our differing opinions on the best path forward for achieving these goals.

In the 113th Congress, a number of proposals have been introduced aimed at reducing the barriers to justice that many survivors of sexual assault face in our military. I have been pleased to work with both Senators GILLIBRAND and MCCASKILL toward this end. As a result of our efforts, as well as those of many others, including Chairman LEVIN and Ranking Member INHOFE, important provisions that all of us agree on have been signed into law as part of this past year's National Defense Authorization Act.

Among those provisions is legislation that I coauthored to extend the STRONG Act to the Coast Guard. In addition, Senator MCCASKILL and I wrote provisions mandating a dishonorable discharge or dismissal for any servicemember convicted of sexual assault. We also allowed a commander to relocate an alleged perpetrator of a sexual assault crime rather than the survivor. Why should it be the survivor who has to move?

Senator GILLIBRAND and I authored a provision that eliminates the elements of the character of the accused from the factors a commander could consider, making it more like what would occur in the civilian system. Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator MCCASKILL, and I authored a provision that eliminates a commander's ability to overturn a conviction by a jury post trial for major offenses.

I mention these reforms because I am encouraged that we have taken these steps to address this vitally important issue. But more remains to be done. I remain cognizant of the fact there are strong views at the Pentagon and within this body about how we should best move forward from here and what that may mean for the military's unique legal system. But one of the criticisms which I totally reject is that we should just wait a few more months for the result of a few more studies or wait a few more years to see if the recently enacted provisions have made a difference. I strongly disagree.

How many more victims are required to suffer before we act further? How many more lives must be ruined before we take additional steps that we know are required to solve this problem? Rather than waiting for the results of yet more studies, we must continue to enact real reforms to increase the confidence of survivors to come forward and report the crimes, to ensure that perpetrators will be dealt with appropriately, and to strengthen prevention efforts right now.

Senator GILLIBRAND's bill is a reasonable proposal designed to communicate to survivors and potential perpetrators alike that when survivors are subjected to these unacceptable, horrific crimes, they will have access to a legal system that fully protects their interests. Providing our troops with that basic confidence is the least we can do.

I believe there is no question of Congress' commitment to reducing the instances of sexual assault in the military and providing appropriate redress and care for survivors. While we debate various proposals, we are united by the need for serious reforms that will strengthen the military's response to sexual assaults. But for the leadership of Senator GILLIBRAND and Senator MCCASKILL, and the courage of those survivors who were finally willing to come forward and tell their stories and know that we would listen to them, believe them, and act, we would not be here today. I am certain that our work will reduce the unnecessary suffering and injustice felt by those who have survived these horrific crimes.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I yield time to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Senator from New York.

The Defense Department has been promising Congress and the American people for a long period of time that they are working on this problem of sexual assault, and we are still looking for results, and the statistics get worse. So I believe what Senator GILLIBRAND is saying with her legislation is enough is enough.

I am proud to be a partner in this effort. It fits into an overall principle of government that I have: Greater transparency brings accountability. And I believe this legislation will make this whole problem much more transparent and, with it, accountability to hopefully get the issue solved.

I appreciate the fact that a large number of commonsense reforms were included in the national defense authorization. These changes were long

overdue. However, we are past the point of tinkering with the current system and hoping that does the trick. We have had promises about tackling the problem of sexual assault within the current system for years and years, but the problem is still not any better and, statistics show, is getting worse. We don't have the luxury of time to try some new reforms of the current system and hope they have an impact. We have had those promises before.

What is more, the current system appears to be part of the problem. I will elaborate on that.

We know from the recent Defense Department report that 50 percent of female victims stated they did not report the crime because they believed nothing would be done as a result of their reporting; 74 percent of the females and 60 percent of the males perceived one or more barriers to reporting sexual assault; and 62 percent of the victims who reported sexual assault indicated they perceived some form of professional, social, and/or administrative retaliation.

We can talk about protecting victims, and we can enact more protections, as we did in the national defense authorization, but the fact remains that the current structure of the military justice system is having a deterrent effect on the reporting of these assaults. If sexual assault cases aren't reported, they can't be prosecuted. If sexual assault isn't prosecuted, predators will remain in the military, which results in the perception that sexual assault is tolerated in this culture. That destroys morale and it destroys lives. If an enemy tried to sow that kind of discord among our military, we wouldn't tolerate it, but we are doing it to ourselves.

The men and women who have volunteered to place their lives on the line deserve better, and our military readiness obviously demands it.

Taking prosecutions out of the hands of commanders and giving them to professional prosecutors who are independent of the chain of command will help ensure impartial justice for the men and women of our forces.

I know some Senators will be nervous about the fact that the military is lobbying against this legislation. I have the greatest respect for our military leaders, but Congress has given the military leadership more than enough time to fix this current system. We can't wait any longer. We should not be intimidated by people coming to the Hill because of their stars and ribbons. They deserve our respect but not deference to their opinion.

We also hear that this measure will affect the ability of commanders to retain ''good order and discipline.'' Our legislation in no way takes away the ability of commanders to punish troops under their command for military infractions. Commanders also can and should be held accountable for the climate under their command. But the point here is that sexual assault is a law enforcement matter, not a military one.

If anyone wants official assurances that we are on the right track, we can take confidence in the fact that an advisory committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense supports these reforms. There is an organization appointed by the Secretary of Defense which goes by the acronym DACOWITS—the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services—which voted overwhelmingly in support of each and every one of the components of the Gillibrand bill.

DACOWITS was created back in 1951 under Defense Secretary Marshall. The committee is composed of civilian and retired military women and men appointed by the Secretary to provide advice and recommendations on matters and policies relating to the recruitment and retention, treatment, and well-being of our highly qualified professional women in the Armed Forces. Historically, the recommendations by DACOWITS have been instrumental in effecting changes to laws and policies pertaining to women in the military. This isn't an outside advocacy group or ad hoc panel; it is a longstanding advisory committee handpicked by the Secretary of Defense, and it supports the substance of this legislation.

It is easier to support incremental reform. In fact, it is also prudent to try small reforms before making bigger changes. I understand why some Senators are nervous about a total overhaul of the military justice system. It isn't something I approach lightly. However, we have waited for years as various initiatives to tackle this problem have been tried.

When we are talking about something as serious and life-altering as sexual assault, we cannot afford to wait any longer than we already have. The time has come to act decisively to change the military culture. We need a clean break from the system where sexual assault isn't reported because of a perception that justice won't be done. Our men and women serving this country deserve nothing less, and they deserve it now. They shouldn't have to wait any longer for justice.

For those reluctant to take this step, I would say that if the more modest reforms proposed by others prove insufficient and we have to come back and enact our reforms at a later time, how will you justify your vote today?

Now is the time for bold action, and I urge my colleagues to join in the effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I yield to the Senator from Montana, followed by the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I thank Senators GILLIBRAND and MCCASKILL for their dedication and commitment to dealing with sexual assault in the military and for bringing a serious problem to the forefront of Congress. Their work on the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act helped reform the Uniform Code of Military Justice. But I believe we must do more.

My perspective on prosecuting military sexual assault comes from my 33 years in the Montana National Guard. My view on this is simple: The current system is failing the men and women in uniform. And failure is unacceptable.

While no legislation is perfect, I believe we must fundamentally change how we deal with sexual assault in our military. While I support the reforms that passed last year, we have moved too slowly. Today's debate is about where we go from here.

In the Armed Forces today, a military commander is ultimately responsible for the prosecution of these crimes. In the Montana National Guard, except when federalized, we did things differently. If the unimaginable happened, the prosecution of sexual assault would occur outside the purview of a military commander. Senator GILLIBRAND's Military Justice Improvement Act removes prosecutions from the purview of military commanders—much like the Montana National Guard system.

One of the arguments I have heard against this bill is that if we shift the prosecution of sexual assault outside the chain of command, military leaders will somehow lose their authority on other matters. As a retired military commander, I am confident this is not the case. I have never found myself in a situation with the units I commanded where discipline and devotion to a mission was jeopardized by compliance with the civilian justice system. I am not talking hypotheticals. The chain of command's function is not a mystery to me. I lived it. And it is hard to convey how angry you feel when the system fails your fellow soldiers.

Today's debate is part of a broader effort to improve our military and the lives of those who have served—from the justice system, to the VA claims backlog, to ensuring that veterans find jobs when they complete their service. We have the opportunity to guarantee justice for the men and women within our military and to correct its failures. Now it is time to get it done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. William Wilberforce wrote:

> Having heard all this you can choose to look the other way, but you can never again say, ''I did not know.''

Having heard the stories of sexual assault in the military, we can look away, but we can never say that we have not heard of this problem, that we are going to ignore this problem. I don't think anybody in this body wants to, but the definition of ''insanity'' is doing the same thing over and over and

expecting a different result. We have known that sexual assault in the military has been a problem decade after decade. I think it is time we tried something new.

When I heard of a young military recruit from my State—a young woman who was raped, attacked, beaten to a pulp, three nerves pinched in her back, her legs and hips bruised such that she couldn't walk, and she considered suicide—when I heard her rape kit was lost and the case was dismissed, I was disheartened. Her assailant is still in the Navy. We have to do something different. We cannot ignore this problem.

To me it is as simple as this: Should you have to report your assault to your boss? This is what we are talking about. What if your boss goes drinking with the person who assaulted you, who is friends with them? Wouldn't we want the person you complained to completely outside the chain of command? Wouldn't we want to have lawyers involved whose specialty is this type of situation?

I am not saying it is easy. Guilt and justice are sometimes hard to find. But we have evidence that people don't trust the system. They say there are 26,000 episodes of unwanted sexual contact. They say 50 percent of the victims, though, go unreported. There are a lot of reasons for this. Even in the private world, people are afraid or ashamed or don't feel they can talk about this publicly. But we should do everything possible to make sure it is easy to report this because we don't want this to occur.

This doesn't mean, for our men and women who serve, it is a problem that overwhelms the military. It is still a small percentage. But for the 26,000 people having this happen to them, we need to come up with a solution.

What Senator GILLIBRAND has done is an idea whose time has come. It is about justice for victims, but it also is about finding due process. Getting this out of the arbitrary nature of a commander making a decision and into a court with judges where there will be arguments on both sides I think protects the innocent as well as finds justice for the accused.

I overwhelmingly support this bill and this crusade Senator GILLIBRAND has led. I suggest to the Senate that we understand the problem goes on, and tweaking this problem or nibbling around the edges and saying: Oh, we are just going to wait and see if what we are doing is better—we have been doing this for 20 years. I think the time is now to make the change.

I stand with Senator GILLIBRAND, and I wholeheartedly support her bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, there is no doubt that when a sexual assault occurs in a military unit, when a servicemember is a victim or a perpetrator of sexual assault, then we all fail. It is not just the military chain of command; it is all of us. That is why the efforts of Senator MCCASKILL and Senator GILLIBRAND have been so critical and important. They have galvanized this debate. They have forced action where action needs to be taken. Now the question is, What is the pathway forward that will achieve what we all want—the reduction of sexual assault in the military forces?

I have expressed before concerns with the approach Senator GILLIBRAND has taken because I firmly believe, based on experience in the Active military, leadership has to be involved at every stage—recruitment, training, evaluation, promotion, and retention. When we take the commanders out of any of these steps, we diminish their effectiveness in every one of these steps. Removing the commander from these responsibilities, in my view, will weaken his or her effectiveness, and the test of that effectiveness is not in the courtroom, it is on the battlefield, and the consequences of such weakness could be significant to the forces of the United States. So we have to continue to maintain a system that recognizes the need for constant attention to this issue, constant leadership and command focus, on this issue.

We also have to recognize that the proposal we are putting forward today—and I think this is critical—is not just about sexual assault; it covers a wide range of offenses, offenses like larceny of personal equipment in the barracks. It covers a whole host of crimes that are not directly related to sexual assault.

As a result of this bifurcated system that would be created, some traditional charges, such as AWOL, have been reserved for the commander, but a significant amount of charges has been referred to this new process. This bifurcated system will cause practical problems that will undercut the effectiveness of units to perform their mission and to do what is necessary to protect their soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

The service JAGs—very experienced legal officers who have served in the uniformed military justice system in the United States—have pointed out several defects.

First, the proposal fails to address the complexity of these cases. Some cases will be referred to the special prosecutor, while others will remain with the commander, creating a multiplicity of venues, multiplicity of investigations, and perhaps conflicting decisions; all of which not only impose significant costs, but I think interferes with the sense the soldiers should have that they know what the system is.

Second, this proposal takes away one of the most significant aspects of the military justice system; that is, nonjudicial punishment. For example, as I illustrated before in my remarks, you could have a barracks thief who steals an iPhone and an iPad that accumulates to a certain amount to trigger a charge that has to be referred to a special prosecutor. If that special prosecutor declines to prosecute, then it goes back to the company commander. But the company or the battalion commander, given the level of jurisdiction, cannot now impose nonjudicial punishment for the simple fact that the accused has to accept the punishment, but if there is no way he or she can be court-martialed, that punishment will not be accepted.

For offenses that are properly tried or adjudicated through the Article 15 process, those offenses will literally not only go unpunished, but the whole climate of command could be significantly changed.

Third, there is a constitutional issue, which is that under this proposal, you have the creation of a single office—and again I will refer to it generically as special prosecutors—with the authority to appoint counsel—defense counsel—and members of courts-martial panels, and that raises constitutional problems.

Let me conclude by saying that we have had a vigorous debate, and it has been an important debate, but we have had the opportunity since that debate to get the results of the Role of the Commander Subcommittee from the Response Systems Panel. These are objective members—in fact, many of them have for years been in the forefront of urging sensible reforms in the military, of being the vanguard in protecting victims in many different forms. They have concluded that the commander should remain within the loop, should remain as Senator MCCASKILL, Senator AYOTTE, and Senator FISCHER proposed, with corrections and with improvements that I think are very appropriate.

I would urge that we support strongly the provisions Senators AYOTTE, MCCASKILL, and FISCHER have proposed. They strengthen the system. But I must say that to remove the commander as proposed would in the long run be detrimental not only to the effectiveness of the military forces but detrimental to our common goal, which is to reduce sexual assault in the military of the United States. If we do not, if we allow it to continue—it is a corrosive force that will undermine our forces more than anything else.

Committed to that goal, I think we should support Senator MCCASKILL, and I am pleased to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I yield time to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Madam President.

I thank Senator GILLIBRAND for her extraordinary leadership.

Today you will hear two things: One is to support both bills, which I believe

we should do, and one is an attack on the Gillibrand bill, which for the life of me I do not understand. I am not going to filibuster Senator MCCASKILL's bill because I think it is important. I am not going to filibuster Senator GILLIBRAND's bill because it is the one opportunity to bring about the change that the survivors of rape and the survivors of sexual assault are pushing for.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of 45 organizations that are supporting the Gillibrand bill.

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

VETERAN & WOMEN'S GROUPS SUPPORTING THE MILITARY JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Numerous organizations support the Military Justice Improvement Act, including:

Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America (IAVA), Vietnam Veterans of America, Service Womens Action Network, Protect Our Defenders, National Women's Law Center, National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, National Research Center for Women & Families, Jacobs Institute of Women's Health, Our Bodies Ourselves, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Members of the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, 9to5, Baha'is of the United States, Equal Rights Advocates, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Federally Employed Women, Feminist Majority, Futures Without Violence, General Federation of Women's Clubs, GetEqual, Girls, Inc.

Hindu American Seva Communities, Institute for Science and Human Values, Inc., Jewish Women International, Joyful Heart Foundation, National Capital Union Retirees, National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Congress of Black Women, Inc, National Council of Churches, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Women's Organizations, National Organization for Women, National Women's Health Network, OWL-The Voice of Midlife and Older Women, Peaceful Families Project, Presbyterian Women in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Inc., Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, SPART*A, an LGBT Military Organization, The National Congress of American Indians, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries, V-Day, Woman's National Democratic Club, Women's Research & Education Institute, YWCA USA.

Mrs. BOXER. So when people stand here and start attacking that bill and saying how awful it is, I want them to remember just a few of the organizations that stand with Senator GILLIBRAND: the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America—do you want to listen to the bureaucrats or do you want to listen to the people who know what is going on—the Vietnam Veterans of America; the Service Women's Action Network; the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; the National Congress of Black Women, Inc.; the YWCA. There are 45 organizations.

I have a very strong message for colleagues: Do not filibuster justice. Do not filibuster the Gillibrand bill. Do not filibuster the McCaskill bill. My goodness, these women deserve an up-or-down vote on their bills. And the only reason I think some are forcing a filibuster on the Gillibrand bill is they know we have a majority. Just how strong it is we will find out. But what a sad day, when 17 women in the Senate support both approaches—17 of the 20 women—that we are facing a filibuster on the Gillibrand bill. Do not filibuster justice. It is pretty simple. You are going to hear a lot of words from politicians like me. Fine. But I think it is important to listen to the words of the victims and find a little humility—stories of victims such as Amando Javier, who served in the Marine Corps in 1993. He was brutally raped and physically assaulted by a group of fellow marines. Ashamed and fearing for his life, he kept his rape a secret for 15 years. Do you know what it is like to keep a secret such as that, to suffer the pain and humiliation for 15 years.

When he finally found the courage to share his story with a friend, he decided to write it down. I want you to listen to his words:

My experience left me torn apart physically, mentally and spiritually. I was dehumanized and treated with ultimate cruelty by my perpetrators. I was embarrassed. I was ashamed. I didn't know what to do. I was young at the time, and being part of an elite organization that valued brotherhood, integrity and faithfulness made it hard to come forward and reveal what happened.

Well, here we are two decades later and no one has been held accountable for that heinous crime. And it goes on. I appreciate Senator PAUL reading what happened to one of his constituents. But you will hear the voices of the status quo in this body, and let me tell you, they are in great company, the voices of the status quo, the ones who are filibustering the Gillibrand bill. Let me tell you some of the voices of the status quo—and notice this: They are Republicans and Democrats.

Dick Cheney said in 1992: ''We've got a major effort underway to try and educate everybody . . . let them know that we've got a zero-tolerance policy.''

Secretary Bill Perry: ''For all these reasons, we have zero tolerance for sexual harassment.''

This has been going on for 20 years, and that spirit is being continued right here today from those who want to filibuster the Gillibrand proposal.

Secretary Cohen: ''I intend to enforce a strict policy of zero tolerance.''

Secretary Rumsfeld: ''Sexual assault will not be tolerated.''

Secretary Gates: ''I have zero tolerance.''

Secretary Leon Panetta: ''We have no tolerance for this.''

Secretary Hagel: ''These crimes have no place in the greatest military on earth.''

Words are swell. Who can argue with these words? But let's look at where we are today in terms of what is actually happening on the ground. I say to the voices who are standing in the way of an up-or-down vote on KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND's bill: Look at these facts. There were 26,000 cases of sexual assault in the military in 2012, and 1.2 percent of them have been prosecuted. This white circle represents the 26,000 cases. This thin sliver in green that you can barely see represents the amount that was prosecuted. Do you know what happens to these folks who get out? They continue their activities either in the military or on the streets of our cities, our counties, and our States. Yet these voices of the status quo in this Senate will tell you ''oh my goodness, we cannot make this change'' even though 45 organizations, including the Iraq and Afghanistan fighters, are telling us to do so.

Here is the deal. This is another way to look at it. There were 26,000 estimated sexual assaults in 2012. We have a 90-percent problem—90 percent of these cases go unreported. Guess what, folks. Are you surprised they are afraid to go to their commander, those of you who are supporting this status quo? Just ask them. Do not listen to Senator GILLIBRAND or to me. We are not in the military. The people who are in the military are telling us, begging us, along with every organization that stands for the survivors: Please change it.

Now I ask you, if there was a rape in your office in the Senate and somebody upstairs yelled and screamed and you went up there as a Senator, what would you do? Would you decide whether the case ought to be prosecuted or would you call the police? Would you call the experts?

I do not think CEOs ought to determine whether a case of rape should be prosecuted. Do you? I don't think so. Yet that is what you are supporting here with the commander who knows all the players. Suppose he goes out to drink with the perp, knows him well, thinks he is a great fighter. I know Senator MCCASKILL is trying to fix these problems around the edges—fine—but let's get to the heart of the matter.

In summation, we can continue the 20 years of baloney and not make the change that needs to be made under the important Gillibrand bill. What we do is we say we are keeping this in the military, but we are allowing the experts to make the decision. That is fair to the accuser, and that is fair to the accused. As a matter of fact, we have people supporting us because they believe it is fair to both sides, not just the accuser.

So let's not filibuster justice. Do not stand here and say how you care about this and then filibuster the Gillibrand bill because you will be judged on that vote. If you have problems with the details of the bill, vote against the bill but do not filibuster justice.

This is a chance we have, an opportunity we have. Yes, it will be revisited over and over because these problems, if we do not make these changes, are going to continue. Today is an amazing moment in time that we could come together and allow an up-or-down vote on

the Gillibrand proposal. We wouldn't be filibustering justice, and I think we would bring some needed change—needed change, Madam President, that all the leading named organizations I have put in the RECORD endorse. I hope we will stand with those victims, stand with those providers, and stand with those advocacy groups and be humble and not say we know better than they.

Thank you very much, and I thank Senator GILLIBRAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. LEVIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, first let me thank Senator MCCASKILL for her terrific leadership on this matter and Senator AYOTTE and others on our committee who worked so hard to strengthen our laws against sexual assault and strengthen the ability of our commanders to act, as we did in our defense authorization bill and in the second bill we will be voting on today.

We will be voting today on two bills regarding sexual assault in our military, and I believe the strongest, most effective approach we can take to reduce sexual assault is to hold commanders accountable for establishing and maintaining a command climate that does not tolerate sexual assault. In order to do that, we must maintain the important authority to prosecute sexual assaults that our military commanders now have, and we must add greater accountability for those commanders.

The evidence shows that removing this authority from our commanders would weaken, not strengthen, our response to this urgent problem. That is why I believe the bill offered by Senator GILLIBRAND and others, though offered in the hope that it would strengthen our efforts against sexual assault, will in fact have the opposite effect.

In the last year we have learned that in scores of cases during the period study, commanders prosecuted sexual assault cases that civilian attorneys had declined to prosecute. We have learned our military allies, whose policies have been cited in support of removing commanders' authority, generally made their changes to protect the rights of the accused, not the victim. We have learned there is no evidence that their changes resulted in any increase in reporting of assaults. So when the allies made the change—not to protect victims but to increase the rights of the accused—it did not lead to any increase in the reporting of assaults.

On January 29, we received the conclusions of a report from the Response Systems to Adult Sexual Assault Crimes Panel—an independent panel of legal and military experts of diverse backgrounds that was established by Congress to advise us on how to respond to this issue. A subcommittee of the panel addressed the role of commanders in prosecuting sexual assaults, the very issue we will be voting on today.

Here is what that subcommittee concluded:

> There is no evidentiary basis at this time supporting a conclusion that removing senior commanders as convening authority will reduce the incidence of sexual assault or increase sexual assault reporting.

The subcommittee reached that conclusion, despite the fact that many members began the process sympathetic—if not outright supportive—of the notion that we should remove the commanders' authority.

Here is what one member of the subcommittee, former Congresswoman Elizabeth Holtzman, said:

> I've changed my mind, because I was just listening to what we heard. I started out . . . thinking, why not change it and now I am saying, why change it. . . . Just turning it over to prosecutors doesn't mean you are going to get the results you are looking for. . . .

Congresswoman Holtzman authored the Federal rape shield law when she was a Member of Congress.

Another member of the subcommittee, former Federal Judge Barbara Jones, said that if you remove this authority from commanders ''there is no empirical evidence that reporting is going to increase. . . . If I were persuaded that removing the convening authority would encourage victims to report then this would be a different story. But I am not persuaded of that.''

Listen to Mai Fernandez, the executive director of the National Center for Victims of Crime. She was a member of the panel, and this is what she said about the proposal to remove commanders' authority to prosecute:

> When you hear it at first blush, you go, ''Yeah, I want to go with that.'' But when you hear the facts, like you would in a case, it just doesn't hold up.

The women making those statements had no stars on their shoulders; they are not Pentagon insiders. They are members of the independent panel that we in Congress tasked with reporting to us on these issues.

Underlying the crisis of sexual assault in our military is a problem of culture, a culture that has been too permissive of sexual misconduct, too unaware that a person who is successful in his professional life may also be a sexual predator. It is a culture too prone to ostracize or even act against those who report sexual assaults.

The military has unique tools to address those problems. Foremost among those tools is the authority of the commander to establish a command climate by giving orders and enforcing discipline. At every time in our history when our military has faced such cultural challenges—such as the challenge of ending racial discrimination in the 1940s and 1950s or the challenge of ending don't ask, don't tell in our time—commanders with the authority to initiate courts-martial have been essential in achieving change.

But we are not going to achieve change if—at the same time we demand of our commanders that they change the military culture to take on the sexual assault problem—we remove their most powerful tool to achieve that change.

Senator GILLIBRAND's bill creates a new, separate disposition authority to deal with the sexual assault and other serious crimes. Our focus throughout this debate has been, rightly, on how to improve our approach to sexual assault. As a matter of fact, sexual assault would make up just a fraction of the cases this new disposition authority would deal with.

In a letter to me, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness Jessica Wright recently reported in fiscal year 2012, the Department of Defense estimates it handled more than 5,600 cases that would be referred to this new disposition authority if it were created, but two-thirds of those cases did not involve sexual assault. The Gillibrand bill would shift dozens of our top military lawyers to a new authority that would spend only one-third of its time dealing with the problem we are trying to solve, the problem of sexual assault.

The National Defense Authorization Act, which we enacted just a few months ago, provides our commanders with additional tools to meet this challenge and important new protections for victims. It provides victims of sexual assault with their own legal counsel specially trained to assist them. It makes retaliation a crime when that retaliation is against victims who report a sexual assault. It requires that the inspector general investigate all complaints of retaliation. It requires that any decision by a commander not to prosecute a sexual assault complaint will have an automatic review by a higher command authority—in nearly all cases by a general or flag officer and in certain cases by the service Secretary, the highest civilian authority in each service.

The second bill we are going to vote on today—offered by Senators MCCASKILL, AYOTTE, and others—provides additional protections to those we just added in the National Defense Authorization Act. The McCaskill-Ayotte bill ensures victims have a voice in deciding whether their cases will be prosecuted in the military or civilian justice system. Indeed, it requires that special victims' counsel established by the National Defense Authorization Act advise victims on the pros and cons of those two approaches. It requires that commanding officers be graded on their success or failure in creating a climate in which there is no tolerance for sexual misconduct and in which victims can come forward without fear.

These additional protections in the McCaskill-Ayotte bill help us answer

the key question of how can we best strengthen our protections against military sexual assault. I believe we do so by empowering victims and by holding our commanders accountable, but we threaten to weaken those protections if we undermine the authority of the very commanders who must be at the heart of the solution. Powerful evidence should lead us to the conclusion that we should not remove the authority of commanders to prosecute these cases.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I yield my time to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I rise in strong support of Senator GILLIBRAND's Military Justice Improvement Act. I wish to recognize her and all of the Senators who have worked so hard on this legislation and all of the groups who have been involved.

I was very proud to be an original cosponsor of the legislation, and after more than 1 year of meeting with military sexual assault survivors and bringing attention to this ongoing crisis, I am encouraged by the historic opportunity we have today.

As Senator LEVIN said, this is an important debate for us to be having. I certainly applaud Senators MCCASKILL and AYOTTE and everyone who has been involved in this effort because I think it sends a very important message to our leaders in the military and to those who would perpetrate crimes of sexual violence.

Today we not only have the opportunity to make meaningful, commonsense reforms to our military criminal justice system but we also have a chance to send a very powerful message to the tens of thousands of victims—many of whom have been suffering quietly for decades—that what happened to them is not acceptable; it is criminal, and it will no longer be tolerated.

Let's be clear: Sexual assault is a crime. It is not an accident. It is not a mistake. It is a violent criminal act often perpetrated by serial offenders. We can't allow sexual assault perpetrators to escape justice in any setting but particularly when these assaults occur within our Nation's military.

Unfortunately, it has been 23 years since the Tailhook scandal, and despite the repeated assurances that the chain of command is committed to addressing this issue, we are no closer to a solution. How long will we wait? How many tens of thousands of our sons and daughters will be victims? How many will be victims without reliable access to justice?

Today we have a rare opportunity to end one of the fundamental structural biases that persists in our military criminal justice system. This is not about undermining battlefield command or good order and discipline. No one wants to do that. This is about access to justice.

Survivors overwhelmingly tell us that the reason they don't come forward is because they don't trust that chain of command. They don't trust that the chain of command will handle their case objectively, a fact that has been repeatedly acknowledged by military leaders during Armed Services Committee hearings. Placing the decision on whether to go to trial in the hands of experienced military prosecutors is a commonsense reform that will go a long way toward promoting transparency and accountability within our system.

Our military's tradition of honor and respect is too important to continue to be plagued by the status quo. We strengthen our military when victims of sexual assault have the confidence to come forward and report crimes and we remove fear and stigma from the process. We strengthen our military when we are able to deliver fair and impartial justice on behalf of victims.

Victims' eyes are on us today. There is strong bipartisan support behind the Gillibrand bill. It is on full display. I certainly urge all of my colleagues to support this measure, and let's make meaningful reform to what has happened for too long to victims of sexual assault in the military.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I rise, together with my colleagues Senator GRAHAM and Senator AYOTTE, and ask that the Chair advise when we have used 20 minutes of time. We are going to engage in a colloquy about this important decision that is in front of the Senate.

It is, in fact, with great humility that I come to this policy debate. I don't think anyone in the Senate has spent more time in a courtroom putting perpetrators in prison who have committed sexual crimes. I don't think anybody has spent more time with victims of sexual assault. There is an incredible amount of pressure that you feel when you walk into a courtroom knowing that victim has placed trust in you to bring the evidence forward, and I am forever marked by that experience. It is with that experience that I have become convinced that the policy changes that are being advocated will not work for victims.

In fact, it is clear that when these changes have been enacted other places, reporting has not increased. It is clear that right now we have more cases going to court-martial over the objections of prosecutors than the objections of commanders. Today there is a court-martial ongoing where a prosecutor walked away from the serious charges and the commander said go forward. There have been almost 100 cases over the last 2 years where prosecutors said this case is too tough and the commanders have said, no, we have to get to the bottom of it. We can't let the commanders walk away. We cannot let the commanders walk away.

There is nothing in the Gillibrand proposal that provides additional protection from retaliation.

I ask Senator GRAHAM: If someone walks back into their unit after being victimized and the unit knows the commander has said this case is going forward, how would that contrast to walking back into his or her unit when the unit knows some lawyer in Fort Belvoir—hundreds of miles away—has said whether this case should go forward? I am trying to figure out how removing the commander provides any additional protection from retaliation to that victim.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a very good question. The commander in the military is just not somebody. The man or woman in charge of that unit is the person to whom we give the ultimate authority to decide life-and-death decisions for that unit. So if we deal the commander out, we have a rape in the barracks. The worst thing that could happen in a unit is for the commander to say, This is no longer my problem. It is the commander's problem. Every commander I have met wants it to continue to be their problem, because when we have one member of a unit assaulting the other, it affects everybody in that unit. And the person we as a nation choose to run the finest military in the world—the commander—has the absolute authority to maintain that unit for readiness. If we don't give that commander the tools and hold them accountable, that unit will fall apart right in front of our eyes, because some lawyer somewhere is no substitute for the commander who is there every day.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I would say to Senator AYOTTE, I am also struggling with some of the practical problems in this policy, and one of the things I can't figure out is why the amendment limits the ability to add any additional resources. It strictly prohibits the military from bringing additional resources to bear on this problem, which is counterintuitive to me. If the goal here is to do our very best job to protect victims, and the practical problem is we do not have enough of the level of JAG officers right now to set up these offices on a global basis, which means things are going to slow down because we don't have enough—I know the Senator from New Hampshire has been a prosecutor. Certainly there is nothing harder for a victim than justice delayed.

So in addition to it not increasing reporting, in addition to it not protecting from retaliation, in addition to removing commanders from their accountability, we also have some real practical implications.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank the Senator from Missouri for her leadership. She is correct. She has prosecuted more of these cases than I think anyone in this body, so I appreciate her leadership.

Under the system that is put forward under the Gillibrand proposal—let me thank her for her passion about this issue as well—we know it prohibits funding and personnel. How does that work when we are going to set up a whole new system? I worry about the deployability of this system. When someone is in Iraq or Afghanistan and they are a victim, where are these JAG lawyers going to be? Will they be in Washington making these decisions? But we won't be able to put any additional resources toward it. So is this system still deployable?

There are other problems with implementation. There are big concerns about the right to a speedy trial. If that happens, as we know, then the defendant can't be prosecuted.

Eliminating the ability to plea bargain—we heard Senator REID speak about that, because this proposal eliminates two-thirds of the crimes from the UCMJ out of the authority of the commander, well beyond this issue of sexual assault, which we are committed to addressing. It also creates serious due process concerns. So there are serious implementation questions about this.

I wish to raise a question that keeps coming up: We need to hold the commanders more accountable. I agree with the Senator from Missouri. We cannot allow them off the hook. If we take them out of this equation, then there will be less accountability. Our proposal actually has it as part of how a commander is going to be judged, how the commanders handle these cases. That is not the status quo, because we want the chain of command to be more accountable. But we keep hearing we want victims to come forward, and the Senator from Missouri knows that from her experience as a prosecutor.

I would say this: Does the evidence support that more victims will come forward if we actually pass the Gillibrand proposal? Because why are we here. We want more victims to come forward. Will more victims see justice if this proposal is passed? Because this is ultimately what we are trying to get at.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. We have hard data on that. In fact, I think that is one of the reasons, if we look at this quote:

> I went into this thinking Senator Gillibrand's legislation made sense, but when you hear the facts, it doesn't hold up.

That is an important quote, but even more important when we realize who said it. This is the woman who runs the National Center for Victims of Crime for our entire Nation. She heard 150 witnesses, representing many of the groups that have been referenced in this debate. She realized that when they looked at the data, our allies have done this, and not in one nation, after years of experience with changing the system, has the reporting increased.

The way we increase reporting is to give the victim a safe harbor, which we have done, to report outside the chain of command, and to have their own lawyer, and to make sure they have power and deference in the process, which we have done, along with the reforms, on which I am very proud to have worked with Senator GILLIBRAND.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, if we wanted to find the definition of leadership in 2014: MCCASKILL, AYOTTE, and the great Senator from Nebraska, three women taking on an issue head on. To those of my Democratic colleagues who are going to stick with making reforms without destroying a commander's role in the military: You deserve a lot of credit because people have been on your butt in the donor community to vote the other way.

To these ladies—and there have been plenty of people helping—they don't know how much it will be appreciated in the military. This is not a legal debate here. How many of my colleagues have done courts-martial? How many of my colleagues have court-martialed anybody in the military? I have done hundreds, as a prosecutor and as a defense attorney. This is not some casual event to me.

What Senator GILLIBRAND is doing is way off base. It will not get us to the promised land of having a more victim-friendly system to report sexual assaults. That is being accomplished because of the people I have just named: Senators FISCHER, AYOTTE, MCCASKILL, and Senator LEVIN. They have brought about reforms in terms of how a case is reported in the military, allowing a lawyer to be assigned to every victim. I cannot tell my colleagues how proud I am of what they have been able to accomplish. The U.S. military is going to have the most victim-friendly system of every jurisdiction in the land, including New York and South Carolina.

But this is about the commander. How many of my colleagues believe we have the finest military in the entire world? Every Member of this body would raise their hand. The question is why. Because we have the best lawyers in the world? No. Because we have the best commanders—men and women who are given the responsibility to defend this Nation and have power and responsibility that most of my colleagues could never envision. And if this is about sexual assault, why the hell are we taking barracks theft out of the commander's purview?

This is about liberal people wanting to gut the military justice system—social engineering run amok. I want to help victims, but I also want a fair trial. But the one thing I will not say to our commanders who exist in 2014: You are fired, because you are morally bankrupt. You don't have the ability to render justice in your unit because there is something wrong with you; your sense of justice is askew, so we are going to fire you and take away an authority you have had traditionally to make sure that your unit is ready to go to war, because we feel as though you are morally bankrupt. What other conclusion can we come to?

The next time we see somebody in the military who is a senior member of the 3 percent that Senator GILLIBRAND speaks about—it is only 3 percent who make these decisions. Who are these 3 percent? They are our wing commanders, our squadron commanders, our fleet commanders, our brigade commanders—the people we entrust and hold accountable for fighting and winning the war.

I say to my colleagues, if we care about what military lawyers think, every judge advocate general is begging us not to do this. The people we are going to give the power to don't want it because they understand that the commander is different than the lawyer. The first female judge advocate general of the Army has made an impassioned plea: Do not do this.

This is not a legal issue alone; this is about how to maintain the best military in the world.

I would conclude that if we want to create confusion in the ranks and if we want to tell every enlisted person who has to—should be—looking up to the commander, the Senate just fired your boss when it comes to these kinds of matters, but you should still respect him, that is a very confusing message.

I wish to end my speech with this: We have had some bad commanders. However, to those who command the military, I have confidence in you. You will take this system to a new level. You have to up your game, but I am not going to fire you. Thank you for commanding the finest military in the world. I will do nothing to say you are morally bankrupt, because I don't believe that.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I have great respect for the Senator's time and for working in the trenches as a military prosecutor in the JAG corps. I will tell my colleagues honestly, I am less concerned about the commanders than I am the victims. The Senator and I maybe don't see it exactly the same way in that regard. I believe there are commanders who deserve to be held accountable for their failure to act, for their want to sweep this crime under the rug throughout history, but I think we are handing the broom to the prosecutors at this point based on the data we have.

One of the things I wanted to go over and mention to Senator AYOTTE is the systems response panel. I think it is important to understand—the DACOWITS panel was mentioned. I want everybody to understand the difference between the DACOWITS panel and the systems response panel. The DACOWITS panel has been in place for years, and they took up this matter and heard no witnesses from the JAG corps. In fact, I think they heard two witnesses or three witnesses and two of them were me and KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND. They took no time to really go deeply into this very complex subject.

The systems response panel was created by Congress, and it was for the purpose of giving us their clear eye of

advice on the best way to deal with this problem in the military.

This is a majority of civilians and a majority of women who made up this panel. They heard 150 witnesses over months. They heard from all of the people who are advocating for the Gillibrand proposal. They heard from the JAGs. They heard from victim organizations. They came out overwhelmingly rejecting this proposal.

One of the most interesting members—and I will be honest; when I went to testify in front of this response panel, I was very worried that Elizabeth Holtzman maybe would not agree with me. She has a long history in Congress. She wrote the Federal rape shield statute. I assumed she would begin this process assuming that in the simple equation of victims versus commanders, I take victims. If only it were that simple. What the response panel figured out is that it is not that simple.

Judge Holtzman, the judge who wrote the decision overturning DOMA, said:

> Just turning it over to prosecutors doesn't mean you are going to get the results you are looking for.

And Elizabeth—this is what Elizabeth Holtzman said: ''Just turning it over to prosecutors doesn't mean you are going to get the results you are looking for.'' That is what Holtzman said.

Judge Jones: ''There is no evidence that removing the convening authority is going to improve any of the parts of the system.''

That is startling, this response, from a panel that looked at it over months, 150 witnesses, majority civilians, majority women. This is not a bumper sticker. It is not as simple as it sounds. I would never oppose anything that I thought was going to help victims or put more perpetrators in prison—ever. This will have the opposite impact that many of the advocates are indicating that it will.

Ms. AYOTTE. Let me just say, this panel took on the key question. That is why we are doing this. I am doing this because I believe victims will get justice and there will be more accountability. I want to hold commanders more accountable for not only how they handle these crimes but also for that zero tolerance policy within their unit. That is why we want them judged on this basis.

That panel has looked at this issue of reporting and found that there is no evidentiary basis at this time to support a conclusion that removing senior commanders as the convening authority will reduce the incidence of sexual assault—which we want them to establish that climate within their unit to do so—or increase reporting of sexual assaults.

I would also say, if we want justice for victims, what about those 93 victims where the commander said: Bring the case forward, even though the JAG lawyer said no? They would not have gotten justice. So the evidence is the opposite. What would we say to those victims? The evidence shows that actually commanders are bringing cases more frequently than their JAG's lawyers and over their objections.

The panel also found that none of the military justice systems of our allies was changed or set up to deal with the problem of sexual assault. So for those allies who have taken it out of the chain of command, this panel said that none of them can attribute any changes in the reporting of sexual assault to changing the role of the commander.

We were told from the beginning of this argument that our allies changed this so that more people would come forward. Well, they have not. In fact, what we learned is many of our allies changed it to protect defendants.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Isn't it true that, in fact, our reporting is up?

Ms. AYOTTE. Our reporting has actually—since 2013, in the Marine Corps it is up 80 percent and in the Army it is up 50 percent. That is even before the legislation that we have all worked on to have special victims counsels for every single victim that we have already passed in this body.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the Senator yield for just a second?

Ms. AYOTTE. Yes, I will.

Mr. GRAHAM. Why is it nobody seems to think taking the commander out of the loop is going to help the problem? Because you cannot solve the problem in the military unless the commander buys in. I cannot think of any change in the military that is major and substantial that can happen without the chain of command being held accountable and buying in.

I would like to say this. To those who believe our military is set up where a victim's case is never heard because you have some distant figure called the commander and they just put this stuff under the rug, O–6 commanders—the O–6 level are special court-martial convening authorities. General court-martial convening authorities are flag officers.

It is not rampant in the military, folks, where a JAG will go in to the commander and say: This is a case that needs to be prosecuted, sir, madam; and the commander says: I don't want to fool with this.

The opposite is true, where the JAG will say: Tough; and the commander says: Move forward.

Well, what have we done here. We have said to the command that if your judge advocate recommends prosecution in the four areas in question—sexual assault—and the commander refuses to prosecute, that decision is appealed to the Secretary of the service.

So if you are wondering about rogue commanders—and there are bad commanders—you are indicting the whole chain of command here, folks. That is why I am so emotional about this. You are indicting a class of Americans who deserve praise and a chance to get their act together where they failed.

But the bottom line is, if a commander refuses to—I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute—2 minutes.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. One minute.

Mr. GRAHAM. OK.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. If the commander refuses the JAG's recommendation, it goes to the Secretary of the service. If the JAG and the commander both say this is not a case we want to prosecute, when it is in the area of sexual assault, it goes to the commander's commander. So there are built-in checks and balances.

The key to fixing this problem is the commander. The key to maintaining a well-run military is the commander. The key to fighting and winning wars is the commander. The key to bringing justice to victims is the court-martial panel, the lawyers, the judge and the juries, and the commander. But the key to American military success over time has been the commander.

Madam President, 800 trials in Iraq and Afghanistan since 9/11. This is a nondeployable military justice system that Senator GILLIBRAND is trying to create. Please do not change the structure of the military because of this issue. Fix this issue. Preserve the structure of the military that has served us so well, and keep reforming.

To the Senators I have named, you have done those in the military—victims—a great service. For God's sake, Members of the Senate, do not change the structure of the military at a time we need it the most. Hold it more accountable, not less.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I yield my time to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I first would like to thank Senators GILLIBRAND, MCCASKILL, AYOTTE, and FISCHER for their hard work on this issue, and my friend from South Carolina, who has worked passionately hard on this issue also.

As someone who strongly believes in bipartisanship, I am glad to see the Senate moving forward today on debating and voting on this particular issue.

While we may not all agree on how to best solve this particular issue, we can all agree that it is too important not to debate and ultimately vote on ways to address it.

Our military is the greatest fighting force the world has ever known. The freedoms we enjoy as Americans are because men and women continue to volunteer to serve and to protect our Nation.

The vast majority of these men and women serve with honor and integrity. However, there are a few bad actors in our military who commit crimes against their fellow servicemembers.

The question the Senate faces is whether or not the military justice system is equipped to properly handle sexual assault within the ranks.

After careful consideration, weighing all the facts, I feel the military today is not equipped, and that is why I support Senator GILLIBRAND's approach.

Like everyone else in this Chamber, I am disappointed we ever got to this point. No soldier should have their service degraded due to dishonorable conduct in the ranks. But there have been ample opportunities for the military to address this issue within its own ranks, and too much time has passed without this problem being resolved.

It is Congress's responsibility now to step in to protect the best America has to offer. Congress needs to address what is currently lacking for victims. Victims need to feel confident in reporting crimes of sexual assault. Victims must be protected from retaliation, and victims must be confident that justice will be served.

Senator GILLIBRAND's legislation will accomplish these goals.

If the Senate passes this bill today, loopholes in the military structure will no longer be an option to protect sexual assailants. These changes are long overdue and will hold the military to the highest standards that they strive towards.

I encourage the rest of my colleagues to join me in supporting her efforts and keeping our commitment to protect the men and women who are honorably serving our Nation.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I yield Senator MCCASKILL's time to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to speak in full support of the McCaskill-Ayotte-Fischer proposal that is before us today. It will only strengthen the historic reforms that have already been passed by this body to combat sexual assault in the military.

I also rise to express concerns with the Gillibrand proposal to remove commanders from this process because I believe that is going to undermine credibility and accountability.

I am glad we are having this debate on the floor because every Member of this Senate agrees that this is a problem that needs to be addressed.

Over the past year the members of the Armed Services Committee have focused on this issue. It cuts across ideology, across gender, and across regions. It also cuts across party lines.

I was happy to work across the aisle with Senator SHAHEEN on improving the standards for personnel responsible for sexual assault prevention. I was pleased to join with Senator BLUMENTHAL to ensure that victims' rights are protected under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

I would argue that our efforts to fight sexual assault show Congress at its best. It is how we are supposed to work. So although we may disagree, we do share the same goals.

Senator MCCASKILL and Senator GILLIBRAND have both been real leaders in the Senate Armed Services Committee, which held that landmark hearing with our top commanders to explore the problem of sexual violence in the ranks last June.

The committee received input from all sides, and we, along with our House colleagues, passed a series of very meaningful reforms when we passed the National Defense Authorization Act. Those are reforms of which we can all be proud.

We stripped commanders of the ability to overturn jury convictions. We made retaliation against victims a crime. We required dishonorable discharge or dismissal for those convicted of sexual assault.

Now we are trying to strengthen that. We are trying to strengthen those great reforms with the McCaskill-Ayotte-Fischer legislation. I believe our proposal will do more to strengthen the rights of victims, and it will enhance the tools to prosecute the criminals.

Specifically, our bill extends the current protections to service academies. That is so important. That is in our bill. It boosts the evaluation standards for commanders—also important. It allows the victims increased input—extremely important. So rather than revamping the entire military justice system, which I believe carries massive risk, our proposal improves and updates the current system.

Unfortunately, the Gillibrand proposal, I believe, takes radical steps, and it undermines the commander's responsibility for his or her troops. Under that proposal, almost all crimes—from forgery to sexual violence—are removed from a commander's purview. It does not bring that focus to the challenge we are facing. Our proposal does.

The other proposal detaches the commander from his or her unit, and it removes all responsibility. I do not want to remove the responsibility from a commander. We trust these people to watch our best and our brightest, our children and our grandchildren, as they go into battle. We need to trust them in this as well.

Senator MCCASKILL brings a wealth of experience to bear on this topic from her days as a prosecutor, and I believe we should all be listening to her. She mentioned in November that the other proposal was ''seductively simple.'' I agree. I agree that its simplicity cloaks a host of very complex policy problems. She has invested a lot of time on this issue. She has explained the technical problems, and I echo her concerns.

But I would like to underline one critical point to my colleagues. Many of our problems with the other proposal might appear to be minor procedural details. However, experience tells us that it is exactly these sorts of problems that can grind a justice system to a halt, and they can damage a legal system.

That was the case in 2007, when Congress, armed with the best of intentions, modified the rape statute. Those hasty changes disrupted the judicial process and compelled Congress to rewrite the language. Do you know what happened? It delayed justice.

So I urge my colleagues and anyone interested in completely revamping that military justice system, you need to be certain that all the questions are resolved and you need to be certain that the implementation will be bulletproof because anything less means delayed justice or no justice at all for the victims.

I can go on and talk about the commission that brought forth their recommendations that the justice remain with the commanders. They did not say take it away from the commanders. And the makeup of that commission? Mostly civilian and mostly female.

I hope my colleagues will remember these things, look at the facts, look at how we truly can address the needs of the victims, truly find them justice. Support the McCaskill-Ayotte-Fischer proposal, and I would ask that you not support the Gillibrand proposal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I want to profusely thank her and Senator AYOTTE and Senator FISCHER for their leadership on this very difficult and emotional issue which obviously is very unpleasant and very controversial and understandably so. We are talking about the livelihood, the right to function as members of the military, of women in the military.

It is a vital issue because there should be no organization that is at the level of the United States military for providing an equal opportunity and equal protection under the law than the United States military. When these young men and women join the military, they do something very unique; that is, they are willing to put their lives on the line for the defense of this country.

Therefore, because of this unique aspect of their lives, that they are willing to serve for the benefit of the rest of us, there is also the responsibility of those who command them. That is unique as well. Those who command in the military may have to make the toughest decision of all and to send these young people into harm's way. No other—no other—person in American society, outside of the President of the United States, has that responsibility.

So what we are really talking about today here is, will we hold those commanders responsible for anything that

happens within their command or will we take that responsibility and shift it over to a lawyer? That is what this is really all about. Right now we have units operating in Afghanistan.

Frankly, according to the Gillibrand proposal, if there was a charge, we may have to try to find some way to fly a lawyer in. I do not think that is either likely or agreeable. But the major point here is that we hold commanders responsible for what happens under their command. If they do not carry out those duties, then we relieve them of that command. If they are responsible for egregious conduct, we prosecute them.

I have had the great honor of command. I have had the great honor of commanding, at that time, the largest squadron in the U.S. Navy, some 1,000 people. There were a large number of women in that organization, even then, because it was a shore-based squadron. Now we have women throughout—I am happy to say—throughout the military, including combat roles.

I can tell you that in those days we had severe racial problems in the United States military. We had race riots on aircraft carriers. We held commanders responsible. We punished those who practiced discrimination. We had people in our chain of command that alerted and were responsible for the indoctrination and the good conduct of people who in any way showed a taint of discrimination. I am happy to say that I believe that the greatest equal opportunity organization in America today is the United States military.

We can do that with this severe and difficult and emotional issue of sexual assaults in the military. The exact wrong way to do that is to make the commanding officer less responsible because if you take the responsibility from that commanding officer, then you are eroding his ability to lead and, I would argue, their ability to fight.

We have the finest commanders in our military. We have the finest men and women who are serving in the military. We are the best military in the world. There is a reason for it. As we bring people up the ladder of promotion to positions of command, they are tested time after time. I trust these commanders. I trust them.

With the provisions in the McCaskill bill as we have today, we will preserve that command authority, but we will also have significant increases in oversight and accountability. But to take away that responsibility from the men and women who command these people, these outstanding men and women, and give to it a lawyer is not the way to go.

I hope my colleagues understand it. I also would ask one other thing before this vote. If any of my colleagues knows a member of the military whom they respect, call them. Call them and ask them whether they would think this proposal of the Senator from New York is in any way helpful to the good functioning of the military and the elimination of sexual assaults. We share the same goal. There are vastly different ways to achieve that goal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii.

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND assumed the Chair.)

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Military Justice Improvement Act. I commend Senator GILLIBRAND for her outstanding work on this effort and all the survivors of sexual assault in the military who have courageously worked with us on this bill.

I also appreciate the bipartisan effort to stop military sexual assaults from happening. While we all do not agree on how to get there, I know that all of us want to stop this terrible scourge in our military.

Every few years, when interest in this topic picks up, it stays relevant for a while, the military leadership promises to stamp out sexual assault in the military, and says that zero tolerance is the policy in place. Unfortunately, despite all of the good faith actions taken by the department as well as Congress, we are still at 26,000 incidents of rape, sexual assault, and unwanted sexual contact in the military.

This bill has nothing to do with telling commanders they are fired or that they are morally bankrupt. They should continue to be held accountable for creating a command climate where sexual assaults do not occur or certainly not occur by the tens of thousands.

This bill is focused on the victims, the survivors of these crimes. When we listen to them, they are in support of the Gillibrand bill. We all agree that commanders are responsible for maintaining good order and discipline in their units. This includes creating an atmosphere of dignity and respect for everyone under their command.

Again, commanders must create an environment where sexual crimes do not occur. Our proposed changes to the military justice system do not absolve a commander of these responsibilities. It is still their job to prevent these crimes. It is still their job to maintain good order and discipline.

I have heard opponents of this legislation say that good order and discipline would be lost if the commander no longer has the court martial disposition authority. I disagree. This is similar to saying, a corporal, a sergeant or a junior officer in a unit would not act in a professional and orderly manner with respect to their O–6 commander, because the commander could no longer decide whether to proceed to trial for a rape or other felony-level offense. That does not make sense. The commander is still responsible for dolling out punishment for insubordination or other negative behavior. The commander is still responsible for maintaining the kind of good order and discipline and a command climate where these crimes not occur in the first place. Historically, when changes to the status quo are proposed—these include the integration of military units, opening military specialties to women, and allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly—a familiar refrain from senior military leadership to block such changes was to claim that the proposed changes would destroy good order and discipline.

By all accounts, I would say that these successful changes to military policies do not destroy good order and discipline. When these crimes do occur, survivors deserve the ability to seek justice. They deserve a chain of command that will take their claims seriously and take appropriate action. We have data that show that many victims do not come forward because they do not trust that the chain of command within the current system will act impartially.

They feel that they might suffer retaliatory actions and ultimately do not report the crime. This allows the perpetrator to go free and commit additional crimes. The Gillibrand bill will increase trust and confidence in the system and help the survivors seek justice. It is time to make fundamental changes to how sexual assault cases are handled in the military.

Senator GILLIBRAND's bill would be a big step in the right direction. Her amendment would take the decision to go forward with a trial out of the chain of command and place it in the hands of an experienced military lawyer. This change would improve the traditional process by increasing transparency, by increasing trust. It would also eliminate potential bias and conflicts of interest because unlike the commanding officer, the military lawyer would be unconnected to either the survivor or the accused.

I commend our colleagues once again, Senator GILLIBRAND and Senator MCCASKILL, for their tireless efforts to help survivors of sexual assault in the military. I would also commend Senator LEVIN, my Armed Services Committee colleagues, and many other Senators for working so hard on this difficult, painful issue.

We have instituted many positive changes in this area, but I urge my colleagues to take the next step and support the Gillibrand Military Justice Improvement Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I join my colleagues today in a discussion about an issue that I think we all would agree is an issue that really tears at the heart, causes great anguish, as we think that those who have volunteered to serve our great Nation, who have agreed to put themselves on the front lines, would be in a situation where they would be made a victim—made a victim of military sexual assault and be put into a situation where

they do not know where to turn, they do not know if it is safe to speak up, and they do not know how to respond.

Our military men and women, we are proud to say, are the most professional, the most highly trained and skilled and qualified. We will match them against any. Yet, when we face these very troubling and difficult issues of military sexual assault, it is an underside of the military culture that we have not been able to sufficiently address and eradicate.

The most recent report of the Defense Department Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office, which covers 2012, speaks to the statistics. These statistics have been reported so frequently on the floor of the Senate. We know them. We share them. We really agonize over them. An estimated 26,000 cases of unwanted sexual contact and sexual assault occurred in fiscal year 2012, a 37 percent increase from fiscal year 2011.

Some 25 percent of women and 27 percent of men who received unwanted sexual contact indicated that the offender was someone within their military chain of command. Then, the statistics that really just go to the heart of what we are talking about here today: Across the services, 74 percent of females and 60 percent of males perceived one or more barriers to reporting the sexual assault; 50 percent of male victims stated that they did not report the crime because they believed nothing would be done.

They have been victimized once, and now they do not believe that anything will happen if they speak. They do not believe that anything will be done with their report. Some 62 percent of victims who reported a sexual assault indicated that they perceived some form of professional, social or administrative retaliation, retaliation from the system that they have been trained to trust, to be there for one another, and yet now fear retaliation.

This report was such an eye-opener for many of us. It certainly has galvanized the issue to address where we are today, to truly put on the front burner of this body, the issue of what has happened with military sexual assaults and what we can do to address it. It has remained on the front burner, thanks to the persistent efforts of the Senator from New York to keep it there. She has relentlessly pursued the vote that we will take today.

Regardless of the outcome, I think that she should take pride, I think we should all take pride in what we have collectively accomplished.

I also note the very fine work of my colleague from Missouri, Senator MCCASKILL, and her efforts, along with Senator AYOTTE, Senator FISCHER, and the Presiding Officer, to bring this issue to a level where we have seen changes made already, but the question that remains is, is there more that can be done.

This Congress has significantly improved the system through amendments to the military justice system that were included in the National Defense Authorization Act. The services have also done their part to improve ways to improve their sexual assault and prevention programs, such as making sure that a Naval Academy midshipman need not be driven across the State of Maryland searching for a hospital that has a sexual assault nurse examiner on duty.

In my State of Alaska, the headlines over the past year, as they related to military sexual assault within the ranks of our National Guard units, stunned us all. I recently received a further briefing from our adjutant general and folks within the Alaska National Guard in terms of what they too are doing to address, within their own system, the changes that are absolutely necessary.

But the question is whether these changes will move the needle on these statistics we have just recited. In my view, it remains to be seen. Will they give the victims more confidence in the system? Will they deter offenders by increasing the certainty that there is going to be accountability if these acts are taken?

Today the Senate considers the Military Justice Improvement Act, a measure that provides victims with the certainty they need to have confidence in the system. If they don't believe the system is going to be there for them, if they don't believe it is going to work for them, they are not going to report it. They will not expose themselves again.

As I said on the Senate floor before, this is strong medicine. It is very strong medicine to any offender who believes that the ''good old boys'' system will permit him to escape the consequence of his actions. In my judgment, enactment of the Military Justice Improvement Act will lead to greater consistency in charging decisions. This, again, is a very important aspect. It will ensure that those decisions are based on the facts, the law, and not any external factor. That too offers an increment of protection to victims as well as to the offenders.

The current system of military judgment relies upon the individual decisions of commanders as to whether an offense is to be punished and which charges are to be brought. We recognize we have a complex military and there are many commanders. While our code of military justice may be uniform, recent history suggests that its implementation is, unfortunately, anything but uniform.

Some have called the Gillibrand proposal a radical solution and one that will make it impossible to maintain good order and discipline in the military. I don't buy that. These were some of the statements that were made several years back when we were considering don't ask, don't tell about 3 years ago.

The military is proving it is resilient enough to implement culture change—and that is what this will take, is culture change. I believe they are resilient enough to implement a change of this magnitude, and it will be resilient enough to implement the Military Justice Improvement Act.

It is not a radical and novel solution to a difficult problem. In fact, many of our allied modern militaries have moved the decision on whether to prosecute sexual assault outside of the chain of command. They have done it. I believe it is high time we do as well.

Again, I commend those who have led so nobly on this effort to make sure that when those fine men and women stand to serve our country, there is ensured a level of justice, a level of uniformity of justice, and that we no longer see the devastating statistics we have, unfortunately, been faced with for far too long.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I ask that I be notified when 7 minutes remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be notified. The Senator has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I ask to be notified when there is 2 minutes remaining.

All of the arguments we have heard today are technical arguments, arguments about why we can't possibly do this. But the victims and the survivors of sexual assault have been walking this Congress for more than 1 year, asking that we do something to protect them, to give them a hope for justice.

It is not whether anyone in this Chamber trusts the chain of command. The people who do not trust the chain of command are the victims. Even General Amos has admitted that. He said the reason why a female marine does not come forward is because she does not trust the chain of command, that breach of trust. That fundamental breach of trust has been broken for victims of sexual assault.

Listen to the victims. Retired Marine LCpl Jeremiah Arbogast was drugged. He was raped. He got his perpetrator to tell what happened on tape and went through trial. His perpetrator got no jail time. He saw no justice.

He said: ''I joined the Marines in order to serve my country as an honorable man, instead I was thrown away like a piece of garbage.''

He attempted suicide, severed his spine, and now advocates for this measure from a wheelchair.

Those are the stories we are hearing from victims over and over.

Sarah Plummer, U.S. Marine Corps, said having someone within your direct

chain of command handling this case doesn't make sense and is like ''getting raped by your brother and having your father decide the case.''

That is the view and the perception of the survivors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I defer my remaining 2 minutes until after the Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank the Senator from Missouri, and I thank the Senator from New York for her passionate and important debate. Let's not forget the work we have already done in the Defense authorization, ensuring that every victim will have his or her own attorney to represent their interests, taking commanders out of overturning verdicts, and making retaliation a crime. So we have done very important work.

But why are we here today? The issue is will more cases be prosecuted if we take it out of the chain of command?

Actually, no. There would be 93 cases under the current situation that wouldn't have been brought where commanders actually made a different decision than their military lawyer. What about those victims and those victims having their day in court? I want more victims to have their day in court.

As we think about it, why are we doing this? Some of our allies did it. We looked at that issue. Our allies haven't seen any greater reporting, so there is no evidence that we are going to have reporting. Many of them did it to protect defendants. We are here to protect victims today. We certainly want a system with due process, but this is about having more victims coming forward.

I also want to make sure people understand that under the system now they do not have to report to their commander. We had people come to the floor and say they shouldn't have to go to their boss. They can go to a sexual assault response coordinator, clergy, minister, civilian medical personnel. Already they can come forward if they don't feel comfortable coming forward to the commander.

No evidence has been presented that we are going to help victims more or that more cases will be prosecuted or more will come forward if we take it out of the chain of command. That is why I want to hold commanders more accountable, not less. That is what Senator MCCASKILL, Senator FISCHER, and I do in our proposal. We want to make sure they are not let off the hook. We want to make sure the victims can get not only justice but make sure they get swift justice. This proposal risks delaying that justice in the system.

I ask my colleagues to vote against Senator GILLIBRAND's proposal. I ask my colleagues to say what will hold commanders more accountable. That is our proposal. I ask them to say where is the evidence that more evidence will be pursued or more cases will come forward. There is no evidence. Our proposal is based on the evidence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I will take a couple of moments at the close of this very difficult debate to express my deep respect to the Senator from New York, Mrs. GILLIBRAND.

While many aspects of this debate have been hard, perhaps the hardest part of this debate has been that this disagreement on policy has overshadowed the amazing work so many have done this year to enact a different day in the U.S. military when it comes to sexual assault and victims of sexual assault.

When the Sun sets today, this body will have passed 35 major reforms in less than 1 year, making the military the most friendly victims organization in the world, giving victims more power, more leverage, holding commanders accountable, and holding perpetrators accountable. It will eliminate the ridiculous notion that how well one flies a plane should have anything to do with whether they committed a crime, professionalizing the process so that victims no longer endure a ridiculous amount of inappropriate questioning at what should be something like a preliminary hearing to establish probable cause, as opposed to some kind of rendering of questioning, torture to a victim who has come out of the shadows and is willing to go forward.

I know I can speak with confidence for Senator GILLIBRAND that she and I have walked lockstep on those 35 reforms. We have disagreed on one. I know in the future she and I will work very hard together to make sure our military does the right thing by victims and puts perpetrators where they belong—in prison—and out of the ranks of the military where they stain the good name of the bravest men and women in the world.

I thank all of my colleagues for their patience during this debate. I know this has been tough for everyone. But I stand with years of experience, holding the hands and crying with victims, with many victims, who have spoken to me and other organizations, knowing that what we have done is right for victims and right to hold perpetrators accountable.

I respectfully request that people support our amendment today and reject the one area of policy on which the great Senator from New York and I disagree.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I want the focus where it needs to be. This is not an opportunity to congratulate ourselves on the great reforms we have done. All of the reforms we have passed today are meaningful and useful, but this problem isn't even close to being solved. Under the best-case scenario, 2 out of 10 case are being reported today.

Let's refocus on what is actually happening in our military today. Let's focus on what U.S. Air Force veteran Amn Jessica Hinves said:

> Two days before the court hearing, his commander called me on a conference at the JAG office, and he said he didn't believe that he acted like a gentleman, but there wasn't a reason to prosecute.

She was speechless. She had been promised a court hearing, and she was told 2 days before the commander had stopped it.

Trina McDonald, U.S. Navy veteran, said:

> At one point my attackers threw me in the Bering Sea and left me for dead in the hopes that they silenced me forever. They made it very clear that they would kill me if I ever spoke up or reported what they had done.

She did not report these attacks.

Continuing:

> The people that were involved in my assaults were police personnel, security personnel, higher-ranking officers, the people that I would have to go and report.

Last but not least is Lt. Ariana Klay, U.S. Marine Corps. Her home was broken into by two colleagues and she was raped brutally. She ultimately reported the crime and attempted suicide. Her perpetrator was convicted—and convicted of what? Not breaking and entering, not rape—calling her a slut.

The thing that makes me most angry is not even the rape itself; it's the commanders that were complicit in covering up everything that happened.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Under the previous order and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

> We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1752, a bill to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.
>
> Harry Reid, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Barbara Boxer, John D. Rockefeller IV, Tammy Baldwin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Claire McCaskill, Jon Tester, Mark Begich, Barbara Mikulski, Maria Cantwell, Charles E. Schumer, Dianne Feinstein.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1752, a bill to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform

Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Grassley	Murphy
Begich	Hagan	Murray
Bennet	Harkin	Paul
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boxer	Heller	Rockefeller
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McConnell	Vitter
Durbin	Menendez	Walsh
Enzi	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Moran	
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NAYS—45

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Ayotte	Graham	Portman
Barrasso	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Hoeven	Risch
Boozman	Inhofe	Roberts
Burr	Isakson	Rubio
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Sessions
Coats	King	Shelby
Coburn	Kirk	Tester
Cochran	Lee	Thune
Corker	Levin	Toomey
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Whitehouse
Fischer	McCaskill	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the ayes are 55, the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The bill is returned to the calendar.

VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2014

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report S. 1917.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1917) to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have a cloture motion which has been filed at the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1917, a bill to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Services.

Harry Reid, Claire McCaskill, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Tammy Baldwin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Barbara Mikulski, Barbara Boxer, Jon Tester, Mark Begich, Maria Cantwell, Charles E. Schumer, Dianne Feinstein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we expect this next vote will be the last rollcall vote until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1917, a bill to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Services.

Harry Reid, Claire McCaskill, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Tammy Baldwin, John D. Rockefeller IV, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Barbara Mikulski, Barbara Boxer, Jon Tester, Mark Begich, Maria Cantwell, Charles E. Schumer, Dianne Feinstein.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1917, a bill to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Forces, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	
Franken	Murkowski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). On this vote the yeas are 100, the nays are 0. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, the Senate vote on passage of S. 1917 at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 10, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar Nos. 504, 513, 640, and 547, as provided under a previous order entered by this body.

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

NOMINATION OF KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

NOMINATION OF RHONDA K. SCHMIDTLEIN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF R. GIL KERLIKOWSKE TO BE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL A. HAMMER TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nominations of Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere; Rhonda K. Schmidtlein, of Missouri, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission; R. Gil Kerlikowske, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security; Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile.

VOTE ON SULLIVAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the Sullivan nomination.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back any time that is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SCHMIDTLEIN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the Schmidtlein nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back all time that is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Rhonda K. Schmidtlein, of Missouri, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON KERLIKOWSKE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the Kerlikowske nomination.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back all time that is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of R. Gil Kerlikowske, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HAMMER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form prior to a vote on the Hammer nomination.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield back any time that is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2014—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Hawaii.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1821

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, nearly 4 months ago the most powerful storm on record struck the Philippines, killing 6,000 people and injuring 27,000 people. According to USAID, more than 4 million people were displaced, and one out of six people in the country was affected. Photographs show the immense destruction caused by Typhoon Haiyan. In some areas nearly all of the buildings were destroyed.

Today, because of the magnitude of the devastation, the Philippines has not yet recovered. It will take them a long time. Relief efforts continue. These efforts have been aided by direct assistance from the U.S. Government to the Philippines, one of our closest allies in Asia. Relief efforts have also been funded by charitable donations made by individuals in the United States. Many of these donations come from Filipino Americans in this country, part of the extensive diaspora here that is the foundation of the deep connections between the Philippines and the United States.

I am about to ask unanimous consent to pass legislation that will encourage people to continue donating to typhoon relief efforts in the Philippines. It has been 4 months since Typhoon Haiyan but help is still desperately needed. Four months is a virtual eternity of news cycles, and other crises in other parts of the world demand our attention. But we should not forget the immense human suffering caused by Typhoon Haiyan.

This legislation, S. 1821, would allow people who make donations after the date of enactment to deduct those donations from last year's taxes. In other words, they can reduce their 2013 tax bill by contributing now. It is a modest step, but it is one we should take.

This is bipartisan legislation, cosponsored by Senator HELLER. This legislation is also cosponsored by Senator MENENDEZ and the majority leader, Senator REID. I thank them for their support.

Identical bipartisan legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives Swalwell and Thompson. That bill has 35 cosponsors, including 9 Republicans: Representatives CALVERT, FRANKS, GRIMM, HECK, ISSA, MILLER, ROYCE, VALADAO, and YOUNG. I thank them for their support.

After the earthquake in Haiti in 2010, Congress passed nearly identical legislation to encourage donations to that country. That legislation passed by unanimous consent in the Senate. The Senate companion bill, S. 2936, had 40 cosponsors, 15 of whom were Republicans. They included Senators ALEXANDER, CORNYN, ENZI, GRASSLEY, HATCH, JOHANNS, ROBERTS, and THUNE. I hope the Senate will provide the same support to the Philippines that it provided to Haiti.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1821; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the Hirono-Heller amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; further, that upon passage, the bill be held at the desk, and that if the Senate receives from the House a bill, the text of which is identical to S. 1821, as passed by the Senate, the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, the bill be read three times and passed, without any intervening action or debate; finally, that passage of the Senate bill be vitiated and the bill be indefinitely postponed, and all motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, first, I commend the Senator from Hawaii for her work and her concern over the Philippines. That country has suffered dramatically from this typhoon. Having lived on the gulf coast and walked in the places where 18 feet of water from Hurricane Katrina flooded us, washed away whole structures, I can imagine what it was like to have lost 6,000 lives. And the country is hurting. It is a great country with great people. They are excellent allies of the United States. I am very sympathetic to their needs and appreciative of the Senator's efforts in seeking this way to further contributions for their relief.

The legislation has an emergency declaration in it. That requires going through the Budget Committee and requires other findings that I am not sure are available here. I think the legislation could be perhaps drafted slightly differently, I say to the Senator, that would avoid the emergency designation part, and maybe we could reach an accord to get this done quickly, as I know the Senator wants to move on it as soon as possible.

So, Madam President, I at this time say I will object. But our staffs will immediately begin to discuss if we can put this in a little slightly different way that would accomplish the Senator's goals without offending some of the budget niceties. Being the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, I feel very, very strongly that when we make agreements about how we are going to spend money and how it should be processed, the more we erode those agreements and the more we spend above the amount of money we agreed to spend or get around the spending limits we ourselves passed into law, the more we place at risk the financial future of the country.

This is not the most costly measure. It is a step that would help the people in the Philippines, I know. But with that explanation, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I thank Senator SESSIONS very much for his agreement regarding the concerns we have for our friends in the Philippines, and I look forward to working

with the Senator to come up with a measure that will accomplish what my bill seeks to accomplish.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank the Senator, and I respect so much her effort in this cause and will do what we can to be cooperative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I have come to visit with you today and the Members of this body with some concerns I have about people who are being impacted by the health care law. By ''impacted'' I mean hurt. Their lives are being hurt as a result of the impact of the health care law. We are seeing it around the country. As people are trying to comply with the law, we are finding that many people are losing their jobs or part of their jobs if they are working part time—to be held under 30 hours a week because under that criteria, people working less than 30 hours a week do not have to be provided with health insurance.

We have seen stories around the country of municipalities, of public employees who are having their hours cut and as a result, obviously, their take-home pay is cut, their wages are cut as a result of the impact of the health care law, as communities try to comply with all the aspects of the law. We have seen it with police forces, with teachers, with coaches, busdrivers, custodians, cafeteria workers, office clerks, sanitation workers, emergency personnel, university faculty—people all around the country who are being hurt as a result of the law.

Members of the Senate come from my side of the aisle to read letters of folks who have been harmed by the health care law. The majority leader comes to the floor and says these stories are lies. These are stories from people at home to whom I talk on weekends. I will be this weekend in Buffalo, WY, at the health fair, having a chance to visit with folks who are from Wyoming who go to a health fair for low-cost blood screening; also go to visit booths that are there from the heart association, the cancer society, the diabetes association, all taking efforts to try to improve the quality of their life, the quality of their care, and the quality of their overall health.

It is interesting to hear from these people, because I do not think the President hears from them. When I hear the majority leader say the people who come to the floor to talk about them—that these stories are lies, it is calling the people of Wyoming who have honest concerns about the way their lives are being impacted by the health care law as being untruthful.

I have come to the floor with more letters today and to talk about some things. It does make me wonder, when the majority leader comes and says these things are not truthful if he is not hearing the stories from the police officers and the teachers, the coaches and the bus drivers, the custodians, the cafeteria workers, the office clerks, the sanitation workers, the emergency personnel, the university faculty in States all around the country who have their lives impacted by the health care law.

What I do think is that other Senators, Senators who perhaps go home more often than the majority leader, Senators who maybe listen to their constituents more and read the letters, are seeing the damage that is being done by the health care law because the President is responding to their claims, their concerns, and to the point that the President himself has unilaterally delayed many components of the health care law.

These are the delays from 2013. Here is the calendar for the year. All of the X's are different days when there have been different delays. There have been dozens of delays as a result of the health care law impact on families across the country. I wish to read a couple of emails about the impact on lives of people in Wyoming.

This is from a gentleman from Casper, my hometown. I was there Monday. I will be there again tomorrow.

He writes:

> My wife and I just received our new monthly premium information for our health insurance. As of March 1, 2014 it will go from $505 a month to $1,045 a month, an increase of over double. This is for a Bronze level plan with a high deductible and high out of pocket.

You know, I wish the President would actually kind of understand what the impact of this law has been on American families. I wish people who supported it, campaigned for it, would realize the impact on people's lives. He has gotten his premiums going from $505 to over $1,000, double increase, Bronze level plan, what the President wants people to have. It is the minimum level. It has a high deductible and a high out-of-pocket.

He said:

> It is also the cheapest plan I have found so far for us that is available in Wyoming and complies with the ACA.

Because the law says this man needs a lot of insurance. Maybe he does not need it. The President does not know this man, does not know his life, does not know his history, does not know what he actually needs in terms of insurance. But the President claims and the Democrats who voted for this health care law believe they know better than this man what he needs.

But you know what we do find out, when he wants to comply with the law, his insurance premiums more than double, for the cheapest plan which has the highest deductible and the highest out-of-pocket.

He says:

> This increase will mean that money we would probably have spent elsewhere will now need to be budgeted for the insurance increase.

We go across the State to Moran, WY. Another resident of Wyoming writes:

> I am a resident of Wyoming and about half of my income comes from Social Security. My benefits total $958 a month. In addition to that, I work part time at a ranch. It is a seasonal job from May to October. I make about the same amount there as I do from Social Security. I have recently managed to submit an application for health care through the healthcare.gov Web site. The cost to me with my current income would be a low end of $837 a month with a $4,000 deductible. With the high end, it would be over $1,300 a month with a $1,000 deductible.
>
> Neither of those amounts are possible with my income range. I would not be able to afford to live. Now I refigured this with only my Social Security income and found that it would be very affordable, lower deductible, lower premiums, but I wouldn't have the income. I could possibly afford that but would have to live in a very substandard poverty lifestyle by quitting working.

So he has these options: He can continue what he does, but he cannot afford the insurance, or he can get affordable insurance by quitting working but then cannot afford to live. This is what the President of the United States and the Democrats have given the people of America.

He said:

> I would like to work and contribute as long as I'm able but things are looking pretty bleak for me.

This is a man who wants to work. This is a man who wants to work, but the health care law is making it a lot harder for him to do so. He said:

> I am giving you this information in the hope that it will be of some value in combating the unfairness of the Affordable Care Act.

The unfairness of the Affordable Care Act. I have to believe that Senators on both sides of the aisle who actually go home and listen to their constituents hear about this, hear these stories, hear these stories all around the country, of the unfairness of the Affordable Care Act.

He then goes on and says:

> Thank you so much for your service to your country and the great State of Wyoming.

So here we have dozens of delays—and this is last year. Now it has happened again. Just yesterday the President came up with another delay. It is interesting the way it has made the front page of the New York Times, a paper that has supported the President, supported the law, front page, above the fold, story by Robert Pear.

> The Obama administration, grappling with continued political fallout over its health care law, said Wednesday that it would allow consumers to renew health insurance policies that did not comply with the new law for two more years—

This is the New York Times speaking, front page, above the fold. This is not me. But they are repeating the kind of things I have been saying.

> pushing the issue well beyond this fall's midterm elections.

So what is the idea here? Push it out beyond the elections, make people not see the reality and the danger and the damage that is coming their way until after they vote.

The article goes on, front page above the fold, today's New York Times:

The reprieve was the latest in a series of waivers, deadline extensions and unilateral actions by the administration—

Here you have them. This is just in 2013. Now we have more in 2014.

—unilateral actions by the administration that have drawn criticism from the law's opponents and supporters, many saying President Obama was testing the limits of his powers.

I believe that. I believe the President has gone way beyond the limits of his powers.

The action reflects the difficulties Mr. Obama—

The President of the United States, who told the American people, if they like what they have they can keep it; if they like their doctor, they can keep their doctor; who said insurance premiums would go down—all of which are untrue, one called the ''lie of the year.''

The action reflects the difficulties Mr. Obama has faced in trying to build support for the Affordable Care Act and the uproar over his promise—which he later acknowledged has been overstated—that people who liked their insurance plans could keep them, no matter what.

Over 5 million Americans got letters of cancellation, 3,500 in the State of Wyoming. A woman with a wonderful policy that worked for her, worked for her family, lost her insurance because it did not cover maternity care. She writes to me as a doctor and says:

Dr. BARRASSO, please explain to the President of the United States that I have had a hysterectomy. I don't need maternity coverage.

You would think the President would understand that. You would think the Democrats who shoved this health care law down the throats of the American people would understand that as well.

This is interesting. Still on the front page of this morning's New York Times:

Under pressure from Democratic candidates who are struggling to defend the President's signature domestic policy, Mr. Obama in November announced a one-year reprieve for insurance plans that did not meet the minimum coverage requirements of the 2010 health care law.

Wednesday's action goes much further, essentially stalling for two more years one of the central tenets of the much-debated law, which was supposed to eliminate what White House officials called substandard insurance and junk policies.

If this is what the President believes, why is he now coming out and having a delay announced—not coming to Congress, not saying: Hey, let's try to do something a little differently. Let me propose this. Let's have a bipartisan agreement to come up with some solutions to actually help people get what they wanted in the beginning with health care reform, the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

The letters I am reading show people not being able to do that. They are paying much higher rates for things they do not need, will never use. We are hearing from people all across the country who are losing their doctor, can't keep their doctor, higher out-of-pocket costs.

We hear now the President wants to do some things unilaterally because a group of Democratic Senators who are up for reelection are worried about their political future, not about the future of the American people and the health care of the American people. That is why they are doing this.

You say: No, that seems like an exaggeration.

Well, let's go on. This next paragraph in the New York Times this morning:

The extension could help Democrats in tight midterm election races because it may avoid the cancellation of policies that would otherwise have occurred at the height of the political campaign season this fall.

So the cancellations are still going to happen, people are still going to continue to be hurt. We have over 5 million people who have gotten letters of cancellation. It is not saying: Oh, the cancellations are never going to happen. It is saying: It will push them out until after the election, so people will not be so irritated, angry, and aggravated at the Democrats who voted for it, in an effort to try to save their elections, try to save their Senate seats, but not to help the American people.

This goes on:

In announcing the new transition policy, the Department of Health and Human Services said it had been devised ''in close consultation with members of Congress,'' and it gave credit to a number of Democrats in competitive races, including Senators Mary L. Landrieu of Louisiana, Jeanne Shaheen of New Hampshire and Mark Udall of Colorado.

So the reason that the White House goes time after time, all these delays, all this and that, is not to help the American people; it is not to help patients; it is not to help the providers of health care; it is not to help the taxpayers; it is to help a couple of Democratic Senators whom they name—whom the Secretary of Health and Human Services names as recipients of the help because the President is worried about Democrats losing elections this fall.

The Hill newspaper yesterday. ''New ObamaCare delay to help midterm Dems.'' Not to help Americans, not to help the people from my State who write letters about the concerns of their lives, not to help all of those people about whom my colleagues and I continue to come to the floor with letters to tell their stories, to tell about their lives, to tell about the pain they are suffering because of the health care law.

It is not about the failed Web site. We all know the Web site. The President said: It will be as easy to use as Amazon, cheaper than your cell phone bill. You will be able to keep your doctor—several days before the Web site opened and crashed. No, it is more than about the Web site. It is about people's lives. It is about if they are able to keep their doctor. It is about cuts to Medicare Advantage and hurting our seniors who are having a harder time getting doctors. It is about people paying higher premiums. It is about people having higher out-of-pocket costs, higher copays, higher deductibles. It is all of those things.

It is about hospitals in States that are not part of any of these exchanges, people in the communities cannot go there, they have to travel further distances. Nope, the President is not doing this for any of those reasons, not to help any of those people, he is doing it to help midterm Democrats because they are afraid they are going to lose their States, their majority, afraid they are going to be impacted and thrown out of office for absolutely reckless behavior on the part of a Congress that did not work in a bipartisan way, shoved the health care law down the throats of the American people in a way not to improve their lives, but to say that Congress knows better than people back home.

I am going to continue to come to the floor with letters and stories. I will be at the health fair in Buffalo, WY, on Saturday morning talking to folks in my community, seeing what they have to say about their lives, their families, their jobs, their wages, those of them who are losing jobs or losing hours as a result of the health care law, those who cannot afford new insurance under the exchanges even though they had insurance they liked—even though they did not like the price, it was cheaper than it is now. The President said it wasn't good enough for them.

I am going to continue to work for solutions to help patients all across this country have patient-centered care—not government-centered care or insurance company-centered care—to help patients get the care they need from a doctor they chose at lower cost—a complete failure by this administration and by this health care law.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for that purpose.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we now are in about the sixth month of the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. We have over 11 million people who have received health care—who previously had not been able to receive it—either through the private exchanges, which have signed up 4 million people all across the country; through the expansion of Medicaid, which has reached millions more; or through all of the young people who are able to stay on their parents' plans until they are 26 years old.

Taxpayers are saving money. In fact, CBO has redone their estimates for the 10-year period after the passage of the Affordable Care Act to suggest that we are now going to save $1.2 trillion on Federal health care spending, in large part because of the reforms in the Affordable Care Act.

Across this country millions of Americans who had been kept out of the ranks of the insured because of a preexisting condition now have access to health care, and tens of millions of seniors are paying less for their health care because they get checkups for free and they are able to access prescription drugs for 50 percent or less than the original cost when they reach that doughnut hole. So the Affordable Care Act is changing lives.

When you reorder one-sixth of the American economy, there are going to be bumps along the road. No one should come to the floor—even those of us who are the most vocal proponents of the law—and suggest there are not going to be some people who are not going to have the perfect experience. Of course there is no excuse for the way in which the Web site operated for the first several months. But it is time for proponents of this law to tell the real story, and the real story is that the Affordable Care Act is working. It is working for millions of Americans who now have access to health care. It is working for taxpayers who are spending less than ever before as you look at annual rates of growth in Federal health care spending.

Today and this week my colleagues and I are focusing on the benefits for one specific group of patients, one specific set of families all across this country, and those are patients and families dealing with cancer diagnoses.

So I will start this off—I will be joined later by Senator STABENOW and some of my other colleagues—and I want to talk first about a family in Indiana. I will talk about some families in Connecticut as well, but the Treinens have a story that is, frankly, not unique. They had insurance and they thought they had really good insurance. They didn't pay too much attention to the lifetime cap of $1 million that was in their insurance policy because they just figured, as a relatively healthy family, there was no way they were ever going to spend $1 million on health care over the course of their time on that insurance plan.

But as millions of families across this country know, cancer can interrupt your plans, and that is what happened to the Treinens. Their doctors diagnosed their teenage son Michael in 2007 with an aggressive form of leukemia. The treatment called for ten doses of chemotherapy that cost $10,000 per dose. A 56-day stay in an Intensive Care Unit alone cost about $400,000. So Michael and his family reached that $1 million lifetime maximum in less than 1 year, and it was then left to this brave family to go out and raise money in solicitations in their neighborhood, in their community and all across the country, which miraculously allowed them to bring in $865,000 in 6 days to keep their son's treatment going.

Needless to say, that avenue is not available to every family. But due to their ingenuity and their passion, the Treinens were able to raise almost $1 million from private donors in order to keep their son's treatment going. But the story doesn't end well, however, for the Treinens. Even though money came in from all over the United States, and as far away as places such as Germany, Michael's cancer eventually stopped responding to chemotherapy and he died May 25, before he could receive the transplant they all hoped would save his life.

The reality is that insurance companies have been getting away with this practice for years—lifetime or annual limits that for 105 million Americans were preventing them from receiving care when they really got sick. That is what insurance really is supposed to be for. For those of us who buy insurance, we get it in the hopes that should we get very sick, that insurance plan will be there to help us. But with annual and lifetime limits, when people got really sick, especially with cancer diagnoses, that help wasn't there.

Tom Bocaccio, who is a retired police officer in Newington, CT, is still dealing with the consequences of lifetime caps. His wife past away after an 8-year struggle with adrenal cancer. After her death, the husband she left behind was saddled with a $1.5 million bill because the Bocaccios, over that 8-year period of fighting cancer, had exceeded their lifetime cap. That changes Tom's life in a myriad of ways. He has lost his wife, and there is no way to describe the pain that comes with that, especially after that brave, courageous battle of almost a decade, but now his entire life is upended by the fact that he has a $1.5 million bill he has to pay, and he doesn't have the resources to do that.

So first and foremost, for cancer patients all across this country, 105 million Americans no longer face lifetime limits on health care benefits. For cancer patients, not only does that deliver financial security, but it delivers mental and psychological security as well—to know in the midst of dealing with this diagnosis and all the pain that comes with confronting this disease head on, they do not also have to worry about skimping on treatments, about cutting back on hospital stays that might harm the recovery or treatment of the patient simply because they are trying not to get above that annual or lifetime limit.

The benefits to cancer patients extend beyond just that protection on lifetime and annual limits. In addition, cancer patients are going to be able to keep their health care because of the ban on discrimination against families and individuals with preexisting conditions.

I have spoken about the Berger family many times on this floor. They are a family that explains exactly why we need this protection. The Bergers, from Meriden, CT, had a son who was diagnosed with cancer during the 2-week period in which the husband, through which the family had insurance, didn't have a job. He switched jobs, and during that 2-week period in which he was waiting to get insurance through his new job, their son was diagnosed with cancer. The new insurance policy decided it was a preexisting condition. The Bergers had to pay every dime of that treatment and they lost everything. They lost their savings, their home. Their lives were transformed because of the misfortune of having a cancer diagnosis at the wrong time.

No family anywhere in the country dealing with a cancer diagnosis will ever have to go through what the Bergers went through because here ever after the law of this land says that if you have a preexisting condition, you cannot be discriminated against.

There are all sorts of other benefits that matter, whether it be the fact you don't have to pay for preventive health care any longer so you can get a checkup without cost or clinical trials are now covered which many cancer patients enjoy the benefit of. Life changed for cancer patients and families dealing with cancer when the Affordable Care Act passed.

Senator STABENOW, myself, and others had a press conference earlier this week in which we heard the story of David Weis, a senior at Georgetown University who was diagnosed days before his 19th birthday with thyroid lymphatic cancer. David talks about the difference the Affordable Care Act makes for him, not only in financial terms but in terms of how he thinks about his future. David now can go out and get a job, search for and pursue a career based on what he wants to do with his life rather than based on what job will provide him with adequate benefits to treat his cancer should it reoccur.

I have a constituent who talks about it the same way. He was 14 when he was diagnosed with a form of leukemia. He went through treatment for over 3 years. His family now knows that with the Affordable Care Act—because he is only covered on his mom's policy until he is 26—after he ages out of his mom's plan, he will be able to pursue his dreams no matter what kind of insurance plan his prospective employer has.

What we have learned over the years is there is a connection between the mind and the body. If you are stressed out about things such as how you are going to pay for treatment of your disease, it does have an effect on your body's ability to fight that disease. Unfortunately, for millions of families dealing with cancer, their treatment has been restrained, their body's recovery has been curtailed because they are obsessively—and appropriately—always worried about what will happen if their insurance runs out.

The ACA says never again. No family will have to worry because that will be guaranteed, and discriminatory policies of annual and lifetime limits disappear.

I will end with the notion that it is important to remember every time our Republican friends come down to the floor and talk about how awful they believe the Affordable Care Act is, their proposal is to return cancer patients and families dealing with cancer back to the reality in which they had lifetime limits which ended their coverage—for this family I talked about from Indiana, after only several months—and they want to go back to the days in which families such as the Bergers lose everything, their savings, their home, because of a mistimed cancer diagnosis.

This week the House of Representatives voted for the 50th time to repeal all or part of the Affordable Care Act. I was a Member of that body for 6 years, and I probably participated in about 40 of those votes. Despite the fact I heard lots of my Republican friends come down to the floor and say: We are voting to repeal and replace, they never voted once to replace the Affordable Care Act because their agenda is not to replace it. Their agenda is simply to repeal it and go back to the days in which cancer patients were treated with this kind of carelessness.

Our colleagues on the Democratic side who voted for the Affordable Care Act understand there are places where it can be better. We understand there is a process of perfecting it. But we understand—because of families such as the Barrows, because of families such as the Weises, the Treinens, and the Bergers—for cancer patients and the families who love them, they know the ACA is working, and they know they never want to go back to the days in which their lives were put in jeopardy by a health care system which didn't work for them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Connecticut for his passion and his wonderful advocacy for people who just want to know they have health care for themselves and their families, which is pretty basic. I thank Senator MURPHY for his vigilance, for speaking out and being here and talking about what is at stake.

There is an ad on TV which says something like: New car, $30,000; new house, $150,000; peace of mind, priceless. What we are talking about in terms of access to affordable health care, getting what you are paying for, knowing you can't get dropped just because you get sick, knowing your child with juvenile diabetes can get care even though it would be viewed as a preexisting condition, is peace of mind.

I can't imagine how scary it must be to sit in a doctor's office and have a doctor come in and say: You have cancer. You have leukemia. You have breast cancer. This is happening to people every single day, and there are many thoughts going through their minds at that time. At some point they will turn to the doctor and want to talk about: What kind of treatment do I need? Is it going to be covered? How do I get it? What is going to happen?

One in every eight women in America will develop invasive breast cancer during their lives. It is not a statistic. These are real women, such as my sister-in-law, such as many other people I know. They are our daughters, our sisters, our mothers. Men as well are being given diagnoses of breast cancer—our friends. They now have the peace of mind of knowing they are going to be able to get the care they need at an affordable price and they can't be dropped. There is no cap on how long they are going to be able to get treatment, and that is priceless.

I will share a true story about a cancer survivor whose life has been changed thanks to the Affordable Care Act. Her name is Chris G.

Chris found a lump in her breast. Every woman can imagine the thoughts which must have gone through Chris's mind. The fear must have been unimaginable. It was even worse for Chris because her husband lost his job and they didn't have insurance—the worst of all possible situations. Because she didn't have insurance, she couldn't see a doctor to get the tests she needed. Chris didn't ignore her lump. You can't ignore something like that. It is on your mind every single minute of every single day. But at that moment she didn't feel she could do anything about it because without insurance, if Chris went to a doctor, her breast cancer of course would count as a preexisting condition and then she would never be able to get insurance.

But now, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, Chris and millions of women like her can get the affordable insurance they need, and marketplaces where insurance companies now have to compete for her business give their best price for her business. These are good policies which cover treatment women need to beat cancer and survive. But before the Affordable Care Act, cancer would haunt these women for the rest of their lives as insurance companies labeled their survival a preexisting condition—no more.

Thanks to the ACA, millions of cancer survivors similar to Chris have peace of mind—priceless. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, millions of women have access to mammograms and other preventive services. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, millions of women similar to Chris will never have to worry about annual or lifetime limits on their coverage, not being told: OK, cancer. You have eight visits. That is it. I hope it works. That is it. No more.

In fact, the ACA flips that around. It says cancer patients such as Chris will never be asked to spend more than a set amount of money in total on their treatment. Once they hit that number, the insurance company has to pick up the rest of the cost of the treatments. For women fighting cancer, this law is a lifesaver.

There are 7,000 women in my State of Michigan alone who will be newly diagnosed with breast cancer this year. This is why it is so important for women to get covered, to sign up before March 31, so they can have the health care they need this year. This is literally a lifesaving day on March 31.

Once you are covered, you get no-cost preventive services. So you can go in, get the checkup, get the mammogram, get other cancer screenings, and not have out-of-pocket costs. You get again the peace of mind of knowing you are not going to go broke because of health care. Even if you get diagnosed with cancer, it is not: Do I get the treatments I need for breast cancer or do I have a home for my family? Do I go bankrupt or do I try to survive through treatments? Those are not the choices available to women and families anymore, and there is access to your doctor instead of using the emergency room.

One of the fallacies of health care reform is this idea of somehow we ignore when people get sick and somehow we don't pay for it. Yet we all know people who don't have insurance use emergency rooms. I think it is interesting to note there is a proposal, in Georgia, where the Governor has said: The way to fix the problem with emergency rooms is to say you don't have to treat people. That is one way to do it, to say we are not going to treat people who are sick, who are in a car accident or have a heart attack.

The other way is through the Affordable Care Act, where we say: Instead of people using emergency rooms without insurance and then shifting all the costs onto everybody with insurance—which is what happens now—we pay for it. We all pay for it. Instead of that happening, we will set up a way for people to take personal responsibility for their health care and create a way to make it as affordable and competitive as possible. Then people will be able to go to their doctor instead of the emergency room and be able to get the treatment they need on an ongoing basis.

As women such as Chris can attest, cancer sneaks up on you. You can't predict it. You can't avoid it. This is not one of those events where you can

say just buck it up and don't get cancer. We don't want those costs, so just don't get sick.

We all know how ridiculous that is. Yet in some ways this is sort of what we keep hearing in some fashion.

The reality is you can't predict it. You can't avoid it. The only thing you can do is survive it, which millions of women are now doing who have access to the treatments and health care they need. This is why this new health care reform law is so important.

It is two things. It is health insurance reform, making sure those of us who have insurance are getting what we are paying for—as we have said before, can't get dropped, don't put artificial limits on the number of treatments. So it is insurance reform, so you are getting what you are paying for—what you thought you were paying for. It is also creating a way for more affordable insurance by creating a marketplace where insurance companies then have to bid for your business and provide you the best bed possible. We have competition to bring the costs down. I know for Chris, I know for women in my own family, and I know for people across Michigan, the peace of mind that comes with that is, in fact, priceless.

The debate on the other side is about taking that all away—not making it better, not fixing it. Medicare over the year has been improved. Medicaid has been improved. Social Security has been improved. Everything that is worth doing gets started and then has to be worked on to get improved. We are committed to doing that. But there are 50 votes now happening in the House to take it all away and to go back to saying good luck. If you are a woman, good luck. By the way, being a woman is probably viewed as being a preexisting condition. Trying to find insurance? Good luck. Good luck trying to get what you need from the insurance companies. Peace of mind is worth fighting for, and that is what the Affordable Care Act is all about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss promises made and promises broken, of hypocrisy and politics, of the difference between the photo op speeches, press releases, and real action.

Let me start at the beginning, for those who are just joining us in this decade-and-a-half battle. The Panama Canal is about halfway through a $5.25 billion expansion which will accommodate the larger post-Panamax vessels that are too large to transit the current Panama Canal. These new post-Panamax ships are the length of aircraft carriers. From the waterline they are 190 feet tall, or nearly twice the height of the Lincoln Memorial. The ships can carry as many as 12,000 containers, or translated into TVs, a million flat screen TVs.

Thus, the United States must be prepared to accept these larger vessels by 2015, when the Panama Canal expansion is complete. The Port of Savannah in Savannah, Georgia, is the second busiest U.S. container exporter, handling 13.2 million tons in exports in 2012 alone. It is the busiest port on the East Coast. In order to accommodate the new larger ships at the Port of Savannah, the Savannah river must be deepened from its current depth of 42 feet to 47 feet.

Georgia has been working on the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project for well in excess of a dozen years. Environmental studies have been completed, permits have been issued, and state funding has been secured for 40 percent of the project. It has the support of every Member of the Georgia congressional delegation and every single leader in our State, Republican as well as Democrat. This is a unifying bipartisan project for us, one that will support hundreds of thousands of jobs each year while generating billions of dollars in revenue for the entire southeastern United States.

Until recently we had the support of the Obama administration as well. After all, this is exactly the type of project the President has been touting as the secret to our economic recovery. He even included the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project as one of the four port projects in his 2012 ''We Can't Wait'' initiative.

Vice President BIDEN visited the Port of Savannah along with Senator ISAKSON, myself, and Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx last year, and in comments while at the Port of Savannah to the public that was gathered, he stated: ''We are going to get this done, come hell or high water.''

Acting U.S. Deputy Secretary of Commerce Rebecca Blank visited the port in 2012, calling SHEP a national bipartisan priority for this administration. Former Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood visited the Port of Savannah in 2011 promising to find funding for the port expansion. In fact, in every conversation I have had with various administration officials since this project started in 1997, I have been assured that we would find a way to get this project done.

So you can see how confused I was to learn this week that the administration is now stonewalling us on this project by not including the project in its 2015 budget. It is baffling to see this administration choose to ignore a congressional statute passed just 6 weeks ago that cleared all remaining obstructions to moving forward with this project.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 gave clear direction to the administration to begin construction on the SHEP project and to request the necessary funding. The administration's position as evidenced by the Office of Management and Budget is that they will ignore the clear guidance from Congress and will instead request more funding for unnecessary additional studies this year. Apparently the administration would rather pay lip service to Georgians than deliver on their promises. The State of Georgia has done its part, and I commend Governor Deal and the Georgia legislature, who have committed $265 million to start construction. We just need the Federal Government to get out of our way so Georgia can begin construction on this very vital project.

The administration can repair some of the damage that has been done by finalizing the agreement between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Georgia Ports Authority so that they can begin construction with State money that under the leadership of Governor Deal is now going to be available. Without any Federal funding at this point in time, the State is willing to move forward.

I urge the administration to move ahead with the securing of that agreement between the Army Corps of Engineers and the Ports Authority, and let's begin construction.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I seek recognition to speak for 10 minutes.

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

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, we have now engaged in a debate over the last couple of weeks over whether we should begin to expand a massive exportation of American natural gas—our own natural gas—to put it out onto the world market as a way of helping Ukraine deal with Russia.

This whole notion is constantly being invoked, like an incantation—a talisman—that somehow or other this is some kind of a magic bullet that will help solve the problems in Ukraine. In fact, it really is nothing more than another aggregation encyclopedically of discredited notions, nostrums, that have no relationship to the reality of the global energy marketplace. These are actual arguments being made, false premises that do not, in fact, have any likelihood of having any substantial impact on the totality of the Ukrainian situation.

Let me give a few facts as a way of dealing with where we are right now. The United States has already approved five export terminals that could send 4 trillion cubic feet of natural gas abroad. How much natural gas is that? Let me tell my colleagues: It is more than twice what Ukraine uses in a year. The United States has already

committed to doing that. More than a quarter of all of the gas Europe imports in a year would be ascribable to the amount of natural gas the United States has already approved. It would be nearly as much as every single U.S. home uses yearly. That is how much natural gas is part of the already approved export terminals in this country.

The Department of Energy found that exporting 4.4 trillion cubic feet—a level we will reach within the next approved export terminal—could raise the price of domestic natural gas up to 54 percent. That could mean that American consumers would pay $2.50 more per thousand cubic feet. That translates into—listen to this number, I say to my colleagues—a $62 billion energy tax every year on American consumers and businesses.

What do I mean by energy tax? I mean that but for that exportation, consumers' bills, corporations' bills, would be $62 billion lower per year over the next 10 years. Can we imagine the debate here in the Senate over increasing $62 billion worth of taxes on Americans in one year? We would come to a standstill if we had that kind of debate. But because it is part of energy policy, people assume it is something that is outside the purview of what should be a great national debate which we are having.

Let me tell my colleagues, low-cost domestic natural gas has allowed the United States to add—let me say this—530,000 manufacturing jobs since 2010, according to Dow Chemical. If low prices continue, we could add 5 million more jobs in the manufacturing sector by 2020. Who says this? America's Energy Advantage. Who is in that organization? Dow, Alcoa, Nucor, and other major corporations. To what do they relate the manufacturing revival in our country? Low prices. Energy that gives them a reason to return the manufacturing jobs from overseas.

Except for the cost of labor, what is the single largest component in a manufacturing job? The cost of energy. The lower it is, the more likely the manufacturing company will have the jobs here in America. If we increase the price by 54 percent or more, which is what many people here are now proposing, we reduce the incentive for a manufacturer to create those new jobs here in the United States.

Let me give my colleagues another fact. Every dollar invested in domestic manufacturing creates $8 in finished products. Manufacturing is at the heart of who we are as a country. This is something that right now is a discussion we should have in this country—the relationship between low-cost energy and the new manufacturing jobs we want to see. We can generate that economic value here in America, but if we send our natural gas overseas, that same kind of manufacturing future can be constructed in China. Let's have that debate here in our country.

Last month the U.S. chemical industry topped $100 billion in new investments as a result of low-cost U.S. natural gas. According to the American Chemistry Council, those 148 new factories and expanded projects could generate $81 billion per year in new chemical industry output and 637,000 new jobs in manufacturing here in the United States by the year 2023.

Now let's go to, in my opinion, some of the complete canards that are thrown out about where this natural gas will go if it is put out into the free market. First of all, let me say this: We are not Russia. We are not Venezuela. We are not a Communist country where the government controls where energy goes. No. We are a capitalist country. We are proud of it. The decision as to where natural gas is going to go is going to be made by the CEOs of oil and gas companies in our country, and they are going to send it to where they can get the highest dollar. Let me say this right now: The highest dollar is in China. The highest dollar is in South America. The highest dollar is not in Ukraine. So anyone who thinks that setting up these export terminals and sending our natural gas that could be helping our manufacturing sector overseas is going to help Ukraine's geopolitical situation doesn't understand the geo-economics of it, the geology of it, or the geopolitical implications of it. They have not thought through the totality of what happens when we take our precious resource and we start spreading it around the world.

Some are going to argue that it helps Ukraine. Well, it is going to help China more than it helps Ukraine. It is going to help South America more than it helps Ukraine. It is for sure going to help the CEOs of big oil and gas companies. That is what this debate is really going to be all about. Because we don't captain those ships. ExxonMobil has a tiller for those ships, and those ships are going to steer toward where the highest price is on the world marketplace. When those LNG tankers set sail for Asia or South America, we should know what else we are sending abroad on those ships. American jobs will be on those ships. They will be sailing to other countries. Fighting climate change is on those ships, because we will burn more coal here in the United States rather than natural gas, which has half of the pollutants of coal. We will be increasing the greenhouse gases the United States of America is sending up into the atmosphere.

When we are sending that natural gas overseas, we will be increasing the cost of a conversion of our large bus fleet and our large truck fleet over to natural gas as the fuel which makes it possible to drive them around our country. Here are the statistics. It is quite simple. If we move one-third of our fleet off of oil and on to natural gas as a way of fueling large buses and large trucks, then we back out 1 million barrels of oil—1 million barrels of oil—per day. That is a signal we should be sending to the Middle East. That is a signal that we are serious, that we are tired of exporting young men and women overseas and getting nothing in return.

So let me summarize by saying this: No. 1, it is a $62 billion consumer tax. No. 2, it slows our conversion from coal over to oil in our utility industry. No. 3, it slows the conversion of vehicles over to natural gas. No. 4, it slows our manufacturing revolution. No. 5, it slows our economic recovery. Our real strength is in our strong economy fueled by this low-cost oil and natural gas in our country.

We need a huge national debate in our country about the impact on our economy before we start putting it out on the high seas believing, erroneously, it is going to have some huge impact on Ukraine.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UKRAINE

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, Russia's invasion of Ukraine is one of the most serious breaches of the OSCE principles since the signing of the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. These principles are at the foundation of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Russia, as a participating state, agreed to hold these principles, including territorial integrity of states, inviolability of frontiers, refraining from the threat of use of force, peaceful settlements of disputes, and others.

With this invasion, which is based, as Secretary Kerry has stated, on a completely trumped-up set of pretexts, Russia has shown its utter contempt for these core principles, indeed, for the entire OSCE process—not only the OSCE but the 1994 Budapest Memorandum signed by the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, and Ukraine that provides security assurances for Ukraine, the 1997 Ukraine-Russia bilateral treaty, and the U.N. charter, and other international agreements. Russia's military invasion of Ukraine is also a gross violation of the Vienna Document's confidence and security building mechanisms which govern military relations and arms control.

So let's examine Vladimir Putin's justification for this unprovoked invasion. He claims there is a need to protect Russian interests and the rights of Russian-speaking minorities. They characterize it as a human rights protection mission that it clearly is not. Russian officials fail to show any real evidence that the rights of ethnic Russians in Crimea—where they actually constitute a majority and have the most clout politically—and Ukraine at large have been violated. In fact, there is overwhelming evidence that the protests in some Ukrainian cities is being stoked by the Russians.

Putin and other Russian officials make all sorts of unfounded accusations, including that masked militia are roaming the streets of Kiev, although the Ukrainian capital and most

of Ukraine has been calm for the last few weeks. Mr. Putin claims there is a ''rampage of reactionary forces, nationalist and anti-Semitic forces going on in certain parts of Ukraine.'' Yet Kiev's chief rabbi and a vice president of the World Jewish Congress on Monday accused Russia of staging anti-Semitic provocations in Crimea.

Mr. Putin accuses Ukraine's new legitimate transition government—not yet 2 weeks old—of threatening ethnic Russians. Yet there is a myriad of credible reports to the contrary. Indeed, although there has been unrest in some cities, there has been no serious movement in the mostly Russian-speaking eastern and southern regions to join with Russia.

The clear majority of Ukrainians wants to see their country remain unified and do not welcome Russian intervention. All Ukrainian religious groups have come out against the Russian intervention and stand in support of Ukraine's territorial integrity and inviolability of its borders, as have minority groups such as the Crimean Tatars and the Roma.

I submit that the real threat posed by the new government is that it wants to assertively move Ukraine in the direction of political and economic reforms and in the direction of democracy, respect for how human rights, the rule of law—away from the unbridled corruption of the previous regime and the kind of autocratic rule found in today's Russia.

As for protecting Russian interests in Crimea, the Russians have not produced one iota of evidence that the Russian Black Sea Fleet, based in the Crimean city of Sevastopol, is under any kind of threat. Indeed, when the Ukrainians reached out to the Russians to try to engage them peacefully, they have been rebuffed.

Russian authorities need to send their troops back to the barracks and instead engage through diplomacy, not the threat or use of force. The Russian actions pose a threat beyond Ukraine and threaten to destabilize neighboring states.

I pointed out at a hearing we had this week in the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and in a hearing of the Helsinki Commission, that if Russia can use force to try to change territories, what message does that send to the South China Sea, what message does that send to the Western Balkans?

Just as Poland has already invoked article 4 NATO consultations, the Baltic States and others in the region are wary of Russian goals.

As chairman of the Helsinki Commission and a former vice president of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, I am encouraged to see active and wide-ranging engagement of the OSCE to de-escalate tensions and to foster peace and security in Ukraine. The OSCE has the tools to address concerns with regard to security on the ground in Crimea, minority rights, and with regard to preparations for this democratic transition to lead to free and fair elections.

In response to a request by the Ukrainian Government, 18 OSCE participating states, including the United States, are sending 35 unarmed military personnel to Ukraine. This is taking place under the Vienna Document, which allows for voluntary hosting of visits to dispel concerns about unusual military activities.

Various OSCE institutions are activating, at the request of the Ukrainian Government, including the OSCE's human rights office, known as the ODIHR, to provide human rights monitoring as well as election observation for the May 25 Presidential elections. The OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, Representative on Freedom of the Media, and the head of the Strategic Police Matters Unit, among others, are all in Kiev this week conducting factfinding missions. A full-scale, long-term OSCE Monitoring Mission is being proposed, and this mission needs to go forward.

All of these OSCE efforts are aimed at deescalating tensions, fostering peace and stability, ensuring the observance of OSCE principles, including the human dimension, helping Ukraine in its transition, especially in the runup to the May elections.

These OSCE on-the-ground efforts are being thwarted by the Russian-controlled newly installed Crimean authorities. The OSCE Unusual Military Activities observers have been stopped from entering Crimea by unidentified men in military fatigues.

Also, the OSCE Media Freedom Representative and her staff were temporarily blocked from leaving a hotel in Crimea where she was meeting with journalists and civil society activists. The U.N. special envoy was accosted by unidentified gunmen after visiting a naval headquarters in the Sevastopol.

The blocking of international monitors—who were invited by the Ukrainian Government and who clearly are trying to seek peaceful resolutions to the conflict—is completely unacceptable and we should hold Russia responsible for their safety.

Russia is a member of the OSCE—one of the founding members—and they are openly violating the core principles of the Helsinki Final Act. Russia signed on to the institutions that are available under OSCE for this exact type of circumstance—to give independent observation as to what is happening on the ground. Sending this mission, at the request of the host country, into Crimea is exactly the commitments made to reduce tensions in OSCE states, and Russia is blocking the use of that mechanism.

The United States and the international community are deploying wide-ranging resources to contain and roll back Russia's aggression and to assist Ukraine's transition to a democratic, secure, and prosperous country. Both the Executive and the Congress are working around the clock on this. President Obama has taken concrete action and made concrete recommendations.

As the author of the Magnitsky Act, I welcome the White House sanctions announced today, including visa restrictions on officials and individuals threatening Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity and financial sanctions against those ''responsible for activities undermining democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine.''

It was just a little while ago that we passed the Magnitsky Act. We did that in response to gross human rights violations within Russia against an individual named Sergei Magnitsky. What we did is say that those who were responsible for these gross violations of internationally recognized rules should be held accountable, and if they are not held accountable, the least we can do in the United States is not give them safe haven in our country, not allow the corrupt dollars they have earned to be housed in America—no visas, no use of our banking system. The President is taking a similar action against those responsible for the invasion and military use against international rules in Ukraine.

These steps are in addition to many other actions, including the suspension of bilateral discussions with Russia on trade and investment, stopping United States-Russia military-to-military engagement, and suspending preparations for the June G8 summit in Sochi. Both Chambers are working expeditiously on legislation to help Ukraine in this delicate period of transition. We also need to work expeditiously with our European friends and allies, and I am encouraged by the news that the EU is preparing a $15 billion aid package.

Ukraine has exercised amazing restraint in not escalating the conflict, particularly in Crimea. I applaud their restraint and their action. The people of Ukraine have suffered an incredibly difficult history, and over the last century they have been subjected to two World Wars, 70 years of Soviet domination, including Stalin's genocidal famine. They certainly do not need another senseless war. Nothing justifies Russia's aggression—nothing. Our political and economic assistance at this time would be a testament to those who died at the Maidan just 2 weeks ago and a concrete manifestation that our words mean something and that we do indeed stand by the people of Ukraine as they make their historic choice for freedom, democracy, and a better life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

MANUFACTURING INNOVATION HUBS

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor once again to talk about good jobs—about manufacturing jobs—and about what we can do together in this Chamber to strengthen

the vital manufacturing sector of the American economy.

Last year, Democratic Senator SHERROD BROWN and Republican Senator ROY BLUNT came together in a bipartisan effort to cosponsor an important bill, S. 1468, the Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act of 2013—an effort to build a national network for manufacturing and innovation, also known as manufacturing innovation hubs.

This bill, if enacted, would allow us to build institutes across our country dedicated to discovering the next breakthroughs in technology and translating them to the next breakthroughs in manufacturing. I have been proud to support and fight for this bill, and now, because of my colleagues' leadership and determination, we are close to getting a vote.

We have heard about the importance of these innovation hubs for manufacturing before. Last year two hubs opened—one in Youngstown, OH, and another in Raleigh, NC. Just last week I was thrilled to hear about two more opening—one in Detroit and another in Chicago.

These hubs are good first steps, but they are being done by the executive branch, without express and explicit authorization for a whole and broader program through this bill, which would extend this national network, would make its life longer and greater, and give more specific details to the process by which they would be authorized going forward.

It is my hope, having already seen several demonstrations on a more modest scale, this Congress will come together in a bipartisan way and enact this legislation to put a framework in place for the long term.

These hubs, as I said, are good first steps, but we in Congress can and should do more. In my home State of Delaware we are blessed to have some remarkable institutions of higher learning: Delaware State University, led by the great President Dr. Harry Williams; the University of Delaware—both research institutions which benefit from federally funded research and both of which do work in energy and engineering, relevant to manufacturing. We also have Del Tech—Delaware Technical & Community College—which does great workforce training and partners with manufacturers. We also have a whole series of manufacturers, large and small; some iconic companies such as DuPont, some unknown outside my State that employ dozens or hundreds.

What a manufacturing hub would do is bring together a university that is doing cutting-edge research in a new field with companies looking to start manufacturing using that technology, with those community colleges and others who would train the new workforce, creating a network that would do the innovative work in an iterative way that would accelerate new manufacturing opportunities.

The reason this bill has such a diverse set of bipartisan backers—from Democrats such as SHERROD BROWN, DEBBIE STABENOW, and myself, to Republicans such as ROY BLUNT, LINDSEY GRAHAM, and MARK KIRK—is because these hubs represent a great example of how the Federal Government can help foster partnerships between businesses, universities, and communities in a hands-off way.

As to these first four hubs I mentioned, in these instances, the Federal Government is also getting terrific leverage. There is a more than 1-to-1 match from private, State, and local partnerships in these existing hubs—partnerships, I might add, that have national reach, giving the hubs the potential to benefit not just their immediate regions or their immediate communities but the whole country.

General Dynamics and Honeywell, for example, are two of the partner companies in the Youngstown, OH, lab. They have footprints all across our country. At the hub in Raleigh, NC, researchers from other universities—such as Arizona State and Florida State—are collaborators as well, contributing their knowledge to the great work of these hubs and then also bringing back to their labs and their communities what is being learned through this common collaborative work.

So the Youngstown and Raleigh hubs—now well established—are about more than just those two cities, and the hubs in Detroit and Chicago will be about more than just Michigan and Illinois, and the hubs we would create, we would authorize, through this bill would be about more than just the cities or States in which they are based.

By bringing together such a wide-ranging and diverse set of partners, hubs allow many different stakeholders to pool their resources, minimizing the risks of investing in the early stage research that is critical to innovation but not feasible for one company alone to invest in.

It is about the private sector coming together with the university and public sectors to solve tough problems without just one firm bearing all the risk or the burden. R&D—research and development—as we know, is critical to our economic future. These hubs offer an innovative model for increasing our national capacity for invention.

The Federal Government acts as a convener for private firms, nonprofits, universities, and researchers, creating an environment where they can all do what they do best and share it. This idea transcends ideology or party. That is why I think Members of both parties should feel comfortable getting behind this bill. It has been endorsed by folks ranging from the National Association of Manufacturers to the Bio, which represents the bio and pharmaceutical community, and folks in the private sector and public sector in my own State and in States across the country.

Manufacturing is at the heart of what can and should make this country competitive and prosperous in this century. At the end of the day, this is about creating good jobs. Manufacturing jobs are high-quality jobs. It has a significant secondary benefit in the community as well as having higher wages and benefits than jobs in any other sector.

If we are looking for the key to a dynamic innovation economy, we need to look no further than manufacturers. They invest more in R&D than any other private sector within the country. When we think of manufacturing and innovation today, we often picture researchers in the United States inventing things and manufacturing factories overseas. But that is not how sophisticated, advanced manufacturing innovation works anymore. The reality is that innovation is just not linear. R&D and manufacturing need to be closer together. It does not just start in the lab and then get sent to a factory and then to a store and your home. More often R&D results in innovations that improve the products already in our home, that improve the manufacturing process to discover better ways to make things faster, more safely, more efficiently, and that innovative cycle can speed up the more closely connected and articulated it is.

By creating these manufacturing innovation hubs, all of which focus on a specific sector or industry, we can help fuel the discoveries that will make manufacturing a critical part of our long-term economic future, while ensuring that the discoveries that change our world are made here in America and the products that come out of them are manufactured here in America.

These hubs focus on emerging areas where there is enormous potential. For example, the hub in Youngstown, OH, is focused on 3D printing, which already has the potential to transform how manufacturing, large-scale and small-scale, is done not just in the United States but around the world. We believe—I certainly believe we should continue to be at the cutting edge of developing and deploying what 3D printing has to offer.

The one in Raleigh, NC, is about wide bandgap semiconductors or energy-efficient electronics and will likely dominate much of the next generation of electronics. Again, why would we not want to be on the ground for not just the inventing of new technologies but demonstrating how to manufacture them?

In Detroit, researchers and businesses and universities and other stakeholders in this newest hub will work together on advanced lightweight materials, on remarkable metals that are stronger, more durable, more ductile, and more lightweight than other existing materials, with applications, of course, in automobiles but across a very wide range of products and platforms.

Lastly, in Chicago, small businesses, universities, and larger companies are

working together on some remarkable advances that speed up the whole manufacturing process so new ideas can go from the lab to your home faster than ever before.

Hubs such as these are central to our competitiveness because it is not just about the work happening at the lab or the institute itself; it is about how they then attract companies with a national reach to an area that is capable of building sustainable and dynamic local economies. It is about bringing researchers and manufactures together to spur innovation, commercialize R&D, and create good jobs that do not go somewhere else. It is about the larger impact for our communities and our country, as innovation breeds new supply chains and new businesses locally and across our country.

Today's global economy is more competitive than it has ever been. We are competing not just with developing countries that have lower labor and environmental standards or lower wages but also with developed nations that are trying to out-educate, out-research, and out-innovate us. Germany, for example, has a well-developed, well-established, well-deployed network of more than 60 manufacturing innovation hubs exactly like the ones I have just described. It also has fairly high labor and environmental standards but is the manufacturing powerhouse of Europe. It has nearly double the percentage of its GDP in manufacturing as the United States. How are they able to do this? How can they sustain these high levels of manufacturing? It is in no small part because of the manufacturing innovation hubs they have developed and deployed.

So let's get this done. There is absolutely no reason that the season of governing and of legislating here in Washington needs to be over, especially when there is so much important work to do—work that I know we can and should get done on a bipartisan basis. Senators BROWN and BLUNT have done great work and shown strong leadership in developing this bill, refining this bill, and getting it to this point.

Let's show that we can come together in areas where we do agree and put campaigns and politics aside for now and put American jobs and American innovation first.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CAROLYN B. McHUGH TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH DISTRICT

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 563.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Carl Levin, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Jeanne Shaheen, Amy Klobuchar, Tom Udall, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Joe Donnelly, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Tom Harkin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MATTHEW FREDERICK LEITMAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 577.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Matthew Frederick Leitman, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk, Mr. President.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Matthew Frederick Leitman, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Carl Levin, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Jeanne Shaheen, Amy Klobuchar, Tom Udall, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Joe Donnelly, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Tom Harkin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JUDITH ELLEN LEVY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Judith Ellen Levy, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Judith Ellen Levy, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Carl Levin, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Jeanne Shaheen, Amy Klobuchar, Tom Udall, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Joe Donnelly, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Tom Harkin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LAURIE J. MICHELSON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 579.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Laurie J. Michelson, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk I wish to have reported.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Laurie J. Michelson, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Carl Levin, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Jeanne Shaheen, Amy Klobuchar, Tom Udall, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Joe Donnelly, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Tom Harkin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

LINDA VIVIENNE PARKER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Linda Vivienne Parker, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Linda Vivienne Parker, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Carl Levin, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara Boxer, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Jeanne Shaheen, Amy Klobuchar, Tom Udall, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Joe Donnelly, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Tom Harkin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, March 8 is International Women's Day—a day when we can celebrate the enormous advances women have made while pledging to continue to work for greater opportunity for all women.

Rooted in the long-term struggle for equality, International Women's Day has been observed since a time when American women were fighting for basic rights, such as voting or fair employment. Today, we see women breaking ground and becoming leaders in business, government, and the military—both here in the United States and overseas. While this is encouraging, many women around the world continue to face significant social and economic obstacles.

The official United Nations theme for this International Women's Day is ''Equality for women is progress for all.'' I couldn't agree more; empowering women is one of the most critical tools in our toolbox to fight poverty and injustice.

According to some reports, women represent nearly 70 percent of the world's poor. In many regions of the world, a woman's ability to earn a sustained income is severely limited by cultural norms and a lack of opportunity.

Economically empowering women is one of the most important tools we have to alleviate poverty. Women around the world participate in the political, social, and economic life of their communities and play a predominate role in providing and caring for their families. Research has shown that men only reinvest 30–40 percent of their income into their households, while women reinvest 90 percent—choosing to spend their money on food, clean water, education and health care. Greater economic opportunity and earning capacity also increases equality and mutual respect within households, reducing women's vulnerability to domestic abuse.

Until women around the world have improved access to economic, political, and social opportunities, many of the great challenges we face today, from pervasive global poverty to violent extremism, will go unresolved.

We must continue to promote women's leadership and integrate gender perspectives in our development and foreign assistance programs. Advancing gender equality and women's empowerment in this realm will not only lead to increased productivity and income for women but can have a positive impact for generations to come.

I urge all my colleagues to work together to call attention to the injustices women face around the world and to work to implement laws and policies that advance the cause of women both at home and abroad.

DEAMONTE DRIVER'S PASSING

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to mark the seventh anniversary of Deamonte Driver's death.

Deamonte Driver was a 12-year-old child who lived in Prince George's County, MD, whose border sits only a few miles from the U.S. Capitol Building. He died 7 years ago at the Children's National Medical Center in Washington, DC, from a brain infection caused by an untreated tooth abscess.

The Driver family, like many other families across the country, lacked dental insurance. At one time, the Drivers were covered by the Medicaid Program, but they lost that coverage when they moved into a shelter and their paperwork fell through the cracks. When advocates for the family tried to help the Drivers locate a dentist to treat Deamonte's cavities and tooth pain, it took more than 20 calls to find a dentist who would see him.

Around mid-January in 2007, Deamonte began to complain of severe headaches. A subsequent evaluation at Children's Hospital led beyond the basic dental care that the family had anticipated to emergency brain surgery. Deamonte later experienced seizures, and a second operation was required. After additional treatment and

therapy, Deamonte appeared to be recovering, but medical intervention had come too late. By the end of his treatment, the total cost to our health care system exceeded one-quarter of a million dollars—more than 3,000 times the $80 cost of a tooth extraction.

Deamonte Driver passed away on Sunday, February 25, 2007. This child's death was a national tragedy because it could have been prevented had he received timely and proper basic dental care. It was a tragedy because it happened right here in the United States, in a State that is one of the most affluent in the Nation. It happened in the State that is home to the first and one of the best dental schools in the Nation, the University of Maryland's dental school. It happened in Prince George's County, whose border is less than 6 miles from where we are standing in the U.S. Capitol.

I have spoken on the Senate floor about Deamonte Driver several times since his death, and in the intervening years, both in Maryland and nationally, we have made tremendous progress. When Deamonte's story was brought to light, I believe it was a wakeup call for our Nation. It brought home the statement of former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop: ''There is no health without oral health.''

Medical research reinforces Dr. Koop's words. Scientists have discovered the nexus between tooth plaque and heart disease, that chewing stimulates brain cell growth, and that gum disease can signal diabetes, liver ailments, and hormone imbalances. They have identified the vital connection between oral health research and advanced treatments like gene therapy, which can help patients with chronic renal failure. They have found that investing in basic dental care for children and adults can reduce health care expenditures down the road for costly medical interventions related to other diseases.

But for all their research findings, we also know that without insurance coverage and adequate access to providers, the needs of millions of children and adults will remain unmet, and the complications resulting from poor oral health will persist.

That is why the progress we have made over the past 7 years is so important to America's health. I have come to the floor today to talk about what has been achieved and how we can move forward as a nation to ensure even greater access to oral health care.

Since Deamonte's passing, the State of Maryland has emerged as a national leader in oral health—launching a $1.2 million oral health literacy campaign, raising Medicaid reimbursement rates for dentists in the program, and providing allied health professionals and hygienists the opportunity to practice outside clinics. The Deamonte Driver Dental Project Van, which was dedicated in front of the U.S. Capitol in May 2010, provides care in underserved neighborhoods in Prince George's County, thanks to efforts conceived and launched by members of the Robert T. Freeman Dental Society. An arm of the National Dental Association, the society is named for Dr. Robert Tanner Freeman, who in 1869 became the first Black graduate of the Harvard School of Dental Medicine.

It was 2 years after Deamonte's death, in 2009, that Congress reauthorized the Children's Health Insurance Program. Some of my colleagues recalled the difficulty that Deamonte's mother had finding him care. Hers was not an isolated instance. For varied reasons, it is difficult for Medicaid and CHIP enrollees to find dental providers, and working parents whose children qualify for those programs are likely to be employed at jobs where they can't afford to spend 2 hours a day on the phone searching for a provider. So part of the CHIP Reauthorization Act requires HHS to include on its Insure Kids Now Web site a list of participating dentists and benefit information for all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Also in 2009, Congress passed the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, which created the Healthy Futures Corps—a program that provides grants to States and nonprofit organizations so they can fund national service in low-income communities. The law's goal was to put into action key tools that can help close the gaps in health status—prevention and health promotion. With the help of Senator MIKULSKI, we added language to that law specifying oral health as an area of focus. Now, the Healthy Futures Corps is recruiting young people to work in the dental profession, where severe shortages of providers exist in many urban and rural communities. The law is funding the work of individuals who can help parents find oral health care for themselves and their children. It is making a difference in the lives of the Healthy Futures Corps members who work in underserved communities and in the lives and health of those who can now get care.

Then in 2010, Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, which guarantees pediatric dental coverage as part of each State's Essential Benefits health care package. The ACA also established an oral health care prevention education campaign at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which is targeted toward key populations, including children and pregnant women, and it created demonstration programs to encourage innovation in oral health delivery. The law also significantly expanded workforce training programs for oral health professionals.

Moving forward, the States have a critical role to play in ensuring that the ACA benefit is designed to incentivize prevention, recognize that some children have greater risk of dental disease than others, and deliver care based on their level of risk.

Among the most cost-effective ways to improve children's dental health are investments in prevention. Dental sealants, clear plastic coatings applied to the chewing surface of molars, have been proven to prevent 60 percent of tooth decay at one-third the cost of filling a cavity. So it is essential that prevention be part of every State's benefit package.

Further, in 2010, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services launched its Oral Health Initiative, based on a bill I introduced with Senator SUSAN COLLINS. The initiative establishes a coordinated multiagency effort to improve access to care across the Nation.

One of the most effective organizations in tracking access to care is the Pew Children's Dental Campaign, which produces report cards that grade the States on eight policies that are evidence-based solutions to the problem of tooth decay. In 2011, Maryland received an ''A'' grade in both reports for meeting or exceeding these benchmarks, which include dental sealant programs, community water fluoridation, Medicaid reimbursement and enrollment, and collection of data on children's dental health. Maryland's grade is significant because in the late 1990s, my State had one of the worst records in the Nation with respect to oral health care for its underserved population. Now it is one of the top-ranked States for oral health care.

Our State has just received even more good news. The number of children in Maryland with untreated tooth decay dropped 41 percent from 2001 to 2011, and the overall oral health status of Maryland children has dramatically improved, according to a 2014 report conducted by the University of Maryland's School of Dentistry. The State assessment looked at 1,723 students in 52 schools from the five regions of the State. About 33 percent of the children had at least one dental sealant on their permanent first molars, and this milestone exceeded Federal goals by 5 percent. About 14 percent of students had untreated dental caries, a drop from 23 percent in 2000, and the State's achievement exceeded Federal goals by 12 percent. According to the assessment, 75 percent of the children surveyed had a regular dentist.

Another key player in our State's effort is the Baltimore Oral Health Impact Project, which provides care to children in Baltimore's public schools. Since February 2010, its providers have seen more than 3,500 children and treated more than 1,500 for dental disease. The program places a high value on delivering comprehensive and compassionate oral health care.

This organization has also launched the Baltimore Oral Health Academy, offering scholarships to students who choose to pursue careers as a clinical dental professional including dental assistants and hygienists, and who agree to serve in a public health setting.

Nationally, HRSA's National Health Service Corps addresses the nationwide shortage of primary care oral health

providers in dental health professional shortage areas—HPSA—by offering incentives in the form of scholarships and loan repayments to primary care dentists and registered dental hygienists to practice in underserved communities. The Corps has awarded more than 1,100 new loan repayment awards to dentists and nearly 300 new loan repayment awards to registered dental hygienists. But this is not nearly enough to erase the shortages. The NHSC has also implemented a part-time service program for providers who did not wish to make a full-time commitment, and I am hopeful that this new option will increase participation in the coming years.

Our Nation has made significant progress in improving children's dental health in the 7 years since Deamonte died, but there is still much work to be done. The access problem in some communities has become so severe that many people are forced to seek treatment for tooth pain in the Nation's emergency rooms, increasing the overall cost of care and receiving uncoordinated care in the least cost-efficient setting. In fact, more people seek treatment in emergency rooms for tooth pain than they do for asthma.

I will continue to work to increase funding for grants to States and expand training opportunities for dentists. We do not have enough professionals who are trained and available to treat children and adults with dental problems, and it is our responsibility to fix that. We must improve public reimbursement to dental providers in offices and clinics so that no one who needs treatment will be turned away.

Soon, Congress will turn again to the Reauthorization of the CHIP program, and I will be once again fighting for the strongest possible language we can get to promote children's oral health. For my colleagues who may not be familiar with CHIP's track record on oral health, I would like to leave you with three facts:

First, tooth decay is the single most common chronic disease of childhood, and it is five times more common than asthma. The complications of dental disease, which we now know can be fatal, are completely and easily preventable if we give children the care they need. Second, because of Congress's passage of the 2009 Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act, in 2013, more than 8 million American children had comprehensive dental coverage through CHIP. Third, CHIP has kept comprehensive coverage affordable. Under CHIP, families cannot pay more than 5 percent of their annual income in out-of-pocket costs for their children's medical and dental care.

What we have been able to achieve for children is due to support in Congress and also to the efforts of the many nonprofit organizations, universities, and providers who are also working across the Nation to make sure that we will never forget Deamonte and never forget our responsibility to improving oral health care for America's children.

On this sad anniversary, in Maryland and throughout the Nation there are signs of hope for the future of oral health care. I thank my colleagues for the role they have played in this process and look forward to working with them in the months to come to strengthen oral health care access for our Nation's children.

TRIBUTE TO ANTONIA FERRIER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Antonia Ferrier on my staff. After 4 years of trying to keep this tough old bird in line, she'll be leaving my office in the coming days. She will most certainly be missed.

Antonia first came to Capitol Hill to work for the former distinguished majority leader and my good friend, Bill Frist from Tennessee. After that, she went on to serve on the staff of another one of our former colleagues, Olympia Snowe. Now, Maine is pretty different from Tennessee, but I'm sure it felt like a bit of a homecoming for Antonia, who is from Massachusetts. After more than 3 years with Senator Snowe, Antonia made her way across the Capitol Rotunda to work for Senator ROY BLUNT during his time as the House Republican Whip.

For a Senate purist like Antonia, one House Member probably felt like enough, but she then went on to serve JOHN BOEHNER during his time as the House Republican leader. Finally, we were able to woo her back on this side of the Capitol to come be a member of our team.

As I said, Antonia is a Senate purist. She understands the Senate's role in our system of government, she appreciates the personalities and complexities of those that are honored to serve here, and she knows how much the work we do here impacts the lives of Americans from Tennessee to Maine, and Ohio to Utah. And, given her experience, she understands the House very much as well.

I'll deeply miss having Antonia around, not only for her sage advice and counsel, but also for her wit and sense of humor, and her willingness for straight-talk. I think she would say that the hardest part of her job is protecting me from myself. That's a tough job for anyone. And, I have to say that she's been up to the task, even during those times when I've made it particularly difficult.

I want to thank Antonia for her service to me, to Utah, and to the Senate over these last several years. She has been an amazing asset, and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

REMEMBERING JOHN S. WILLIAMS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President. I am grateful for the opportunity to pay tribute to a truly extraordinary public servant, father, grandfather, and neighbor—Mr. John S. Williams. Sadly, John passed away this week leaving behind a legacy of dedication and service.

John worked for an unprecedented 27½ years as the executive director of the Five County Association of Governments, AOG; only the third person to serve in that position since the association's inception. This association was formed to address the needs and challenges facing the southwest region of Utah—Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington Counties. As the director, John set a tone of hard work, commitment, and a belief in the greatness of southwest Utah. He was comfortable not only in the director's chair—but rolling up his sleeves and getting the hard work done.

He was a key figure in promoting economic development in southwest Utah, as well as the whole State. He helped formulate policy and address issues facing an increasingly expanding region including: infrastructure, public lands issues, population growth, and quality of life. The Five County AOG has a reputation throughout Utah as an association that makes a difference and helps forge the way, largely in part because of the strength of John's leadership for almost three decades.

While working with John on many occasions throughout my Senate service I have always found him as someone who deeply cared about those he served, and had ideas and solutions to address the challenges facing a very important region of Utah. The example he set will be felt for generations to come; and the five counties he served are better prepared for the future challenges and triumphs they will face in the coming years.

Elaine and I convey our deepest sympathies to John's wife Jamie, his five children, and many grandchildren. May our Heavenly Father bless them with peace and comfort at this time. The contributions and impact John made on his family, his community, and our State will be felt and appreciated for generations to come. Utah is a better State because of the service John rendered throughout his life and his strong advocacy of southwest Utah.

FREEDOM FOR BOB LEVINSON

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise today on the anniversary of Bob Levinson's disappearance from Kish Island off the coast of Iran.

March 9 will mark 7 excruciating years of waiting and wondering for Bob's family who have desperately sought assistance from the Governments of Iran and the United States in finding him and bringing him home.

Bob, a retired FBI agent, is now one of the longest held Americans in our Nation's history. Bob's safe return is his family's highest priority—as it must remain for the U.S. Government as well.

At the beginning of this year, this body unanimously passed a resolution

urging the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance in Bob's case. At a time when our governments are talking to one another after more than 30 years, I ask that they talk about locating Bob and bringing him home to Florida. This case transcends any differences between the United States and Iran.

I continue to believe our two countries share the same goal: as a humanitarian matter both governments can readily support bringing a father home to his children and grandchildren.

I have said as much to officials in the Iranian Government, and I rise today to reiterate this same message. I will also continue to call on the U.S. Government to raise Bob's case with Iranian officials at every opportunity and do all they can to end this ordeal.

Bob and his wife Christine have seven children and four grandchildren.

For their sake, after 7 heart-wrenching years, we must all redouble our efforts to bring Bob home.

AROOSTOOK COUNTY, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this year marks the 175th anniversary of the incorporation of Aroostook County, ME. As one who was born and raised in that wonderful place, I wish to celebrate its fascinating past, energetic present, and bright future.

If the story of Aroostook County could be summed up in one thought, it would be this: We are the largest county east of the Mississippi River, yet we are all neighbors. From the frontier to the front lines of innovation, the people of ''The County,'' as it is known throughout Maine, have always worked hard and worked together.

The story of Aroostook County begins long before its incorporation in 1839. For thousands of years, it has been the home of the Micmac and Maliseet; the name Aroostook comes from the Native American word for ''beautiful river.''

French explorers, led by Samuel de Champlain, first visited the area in 1604. The settlements that followed laid the foundation for the vibrant Acadian culture that is so important in Maine, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and as far away as Louisiana. Under French, and later, English rule, Aroostook's rich natural resources drew hardy lumberjacks and trappers to the area.

For decades after the American Revolution, Maine's northernmost region was the site of a protracted and tense border dispute between our new Nation and British Canada. As negotiations, led by the great American statesman Daniel Webster, to end what is now called the Bloodless Aroostook War neared completion, families and entrepreneurs settled in the area, and Aroostook County was incorporated. Among those early settlers was my ancestor, Samuel W. Collins, who built a lumber mill in Caribou in 1844 that was the beginning of our fifth-generation family business still in operation today.

People were drawn to Aroostook County in search of liberty and opportunity, and they have always worked and sacrificed to extend those blessings to others. In the years before emancipation, Aroostook County was the last stop on the Underground Railroad that took slaves to freedom. The Friends Quaker Church in Fort Fairfield stands today as a powerful memorial to that time of courage and compassion. Civil War monuments in villages throughout Aroostook County stand in honor of the many heroes who gave their lives so that all could be free.

Throughout the 19th century, the people of Aroostook County connected their remote region to the world with their own hands. Town by town, they built roads and railroads with pick, shovel, and wheelbarrow. These transportation networks, combined with the region's rich soil, made Aroostook County an agricultural powerhouse. The potato industry remains an essential part of the Maine economy.

During World War II, Presque Isle and Houlton both had U.S. Army bases. Houlton had a prisoner-of-war camp for German soldiers. Presque Isle's base was used to launch P–38s, C–47s, and B–17s to the European theater. During the cold war, Loring Air Force Base in Limestone, due its proximity to Northern Europe, became a crucial forward post in America's defense.

The closure of Loring Air Force base in 1994 was a difficult challenge. But the people of Aroostook County responded with the qualities that wrote their history: strength, a strong work ethic, and determination. They are building a new economy with new jobs and opportunities. Back then, biathlon was little-known, yet today Aroostook County is a world-class center for winter sports and Olympic training and the home to an Olympian in the biathlon.

Aroostook's hospitals have become national models for expert and compassionate care in rural regions, particularly for our veterans. Educational institutions and industry have joined together to lead the way in the development of renewable energy sources. The closed bases in Houlton and Presque Isle, and Loring Air Force Base have evolved into hubs of commerce and industry.

Through the years, Aroostook County has gone by many names—the Crown of Maine, the Garden County, the Last Frontier of the East, and, of course, The County. A more recent addition is the motto of the University of Maine at Presque Isle—''North of Ordinary'' is the perfect way to describe a place that is truly extraordinary.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO SHAUNA JEAN RINGEL

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the outstanding work of Shauna Jean Hill Ringel, who is retiring after 22 years of employment with Madison County, ID.

Shauna is a native of St. Anthony, ID. She moved to Rexburg with her husband, Brad, in 1970, and she raised three children, Ryan, Shelli and Tracy, in Rexburg. After the death of her husband in 1987, Shauna worked at Madison School District's Burton Elementary School as the school's secretary. She began working for Madison County in 1992, and she served as a clerk of district court, 7th Judicial District. She moved to the Madison County Clerk's office in 1996, and she worked both as deputy county clerk and as Madison County's elections clerk. In 2004, she joined the planning and zoning office. She has participated in emergency management training and helped develop emergency plans for Madison County.

The community and our State have been fortunate to have benefited from her devoted assistance that includes significant public service and volunteer work. She served as the co-chair of the Madison County Centennial Committee and coordinated a year of festivities recognizing the pioneer spirit of current and former residents of Madison County. She is also active in the local chapter of the American Red Cross through which she has assisted her friends and neighbors in Red Cross evacuation centers for flooding and wildfire emergencies. She assists families in the Upper Snake River Valley whose lives are disrupted by house fires. Shauna was also deployed to New Jersey to assist with the recovery after Hurricane Sandy, and she assisted with recovery efforts in Montana after devastating wildfires.

Shauna is viewed as someone who can be counted on to go the extra mile and put the team ahead of herself. She is respected for her steady, loyal and reliable efforts. Madison County Commissioner Kimber Ricks characterized Shauna as ''a go to' team player. She's always been hard working and reliable; always counted on for good judgment and good nature; and always that sense of humor that helps so much in tough situations . . . Shauna will be missed, but never forgotten.''

Thank you, Shauna, for your outstanding and dedicated service. I hope that retirement affords you more well-deserved time with your friends and family, including your children and three grandsons, and opportunities to do all the activities you love the most. I congratulate you on your retirement and wish you all the best.•

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER DECLARING A NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE UNUSUAL AND EXTRAORDINARY THREAT TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES POSED BY THE SITUATION IN THE UKRAINE—PM 33

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the ''order'') declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Ukraine.

The order does not target the country of Ukraine, but rather is aimed at persons—including persons who have asserted governmental authority in the Crimean region without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine—who undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets. The order blocks the property and interests in property and suspends entry into the United States of any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State:

- to be responsible for or complicit in, or to have engaged in, directly or indirectly, any of the following:
  - actions or policies that undermine democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine;
  - actions or policies that threaten the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine; or
  - misappropriation of state assets of Ukraine or of an economically significant entity in Ukraine;
- to have asserted governmental authority over any part or region of Ukraine without the authorization of the Government of Ukraine;
- to be a leader of an entity that has, or whose members have, engaged in any activity described above or of an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order;
- to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described above or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order; or
- to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to the order.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order. All agencies of the United States Government are directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of the order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 2014.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:49 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 938. An act to strengthen the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2126. An act to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4118. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the implementation of the penalty for failure to comply with the individual health insurance mandate.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 938. An act to strengthen the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2126. An act to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3370. An act to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 4118. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the implementation of the penalty for failure to comply with the individual health insurance mandate.

S. 2097. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 6, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 23. An act to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–198. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the Congress of the United States to adopt House Concurrent Resolution No. 50, regarding the National Railroad Monument in Durand, Michigan; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 88

Whereas, Railroads are an integral part of our nation's past, present, and future. The railroad industry played a vital role in building and developing the United States. This role should not be forgotten; and

Whereas, Durand, Michigan, is at the historic crossroads of three major railroads and is home to one of the largest surviving train stations in the United States. The existing statuary, structures, and historic railroad equipment at Diamond District Park in Durand make it an ideal location for a National Railroad Memorial; and

Whereas, Congressional House Concurrent Resolution No. 50 would designate a National Railroad Monument located in Diamond District Park in historic downtown Durand, Michigan, as the National Railroad Memorial. This recognition would help draw visitors from around the world to the educational programming and exhibits in Durand. It would help ensure that current and future generations do not forget the historical importance of the railroad industry to our nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the Congress of the United States to adopt House Concurrent Resolution No. 50, regarding the National Railroad Monument in Durand; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–199. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado relative to the U.S.S. Pueblo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 14–1007

Whereas, The U.S.S. Pueblo was originally launched as a United States Army cargo ship in 1944 but was transferred to the United States Navy and renamed the U.S.S. Pueblo in 1966; and

Whereas, The U.S.S. Pueblo was named for the city of Pueblo, Colorado, and the county of Pueblo, Colorado, and was the third ship in the naval fleet to bear the name Pueblo; and

Whereas, After leaving Japan in early January 1968 on an intelligence mission, the U.S.S. Pueblo was attacked by the North Korean military on January 23, 1968; and

Whereas, According to United States Naval authorities and the crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo, the ship was in international waters at the time of the attack; and

Whereas, One crew member of the U.S.S. Pueblo was killed during the attack, and

eighty crew members and two civilian oceanographers were captured and held for eleven months by the North Korean government; and

Whereas, This year marks the forty-sixth anniversary of North Korea's attack on the U.S.S. Pueblo and her crew; and

Whereas, The U.S.S. Pueblo is still in commission in the United States Navy but continues to be held by the North Korean government and is currently a museum in Pyongyang, North Korea: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

(1) That we, the members of the General Assembly, recognize the bravery and sacrifice of the crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo; and

(2) That we take pride in the fact that the U.S.S. Pueblo bears the name of a city and a county in Colorado, and, therefore, the citizens of Colorado should be aware of the incident that occurred with the U.S.S. Pueblo forty-six years ago; and

(3) That we continue the call for Kim Jong Un and the North Korean government to return the U.S.S. Pueblo to the people of the United States; and

(4) That we hereby designate January 23 each year as ''U.S.S. Pueblo Day'' as a day to remember and honor the brave crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo.

Be It Further Resolved, That copies of this Joint Resolution be sent to President Barack Obama, Governor John W. Hickenlooper, President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate Patrick Leahy, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives John Boehner, and the members of Colorado's Congressional delegation.

POM–200. A memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico requesting the New Mexico Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C., to vote to support legislation that would remove the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE MEMORIAL NO. 2

Whereas, equal rights for women are not specifically included in the United States Constitution; and

Whereas, the rights of women in the United States to receive equal pay for equal work, be protected against domestic violence and have fair work-leave policies and access to the reproductive health care services of their choice, among others, are daily being questioned and restricted; and

Whereas, protection of women's rights at present is through a patchwork of existing laws, executive actions and judicial decisions that address individual cases of discrimination one by one as they arise; and

Whereas, each or all of these individual existing laws, executive actions and judicial decisions may be ignored, eroded or overturned; and

Whereas, an Amendment that would guarantee rights for women that are equal to those of men would provide a fundamental legal remedy against all cases of discrimination based on gender; and

Whereas, Resolutions to pass an Amendment to the United States Constitution that would guarantee equal rights for women and men have been introduced into Congress each year since 1923; and

Whereas, thirty-five of the thirty-eight states required for the Amendment to become part of the Constitution ratified the Equal Rights Amendment by the deadline of 1982; and

Whereas, the deadline for ratification is not in the binding text of the document itself and, in fact, was later extended by another Congress for an additional three years, thus establishing the precedent that Congress has the power to do so; and

Whereas, in the One Hundred Twelfth Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 39, introduced by Senator Ben Cardin, and House Joint Resolution 47, introduced by Representative Tammy Baldwin, would remove the deadline for ratification of the Amendment so that an additional three States may ratify it; and

Whereas, New Mexicans feel justly proud that New Mexico was one of the first states in the union to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment in 1973, and it passed its own Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of New Mexico in 1972: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That it call upon the New Mexico Congressional Delegation in Washington, D.C., to vote in favor of Legislation that would remove the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment so that efforts can proceed to get ratification by the necessary additional three states so that, finally, the guarantee of equal rights for women and men in the United States will become the Law of the Land; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to each member of the New Mexico Congressional Delegation and to the Chief Clerks of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States Congress.

POM–201. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen of Boonton, New Jersey, urging Congress to dedicate additional federal funds for highway maintenance and infrastructure improvements in New Jersey; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM–202. A resolution adopted by the Commission of the City of Pompano Beach, Florida, supporting efforts to reduce gun violence and illegal firearms trafficking through more responsible gun sales and marketing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 149. A bill to provide effective criminal prosecutions for certain identity thefts, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Robin S. Rosenbaum, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mark G. Mastroianni, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

Bruce Howe Hendricks, of South Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina.

Leslie Ragon Caldwell, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COATS, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2086. A bill to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 2087. A bill to protect the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to reconciliation involving changes to the Medicare program; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2088. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act with respect to the exportation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2089. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 2090. A bill to prohibit the export from the United States of certain electronic waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2091. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2092. A bill to provide certain protections from civil liability with respect to the emergency administration of opioid overdose drugs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2093. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to modify the purposes of authorized collection of business records and to prohibit the bulk collection of metadata, to require judicial review of national security letters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2094. A bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. KING):

S. 2095. A bill to reauthorize and modify the pilot program of the Department of Veterans Affairs under which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs provides health services to veterans through qualifying non-Department

of Veterans Affairs health care providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 2096. A bill to amend the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 2004 to provide for the authorization of liquified natural gas terminals and related facilities necessary for the export of Alaska natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COATS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 2097. A bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

S. 2098. A bill to ratify and approve certain payments to school districts serving Yellowstone National Park; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. Res. 376. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 37

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 37, a bill to sustain the economic development and recreational use of National Forest System land and other public land in the State of Montana, to add certain land to the National Wilderness Preservation System, to release certain wilderness study areas, to designate new areas for recreation, and for other purposes.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 192, a bill to enhance the energy security of United States allies, and for other purposes.

S. 315

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 315, a bill to reauthorize and extend the Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research, and Education Amendments of 2008.

S. 370

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 813

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 813, a bill to require that Peace Corps volunteers be subject to the same limitations regarding coverage of abortion services as employees of the Peace Corps with respect to coverage of such services, and for other purposes.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 836, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the earned income tax credit and make permanent certain tax provisions under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 933, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018.

S. 972

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 972, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services replacing ICD–9 with ICD–10 in implementing the HIPAA code set standards.

S. 975

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 975, a bill to provide for the inclusion of court-appointed guardianship improvement and oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009.

S. 1114

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1114, a bill to provide for identification of misaligned currency, require action to correct the misalignment, and for other purposes.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1456

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1456, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1688

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1688, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), collectively, in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II.

S. 1708

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1708, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the establishment of performance measures for the highway safety improvement program, and for other purposes.

S. 1764

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1764, a bill to limit the retirement of A–10 aircraft.

S. 1799

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1799, a bill to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

S. 1828

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi

(Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1828, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 1920

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1920, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the research and development credit to encourage innovation.

S. 1961

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1961, a bill to protect surface water from contamination by chemical storage facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1998

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1998, a bill to amend the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act to reserve funds for American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian, and Tribal College or University adult education and literacy.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2085, a bill to address shortages and interruptions in the availability of propane and other home heating fuels in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 370

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 370, a resolution supporting the territorial integrity of Ukraine and condemning Russian military aggression in Ukraine.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 376—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 376

Whereas there are more than 3,500,000,000 women in the world today;

Whereas women around the world participate in the political, social, and economic life of their communities, play a critical role in providing and caring for their families, contribute substantially to the growth of economies and the prevention of conflict, and, as both farmers and caregivers, play an important role in advancing food security for their communities;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas on November 15, 2013, Secretary of State John Kerry stated: ''Creating opportunities for women is not just the right thing to do. It's also a strategic necessity. Societies where women are safe, where women are empowered to exercise their rights and to move their communities forward—these societies are more prosperous and more stable—not occasionally, but always.'';

Whereas on December 19, 2011, the Obama Administration launched the first United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (referred to in this preamble as the ''National Action Plan'') that included a comprehensive set of national commitments to advance the active participation of women in decision making relating to matters of war and peace;

Whereas the National Action Plan states: ''Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become equal partners in all aspects of peace-building and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their experiences considered, and their voices heard.'';

Whereas women remain underrepresented in conflict prevention and conflict resolution efforts, despite proven successes by women in conflict-affected regions in moderating violent extremism, countering terrorism, resolving disputes through non-violent mediation and negotiation, and stabilizing their societies by improving access to peace and security services, institutions, and decision-making venues;

Whereas the ability of women to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve strong and lasting economic growth and political and social stability;

Whereas according to the International Monetary Fund, ''focusing on the needs and empowerment of women is one of the keys to human development'';

Whereas according to the Global Gender Gap Report 2013 published by the World Economic Forum, ''reducing gender inequality enhances productivity and economic growth'';

Whereas according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, two-thirds of the 774,000,000 illiterate people in the world are female;

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, ''educated women are less likely to marry early and more likely to have smaller and healthier families. They are also more likely to get a job and earn a higher wage.'';

Whereas according to the United Nations Children Fund, ''adolescent girls that attend school [are more likely to] delay marriage and childbearing, are less vulnerable to disease including HIV and AIDS, and [are more likely to] acquire information and skills that lead to increased earning power. Evidence shows that the return to a year of secondary education for girls correlates to a 25 percent increase in wages later in life.'';

Whereas according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the majority of women living in rural areas of the developing world are heavily engaged in agricultural labor, yet they receive less credit, land, agricultural inputs, and training than their male counterparts;

Whereas according to the World Bank, women own or partly own over one-third of small and medium-sized enterprises in developing countries, and 40 percent of the global workforce is female, yet, women entrepreneurs and employers have disproportionately less access to capital and other financial services;

Whereas despite strides in recent decades, women around the world continue to face significant obstacles in all aspects of their lives, including underrepresentation in all aspects of public life, denial of basic human rights, and discrimination;

Whereas despite achievements by individual female leaders, women around the world are still vastly underrepresented in high-level positions and in national and local legislatures and governments and, according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 21.4 percent of national parliamentarians;

Whereas 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of gender-based violence, and 1 in 4 women has suffered abuse during pregnancy;

Whereas according to UN Women, violence against women causes more death and disability for women and girls between the ages of 15 and 44 than cancer, war, traffic accidents, and malaria combined;

Whereas on August 10, 2012, President Obama announced the first interagency Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally;

Whereas violence against women and girls impedes progress in meeting many international global development goals, including efforts to stem maternal mortality and the spread of HIV/AIDS;

Whereas on October 11, 2013, President Obama stated that the practice of child marriage was a ''threat to fundamental human rights'';

Whereas according to the International Center for Research on Women, one-third of girls worldwide are married before the age of 18 and 1 in 9 girls are married before the age of 15;

Whereas according to Save the Children, pregnancy-related complications are a leading cause of death among girls between the ages of 15 and 19 in developing countries;

Whereas according to the United Nations Population Fund, women have access to fewer income-earning opportunities and tend to manage the household and partake in agricultural work, thus increasing their vulnerability to natural disasters and long-term changes in weather patterns;

Whereas it is imperative to alleviate violence and discrimination against women and afford women every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities; and

Whereas March 8 is recognized each year as International Women's Day, a global day to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women past, present, and future, and a day to recognize the obstacles that women still face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of International Women's Day;

(2) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of countries to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security;

(3) recognizes and honors the women in the United States and around the world who have worked throughout history to ensure that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights;

(4) reaffirms the commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women

and girls worldwide, and to promoting meaningful and significant participation of women in all aspects of their societies and communities; and

(5) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's Day with appropriate programs and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2805. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. KING, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2806. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. HELLER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1821, to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2805. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. KING, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PREVENTING REGULATORY OVERREACH TO ENHANCE CARE TECHNOLOGY.

(a) FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(A) The mobile health and mobile application economy was created in the United States and is now being exported globally, with the market expected to exceed $26,000,000,000 by 2017.

(B) The United States mobile application economy is responsible for nearly 500,000 new jobs in the United States.

(C) Consumer health information technologies, including smart phones and tablets, have the potential to transform health care delivery through reduced systemic costs, improved patient safety, and better clinical outcomes.

(D) Clinical and health software innovation cycles evolve and move faster than the existing regulatory approval processes.

(E) Consumers and innovators need a new risk-based framework for the oversight of clinical and health software that improves on the framework of the Food and Drug Administration.

(F) A working group convened jointly by the Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology identified in a report that there are several major barriers to the effective regulation of health information technology that cannot be alleviated without changes to existing law.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the President and Congress must intervene to facilitate interagency coordination across regulators that focuses agency efforts on fostering health information technology and mobile health innovation while better protecting patient safety, improving health care, and creating jobs in the United States;

(B) the President and the Congress should work together to develop and enact legislation that establishes a risk-based regulatory framework for such clinical software and health software that reduces regulatory burdens, fosters innovation, and, most importantly, improves patient safety;

(C) The National Institute of Standards and Technology should be the Federal agency that has oversight over technical standards used by clinical software; and

(D) The National Institute of Standards and Technology, in collaboration with the Federal Communications Commission, the National Patient Safety Foundation, and the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, should work on next steps, beyond current oversight efforts, regarding health information technology, such as collaborating with nongovernmental entities to develop certification processes and to promote best practice standards.

(b) CLINICAL SOFTWARE AND HEALTH SOFTWARE.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(ss)(1) The term 'clinical software' means clinical decision support software or other software (including any associated hardware and process dependencies) intended for human or animal use that—

''(A) captures, analyzes, changes, or presents patient or population clinical data or information and may recommend courses of clinical action, but does not directly change the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals; and

''(B) is intended to be marketed for use only by a health care provider in a health care setting.

''(2) The term 'health software' means software (including any associated hardware and process dependencies) that is not clinical software and—

''(A) that captures, analyzes, changes, or presents patient or population clinical data or information;

''(B) that supports administrative or operational aspects of health care and is not used in the direct delivery of patient care; or

''(C) whose primary purpose is to act as a platform for a secondary software, to run or act as a mechanism for connectivity, or to store data.

''(3) The terms 'clinical software' and 'health software' do not include software—

''(A) that is intended to interpret patient-specific device data and directly diagnose a patient or user without the intervention of a health care provider;

''(B) that conducts analysis of radiological or imaging data in order to provide patient-specific diagnostic and treatment advice to a health care provider;

''(C) whose primary purpose is integral to the function of a drug or device; or

''(D) that is a component of a device.''.

(2) PROHIBITION.—Subchapter A of chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 524B. CLINICAL SOFTWARE AND HEALTH SOFTWARE.

''Clinical software and health software shall not be subject to regulation under this Act.''.

(c) EXCLUSION FROM DEFINITION OF DEVICE.—Section 201(h) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(h)) is amended by adding at the end ''The term 'device' does not include clinical software or health software.''.

SA 2806. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. HELLER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1821, to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines; as follows:

On page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike ''January 1, 2014, and before March 1, 2014,'' and inserting ''the date of the enactment of this Act, and before April 15, 2014,''.

On page 2, beginning at line 23, strike all through line 25.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, March 13, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 10 a.m., to conduct an oversight hearing to receive testimony on ''Tribal Transportation: Pathways to Infrastructure and Economic Development in Indian Country.''

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224–2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SR–328A of the Russell Senate Office.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Map-21 Reauthorization: The Federal Role and Current Challenges to Public Transportation.''

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Enhancing Our Rail Safety; Current Challenges for Passenger and Freight Rail.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate office building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Preventing Potential Chemical Threats and Improving Safety: Oversight of the President's Executive Order on Improving Chemical Facility Safety and Security.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 11 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''Syria Spillover: The Growing Threat of Terrorism and Sectarianism in the Middle East.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 2:15 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 6, 2014, at 10 a.m., in SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room 345 of the Cannon House Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 6, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Oversight of Contractor Performance Information.''

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that MAJ Matthew Altman, a military fellow in my office, be given floor privileges for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by me, with the concurrence of Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 512; there be 20 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of the time the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate on the nomination; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

PHILIPPINES CHARITABLE GIVING ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1821 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that a Hirono-Heller amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; further, that upon passage the bill be held at the desk and that if the Senate receives a bill from the House, the text of which is identical to S. 1821, as passed by the Senate, the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, the bill be read three times and passed, without any intervening action or debate; finally, the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed and all motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 2806) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To change the dates during which contributions may be made to be treated as made in 2013, and for other purposes)

On page 2, lines 7 and 8, strike ''January 1, 2014, and before March 1, 2014,'' and inserting ''the date of the enactment of this Act, and before April 15, 2014,''.

On page 2, beginning at line 23, strike all through line 25.

SEC. 2. ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF TYPHOON HAIYAN IN THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a taxpayer may treat any contribution described in subsection (b) made after the date of enactment of this Act, and before April 15, 2014, as if such contribution was made on December 31, 2013, and not in 2014.

(b) CONTRIBUTION DESCRIBED.—A contribution is described in this subsection if such contribution is a cash contribution made for the relief of victims in areas affected by Typhoon Haiyan, for which a charitable contribution deduction is allowable under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—In the case of a contribution described in subsection (b), a telephone bill showing the name of the donee organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution shall be treated as meeting the recordkeeping requirements of section 170(f)(17) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

The bill (S. 1821), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1821

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 ''Philippines Charitable Giving Assistance Act''.

SEC. 2. ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF TYPHOON HAIYAN IN THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a taxpayer may treat any contribution described in subsection (b) made after the date of the enactment of this Act, and before April 15, 2014, as if such contribution was made on December 31, 2013, and not in 2014.

(b) CONTRIBUTION DESCRIBED.—A contribution is described in this subsection if such contribution is a cash contribution made for the relief of victims in areas affected by Typhoon Haiyan, for which a charitable contribution deduction is allowable under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—In the case of a contribution described in subsection (b), a telephone bill showing the name of the donee organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution shall be treated as meeting the recordkeeping requirements of section 170(f)(17) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 3370

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that H.R. 3370 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3370) to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 4118 AND S. 2097

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2097) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4118) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the implementation of the penalty for failure to comply with the individual health insurance mandate.

Mr. REID. I ask for a second reading but object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 106–567, reappoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Interest Declassification Board: Sanford Ungar of Maryland.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m. on Monday, March 10, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that at 5 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the McHugh nomination and the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to the cloture vote on the McHugh nomination; further, that upon conclusion of the cloture vote and notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, if invoked, the Senate resume legislative session and vote on passage of S. 1917; and that if cloture is invoked on the McHugh nomination, the time during the vote on passage of S. 1917 count postcloture on the nomination.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I didn't note, we are going to be in session at 4 p.m. on Monday. If I could add an additional comment, there will be two rollcall votes on Monday starting at 5:30.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2014, AT 4 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned until 4 p.m. on Monday, March 10, 2014.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:14 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 10, 2014, at 4 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN, OF OHIO, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

SUZANNE ELEANOR SPAULDING, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

JOHN ROTH, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

RHONDA K. SCHMIDTLEIN, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2021.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL A. HAMMER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE.

ROSE EILENE GOTTEMOELLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ARMS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

R. GIL KERLIKOWSKE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO IOWA DONOR NETWORK

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize the Iowa Donor Network for twenty years of saving and enhancing lives in our great state through organ and tissue donation.

The Iowa Donor Network plays a unique role in our state as the sole, federally designated organ procurement organization. For two decades, this remarkable organization has saved and improved countless lives through organ and tissue recovery. By expertly employing the five core values of care, responsibility, adaptability, integrity, and respect, the Iowa Donor Network has made great strides towards fulfilling its vision of increasing Iowa's viable donations and reducing waiting periods for those in need of transplants.

Mr. Speaker, the great work done every day by the Iowa Donor Network, and all organ procurement organizations across the country, provides a crucial and life-changing service to our communities. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in saying "yes" to individual organ donation and I thank all organ and tissue donors for their invaluable and selfless contribution. It is a great honor to represent so many Iowans in the United States Congress who have been positively impacted by organ and tissue donation, and I look forward to many more years of the Iowa Donor Network's positive impact in Iowa.

CELEBRATING MR. MERVIN FIELD

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Mr. Mervin Field on the occasion of the Tiburon Heritage & Arts Commission event to be held on March 10, 2014 to honor more than seven decades of Mr. Fields' service. As founder of the Field Poll, the results of which could make or break careers, he has had tremendous influence in the political history of California and has been the recipient of numerous awards for his work, including the New York-based Market Research Council's Hall of Fame award.

Mervin also served his country by joining the Merchant Marines in 1942, where he was on active duty for three years in the North Atlantic and South Pacific.

After years of such impressive accomplishments, Mr. Field was awarded by the Trustees of the California State University with an honorary Doctor of Laws degree, noting that he had become "a highly respected leader" and "a trusted advisor to academia, civic associations, governmental institutions and the business community."

Mervin is a community treasure, and we are grateful for his long and impressive record of service. Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to Mr. Mervin Field for his many years of dedication and long-lasting impact on California politics.

HONORING CARTER R. THOMPSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Carter R. Thompson. Carter is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 310, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Carter has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Carter has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Carter has earned the rank of Warrior in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say, has become a Brotherhood Member of the Order of the Arrow, and serves as his troop's Senior Patrol Leader. Carter has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Carter cleared a trail and replaced a vandalized handrail at the organized campground at Longview Lake in Lee's Summit, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Carter R. Thompson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3826, which would short-circuit an ongoing process to engage stakeholders and develop reasonable, effective controls on carbon pollution from power plants.

This pollution poses a serious threat to public health. According to the American Public Health Association, about half of the U.S. population lives in areas where air pollution is linked to illness, including asthma, heart attacks, lung cancer, and stroke. Moreover, an overwhelming majority of climate scientists agree that carbon pollution is linked to climate change, causing sea-level rise and more extreme weather events across the globe. That is why the Supreme Court has confirmed that the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority under the Clean Air Act to address carbon pollution and safeguard our health and natural resources.

Power plants are the largest source of carbon pollution in the United States, but their carbon emissions are completely unregulated. Currently, the Environmental Protection Agency is engaged with stakeholders to develop a rule for emissions for new power plants, and they plan to address existing power plants as well. These rules would use available technologies for carbon capture and sequestration.

Today's legislation would halt that process. It leaves pollution controls on new power plants to the discretion of the plants themselves, which are unlikely to take action unless an industry-wide standard is in place. And it effectively repeals the Environmental Protection Agency's authority to limit carbon pollution from existing power plants.

By preventing any limitation on the largest source of carbon pollution in the United States, this bill recklessly endangers public health and the environment. I urge a "no" vote.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014. In my home state of New Jersey, home and business owners are continuing to recover from the devastation caused by Superstorm Sandy, now more than a year ago. Even for property owners not affected by Sandy, premium increases under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) have proven to be unaffordable and unsustainable. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle have been working in recent months to craft the compromise before us today, and it is my hope that following bipartisan passage here in the House, this legislation will quickly pass the Senate and be signed into law by the President.

The Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act will repeal certain rate increase "triggers" that would result in dramatic premium increase from the sale of a home or lapse of a policy. The bill will restore "grandfathered" rates for home and business that were remapped into higher risk areas, often

resulting in catastrophic rate increases. The bill places caps on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) ability to increase policy rates on primary homes, now capped at 15 percent annually under the bill, and enact additional caps to ensure affordability, while providing FEMA with the resources to complete a flood insurance affordability study within 18 months of the bill's enactment. This legislation will provide relief to families that have already been hit with substantial premium increases, and to communities that successfully challenge redrawn FEMA flood maps. Finally, these changes will be paid for by enacting a $25/year surcharge on insured primary residences, and a $250/year surcharge on all other insured properties.

I expect that the passage of this bill will provide relief and certainty to those in New Jersey and around the country dealing with premium increase, but we must not ignore the need to plan for a changing climate, sea level rise, and an increased risk of extreme weather and flooding. For those living in flood prone areas the risk of flood will only increase, stressing the limited resources available under the NFIP, and continuing to devastate communities and families.

I expect flood insurance is an issue that Congress will need to continue to revisit in coming years, but for now I believe the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act will serve to address many of the concerns I have heard from home and business owners, flood plain managers, insurers, and REALTORS in Central New Jersey.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT OF 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2013, because we need to fix the National Flood Insurance Program, create more transparency in how it is administered and get the program out of debt. This bill is a step forward in that direction. In addition to lowering rates for some policyholders who have seen sharp spikes in their annual premiums, the bill requires FEMA to implement a flood mapping program that results in technically credible flood hazard data; designate a flood insurance advocate to educate policyholders and coordinate with local officials; consult with communities before using new flood maps; and make publicly available any changes to rate tables and underwriting guidelines before instituting any such changes.

I also believe, however, that we could do more. By rushing this bill through the Congress we failed even to debate, let alone address, the Program's impact on non-primary residences—moderately priced second homes, small businesses, houses of worship, schools, non-profits. While H.R. 3370 will stop the spike in premiums for some primary homeowners, it will do nothing to keep premiums affordable for the small businesses that provide vital services to and strengthen the economies of coastal communities; and it will do nothing to ensure that the churches, schools, and non-profit institutions that anchor these communities will be able to afford their rising premiums. On the contrary, the bill includes a premium surcharge of $250 per year on second homes and non-residential properties as a way to offset its cost.

Clearly, H.R. 3370 is not perfect, but it is an improvement over the status quo and that's why I will vote for it. On balance, I feel that it is better to accept an imperfect bill than wait for a perfect measure. However, we must continue to seek opportunities to address these defects as we move forward.

HONORING THE 10TH ANNUAL VETERANS SNOWMOBILE RIDE

HON. DAN BENISHEK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 10th annual Veterans Snowmobile Ride, which will occur on Saturday, March 8, 2014.

This event, founded by Don and Diane Reed, veterans and owners of the Fox River Motel and sponsored by the Seney Snowmobile Association, leads riders through approximately one hundred miles of the scenic Upper Peninsula of Michigan in honor of those who have fought to defend the American way of life.

Beginning in 2004 with just 50 riders, it has grown to nearly 300 in the 2013 ride. The Veterans Snowmobile Ride has the distinction of being the largest veterans ride of this type in the United States.

In addition to those who ride their snowmobiles in this event, I wish to commend all those who help to realize the Veterans Snowmobile Ride motto of "be a Vet, bring a Vet, thank a Vet."

This event is a poignant way to thank those who have defended our country and a continuation of the Northern Michigan outdoorsman tradition.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 5, 2014 I was inadvertently detained on rollcall vote 97. Had I been present to vote I would have voted "yes."

HONORING DANIEL J. GILBERT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Daniel J. Gilbert. Daniel is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 865, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Daniel has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Daniel has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Daniel has earned the rank of Firebuilder in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say, has become an Ordeal Member of the Order of the Arrow, and earned the Ad Altari Dei religious award. Daniel has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Daniel dismantled an old playground set, then expanded and mulched the playground area at the Hope House in Lee's Summit, Missouri, in order to prepare the site for a new playground.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Daniel J. Gilbert for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

H.R. 2548, ELECTRIFY AFRICA ACT OF 2013

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of H.R. 2548, the Electrify Africa Act, which will help enrich the lives of the some 589 million people who live in an electricity depleted part of Africa.

This legislation will bring much needed support to a region that desperately needs it. As you are aware, 68 percent of the population in sub-Saharan Africa does not have access to electricity. This bill, if enacted, would establish a base of infrastructure from which economies can grow, improve health and education outcomes, and contribute to sustainable poverty reduction.

I have visited Ghana and Liberia and seen firsthand the struggles that people deal with every day as they try to live a normal life. Power outages are a regular occurrence, while families may wait hours, days, or even weeks for electricity to be restored. A reliable electrical grid will help give businesses looking to make investments in Africa a greater degree of confidence in the infrastructure. The investments they make could help pull many out of poverty and hunger as local economies grow and people gain steady employment.

There are not just economic benefits to consider, though. Electricity is also crucial to health outcomes. Certain medicines and vaccines require strict temperature regulation that is impossible to achieve without access to reliable electricity. Lifesaving devices and monitoring devices also require energy to function. An improved electrical infrastructure could also reduce the prevalence of illnesses like respiratory diseases that come from the use of harmful household fuels. On average, there are more than 3 million annual premature deaths from respiratory disease in sub-Saharan Africa. Shockingly, this number is higher than the annual number of deaths from HIV/AIDS and malaria.

One final benefit I want to highlight is the educational improvement achievable as schools with a dependable source of energy can harness technology to educate the rapidly-growing youth population in Africa. In

some countries, more than half of the population is under the age of 25. Quality education for this generation of young people could further contribute to dynamism and innovation in their countries' economies.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2548 will bring many positive opportunities to a continent that is in great need of assistance. I truly appreciate you and the committee giving this bill the attention it deserves. Electrifying Africa will not only create a brighter future for those who live in the region, but will also strengthen Africa's independence, promote continued economic development, and ensure the continent remains a vibrant source of art, culture, and history for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING LINDA MARTIN

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Mrs. Linda Martin, a finalist for the 2014 School Counselor of the Year award. This distinguished award, presented by the American School Counselor Association, honors school counselors ''who have made outstanding and exemplary contributions to students, the school community, and the school counseling profession.''

Mrs. Martin has led the Comprehensive Guidance Program at Palm Lake Elementary School for 20 years. As an innovative teacher, she founded the Kids Who Care program to serve Palm Lake Elementary, the Orlando community and Nkomo Primary School, a sister school in South Africa. Her classroom lessons cover a wide range of topics including character development and leadership.

Mrs. Martin's remarkable service has also been recognized on the county and state levels. In 2012, she was named Orange County School Counselor of the Year, and, in 2013, was awarded Elementary School Counselor of the Year by the Florida School Counselor Association.

School counselors play an invaluable role in students' academic and personal development, teaching important life skills and compelling them to strive toward their goals. It is my pleasure to recognize Mrs. Martin for her exemplary dedication to the students of Palm Lake Elementary.

IN HONOR OF THE ARIZONA STATE LIBRARY

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Arizona State Library. The 150th anniversary of the Arizona Territorial Library, which was established in 1864 and became the State Library in 1915, was celebrated this year. Next year is the State Library's 100th anniversary.

A department of the Secretary of State's office, the State Library provides access to historical records and operates the Arizona Capitol Museum. In the beginning, the State Library was mainly a law library, recording the laws of the territorial government and conducting legislative research. In recent years, this institution has grown to house historical archives, public records, and special collections such as the Arizona Memory Project, which is a collection of digitized records about the history and geography of Arizona. It also provides consulting services to county and local libraries and other government agencies to help them better manage public records. As part of the Library of Congress's Chronicling America territorial newspaper collection, the State Library also houses the Arizona Digital Newspaper Project. It was recently recognized as the Federal Depository Library of the Year for 2013 and is Arizona's only complete federal documents collection.

Congratulations to the Arizona State Library for its many years of service to the people of Arizona.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the House Energy and Commerce Committee for their leadership and shared goal of promoting legislation that incentivizes stakeholders to manufacture and implement energy efficient technologies throughout our economy. Congress should always be looking for creative ways to incentivize our great American innovators like A.O. Smith to manufacture energy efficient technologies that consumers clearly want. So I commend you on your dedication to this effort and look forward to supporting H.R. 2126.

Sometimes we don't have to look too hard for ways to unleash American innovation and promote energy efficiency. Sometimes, we just have to use common sense and get the Federal Government out of the way.

One concrete way Congress can force the government to get out of the way of our job creators would be to require the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency to recognize independent test results for air conditioning, furnace, boiler, heat pump and water heater products that are already subject to the rigors of an independent voluntary industry compliance program (or ''VICP'').

Through the VICP, manufacturers of these highly efficient products contract with an independent, third-party laboratory to ensure their products comply with federal efficiency and conservation standards. Manufacturers spend millions to participate and run the VICP, and the program has been a resounding success for years.

But the federal government won't accept VICP data for compliance purposes. Instead, the DOE and EPA (which manages the Energy Star program) force manufacturers that participate in the VICP to subject their products to two additional rounds of tests to satisfy agency standards. But to make matters worse, the DOE and EPA tests aren't any different than the VICP tests. Each test takes place at the same laboratories responsible for the VICP tests, with the same technicians on the same products.

The end result: manufacturers of highly efficient air conditioning, furnace, boiler, heat pump and water heater products pay for three rounds of tests to effectuate the same result: making federal regulators happy.

That, my colleagues, smacks of inefficient government bureaucracy that serves no purpose other than redirecting operational capital to satisfy the whims of the Obama Administration. We can and should do a better job of incentivizing manufacturers to innovate and invest in job creation—not to waste precious operational capital on complying with nonsensical bureaucratic mandates.

I intend to eliminate this regulatory roadblock through legislation very similar to an amendment introduced last September by Senators SESSIONS and PRYOR during debate for S. 1392. That amendment, in the words of Senator SESSIONS, would have ''require[d] the Energy Department, when conducting routine testing to verify product ratings, to rely on data submitted through voluntary, independent certification programs'' that satisfy a robust test of independence and transparency.

COMMEMORATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. PETER'S PARISH OF THE NEW YORK ARCHDIOCESE

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 175th Anniversary of the founding of St. Peter's Parish, the mother parish of Staten Island. The social vitality and spirit of community that the St. Peter's Parish brings to my district cannot possibly be overstated and, as the oldest Roman Catholic parish on Staten Island, this historic occasion is of great significance to our entire community. With the Catholic population of Staten Island consisting of only around 100 people at the founding of the parish in 1839, Father Ildefonso Madrano, the first minister of St. Peter's, was also tasked with serving the Catholic communities of Perth Amboy, New Brunswick, and Princeton, New Jersey. While the congregation met in an abandoned factory for five years, construction on a dedicated church moved slowly yet steadily, made possible by a generous donation of land by the New Brighton Association.

Quickly turning into a staple of life on Staten Island, the pastors of St. Peter's directed the construction of a grammar school as well as additional parishes on the island as the local population continued to grow. At the same time, church ministers showed their dedication to the local community by tending to Staten Islanders' various spiritual and material needs. One of St. Peter's early pastors, Father Patrick Murphy, gave his life in the service of those in need, contracting cholera while tending to the thousands of Irish immigrants quarantined in a hospital in the nearby Tompkinsville neighborhood of the Island.

It is in the same spirit that the parish of St. Peter's has exemplified the communal spirit of caring and service over the past 175 years. Thanks to the resilience of community members and parishioners, St. Peter's has survived

and even expanded its educational role with the establishment what is now the St. Peter's Boys High School under Monsignor Joseph Farrell in the early 20th Century. The contributions of the St. Peter's community continue up to this day, with the parish under the faithful guidance of co-vicar Monsignor James J. Dorney since 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply humbled to represent this dedicated congregation in Congress, and I would ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in honoring and celebrating the virtues that the St. Peter's parish has displayed over its long history. I cannot imagine what the Staten Island community would be like today without the contributions of the St. Peter's congregation, and I sincerely wish this incredible institution a happy 175th birthday, with hopefully just as many more to come.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF PATRICK J. McDONOUGH

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, Robert Mansker, a longtime and now retired staff member in the House, asked me to recognize the passing of another longtime and dedicated staff member of this body: Patrick J. McDonough, as Chief of the Publications and Distribution Service.

The House lost a fine citizen on Sunday, November 10. Patrick J. McDonough of Friendship Heights passed away from a continuing struggle with respiratory problems. His illness took him from us far too soon. He was a very familiar face to the long-time employees of the House.

When the House maintained the ''Folding Room'' in years past, Pat rose to the position of Chief of the Publications and Distribution Service, as it was formally known. He maintained an incredibly personable demeanor, and he worked well with both Democrats and Republicans.

Born October 25, 1943, Pat was originally from Parkersburg, West Virginia, where he attended the Parkersburg Catholic School System. He continued his higher education at The Pontifical College Josephinum, Catholic University and American University.

Pat taught high school religion at St. Anthony's Catholic High School in Washington, DC, and coached junior varsity basketball during the period John Thompson, Sr. was head coach. He was an avid supporter of the Georgetown Hoyas, always inviting friends to join him to share his mid-court seats at the Verizon Center for home games.

Pat then began his career in government, when he came to the House of Representatives. He then served in the Clinton Administration in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, until his retirement.

Pat was a proud member of The Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in the City of New York and joined with them each year when the group convened.

A celebration of his life was held at St. Margaret Mary Church in Parkersburg on Sunday, November 18, followed by his burial at Mt. Carmel Cemetery. Our condolences are extended to his family and to his many friends.

RECOGNIZING VICTIMS OF THE MASS MURDER OF ARMENIANS

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness of the mass murder of Armenians during the state-sponsored pogroms 26 years ago in Sumgait, Azerbaijan. These ethnically motivated mass killings were an affront to basic human rights and the continued lack of international recognition and acknowledgment represents a grave injustice.

Peaceful demonstrations by Armenians of Nagorno Karabakh, who sought freedom and protested against policies that discriminated against Armenians, were met with violence against the Armenians of Sumgait, who were hundreds of miles away, defenseless, and targeted simply because they were Armenians. Nearby security forces allowed the violence to continue unabated and turned a blind eye to the horrific violence directed against Armenian civilians. True democracies must respect the rights of the minority and the human rights of all residents.

On July 27, 1988, the U.S. Senate unanimously passed Amendment 2690, which called upon the Soviet government to ''respect the legitimate aspirations of the Armenian people'', and noted that ''dozens of Armenians have been killed and hundreds injured during the recent unrest.'' The U.S. Senate passed an amendment in July 1988, acknowledging that even the Soviet authorities had described these massacres as a 'pogrom'.

Today, I remember the victims and ask this body to join me in honoring their memories.

ECOGRAPHICS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud EcoGraphics Printing and owner Scott Feavel for receiving the Small Business of the Year award from the West Chamber serving Jefferson County.

The Small Business of the Year is awarded to a business with 50 employees or less and is involved and engaged in improving the business community in Jefferson County.

EcoGraphics Printing produces excellent work for their clients. As the leader of the company, Scott Feavel is involved with the community on many fronts. He generously raises money for Children's Hospital cancer ward, donates to several associations throughout Jefferson County and mentors other chamber members and small business people.

I extend my deepest congratulations to EcoGraphics Printing and owner Scott Feavel for this well deserved honor from the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. I have no doubt Scott and EcoGraphics Printing will exhibit the same dedication and character in all their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS A. SHERMAN

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to a man who has dedicated 50 years of his life in the service of the State of California and to the United States of America. I say with the utmost sincerity there are few who have contributed more to the understanding and development of the challenging and dangerous discipline of wildland firefighting as Thomas A. Sherman. Riverside County is fortunate to have enjoyed the leadership and experience that Tom Sherman has provided. On March 8, 2014, he will formally retire from the Bureau of Land Management Fire Service as Division Chief of California Desert District Fire and Aviation. In total, Tom has served in multiple capacities of the fire service at the county, state, and federal level.

The roots of Tom's service go back generations when the Sherman (Schermarm) Family left Germany in the late 1800s to become some of the first settlers of the San Jacinto Mountains. Many years later, Tom was born in Upland, California on July 6, 1946 to Jack and Georgette Sherman. He spent a great deal of his youth in the Santa Ana Canyon learning from his grandfather and attending elementary school in Corona. He began what would become a long and thriving career in firefighting in 1963 as a Seasonal Firefighter with the California Division of Forestry (CDF) in Corona. After graduating from Blythe High School in 1965, he worked as a Firefighter with CDF in San Jacinto, California until 1966.

In September of 1966, Tom answered his nation's call and was drafted into the U.S. Army. He attended basic training at Fort Ord, California and was subsequently sent to Vietnam in 1967 as a soldier with the 1st Battalion, 84th Artillery of the 9th Infantry Division. His potential was recognized by his superiors with a promotion to Sergeant and gun-crew NCO in charge. He and his battalion earned two Presidential Unit Citations for their gallant service. Tom returned to the United States in March of 1968 and took the knowledge learned in Vietnam to train new artillery soldiers at the Artillery School at Ft. Campbell, Kentucky. He was honorably discharged from the Army in June of 1968 as a Specialist 5th Class. Tom returned to California and immediately resumed his job at CDF as a Firefighter in Orange County

Tom's natural leadership led to the initiation of numerous firefighting programs that exist to this day. He designed the Riverside County Fire Department emblem, which was formally adopted in 1976 and is still used. That same year while buying guitar strings at the Corona Music Center he met MaryAnn Colapinto. Not long after they were walking down the aisle to be married.

As the 1970s progressed, he was appointed the first Fire Captain in the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD). In that capacity he further revolutionized wildland fire response through the development of rapidly deployable hand-crews and a state-recognized crew relief driver program. His vast experience led the transformation of obsolete fire trucks into ''Brush Engines'' specifically designed for the unique terrain of Southern California. In 1985

he was recognized as a California State Certified Fire Captain for the impacts made across the county and state. Tom continued to advocate issues at the RCFD as both the President of the Riverside County Volunteer Fire Association and Vice President of the Riverside County Fire Chiefs Association.

In the mid-1990s Tom expanded his influence when he was hired by the US Forest Service. There he was promoted to the position of Fire Crew manager for the Cleveland National Forest's Hotshot Crew. He transitioned to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) as a seasonal Fire Prevention Technician at the Barstow District, Apple Valley Fire Center. His leadership was soon recognized, and he was promoted to Battalion Chief and permanent Fire Prevention Officer for Palm Springs and South Coast Regions. In 2003 was promoted to Division Chief and filled the position of California Desert District Fire Operations Supervisor. There, he was responsible for training, equipping, and standardizing engine crews, thus increasing professionalism of the teams and interoperability throughout the district. Most recently, Tom has acted as California Desert District Fire and Aviation Manager, where he enhanced interagency cooperation throughout the State of California, formalized federal air support to fire, and reinforced the reputation of BLM as a viable firefighting service.

Today, Tom and MaryAnn reside in Corona, where MaryAnn is a Librarian of 25 years at Jefferson Elementary and a member of the Corona Library Board of Trustees. Tom has also been a member of the Elks Club and supports veterans issues as an active member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Their son, Tom began following his father's footsteps as a volunteer firefighter until he entered the United States Air Force Academy in 1991. He is currently a Colonel-Select in the United States Air Force's Security Forces and a student at the National War College at Ft McNair. Their daughter, Nancy, is a Global Clinical Research Program Manager at City of Hope in Pasadena, California.

Throughout his career, Tom's unending love for the fire service created a drive that never ceased to encourage those around him. Fortunately, his legacy will live on through the countless firefighters he has mentored. I am proud to honor such a tremendous member of our community. Passion of this level is rare, but it is the standard that Tom has set for his family, his fellow firefighters, and his community members. I believe I speak for the countless individuals who have benefited from Tom's service when I thank him for the contributions he has made and salute him as he retires after 50 years of service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the record that on Wednesday, March 5, 2014, I unfortunately missed rollcall votes as I traveled to New Britain, CT, with President Barack Obama on official business.

Had I been present I would have voted:

''No'' on the Previous Question (roll #93). Had a majority of the House voted no, this bill would have allowed a vote to renew the emergency unemployment insurance to help over 35,000 jobseekers in Connecticut;

''No'' on H. Res. 497 (roll #94), which prevented any amendments to H.R. 4118 from being considered;

''Aye'' on H.R. 938, the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act (roll #95), which I proudly cosponsored;

''Aye'' on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 4118 (roll #96) to prevent H.R. 4118 from altering, weakening, or delaying the ACA's prohibition of discrimination based on pre-existing conditions or gender and tax credits and rebates;

''No'' on H.R. 4118 (roll #97). Back in July of last year, I was concerned that the federal marketplace would not be ready for the October 1, 2013, start date for enrollment under the Affordable Care Act. And, in fact, as we saw last fall, the federal website was not ready to handle the volume from states that didn't set up their own exchange. The website problems were unacceptable. Based on the situation that I saw eight months ago, I believed that giving folks an extra year to learn about the benefits and responsibilities under the new law without penalty was a reasonable modification, particularly with misinformation spread about the Affordable Care Act and the uncertainty about the readiness of the marketplace.

I believe that my job is to solve problems and vote based on actual facts in my state and district, not ideology. And the facts in Connecticut in March 2014 are quite different than they were in July 2013. The exchanges have been up and running for five full months, and Connecticut is leading the way. With less than one month left in the enrollment period, over 130,000 people in Connecticut have signed up for health coverage through Access Health CT, exceeding the state and federal government's goals. Now is not the time to retroactively delay the individual mandate. As I've previously stated, the individual mandate, upheld by the Supreme Court, is a critical part of the Affordable Care Act. Since July 2013, I've held workshops for small businesses and individuals to learn more about the Affordable Care Act and how to sign up for health insurance. I've heard stories from constituents about how the Affordable Care Act has helped them access affordable, quality health care. A woman from Canaan, a breast cancer survivor, is now saving over $1,500 on her monthly premium; a former small business owner in New Britain can afford health insurance for the first time in 12 years.

The law is not perfect, and improvements can, should, and have been made. I will continue to raise concerns I've heard from folks in my district and to work with the Obama Administration to fix problems as they arise. But there is no question that the responsible course of action is to continue to move forward;

''Aye'' on H.R. 2126, the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act (roll #98), which was a bipartisan bill to expand energy efficiency standards.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 98 on Wednesday, March 5, 2014, I was inadvertently recorded as ''nay'' when I intended to vote ''aye'' on H.R. 2126, the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2014, as amended.

I've long been a proponent of improving energy efficiency across the board. I know the cheapest and cleanest kilowatts are the ones we don't need to generate because we are using energy more efficiently.

I've even authored my own bill to improve the energy efficiency of consumer electronics, the Smart Electronics Act. I whole heartedly support the package of measures that were included in H.R. 2126, which include improving energy efficiency at federal data centers, increasing efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters, promoting efficiency retrofits on low-income housing, and creating incentives for landlords and tenants to boost energy savings in commercial properties.

I hope that House passage of this bill will enable progress in the Senate on energy efficiency legislation; and I want to reiterate my support for H.R. 2126, which I had intended to express through an ''aye'' vote.

CONGRATULATING THE OXFORD HILLS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Oxford Hills Chamber of Commerce Business and Community Award Winners. The Oxford Hills Chamber of Commerce serves the people and business communities of central and western Maine, working hard to strengthen economic opportunity throughout the region and the state.

Each year, the Oxford Hills Chamber of Commerce recognizes local businesses, business leaders, and individuals who promote and advance a vital and healthy business environment. These individuals and businesses are committed to strengthening opportunity and prosperity in Maine.

This year's award recipients include: Oxford Federal Credit Union, recipient of the Business of the Year Award; Ronald Kugell, recipient of the Community Service Award; Catherine Fanjoy-Coffey, recipient of the Employee of the Year Award; and Buy the Fire, recipient of the Rising Star Award.

These recipients are among the best that Maine has to offer. Through their leadership and incredible commitment to their communities and the region, Maine is a better place in which to live and do business.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Oxford Hills Chamber of Commerce and these award recipients on their outstanding service and achievements.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following regarding two missed votes on March 4, 2014.

''Yes'' on H.R. 3370, Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

''Yes'' on H. Res. 488, Supporting the people of Venezuela as they protest peacefully for democratic change and calling to end the violence.

ALEXSANDER HAY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexsander Hay for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alexsander Hay is an 11th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexsander Hay is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alexsander Hay for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING A.H. PARKER HIGH SCHOOL AS ALABAMA'S CLASS 5A STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS 2014

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, continuing in the tradition of the ''District of Champions,'' I rise today to honor the A.H. Parker High School Thundering Herd on winning the 2014 State of Alabama title in the 5A State Basketball Championship—the first state title since 1975. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, I pay tribute to the Thundering Herd for their exemplary athleticism and teamwork as well as the outstanding leadership of Head Coach Reggie McGary and his coaching staff. We are extremely proud of these young men!

Parker's championship victory capped off an extraordinary season of 23 wins and 6 losses. Coach McGrary credited his team's success to the leadership of his assistant coach, Randal Smith. According to McGary, Smith's persistence in stressing the importance of defense was the team's key to victory. Throughout the championship game, Smith demanded that his defensive players bring their best to the court.

To earn their spot in the championship game, Parker High School dominated their opponents during the Steele City Invitational Tournament last December. The Thundering Herd faced its rival Ramsay High School to clinch the state title on March 1, 2014. During the championship game, the thundering herd played with the same skill and intensity that sustained them throughout the season. The team was celebrated for their consistent ability to defensively shutdown their opponents. Their strategy was no different when they competed for the state title as the Thundering Herd held Ramsey to just six points during the third quarter.

Although the team trailed 23–20 with 2:17 left in the first half, they would not allow their opponent to score again until the end of the third quarter. Senior Marquell Olivier led Parker with 15 points and nine rebounds while Omani Williams served as a defensive force for the team. Alontae Johnson also contributed nine points to the Thundering Herd's 56–46 victory. The win occurred on the 50th anniversary of the Thundering Herd's 1964 National Black High School Championship won at Tennessee State University.

As the daughter of a high school basketball coach, I know this decisive victory is the result of the tremendous efforts of both the players and coaching staff of A.H. Parker High School. The exemplary leadership and dedicated support from the coaching staff was a major factor in the success of the Thundering Herd. I commend Head Coach Reggie McGary and assistant coach Randal Smith and I am so proud of all they have accomplished.

On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the accomplishments of the A.H. Parker High School Boys Basketball Team for their victory in the Class 5A Alabama State Championship.

Congratulations! Go Bisons!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 28, 2014, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. I would have voted:

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 86 (on agreeing to the Cummings Amendment to H.R. 899),

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 87 (on agreeing to the Connolly Amendment to H.R. 899),

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 88 (on agreeing to the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 899),

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 89 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 899 with instructions), and

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 90 (on passage of H.R. 899).

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH HEIM HASKELL

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Representative MORGAN GRIFFITH, I submit these remarks to commemorate the life of Elizabeth Heim Haskell, who passed away February 11, 2014.

Mrs. Haskell was a pillar in her community and across the Commonwealth. She ran her own environmental consulting firm for nine years and authored many books and articles on the environment. She served on numerous boards and commissions, including the Air Pollution Control Board. She then served as Virginia's Secretary of Natural Resources under Governor Douglas Wilder.

After completing her term, Mrs. Haskell returned to Martinsville to work in her family's newspaper business as the director and vice president of The Martinsville Bulletin. She became involved with local civics, serving four years on the Martinsville City Council. She also was a member of the New College Planning Commission and then New College Institute's Board of Directors, where she promoted her firm belief in the important role of higher education in the area's economy. For her many contributions, particularly her work to further higher education in Southwest Virginia, the Virginia General Assembly named Mrs. Haskell the Outstanding Virginian in 2005.

Elizabeth Haskell exemplified commitment to bettering the lives of all Virginians. She will long be remembered for her distinguished service. She was predeceased by her husband, Robert H. Haskell III, and is survived by her son, Andrew Haskell of Morristown, N.J., three grandchildren, Chase Winn Haskell, Catherine Antoinette Haskell, and Harrison Robert Haskell, and her brother, Henry C. Heim of Gig Harbor, Washington.

Congressman GRIFFITH and I note with great sadness the loss of Elizabeth Haskell, a prominent leader in the Martinsville community and all of Virginia.

THE OCCASION OF MAJOR ALEX CROSS' RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

HON. JOHN KLINE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize and pay tribute to Major Alex Cross, United States Marine Corps, on the occasion of his retirement. My colleagues and I have had the pleasure of working with Major Cross over the past three years, to include his service as part of my congressional staff and later as the Deputy Director of the USMC Liaison Office in the United States House of Representatives.

From his arrival in January of 2011, Major Cross was a valuable member of my legislative team. Major Cross represented the Marine Corps with honor while providing expertise on Marine Corps programs and policies, and advising me on issues ranging from defense authorization to foreign affairs. Major Cross's work on my personal staff culminated in his recommended changes to Department of Defense recruitment policies signed into law in the FY13 National Defense Authorization Act that resulted in expanded opportunities for students of all educational backgrounds to join the Armed Forces.

From 2012 to 2014, Major Cross served as Deputy Director of the USMC House Liaison Office. During his time in the House Liaison Office, Major Cross planned, led, and executed many of the Marine Corps' most difficult

and challenging legislative initiatives. Major Cross distinguished himself as a leader and as a visible example of Marine Corps professionalism and values. Through his direct and skillful engagement with numerous Members of Congress, Major Cross ensured the Marine Corps' concepts, programs, and requirements were widely understood which resulted in direct and lasting improvements to Marine Corps war fighting capabilities, and the quality of life for Marines throughout the Marine Corps.

Major Cross also successfully planned, coordinated, and escorted more than 20 international and domestic trips for Congressional and Staff Delegations. These delegations traveled world-wide and visited heads of state, military commands, and deployed US military personnel. His meticulous planning, attention to detail, and anticipation of requirements allowed members of the House and staff to focus on fact-finding and learning new information to guide critical decisions made by the Members of Congress.

Throughout his tour, Major Cross personally responded to hundreds of Congressional inquiries, many of which gained national level attention. Through his exceptional interpersonal skills and broad knowledge in a wide range of military affairs, he assisted the Director, Marine Corps House of Representatives Liaison Office, in gaining the Members' support for issues critical to the Marine Corps. Major Cross also supported USMC House Liaison operations, to include planning and coordinating receptions and meetings on Capitol Hill for USMC personnel. These events included New Member Orientation for the Freshman Congressional Class of the 113th Congress and three Marine Corps Birthday Cake Cutting Ceremonies. He also scheduled and facilitated several hundred office calls for the leadership of the USMC to include the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, and numerous other General Officers conducting business on Capitol Hill.

Major Cross, through his dedication to professional engagement with Congress, has contributed immeasurably to the Marine Corps' reputation throughout Capitol Hill. The rapport he developed with Members of the House has made a lasting impression and set the tone for a lasting partnership between the Marine Corps and Congress for years to come. The time he has spent supporting my constituents and other Members of the House has been truly noteworthy. He has made lasting contributions to the United States House of Representatives and we wish him well in retirement.

ANGEL LUTHMAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angel Luthman for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Angel Luthman is an 8th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angel Luthman is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Angel Luthman for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following. I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote Number 93 on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule ''Providing for consideration of H.R. 3826, Electricity Security and Affordability Act, and providing for consideration of H.R. 4118, Suspending the Individual Mandate Penalty Law Equals Fairness Act'' (H. Res. 497). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote Number 94 regarding the Rule ''Providing for consideration of H.R. 3826, Electricity Security and Affordability Act, and providing for consideration of H.R. 4118, Suspending the Individual Mandate Penalty Law Equals Fairness Act'' (H. Res. 497). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote Number 95 regarding the ''United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013'' (H.R. 938). Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes''.

I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote Number 96 regarding the Motion to Recommit with Instructions on ''SIMPLE Fairness Act'' (H.R. 4118). Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes''.

I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote Number 97 regarding the ''SIMPLE Fairness Act'' (H.R. 4118). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote Number 98 regarding the ''Better Buildings Act of 2014'' (H.R. 2126). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no''.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTOPHER WARE

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Christopher Ware of Clinton, Illinois, a man who has overcome great personal obstacles and dedicated his life to public service and helping others.

Mr. Ware has worked for State Farm Insurance Company in Bloomington, Illinois as a Security and Safety Specialist for over twenty-two years. Christopher also served as a law enforcement officer with the Bloomington Police Department until he suffered a severe stroke in 1997. During his time with the police department, Christopher helped to coordinate outreach programs within his community.

In his limited spare time, Christopher has dedicated himself to public service and volunteering in his community. He currently serves as Chairman of the DeWitt County Housing Authority Board, Precinct Committeeman for DeWitt County, and trustee of the DeWitt-Livingston-McLean Counties Regional School Board.

In addition to his public service work, Christopher has volunteered countless hours for the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, serving in many leadership roles. In 2005, he received the ''Award of the Year'' or ''Hero Award'' from the Coast Guard Foundation for his work during Hurricane Katrina. In 2004 and 2011, Ware received the Lifetime Achievement Award in the USA Freedom Corps for his volunteer service activities. In 2002, the Governor of Illinois appointed Chris to the Illinois State Rehabilitation Council and in 2012 he was appointed to the Illinois Stroke Task Force.

It is my honor to recognize Christopher Ware for his lifetime dedication to helping others.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on Tuesday, March 4, 2014, I missed two recorded votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall 91 and ''yea'' on rollcall 92.

PATIENT SAFETY AWARENESS WEEK AND THE NATIONAL PATIENT SAFETY FOUNDATION

HON. ANN KIRKPATRICK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this week is Patient Safety Awareness Week, and today I'd like to recognize the National Patient Safety Foundation and the organizations in my district that work to promote and improve patient safety.

In Arizona's District One, we have several facilities that are committed to patient safety, including Oro Valley Hospital, Flagstaff Medical Center, and Ventana Medical Systems.

Oro Valley Hospital has been nationally recognized for its efforts, which include daily safety huddles and employee empowerment. At Flagstaff Medical Center, their patient safety program also encourages employee collaboration.

My district is home to Ventana Medical Systems, a world leader in developing solutions for tissue-based diagnoses. Ventana has a new advisory board that brings together experts to review patient safety.

I applaud the National Patient Safety Foundation and the hospitals and companies in my district and nationwide who are leading the way to keep patient safety as a top priority.

BRADY HOGOBOOM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Brady Hogoboom for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Brady Hogoboom is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Brady Hogoboom is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Brady Hogoboom for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF OPHELIA DEVORE-MITCHELL

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding and truly one-of-a-kind woman, Dr. Ophelia DeVore-Mitchell. Sadly, Dr. DeVore-Mitchell passed away on Friday, February 28, 2014. A Repast and Celebration of Life will be held on Sunday, March 23, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. at the Gallery at Fountain Park in Columbus, Georgia.

Dr. DeVore-Mitchell was widely known as one of our nation's first African-American models and the founder of the first black model agency. She was more well-known in Columbus, Georgia as the longtime owner of the Columbus Times newspaper, which is now owned and operated by her daughter, Ms. Carol Gertjegerdes.

Dr. DeVore-Mitchell was born in 1922 in Edgefield, South Carolina but moved to New York City, where she majored in Mathematics at New York University. At the age of 16, she was working for Ebony magazine and in 1946, she enrolled in the Vogue School of Modeling, which up until then had excluded women of color.

She was acutely aware of how African Americans were stereotypically depicted in the media, and she made it her mission to change this public perception. In 1946, Dr. DeVore-Mitchell opened the Grace del Marco Modeling Agency and in 1948, she founded the Ophelia DeVore School of Self-Development and Modeling. These agencies were pivotal in transforming the social landscape of America by paving the way for African Americans to pursue careers in the fashion and entertainment industries at a time when it was not the norm for black women to be recognized for their beauty.

In 1955, Dr. DeVore-Mitchell and her models made history as the hosts of ABC's ''Spotlight on Harlem,'' New York's first television program produced by and for African Americans. She went on to produce several other New York cable television shows, including the ''Ophelia DeVore Show.'' She again made history in 1959 and 1960 when two of her clients, Ms. Cecilia Cooper and Ms. LaJeune Hundley became the first Americans, Black or White, to win titles at the Cannes Film Festival in Paris, France.

Dr. DeVore-Mitchell helped shape the lives and careers of the country's top African-American models and entertainers. She has received more than 300 awards and honors over her lifetime and in 1985, she was appointed by President Reagan to the John F. Kennedy Center Committee on the Arts. In addition to her accomplishments in modeling and producing, Dr. DeVore-Mitchell was a newspaper owner and publisher, business executive, and consultant.

Maya Angelou once said, ''In diversity, there is beauty and there is strength. We all should know that diversity makes for a rich tapestry, and we must understand that all the threads of that tapestry are equal in value no matter their color.'' Ophelia DeVore-Mitchell used beauty as a public platform to address injustice and prejudice, blazing a trail for countless others along the way. By challenging the status quo and championing diversity, she helped to ensure that future generations would enjoy a robust and truly unique American culture that recognizes all members of society.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife, Vivian, and the nearly 700,000 people in Georgia's Second Congressional District in paying tribute to Ophelia DeVore-Mitchell for her numerous outstanding achievements and her everlasting dedication to promoting African-American power, pride, and presence. May her family members and friends be consoled and comforted by the knowledge that she made a great difference in this world and helped to build a better, more equitable America.

HONORING LEROY ''POP'' MILLER FOR HIS SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY AND OUR COMMUNITY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the memory of Leroy ''Pop'' Miller who recently passed away after living a life of courage, dedication, and bravery. He left behind a legacy of honor, a family who will forever remember him, and a community of friends who say goodbye with gratitude in their hearts.

Leroy Miller—known simply as Pop—left us at the rich age of 94 years old. He was a longtime member of my church, St. James United Methodist, where he found a spiritual home after moving to Kansas City from Charlotte in the early 2000s. He came to Kansas City after his wife, Sadie, passed away. His loving son, William Miller, urged his Dad to make the move so he could be closer to his family, in particular his two grandsons—William, Jr, and Jordan.

Before joining our community, Pop was nothing short of an historical figure in his home state of North Carolina. He was a member of our Greatest Generation and one of the few surviving African-Americans who fought in World War II. Just days after graduating from North Carolina A&T University in 1942, he was drafted into the United States Army where he was stationed in Europe and became a member of the famous Red Ball Express.

Red Ball drivers, mostly African American men, were drawn from the Army's Quartermaster Corps and fought both the enemy and the hazards of the road and weather to successfully deliver their loads. Pop's unit drove trucks from the Cherbourg Peninsula all the way to the North Sea, and throughout France, Germany, and Holland.

Despite his continued display of bravery, Pop and other African American soldiers also had to battle the racist forces that existed among their fellow Americans. When he returned home after serving—and sacrificing—for our country, he found what so many others discovered as well. African Americans were still not treated as equals. Even with his college education, he found his own job choices were very limited. But Pop was a fighter, on and off the battlefield, and became an educational pioneer, helping to break down the barriers of segregation in Charlotte, North Carolina, and throughout the United States.

Pop is remembered as a strong leader who enforced discipline at a time when fights and riots accompanied integration in schools. He is remembered as a strict educator who valued academics as much as sports, and worked to see straight A students recognized as publicly as star athletes. And Leroy ''Pop'' Miller is remembered as a man who wanted to be known not as a successful African American principal, but simply as a successful principal.

I am honored to have had Leroy ''Pop'' Miller as a member of the St. James congregation and as a constituent of the Fifth District of Missouri. He touched the lives of many and will remain in our hearts, and in our memories, for years to come.

HONORING ST. JUDE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE AS ALABAMA'S CLASS 1A BOY'S STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS FOR 2014

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the St. Jude Pirates for capturing their second-straight victory in the Class 1A Alabama State basketball Championship on February 28th. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, I congratulate the Pirates for the tremendous athleticism, determination and energy they displayed throughout their season under the resolute leadership of Head Coach Earl Taylor and his coaching staff.

With their victory over Parrish, the St. Jude Pirates won their eighth Alabama High School Athletic Association (AHSAA) state basketball championship and tenth in school history. The Pirates finished their season with 24 wins and 5 losses. Throughout the season, the Pirates faced some of the state's biggest and best teams which helped to prepare them to perform at the regional and championship levels.

While Parrish scored the championship game's debut shot, the Pirates responded with incredible energy leading by 21 points at halftime. The Pirates' suffocating defense left the opponent scoreless for more than six minutes. The Pirates held Parrish to 37 points overall, tallied 8 steals, retrieved 21 defensive rebounds and blocked four shots. Tournament MVP Jacob Winston finished the game with 21 points, 9 of which came from behind the 3-point arc. Winston grabbed 10 rebounds and Senior Andrew Rogers scored 18 points while LaDarius Brinson scored 10. Overall, the Pirates were 15-of-16 at the foul line.

Winning the state championship reflects the combined efforts of the coaches, players and supporters. I would like to commend the team, Coach Earl Taylor and his coaching staff. Members of the team include: Darian Adams, LaDarius Brinson, Tommy Burton, Keondre Davis, Taylor McCurdy, Andrew Rogers, Roderic Scott, and Jacob Winston.

At the conclusion of the game MVP Player Jacob Winston told reporters, "We try to be a defensive-minded team, but all the dunks and stuff is just a result of that," he said. "Coach Taylor's always taught us to play hard whatever's going on. The dunks and 3s come from defense."

St. Jude's has collected AHSAA state championships in 5 different decades with titles in 1973, 1977, 1985, 1998, 2006, 2008, 2013 and 2014. The team also won two state championships as members of the AIAA before 1968. As the daughter of a high school basketball coach, I know the Pirates' success is the result of the combined efforts of not only the players and the coaching staff, but also the support of the St. Jude faculty and staff and the entire community.

I am honored to represent such a talented group of young men, their dedicated coaching staff and proud community. As I declare the 7th Congressional District as the "District of Champions," the St. Jude Pirates represents one of our very best. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the accomplishments of the St. Jude Pirates for their victory in the 1A Alabama State Championship.

Congratulations! Go Pirates!

BRUKLIN WOMACK

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Bruklin Womack for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Bruklin Womack is a 12th grader at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Bruklin Womack is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Bruklin Womack for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

EMPLOYEE APPRECIATION DAY

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, March 7 is Employee Appreciation Day. I rise today to mark my appreciation for the staff members who so ably help me serve the people of North Carolina's Fourth Congressional District.

My staff are model public servants. They work long hours and late nights. Every year, the staffers working in my North Carolina district offices help thousands of constituents, and all of our local communities, navigate federal agencies. They help me reach out to local businesses and educational institutions to ensure their needs are represented in Washington. Every year, my Washington, D.C. office staff researches thousands of pieces of legislation. They help me hear and respond to hundreds of thousands of constituent communications. They help constituents arrange tours, and they join me in meetings with constituent groups, local and State representatives, universities and businesses on every issue imaginable. The list of tasks my staff helps accomplish could go on and on, but most importantly, they help ensure that the people of the Fourth District have a voice in the people's House.

The previous year has been a challenging one for congressional staff. Congressional staffers were not immune from the unnecessary and mindless across-the-board sequestration spending cuts that affected so many programs that invest in our people, ensure our strength and security, and protect our poorest citizens. Like employees of many executive departments, my staff endured furloughs and reduced pay over the previous year. I truly admire the all-hands-on-deck approach my staff took to maintain a high-level of constituent service in the face of these challenges, and their efforts to ensure sequestration was replaced and critical programs were fully funded once again.

In recognition of their dedication and diligence, I would like to include in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the name of each staffer currently employed by my office.

Nadia Alston, Sonia Barnes, Jean-Louise Beard, Nora Blalock, Andrew High, Asher Hildebrand, James Hunter, Tracy Lovett, Sean Maxwell, William Munn, Cassie Rice, Kate Roetzer, Dave Russell, Laura Thrift, Jackson Tufts, Justin Wein, Robyn Winneberger.

I would also like to extend special thanks to the staffers who have departed my office over the previous year and to include their names in the RECORD. I want them to know that their years of dedicated service strengthened our district and our State, and that their hard work did not go unnoticed or unappreciated. I wish them well as they pursue new and promising opportunities.

Robin Bolash, Sandra Massenburg, Beau Mills, Teresa Saunders, Kate Schisler.

I am grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the effort that my staff continues to put forth and for the opportunity Employee Appreciation Day offers to say thank you.

RECOGNIZING FIRE CHIEF EDMOND LEWIS

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Edmond Lewis, Chief of the Monterey Volunteer Fire Department in Beaver Dams, New York.

Mr. Lewis has served as a member of the Monterey Volunteer Fire Department for an impressive 36 years. He assumed the position of Chief last year and was faced with the enormous task of overcoming a dire financial situation which nearly forced the fire department into bankruptcy. In addition to the financial challenges, when he began his tenure as chief, the department had fewer than twelve members and no junior recruits.

Chief Lewis has never stopped fighting for the department or his community throughout the recovery process. His leadership has been vital in restoring the integrity, financial solvency, and strength of the Monterey Volunteer Fire Department. Through his guidance, the department has increased its ranks to 54 members, including 14 junior firefighters. The hard work and dedication of Chief Lewis has restored the fire department to a position of capably protecting public safety in the community.

Edmond Lewis exemplifies selfless service and true leadership. His generosity and willingness to assist anyone in need has earned him the highest level of respect throughout Schuyler County. Mr. Lewis regularly extends a helping hand beyond his duties at the fire department by volunteering at a local food bank and preparing meals at the Office for the Aging.

I commend Mr. Lewis for all the great work he has done, and will continue to do, at the Monterey Volunteer Fire Department and in our community. He is a selfless and generous individual who has made countless positive contributions to New York's 23rd Congressional District, and I am proud to recognize him today.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COUNTY ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the county Engineers Association of California.

The County Engineers Association of California was established in 1914 and is made up of county engineers, public works directors, county road commissioners and professional personnel throughout California's 58 counties.

The purpose of the association is to advance county engineering and management by providing a forum for exchanging ideas and information to improve service to the public.

The association has a close relationship with the California State Association of Counties and is supportive of advocacy work to develop policies that benefit counties and citizens.

The County Engineers Association of California works on many issues toward improving the state of our water. Specific issues include wastewater, storm water, flood control infrastructure, in addition to matters regarding clean and safe drinking water.

Through much collaboration, the County Engineers Association of California strives to provide, create, and maintain infrastructure that aids in the health, safety, and general welfare for California.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the County Engineers Association of California for their 100 years of outstanding contributions to the community.

RECOGNIZING THE HEALTH WAGON

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I write in recognition of The Health Wagon, a nonprofit health clinic that works to provide mobile health services in Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell, Lee, Scott, and Wise Counties as well as the City of Norton. Last year, The Health Wagon helped more than 11,000 patients receive health care valued at over $1 million, and through partnerships The Health Wagon's Pharmacy Connect program provided patients with approximately $1.2 million in pharmacy assistance.

For this and its important work with the annual Remote Area Medical event, its community health fairs and outreach programs, its women's health programs, its emphasis on education and prevention, its clinics including dental, eye, and specialty services, and more, I am grateful to The Health Wagon and its staff, supporters, and volunteers for serving the people of Southwest Virginia. There is no doubt that The Health Wagon's hard work and dedication has had an impact on countless lives.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,467,228,205,267.47. We've added $6,840,351,156,354.39 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.8 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

SHANE ROBERT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Shane Robert for receiving the Young Professional of the Year award from the West Chamber serving Jefferson County.

The West Chamber Young Professionals engage and connect young professionals throughout Jefferson County. By building relationships with other local business leaders, West Chamber young professional members advance their careers and become leaders in the community.

Shane is a vital contributing member and leader of the West Chamber Young Professionals. He is instrumental in helping the Young Professionals grow over the past two years with particular emphasis on helping with their marketing, donating brochure designs and social media services.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Shane Robert for his well deserved honor from the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker on rollcall No. 91, I was not present due to unavoidable air travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

IN RECOGNITION OF DARWIN L. CURLS FOR HIS DEDICATED CAREER OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of our own. On Friday, March 7, 2014, Mr. Darwin Lenard Curls is retiring from my office after serving the past nine years for the Fifth Congressional District as the Director of Community Affairs and dedicating nearly half-a-century of public service to our community.

Born on October 17, 1943, to a family of public servants, Darwin learned at an early age the importance of giving back to his community. His parents, Fred and Velma Curls raised Darwin and his five siblings to help those less fortunate. His father was a pioneer for civil and political rights in our community and was one of the original founders of Freedom Incorporated, an African-American political organization, based in Kansas City, Missouri. Darwin observed his father's efforts to better the community, such as with his fight against restrictive covenants in residential neighborhoods in our community. His brother, Phil Curls, went on to become a State Senator and President of Freedom Inc. Along with Darwin's help, Freedom rose to be known as one of the most potent political organizations in the United States. Darwin remembers well his father's saying ''make it happen'', and took to heart those words by dedicating his life to making things happen. Make-no-mistake, through his career of action and advocacy in our great state of Missouri, Darwin has been the embodiment of the ''Show me State''.

As a young man, Darwin attended De La Salle Military Academy, before earning his Bachelor of Arts degree from Park College. He eventually found his calling when he landed a position with the Blue Hills Homes Corporation—a community development corporation focused on improving neighborhoods in the urban core thru creating quality housing opportunities. Darwin spent nearly 23 years with Blue Hills.

In 1994, Darwin chose to run for public office and was elected overwhelmingly for the Kansas City Missouri School Board. During a challenging time for the School District, Darwin brought much-needed, common sense approaches to ensure children were given the best opportunities to succeed. After retiring from the School Board, he accepted a Trustee position with the Kansas City Public School Retirement System where he served for 16 years to ensure the employees of the Kansas City School District were treated fairly thru their retirement.

In 1999, Darwin joined the Congressional staff of my predecessor, Representative Karen McCarthy. He served for five years, handling casework and outreach. After a brief stint with Swope Community Builders, I asked Darwin to join me shortly after my election. He started on February 1, 2005 as my Director of Community Affairs. In that capacity, Darwin has overseen the office's casework, helping constituents with issues dealing with the Internal Revenue Service, Social Security Administration, Housing and Urban Development, and much more. He has helped hundreds of individuals traverse the challenges of the federal bureaucracy, helping people to receive back payments, or keep their housing. He was always available to constituents, sometimes just lending a shoulder during their time in need. Equally valuable, he has been an integral part of our outreach efforts, regularly providing remarks at meetings and events on behalf of the office. Over the years, I have relied heavily on his insights and feedback about our community and their concerns, as he has always had his fingers on the pulse of our District.

Darwin has been married for forty-five years to his wife, Sandra, and they are blessed to have three amazing children and seven grandchildren. Their daughter, Shalonn ''Kiki'' Curls, is continuing the family tradition of public service as a State Senator.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing and honoring Mr. Darwin Curls for a lifetime of dedicated service to our community. While he embraces this next phase of life in retirement, I wish to thank him for his guiding counsel over the years. He has served as a role model to many in our office and in the African-American community. The lives of hundreds of constituents he has helped, our neighbors, community, and Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, have been enhanced because he chose to ''make it happen.''

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE HENRY ''HANQ'' NEAL

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the memory of a spiritual leader and an extraordinary musical artist from Houston, Texas, the Honorable Henry ''Hanq'' Neal.

Mr. Neal was born in Fort Wayne, Indiana on September 4, 1956. He had a lifelong love of music, especially gospel music, singing in his youth choir at church. Mr. Neal went on to become a legendary gospel singer, musical artist, and minister of music. Throughout his career, he performed with several different gospel acts and was nominated for a Grammy for his rendition of ''If You Move Yourself' with the legendary gospel group Donald Vails Choraleers in 1980.

He also inspired his community with his work as a minister of music at Windsor Village United Methodist Church and then Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church in Houston. Both churches credit Mr. Neal with expanding and revolutionizing their choirs. Throughout Mr. Neal's career, he was consistently in demand for his musical talents, performing at mayoral inaugurations, for Queen Elizabeth II in 1991, and Congressman Mickey Leland's memorial service in 1989.

As we bid farewell to an exceptional talent and man of God, we acknowledge that our community has lost a resounding voice for faith. Although this is a significant loss, we must find consolation in knowing that many of our lives have been forever changed by the God-given talent of the Honorable Henry ''Hanq'' Neal.

IN HONOR OF IRA LOOMIS FLOWERS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a great man and close friend, Mr. Ira Loomis Flowers. Sadly, Mr. Flowers passed away on Friday, February 28, 2014. A service celebrating his life will be held on Saturday March 8, 2014 at 11:00 a.m. at First Missionary Baptist Church in Thomasville, Georgia.

Mr. Flowers was born on January 4, 1953, in Washington, DC, to Bessie Lee Flowers Moore and the late Guyte Smith, Sr. After obtaining a Bachelor of Arts degree in English at Stillman College, Mr. Flowers dedicated much of his life to youth development. He served in the Boys and Girls Club of Houston, Texas, before serving as a director at the YMCA in Columbus and Thomasville, Georgia, as well as the director of the Thomasville Resource Center. He worked for the Colquitt County Board of Education before retiring. He was steadfastly dedicated to furthering the success of men and women in his church, workplace, and community. He worked tirelessly to open doors and to level the playing field for at-risk youth in Southwest Georgia.

Mr. Flowers was an influential member of society and a local civil rights legend. He organized and was president of the Malcom X Liberation Front. My Brother in the Bond, Mr. Flowers was also devoted to our beloved Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. and was heavily involved in fraternity activities.

Most important to Mr. Flowers was his sturdy and enduring relationship with the Lord. He was a longtime member of First Missionary Baptist Church.

Maya Angelou once said, ''A great soul serves everyone all the time. A great soul never dies.'' We are all so blessed that Mr. Flowers passed this way and during his life's journey did so much for so many for so long. He leaves behind a great legacy in service to all the children, families, and members of the community whose lives he touched.

The race of life isn't given to the swift or to the strong, but to those who endure until the end. Mr. Flowers has run the race of life with grace and dignity and God has blessed him over his lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and my wife, Vivian, in saluting Mr. Ira Loomis Flowers for his outstanding service to his community. We pray that Mr. Flowers' family, friends and loved ones will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

ANAJELY AGUILAR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Anajely Aguilar for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Anajely Aguilar is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Anajely Aguilar is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Anajely Aguilar for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

COMMEMORATING THE SUMGAIT POGROMS

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the Sumgait pogroms. The Sumgait pogroms consisted of the murder of hundreds of Armenians, making it a particularly atrocious event in a long history of hostility against the Armenian people. I would like to recognize the anniversary of the Sumgait pogroms and remind all of us that it is our duty to act when a people are targeted with violence. Our commitment to remembering this injustice strengthens our determination to obtain peace.

In 1988, hundreds of Armenians were brutally murdered, some of them burned alive and thrown from windows. Women and children were raped and maimed by Azerbaijani rioters. Apartments were robbed, shops demolished, and thousands of people became refugees. Despite Sumgait's proximity to Baku, police turned a blind eye to this dire situation, allowing the pogroms to go on for three days. And since that time, authorities in Azerbaijan have sought to erase all traces of these crimes. Yet, the Congressional Armenian Issues Caucus is resolutely committed to ensure that those Armenians who lost their lives are not forgotten.

I ask my colleagues to solemnly condemn all intimidations and acts of aggression against the Armenian people. The Congressional Armenian Issues Caucus will do its very best to ensure that basic rights to life, liberty and security are not violated. I also ask my colleagues to join me in calling upon the Azerbaijani government to acknowledge Ramil Safarov as a convicted murderer and immediately take action to bring him to justice for the murder that he committed against an innocent Armenian man.

As co-chair and founder of the Congressional Armenian Issues Caucus, I will continue to promote peace and security throughout the Caucasus region. I look forward to the day when the Armenian people never have to fear such attacks.

IN HONOR OF OSCAR VILLEGAS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Oscar Villegas to recognize his numerous contributions and years of service to the people of West Sacramento. Oscar has served on the West Sacramento City Council for 14 years and was recently appointed by California Governor Jerry Brown to serve on the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.

Oscar is a homegrown public servant from the Bryte neighborhood and has proudly served his community in different capacities. He was first elected to the City Council in 2000 and then reelected in 2004 and 2008, during which time he served as Mayor Pro Tern on five occasions. Prior to his election, Oscar served on the West Sacramento Planning Commission from 1997–2000. Oscar has served on many boards and commissions, including the Sacramento-Yolo Port District Commission, the Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District Board, the Yolo County Transportation District, and the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board. He is also Chairman of the City's Up for West Sacramento Executive Board, an early learning program.

Oscar has been a strong advocate for a number of programs that have transformed the City of West Sacramento. He played an important role in advocating for the development of Raley Field, the riverfront Bridge District, the new Arthur F. Turner Community Library, the revitalized West Capitol Avenue, the City's park system and the bicycle master plan. His

passion and commitment are evident in his ability to listen and relate to his constituents. His deep understanding of local issues and his strong relationships with the community will serve him well on the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Oscar Villegas for his many years of service to the City of West Sacramento, and wish him the best in his new appointment to the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.

BROWNFIELD REDEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INNOVATIVE FINANCING ACT OF 2014

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced the ''Brownfield Redevelopment and Economic Development Innovative Financing Act of 2014,'' legislation that will help redevelop large brownfield redevelopment projects that have the potential to create jobs, provide affordable housing opportunities and transform regional economies.

Across the country, from Baltimore to Los Angeles, there are large redevelopment sites that communities have identified as the economic development futures of their regions. Older manufacturing sites, retired steel mills, automotive legacy sites and landfills within communities are in need of transformation.

These sites, known as brownfields, are untapped resources that, when environmentally remediated and redeveloped, will address tax base shortfalls, provide affordable housing, create jobs, attract new businesses as well as unify communities with planned sustainable development that will meet the needs of a changing economy and a growing population.

For instance, in my district, the city of Carson provides a shining example of how large brownfield properties can be redeveloped and transformed into successful redevelopment projects.

In 2003, using $90 million of redevelopment funding, Carson invested in the cleanup of an 160 acre site along the 405. Immediately, the private sector matched the city's funding and the project moved forward with the cleanup of the site.

The project, called The Boulevards, is set to finish construction in 2016, and will have two hotels, retail space, affordable housing, office buildings, restaurants and movie theatres that will raise an estimated $107 million in property tax revenues over the next 30 years.

The Boulevards is a great investment for Carson and for the region and will ultimately end up paying for itself. What's changed for Carson, like most communities, is that they do not have another $90 million dollars to quickly redevelop their other large brownfield projects.

Unfortunately, there is no current federal funding or financing mechanism to support and leverage local and private sector resources to move large brownfield redevelopment sites forward.

While Title I of the 1949 Housing Authority Act used to provide a line of federal credit to local communities to undertake major redevelopment projects during the 1970's, this was later replaced with the current Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program administered by HUD. And CDBG funds are currently stretched too thin to be able to adequately address the needs of large scale redevelopment projects.

Additionally, private lenders are hesitant to loan money for these projects since the extensive remediation and clean up of these sites means investors aren't going to begin seeing returns for possibly a decade or longer.

That's why I have introduced the The Brownfield Redevelopment and Economic Development Innovative Financing Act of 2014. This bill creates a pilot program that re-establishes a partnership with communities by providing the HUD Secretary the authority to guarantee the repayment of principal and interest on loans made by lenders to local governments for large brownfield redevelopment projects.

By providing a federally backed loan guarantee for brownfield redevelopment, this will eliminate traditional lending risk and thus attract private resources for projects that otherwise wouldn't have received funding. At the same time, this bill grants local governments enough time to remediate and develop their properties so they won't need to begin making loan repayments until they start receiving revenue.

These tools will provide communities with the ability to make an immediate and long term economic impact on their region and will be the drivers that help move our national economy forward.

That is why this bill is supported by public and private stakeholders alike, including, Weston Solutions, CH2M Hill, Parsons Brinckerhoff, the American Council of Engineering Companies, Smart Growth America, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Brownfield Association, the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties, and the city of Carson, California.

By providing a platform for partnerships and innovative financing tools, we will finally arm communities with the necessary tools to fully plan, invest and develop their futures.

RECOGNIZING DEPUTY POLICE CHIEF MIKE BORGES

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Deputy Police Chief Mike Borges of the Ceres Police Department for his 34 years of outstanding service and commitment to public safety in the community.

Deputy Chief Mike Borges grew up in the Modesto area and worked at a dairy. He graduated from Modesto High School in June of 1974 and joined the Army in March of 1976, where he served in the Military Police until November of 1979. Mr. Borges left the Army at the rank of Sergeant, and returned home to begin his career as a police officer.

In April of 1980, Mr. Mike Borges was hired by the City of Ceres as a police officer. The Ceres Police Department sponsored him while he attended the police academy, and he ultimately chose to remain in Ceres. During his tenure, Borges worked in many different positions within the agency. From 1984 to 1987, he served as a Detective and in 1987, became a Field Training Officer and Corporal. In 1988, he was promoted to the position of Sergeant.

As a Sergeant, Mr. Borges served as a patrol Watch Commander and Supervisor, and served as the agency's Police Explorer Advisor for over 10 years. In addition to this, he served as the SWAT team leader for eight years, and spent over four years supervising the Detective Bureau for the Ceres Police Department. In August of 2005, he was appointed as the Police Division Commander, and in December 2007, Mr. Borges became Deputy Chief.

Deputy Chief Borges earned an Associate of Arts degree in Administration of Justice from Modesto Junior College, and a Bachelors of Science degree in Business Management, with a focus in Human Resources from California State University, Stanislaus. He graduated from the Sherman Block Supervisor Leadership Institute, Class 11; a program designed to stimulate personal growth, leadership, and ethical decision-making in California law enforcement's front line supervisors.

Mr. Borges has been a longtime board member and has previously served as the president of Ceres Youth Baseball. He is also one of the founding members of the Ceres Police Officers Association. He has been an active member in the Ceres Lions Club since 2004, where he has also served as a board member. Mr. Borges enjoys sports, staying active, being involved with community youth, and spending time with his family.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Mike Borges for his 34 years of service and outstanding contributions of the Ceres community as well as our country.

BIANCA NUNEZ–MARTINEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Bianca Nunez-Martinez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Bianca Nunez-Martinez is an 11th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Bianca Nunez-Martinez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Bianca Nunez-Martinez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF CRISP COUNTY SHERIFF DONNIE R. HARALSON

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a great man and outstanding public servant, Crisp County Sheriff Donnie R. Haralson. Sadly, Sheriff Haralson passed away on Tuesday, March 4, 2014. Funeral services will be held on Friday, March 7, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. at Cordele First Baptist Church.

Following in his father's footsteps, Sheriff Haralson began his law enforcement career with the Cordele Police Department in 1977. After years of hard work and determination, he became Cordele's Chief of Police. A well-respected member of his community, Sheriff Haralson was reelected to a seventh term as Crisp County Sheriff in 2012, a capacity in which he served dutifully for twenty-seven years.

During his tenure, Sheriff Haralson established local programs that benefitted both the community he served and the inmates in his care, including personal safety classes and an inmate GED program. Sheriff Haralson was influential in obtaining a regional youth detention center in Cordele and also helped to secure inmate labor in the building of a recreation facility, a significant cost-saving initiative.

Sheriff Haralson was actively engaged in his community and served on numerous committees both locally and statewide. As the longest sitting sheriff in Crisp County history, Sheriff Haralson embodied the definition of a public servant through strong leadership, steadfast dedication and unwavering compassion. His years of distinguished service in law enforcement earned him the Governor's Public Safety Award in 2000 and Georgia's 2010 Sheriff of the Year distinction.

Maya Angelou once said, "A great soul serves everyone all the time. A great soul never dies." Sheriff Haralson is undoubtedly great because of his dedication and service to the community that he loved so dearly. As a lifelong resident of Crisp County, Sheriff Haralson's legacy will live on for years to come in the minds and hearts of all those whose lives he touched in Southwest Georgia.

Sheriff Haralson is survived by his wife, Peggy; daughters, Amanda and Crystal; grandsons, Thomas and Eli; sisters, Sharon and Kadron; and his nephew, Cory. He was a longtime member and a Deacon of Cordele First Baptist Church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to Sheriff Donnie Haralson and his legacy of service to Crisp County, Georgia. He loved the people of Crisp County and dedicated his life and career to improving the quality of life for his fellow citizens. He will truly be missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 2014 I joined President Obama on a trip to Connecticut to discuss the importance of raising the federal minimum wage and missed several recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"no" on rollcall No. 93, on ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 497;

"no" on rollcall No. 94, on passage of H. Res. 97;

"yes" on rollcall No. 95, on passage of H.R. 938, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013;

"yes" on rollcall No. 96, on motion to recommit H.R. 4118 with instructions;

"no" on rollcall No. 97, on passage of H.R. 4118, the SIMPLE Fairness Act;

"yes" on rollcall No. 98, on passage of H.R. 2126, the Better Buildings Act of 2014.

THE INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 4110 "HELPING TO ENCOURAGE REAL OPPORTUNITY FOR VETERANS TRANSITIONING FROM BATTLESPACE TO WORKPLACE ACT OF 2014"

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, study after study has documented the difficulties experienced by a majority of men and women transitioning from the Armed Services to the civilian sector.

Veterans regard one of their greatest challenges to be finding a meaningful job even though nearly 90% of them believe they have the general skills needed to land their ideal job such as problem solving, leadership, ethics, and time management and most believe they possess specific marketable skills, such as information technology, health care, mechanical, and aviation.

Some of the major challenges faced by veterans are:

1. Overcoming the difficulty in translating to employers the value of the skills they learned in the military;

2. Competing with candidates who have been in the workforce longer;

3. The perceived reluctance of employers to hire due to concerns about multiple deployments or military training and time commitments of the Reserve Component, and fears of dealing with veterans' disabilities.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 4110, the "Helping to Encourage Real Opportunity for Veterans Transitions from Battlespace to Workplace Act of 2014" or "Transitioning HERO Act."

The Transitioning HERO Act addresses these problems by providing strong incentives for employers to hire, retain, and employ veterans in positions that take maximum advantage of their skills and experience.

It does this by providing tax credits for those employers who employ Military Relations Managers (MRM), who will be experts in understanding how military-acquired training translates into useful skills in the civilian labor market.

Military Relations Managers (MRMs) will:

1. work with hiring agencies and within their companies to promote the hiring of transitioning military leaders; and

2. advocate and represent the interests of veterans thoroughly by focusing on placement of veterans within companies in positions that reflect the breadth of leadership and technical skills obtained and utilized during military service.

My bill also directs the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish, maintain, publicize, and make available to employers a Military Skills Translator Database. This database will assist private sector employers in understanding, applying, and valuing military skills and experiences to the civilian economy.

The tax credit provided under the bill is $1000 per hired veteran. To be eligible to claim the credit, an employer must employ and utilize a Military Relations Manager.

This important legislation will benefit both veterans and hiring companies, by giving our transitioning veterans the jobs and positions that are appropriate to their invaluable experience and by encouraging companies to examine the application of veterans' acquired skills with quality representation.

Mr. Speaker, Americans want Congress to focus on jobs and economic growth, not more political posturing.

Instead of trying to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act for the 50th time, we should be focusing on the real problems of the American people, like extending unemployment insurance and providing training opportunities for the long-term unemployed and helping our veterans transition from the battlespace to the workplace by passing H.R. 4110, the "Transitioning HERO Act."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on Tuesday, March 5, 2013, I missed several recorded votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted the following ways: "yea" on rollcall 93; "yea" rollcall 94; "yea" on rollcall 95; "nay" on rollcall 96; "yea" on rollcall 97; "yea" on rollcall 98.

BRITTANY CHICOINE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Brittany Chicoine for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Brittany Chicoine is a 12th grader at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Brittany Chicoine is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Brittany Chicoine for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 92, I was not present due to unavoidable air travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

TRIBUTE TO LYLE W. JENKS

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of an American hero, Lyle W. Jenks, who will be celebrating his 94th birthday on March 29.

Like many young Americans, Lyle was horrified by the attack on Pearl Harbor. His immediate response was to serve and defend his country. The following day, December 8, 1941, Mr. Jenks enlisted in the United States Army.

Mr. Lyle Jenks left his job in Lansing, Michigan, and left to complete his basic training at Camp Roberts in Central California. He later was stationed at Fort Custer, Michigan.

Mr. Jenks was deployed to the Aleutian Islands in June of 1943 on the island of Attu. While he was stationed in Attu, he worked in the message department. He stayed there until January 10, 1945 when he was assigned to the message department at the Pentagon. He was discharged on November 3, 1945 at Fort Myer, Virginia. He was proud to serve his country in the Army during the entire period of World War II.

He received many awards and medals during his tour of duty. These medals included: the Good Conduct Medal, Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal, American Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Motor Vehicle Drivers Medal, and Mechanic's Badge with W bar.

Mr. Jenks was also honored with the Expert Infantryman Badge, Honorable Service Lapel Button, WW at Expert Infantryman Badge, Marksman Badge with Carbine bar, and Sharpshooter Badge with a Rifle Bar.

Mr. Lyle Jenks went back to work just days after his separation from the military. He supported his family as a construction supervisor and maintenance worker until he was 80 years old. Lyle helped many elderly people who could not pay to repair their homes. He also served diligently in his church.

Lyle and his wife Helen were married 35 years until she was taken from him by cancer. Lyle and Helen were not able to have children together.

Lyle Jenks then married Patsy Savage and instantly her children became his children. Together, they now share the joy of grandchildren. They will celebrate 32 years of marriage this year.

HONORING F. V. ''PETE'' ALLISON, JR.

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call our colleagues' attention to the passing last Monday of a great North Carolinian, F. V. ''Pete'' Allison, Jr. Mr. Allison died at age 91 after an extraordinary life as a businessman and banker, community, church, and political leader, husband, father and grandfather, and friend and mentor to many. A memorial service is planned for Saturday at the White Rock Baptist Church in Durham, which I am certain will witness an outpouring of community appreciation, affection and respect.

A native of Greenville County, Virginia, Pete Allison came to Durham after receiving his undergraduate degree from Hampton Institute and his master's in business administration from New York University, and he never left. Remarkably, he worked for only two institutions his entire career—in the business office of Hampton Institute and, after 1953, Mutual Savings and Loan of Durham, where he started as a teller and accountant. Mr. Allison rose steadily through the ranks, becoming chairman and CEO in 1978. He saw Mutual through its conversion to a community savings bank and through the acquisition of two other institutions. The bank, which he led with a strong hand until his retirement in 1996, became a mainstay of Durham's African-American community, making home ownership possible for thousands of families and helping launch and expand hundreds of businesses.

Pete Allison's professional and civic endeavors could fill several pages. He was especially proud of chairing the Raleigh-Durham Airport Authority during the period when direct flights to London were inaugurated. He received a gubernatorial appointment to the N.C. Education Assistance Authority. He took leadership roles in the American League of Financial Institutions, the U.S. League of Savings Institutions, and the Savings and Community Bankers of America. In Durham, he was the chair and long-time treasurer of the Durham Committee on the Affairs of Black People, chaired the Durham Business and Professional Chain, helped lead the Greater Durham Chamber of Commerce, and served on the board of visitors for N.C. Central University's business school. For his extraordinary contributions, Governor Jim Hunt named Pete Allison to The Order of the Long Leaf Pine, North Carolina's highest honor for service to the state.

The list goes on, Mr. Speaker, but such a recounting cannot do full justice to the qualities of leadership and friendship that made Pete Allison beloved by so many. His generosity, warmth, and strength of character shone through. I was fortunate to experience this personally in representing the Durham community in Congress and being associated with him in various political and civic endeavors. I always looked forward to seeing Pete, to hearing his observations as to what was going on at the moment. Indeed, he was a keen observer, but he expressed his views gently, with humor and compassion, and he much preferred reaching agreement to dictating his views. People wanted to follow Pete and to work with him because they liked and respected him so much and were assured of his integrity and his genuine concern for them and for the community.

Durham and North Carolina will miss Pete Allison and the wise counsel, encouragement, and inspiration he offered. He is survived by a son, Vincent, a daughter, Michelle, and his wife of 59 years, Lavonia Ingram Allison. Pete and Lavonia have been partners in a commitment to social justice and to community leadership over many decades. Lavonia's political and civic endeavors, including chairmanship of the Durham Committee on the Affairs of Black People, have been ground-breaking, and Pete supported and encouraged her every step of the way. She has been likewise devoted to him, and has especially exemplified compassion and care during Pete's long final years of illness.

Mr. Speaker, it is people of character, compassion, and courage like Pete Allison who make our communities and our country flourish. At this time of loss, we give thanks, in the words of the apostle Paul, ''for every remembrance'' of him.

CARLY BAUER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Carly Bauer for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Carly Bauer is an 11th grader at Ralston Valley High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Carly Bauer is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Carly Bauer for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ACCELERATING MEDICINES PARTNERSHIP (AMP) AND COMPLEX DISEASE RESEARCH

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Accelerating Medicines Partnership and to reaffirm our commitment to responding to lupus, Alzheimer's disease, type 2 diabetes, and rheumatoid arthritis.

This long-awaited and vital partnership brings together the National Institutes of Health, 10 biopharmaceutical companies, and several nonprofits to transform the way we identify and validate biological targets of disease for diagnostics and drug development for

debilitating diseases like lupus. Through this initiative, we can work on disease prevention and reduce the amount of risks in the drug development process. We hope that the partnership will stimulate investment in new effective treatments and help improve the quality of life of the millions of people worldwide living with lupus and other recurring diseases.

Lupus is a chronic autoimmune disease that affects an estimated 1.5 million Americans. Approximately 90 percent of those with lupus are women, but men and children can also develop lupus. Lupus strikes without warning, has unpredictable, sometimes fatal effects, and has no known cause and no known cure. Lupus is also difficult to diagnose, and on average it takes an individual four years and three doctors to get an accurate diagnosis. Traditionally, there has been a lack of investment in research of this debilitating disease. This partnership is a strong step in the right direction. As co-chair of the Congressional Lupus Caucus, I applaud this important initiative, and I have confidence that is a step in the right direction toward finding a cure for this disease.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the Accelerating Medicines Partnership and in thanking these tireless advocates for their persistence and dedication to improving the lives of millions in the United States and around the world.

HONORING WENONAH HIGH SCHOOL ALABAMA'S CLASS 5A STATE GIRLS BASEKTBALL CHAMPIONS 2014

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Wenonah High School Lady Dragons on winning the State of Alabama title in the 5A State Basketball Championship on Saturday, March 1, 2014. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, I pay tribute to the Lady Dragons for their exemplary athleticism and teamwork as well as the outstanding leadership of Head Coach Emanuel Bell and his coaching staff. We are extremely proud of these young ladies for their stellar performance!

Wenonah's championship victory came at the end of an extraordinary season of 27 wins and 7 losses. Coach Bell's longstanding motto for his team is ''hard work pays off.'' He not only commands the best from his team, he commits his personal time year-round to molding the young ladies he leads. The 20 year veteran coach has been a driving force in producing winning teams and leading the Lady Dragons to multiple state titles. The 2013–2014 season was no different.

The Lady Dragons faced Sylacauga High School to clinch the state title on March 1, 2014. The rival squad was favored to win due to having one of the top scorers of the season but Coach Bell believed in his team. In a Birmingham News article, Coach Bell boldly expressed his confidence in the Lady Dragons. ''Everybody kept asking, 'What are you going to do about that girl?' '' said Coach Bell. ''Hey, I've got eight girls. I've got 12 girls. If she can run with us, we've got a problem.''

During the championship game, the Lady Dragons forged ahead with three players who contributed double digits in scoring. The group effort would sustain the Lady Dragons as they worked to contain their opponent's scoring powerhouse.

Wenonah took the lead in the opening minute of the game and trailed briefly late in the first half. However, the Lady Dragons went into halftime with a five point lead. With 5:28 left in the game, both teams were tied at 36 before Wenonah pulled away with a 6–0 run to secure their 57–46 victory. Jameka Holmes led the Lady Dragons with 25 points, followed by Aja Cumbie with 12 points and 11 rebounds, and 10 points from Kaitlyn Rodgers. Holmes added 15-of-21 free throws and had six steals.

As the daughter of a high school basketball coach, I know this decisive victory is also the result of the tremendous efforts of both the players and coaching staff of Wenonah High School. The exemplary leadership and dedicated support from the coaching staff was a major factor in the success of the Lady Dragons. I commend Head Coach Emanuel Bell for his program of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, the Lady Dragons of Wenonah High School are another fine example of the ''champions'' we breed in Alabama's 7th Congressional district. On behalf of the 7th Congressional District, the State of Alabama and this nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the accomplishments of the Wenonah High School Girls Basketball Team for their victory in the Class 5A Alabama State Championship.

Congratulations. Go Lady Dragons.

IN HONOR OF CHEF DARRYL E. EVAN

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a great man and close friend, Chef Darryl E. Evans. Sadly, Darryl passed away on Wednesday, February 26, 2014. A home-going celebration in his honor will be held on Saturday, March 8, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. at New Birth Missionary Baptist Church in Lithonia, Georgia. Interment will take place on Sunday, March 9, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. at Green Acres Cemetery in Columbus, Georgia.

A Columbus, Georgia native, Darryl was a graduate of Carver High School Class of 1979. In 1986, he graduated from the American Culinary Federation (AFC) apprenticeship at Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia.

One of the very few executive chefs of color in the hospitality industry, he achieved national recognition and earned numerous awards and accolades throughout the years. He was the first African American to compete in the International Culinary Olympics in Frankfurt, Germany, where he won three gold medals and one silver medal in 1988 and 1992. He is a three-time recipient of the AFC Chef of the Year Award and was named Chef and Culinarian of the Year by the Greater Atlanta Chef's Association in 1991, 1993, and 1996. He has served as visiting Chef for numerous functions held by the United States Congress and various state governments.

Throughout his career, Darryl trained and mentored generations of culinarians. He made a living from feeding others, but he truly fulfilled his calling by helping to feed the hungry through organizations such as Taste of the Nations, the 1993 World Cooks Tour for Hunger in Johannesburg, South Africa, and Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, as well as through his church, New Birth Missionary Baptist Church, where he served as the Chef of the church for many years.

Darryl loved his life's work. He knew that food was much more than just for sustaining one's body. He strongly believed that food was an important part of history and culture—whether as part of signing a peace treaty, blessing an event or ceremony, or by simply bringing a family together.

Darryl has achieved numerous successes in his life, but none of this would have been possible without the grace of God and his loving wife, Deborah; two sons, Brandon and Branford-Michael; and the rest of his devoted family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 700,000 people of the Second Congressional District salute Chef Darryl Evans for his numerous remarkable achievements. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Darryl's family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

IN RECOGNITION OF NANCY OATES

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Nancy Oates upon her retirement after thirty-one years of service to her community.

In April 1983, Ms. Oates was first elected to serve the town of Duxbury as Town Clerk. She has since been re-elected ten times, and has honorably served her community during her thirty-one years in office. During her tenure, Ms. Oates has supervised many town, state, and federal elections, and she has provided invaluable assistance to the citizens of Duxbury every day. She has long been known as a kind and trusted figure within the town, and her many accomplishments have been invaluable the people she has served.

Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pride to honor Ms. Nancy Oates upon her retirement. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Ms. Oates for her many years of public service.

IN RECOGNITION OF MEMBERS OF THE DENTON COUNTY LEADERSHIP DELEGATION WHO ARE VISITING WASHINGTON, DC THIS WEEK

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Denton County, Texas and members of the Denton County leadership delegation who are visiting here in Washington, DC this week. These local officials and business leaders understand that what goes on here in Washington affects their local communities back home. So this trip, which they make every two years, is a very important one.

During their time here, the group is meeting with members of the leadership here in Congress, as well as Senators and Representatives from Texas and across the country. Additionally, they have had a chance to tour the Marine Corps Barracks and meet with members of the U.S. Chamber of Congress and business associations of Denton County, along with several Denton County local officials, to the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following names of the Denton County delegation:

Diane Callahan, Chuck Carpenter, James Cline, Martha Davis, Patrick Davis, Andrew Eads, Neil Ferguson, Lori Fickling, Thomas "TJ" Gilmore, Ray Hernandez, Kelly Heslep, David Hodges, Kathy Hodges.

Cindi Howard, William Meek, Julie Meyer, Mark Payne, Nate Prevost, Kimberly Reasoner, Lori Salisbury, Todd Salisbury, Greg Tierney, Drean Ueckert, Lori Walker, Mike Walker, Brian Weale.

HONORING FRANK AND TERESSA'S ANCHOR BAR ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHICKEN WING

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Frank & Teressa's Anchor Bar and the 50th anniversary of their signature dish, the chicken wing. The Anchor Bar is an establishment that is deeply ingrained in the fabric of Buffalo, New York; its story exhibits resilience and ambition that define the city in which it stands as well as the people who live in it. This Thursday, March 6, is a date which signifies the 50th anniversary of the chicken wing and its legacy, which transformed the landscape of American cuisine, and made Buffalo, New York synonymous with a finger food that has left its lasting impression on the culinary industry.

Frank Bellissimo was born in Montemaggiore Belsito, a little town in the province of Sicily, Italy. His parents immigrated to the U.S. when he was just four years old. At the age of 14 during a night out in downtown Buffalo, Frank fell in love with the ambiance and persona of the city. He vowed to one day be a part of it.

Frank met his wife Teressa while he was a butcher. Teressa, the daughter of Sicilian immigrants as well, was born in Buffalo. The two became married in 1934 and discovered their shared love of cooking.

After accumulating a few hundred dollars, the two decided to open a restaurant and in 1935, rented a place on Canal Street at the foot of Main Street in downtown Buffalo. Teressa noticed how the sailors docking their boats in the adjacent Buffalo River would drop their anchors into the water. Henceforth, the Anchor Bar was given its emblematic name.

The bar quickly grew in popularity, forcing Frank and Teressa to move to 1047 Main Street—the address at which the bar is located to this day. Not long after that, the dish that would revolutionize pub food was created.

Frank and Teressa's son Dominic was tending bar at his family's restaurant on a late Friday night in March 1964. Some friends stopped by to pay him a visit and have a few drinks. Before long, they asked Dominic for something to eat, though they yearned for something out of the ordinary—something they could eat with their fingers while retaining the ability to drink and converse. Dominic went to his mother Teressa for help. She had recently received a large shipment of wings that were "too meaty" to be used in the stockpot for soup. Remembering those wings, she decided to deep fry them, toss them in a spicy red sauce recipe and serve them with celery sticks and blue cheese dressing. At 12:10 a.m. on Saturday, March 6, 1964, the chicken wing was invented in Buffalo, New York.

Though Dominic and his friends were skeptical, the chicken wings became an instant hit, and the rest is history. Before long, word spread across the city, state, and the country. Today, Anchor Bar serves up more than 70,000 pounds of chicken per month, and its bottled wing sauce retails in over 5,000 supermarkets worldwide. Consumers can even purchase Anchor Bar's famous wings online and have them shipped anywhere in America. Countless celebrities have graced the bar's Main Street location to experience the sensation for themselves.

In 2003, Anchor Bar was presented with the prestigious James Beard Foundation award, given to restaurants "that have timeless appeal, beloved for their quality food that reflect the history and character of their community." In 2014, the Anchor Bar has franchised that timeless appeal and is proudly serving their famed wings at locations in the Buffalo International Airport, Darien Lake Amusement Park, Hamilton, Ontario, and will soon be serving them on the West Coast at a location in Temecula, California.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of the chicken wing. In doing so, I recognize a restaurant that stands as a testament to the American Dream. The children of Italian immigrants, Frank and Teressa Bellissimo took the creativity and resourcefulness of Italian cuisine and combined it with American values of innovation and ingenuity. What was produced was not only a business that has profited for over 65 years and remains a family owned and operated enterprise, but also a symbol that the American Dream, still stands proud today.

HONORING GEORGE ANDREW POUNCEY

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 6, 2014

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Andrew Pouncey on being selected as the 2014 Citizen of the Year by the Lions Club of Germantown, Tennessee. This public recognition is well deserved and stands in support of the career of Mr. Pouncey, who has consistently strived for the betterment of others.

After graduating from both Rhodes College in Memphis and Mississippi State University, Mr. Pouncey began his career in both Planning and Landscape Architecture. Beginning in 1990, Mr. Pouncey served in numerous capacities for the city of Germantown, Tennessee. From Chief Planner to the Director of Economic and Community Development, Mr. Pouncey helped the Mayor and Board of Aldermen, the government of Germantown, and its residents enjoy this wonderful city. Additionally, the Riverdale Nature Garden, Civic Club Plaza, GPAC, Code of Ordinances, Urban Growth Boundary, and Smart Growth have been touched by the work of Mr. Pouncey.

This dedication to preservation also found itself in the non-governmental life of Mr. Pouncey. Serving as the President of the Memphis Belle Memorial Association, board member of the Tennessee Preservation Trust, and the Germantown Museum, he spent numerous years saving our Tennessee heritage for future generations. Mr. Pouncey has selflessly left his mark on safeguarding the history of the United States of America.

On behalf of Tennessee's 8th Congressional District, I congratulate Mr. Pouncey on being the 2014 Citizen of the Year. I wish him the best of luck for all future endeavors.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1329–H1370

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2086–2098, and S. Res. 376. **Pages S1365–66**

Measures Reported:

S. 149, to provide effective criminal prosecutions for certain identity thefts. **Page S1365**

Measures Passed:

Philippines Charitable Giving Assistance Act: Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of S. 1821, to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S1369**

Reid (for Hirono/Heller) Amendment No. 2806, to change the dates during which contributions may be made to be treated as made in 2013. **Page S1369**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached that the bill be held at the desk and that if the Senate receives a bill from the House of Representatives, the text of which is identical to S. 1821, as passed by the Senate, Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; the bill be read three times and passed without any intervening action or debate; and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed and all motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table. **Page S1369**

Measures Considered:

Child Care and Development Block Grant Act: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1086, to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990. **Pages S1329–30**

Military Justice Improvement Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of S. 1752, to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. **Pages S1335–49**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 55 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 59), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Pages S1336–49**

Subsequently, the bill was returned to the Calendar. **Page S1349**

Victims Protection Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of S. 1917, to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Forces. **Pages S1349, S1350–52**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By a unanimous vote of 100 yeas (Vote No. 60), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Page S1349**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the previous order, Senate vote on passage of the bill following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Carolyn B. McHugh, on Monday, March 10, 2014, with all other provisions remaining in effect. **Page S1349**

Appointments:

Public Interest Declassification Board: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 106–567, reappointed the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Interest Declassification Board: Sanford Ungar of Maryland. **Page S1370**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in the Ukraine; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–33) **Page S1364**

McHugh Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit. **Page S1359**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, March 6, 2014, a vote on cloture will occur at approximately 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 10, 2014. **Page S1359**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 5:00 p.m., on Monday, March 10, 2014, Senate resume consideration of the nomination and the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled in the usual form prior to the cloture vote on the nomination; that upon conclusion of the cloture vote, and notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, if invoked, Senate vote on passage of S. 1917, to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Forces; and that if cloture is invoked on the nomination, the time during the vote on passage of S. 1917, count post-cloture on the nomination. **Page S1370**

Leitman Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Matthew Frederick Leitman, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. **Page S1359**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit. **Page S1359**

Levy Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Judith Ellen Levy, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. **Pages S1359–60**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Matthew Frederick Leitman, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. **Page S1359**

Michelson Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Laurie J. Michelson, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. **Page S1360**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Judith Ellen Levy, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. **Page S1360**

Parker Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Linda Vivienne Parker, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. **Page S1360**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Laurie J. Michelson, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. **Page S1360**

Raskin Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader with the concurrence of the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Sarah Bloom Raskin, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury; that there be 20 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use of yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination; and that no further motions be in order. **Page S1369**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 58 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. EX. 58), Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security. **Pages S1334–35, S1370**

Suzanne Eleanor Spaulding, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary, Department of Homeland Security. **Pages S1335, S1370**

John Roth, of Michigan, to be Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security. **Pages S1335, S1370**

Kathryn D. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere. **Pages S1349–50, S1370**

Rhonda K. Schmidtlein, of Missouri, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for a term expiring December 16, 2021. **Pages S1349–50, S1370**

R. Gil Kerlikowske, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security. **Pages S1349–50, S1370**

Michael A. Hammer, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile. **Pages S1349–50, S1370**

Messages from the House: **Page S1364**

Measures Referred: **Page S1364**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S1364, S1369**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S1364, S1369–70**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S1364**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S1364**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1365**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1366–67**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1367–68**

Additional Statements: **Page S1363**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S1368**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S1368**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S1368–69**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1369**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—60) **Pages S1335, S1349**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:33 a.m. and adjourned at 6:14 p.m., until 4 p.m. on Monday, March 10, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1370.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be Chairman, who was introduced by Senator Blumenthal, Sharon Y. Bowen, of New York, and J. Christopher Giancarlo, of New Jersey, all to be a Commissioner, all of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States Central Command and United States Africa Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Lloyd J. Austin III, Commander, United States Central Command, and General David M. Rodriguez, USA, Commander, United States Africa Command, both of the Department of Defense.

MAP–21 REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21) reauthorization, focusing on the Federal role and current challenges to public transportation, after receiving testimony from Michael P. Melaniphy, American Public Transportation Association, Washington, D.C.; Barbara K. Cline, Community Transportation Association of America, Spearfish, South Dakota; and Lawrence J. Hanley, Amalgamated Transit Union, Staten Island, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development: Senators Menendez (Chair), Reed, Schumer, Brown, Merkley, Manchin, Warren, Heitkamp, Moran, Corker, Toomey, Kirk, Coburn, Heller, and Shelby.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection: Senators Brown (Chair), Reed, Schumer, Menendez, Tester, Merkley, Hagan, Warren, Toomey, Shelby, Vitter, Johanns, Moran, Heller, and Corker.

Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment: Senators Warner (Chair), Reed, Schumer, Menendez, Tester, Hagan, Warren, Heitkamp, Johanns, Corker, Shelby, Vitter, Toomey, Kirk, and Coburn.

Subcommittee on National Security and International Trade and Finance: Senators Manchin (Chair), Brown, Warner, Kirk, and Moran.

Subcommittee on Economic Policy: Senators Merkley (Chair), Tester, Warner, Hagan, Manchin, Heitkamp, Heller, Coburn, Vitter, Johanns, and Crapo.

Senators Johnson (SD) and Crapo are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

RAIL SAFETY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant

Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security concluded a hearing to examine enhancing our rail safety, focusing on current challenges for passenger and freight rail, after receiving testimony from Joseph C. Szabo, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration, and Cynthia Quarterman, Administrator, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, both of the Department of Transportation; Christopher A. Hart, Vice Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board; Geoffrey C. Blackwell, Chief, Office of Native Affairs and Policy, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission; and Prentiss Searles, American Petroleum Institute, and Edward R. Hamberger, Association of American Railroads, both of Washington, D.C.

PREVENTING POTENTIAL CHEMICAL THREATS AND IMPROVING SAFETY

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine preventing potential chemical threats and improving safety, focusing on oversight of the President's executive order on improving chemical facility safety and security, including S. 1961, to protect surface water from contamination by chemical storage facilities, after receiving testimony from Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; Rafael Moure-Eraso, Chairperson, Chemical Safety Board; Michael P. Wilson, California Department of Industrial Relations, Oakland; James Frederick, United Steelworkers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Evan P. Hansen, Downstream Strategies, Morgantown, West Virginia; Billy Pirkle, Crop Production Services, Loveland, Colorado, on behalf of The Fertilizer Institute; and Scott Berger, American Institute of Chemical Engineers Center for Chemical Process Safety, New York, New York.

SYRIA, MIDDLE EAST, AND UKRAINE

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Syria spillover, focusing on the growing threat of terrorism and sectarianism in the Middle East, and Ukraine update, after receiving testimony from William J. Burns, Deputy Secretary of State; Derek Chollet, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs; Matthew G. Olsen, Director, National Counterterrorism Center; and Daveed Gartenstein-Ross, Foundation for Defense of Democracies, and Matthew Levitt, The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, both of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Deborah L. Birx, of Maryland, to be Ambassador at Large and Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally, who was introduced by Senator Cardin, Suzan G. LeVine, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Swiss Confederation, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Principality of Liechtenstein, who was introduced by Senators Cantwell and Murray, Maureen Elizabeth Cormack, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Peter A. Selfridge, of Minnesota, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight concluded an oversight hearing to examine contractor performance information, after receiving testimony from Captain Brian T. Drapp, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, Commanding Officer, Naval Sea Logistics Center, Department of Defense; and Kevin Youel Page, Assistant Commissioner, Integrated Award Environment, Federal Acquisition Service, General Services Administration.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1675, to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Robin S. Rosenbaum, of Florida, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, Bruce Howe Hendricks, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, Mark G. Mastroianni, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, and Leslie Ragon Caldwell, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 30 public bills, H.R. 6, 4156–4184; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 90–91; and H. Res. 504–509, were introduced. **Pages H2255–56**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2257–58**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 311, to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms (H. Rept. 113–375). **Page H2255**

Electricity Security and Affordability Act: The House passed H.R. 3826, to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 106. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, March 5th. **Pages H2208–15**

Rejected the Brownley motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 184 yeas to 223 nays, Roll No. 105. **Page H2211**

Agreed to:

Smith (TX) amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 113–373) that was debated on March 5th that requires the Administrator to apply the specific criteria, under the bill, for setting a standard based on the best system of emission reduction for new sources within the coal category, when setting a standard for any fossil fuel category (by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 101). **Page H2209**

Rejected:

Capps amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 113–373) that was debated on March 5th that sought to allow the EPA to consider all pollution control technologies being used in the United States or elsewhere when setting new power plant emission standards (by a recorded vote of 184 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 102); **Pages H2209–10**

Schakowsky amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 113–373) that was debated on March 5th that sought to accept the scientific finding of the EPA that greenhouse gas pollution is ''contributing to long-lasting changes in our climate that can have a range of negative effects'' (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 221 noes, Roll No. 103); and **Page H2210**

Waxman amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 113–373) that was debated on March 5th that sought to provide that the bill takes effect when the Administrator of the EIA certifies that another Federal program, other than one under section 111 of the Clean Air Act, will reduce carbon pollution in at least equivalent quantities, with similar timing and from the same sources as the reductions required under the rules and guidelines nullified by section 4 (by a recorded vote of 178 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 104). **Pages H2210–11**

H. Res. 497, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3826) and (H.R. 4118), was agreed to yesterday, March 5th.

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Fudge announced her intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Page H2215**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Providing for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine: H.R. 4152, to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 385 yeas to 23 nays, Roll No. 114. **Pages H2215–19, H2243**

Responsibly And Professionally Invigorating Development Act: The House passed H.R. 2641, to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 179 noes, Roll No. 113. **Pages H2220–36, H2237–43**

Rejected the DelBene motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 217 noes, Roll No. 112. **Pages H2240–42**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–39 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H2228**

Agreed to:

Webster amendment (No. 3 printed in part C of H. Rept. 113–374) that provides for projects that are under environmental review at the time of enactment to be completed within the deadlines that the underlying bill outlines and **Pages H2234–35**

McKinley amendment (No. 2 printed in part C of H. Rept. 113–374) that does not allow agencies under this legislation to take into account the ''social

cost of carbon'' from the ''Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866 from May 2013 or November 2013'' (by a recorded vote of 222 ayes to 188 noes, Roll No. 109).

Pages H2233–34, H2238–39

Rejected:

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 1 printed in part C of H. Rept. 113–374) that sought to strike deemed approved language for any project for which an agency does not meet the deadlines contained in the bill (by a recorded vote of 180 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 108); **Page H2231–33, H2238**

Nadler amendment (No. 4 printed in part C of H. Rept. 113–374) that sought to exempt from the bill any construction project for a nuclear facility planned in an area designated as an earthquake fault zone (by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 220 noes, Roll No. 110); and **Page H2235–36, H2239–40**

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 5 printed in part C of H. Rept. 113–374) that sought to clarify that nothing in the bill will change or limit any law or regulation allowing for public comment or participation in an agency decision making process (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 217 noes, Roll No. 111).

Pages H2236, H2240

H. Res. 501, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2824) and (H.R. 2641), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 225 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 100, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 99. **Pages H2202–08**

Privileged Resolution: Representative Fudge rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted a privileged resolution. Upon examination of the resolution, the Chair determined that the resolution qualified. Subsequently, the House agreed to the Cantor motion to table H. Res. 504, raising a question of the privileges of the House, by a yea-and-nay vote of 211 yeas to 186 nays with 10 answering ''present'', Roll No. 107. **Pages H2236–37**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 10th and that the order of the House of January 7, 2014 regarding morning hour debate not apply on that day. **Page H2245**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he issued an Executive Order declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Ukraine—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–95). **Page H2250**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and 11 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2207–08, H2208, H2209, H2209–10, H2210, H2211, H2213–14, H2214, H2237, H2238, H2238–39, H2239, H2240, H2242, H2242–43, and H2243. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—HOUSE OFFICERS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing on House Officers FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from the following House Officers: Ed Cassidy, Chief Administrative Officer; Karen L. Haas, Clerk; and Paul D. Irving, Sergeant at Arms.

APPROPRIATIONS—COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Commodity Futures Trading Commission FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Mark Wetjen, Acting Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense''. Testimony was heard from General Martin Dempsey, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense; and Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense.

BENEFITS OF AND CHALLENGES TO ENERGY ACCESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY: FUEL SUPPLY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled ''Benefits of and Challenges to Energy Access in the 21st Century: Fuel Supply and Infrastructure''. Testimony was heard form Adam Sieminski, Administrator, Energy Information Administration; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Ukraine''; and a markup on H. Res. 499, Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation. Testimony was

heard from Eric Rubin, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Department of State; Paige Alexander, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Europe and Eurasia, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Daleep Singh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Europe and Eurasia, Department of the Treasury. The resolution, H. Res. 499, was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislation: H.R. 3732, the "Immigration Compliance Enforcement Act"; H.R. 3973, the "Faithful Execution of the Law Act of 2014"; and H.R. 4138, the "Executive Needs to Faithfully Observe and Respect Congressional Enactments Act". H.R. 3732 was ordered reported, as amended. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 3973 and H.R. 4138.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation held a hearing on the following legislation: H.R. 414, to provide for the continued lease or eventual conveyance of certain Federal land within the boundaries of Fort Wainwright Military Reservation in Fairbanks, Alaska; H.R. 1839, the "Hermosa Creek Watershed Protection Act of 2013"; H.R. 2430, the "Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act of 2013"; and H.R. 3606, the "Emigrant Wilderness Historical Use Preservation Act of 2013". Testimony was heard from Representative Pascrell; and Jim Pena, Associate Deputy Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Stephanie Toothman, Associate Director, Cultural Resources, Partnership and Science, National Park Service, Department of Interior; and public witnesses.

CAN TECHNOLOGY PROTECT AMERICANS FROM INTERNATIONAL CYBERCRIMINALS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight and Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a joint hearing entitled "Can Technology Protect Americans from International Cybercriminals?". Testimony was heard from Charles H. Romie, Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology; and public witnesses.

OBAMACARE AND THE SELF-EMPLOYED: WHAT ABOUT US?

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce held a hearing entitled "ObamaCare and the Self-Employed: What About Us?". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing on President Obama's budget proposals for fiscal year 2015. Testimony was heard from Jacob Lew, Secretary, Department of Treasury.

BUSINESS MEETING

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing on access to transcripts, member access requests, and ongoing intelligence activities. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Senate committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the American Veterans (AMVETS), Blinded Veterans Association, Jewish War Veterans, Military Officers Association of America, Military Order of the Purple Heart, National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, National Guard Association of the United States, The Retired Enlisted Association, Vietnam Veterans of America, after receiving testimony from Colonel Peter Duffy, USA (Ret.), National Guard Association of the United States, Manchester, New Hampshire; Clyde Marsh, National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, Phoenix, Arizona; John Rowan, Vietnam Veterans of America, Middle Village, New York; Colonel Robert E. Pickard, USA (Ret.), Jewish War Veterans of the USA, Miami, Florida; John Mitchell, American Veterans (AMVETS), Knoxville, Tennessee; Ron Siebels, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Anchorage, Alaska; Richard Delaney, The Retired Enlisted Association, Robins, Georgia; Colonel Robert F. Norton, USA (Ret.), Military Officers Association of America, Alexandria, Virginia; and Mark Cornell, Blinded Veterans Association, San Antonio, Texas.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

4 p.m., Monday, March 10

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Carolyn B. McHugh, of Utah, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination at 5:30 p.m.

Also, Senate will resume consideration of S. 1917, Victims Protection Act, with a vote on passage of the bill following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Carolyn B. McHugh.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, March 10

House Chamber

Program for Monday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 2 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beniskey, Dan, Mich., E320
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E326, E329, E331, E333
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E321
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E334
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E322
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E320
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E326, E328
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E328
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E322
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E331
Crawford, Eric A. ''Rick'', Ark., E320
Davis, Rodney, Ill., E325
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E325
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E327, E330, E332
Duffy, Sean P., Wisc., E325, E331
Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E323
Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E334
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E321
Graves, Sam, Mo., E319, E320
Green, Al, Tex., E329
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E328
Grimm, Michael G., N.Y., E321
Hahn, Janice, Calif., E330
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E334
Holt, Rush, N.J., E319
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E323
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E319
Hurt, Robert, Va., E324
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E331
Keating, William R., Mass., E332, E333
King, Steve, Iowa, E328, E332
Kirkpatrick, Ann, Ariz., E325
Kline, John, Minn., E324
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E319
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E329
Michaud, Michael H., Me., E323
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E329
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E322, E324, E325, E326, E327, E328, E329, E330, E331, E332
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E322
Price, David E., N.C., E327, E332
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E327
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E320
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E324, E326, E333
Smith, Adam, Wash., E324
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E319
Veasey, Marc A., Tex., E324
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E321

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.