



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 2014

No. 49

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 27, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, through Whom we see what we could be and what we can become, thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. Be with them and with all who labor here to serve this great Nation and its people.

Assure them that whatever their responsibilities, You provide the grace to enable them to be faithful in their duties, and the wisdom to be conscious of their obligations and fulfill them with integrity.

Remind us all of the dignity of work, and teach us to use our talents and abilities in ways that are honorable and just and are of benefit to those we serve.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. JENKINS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONGRATULATIONS MARS CHOCOLATE

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mars Chocolate North America on the grand opening of their state-of-the-art manufacturing facility in Topeka, Kansas.

This is the first Mars Chocolate factory built in the U.S. in 35 years. Mars has invested more than \$270 million to build this facility, bringing hundreds of jobs to the Topeka area. They will be manufacturing Snickers as well as 39 million individual M&Ms per day.

I want to also congratulate the city of Topeka, Shawnee County, the chamber of commerce, and the State of Kansas for attracting world-class manufacturing to our State. Mars conducted an extensive search, reviewing 80 potential sites. Our talented workforce, access to key infrastructure, and positive

business environment all made Topeka the best choice.

Thank you, Mars, for making Topeka your home in the heartland, and welcome to Kansas.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to recognize the month of March as Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Month. MS is a debilitating, chronic disease that attacks the central nervous system and causes visual problems, overwhelming fatigue, difficulty with balance and coordination, and impaired mobility.

One of my most trusted and long-term district staff members, Ms. Robin McCray, who has been with me for many, many years—first, when I was in the California State Legislature and now in Congress—has a son, Ian, who is now 42 years of age, who has MS.

Ian was diagnosed at the age of 29, at the most productive time in his life. He was an avid snowboarder, an outdoorsman, and practiced masonry. MS has stolen these things away from him.

There is no cure for MS, which is why we need advocates to help fight this terrible disease. I have seen, through Robin and Ian, how MS not only affects the individual, but the entire family.

Today I speak for Ian, but I advocate for the 400,000 Americans diagnosed with MS.

NATIONAL MULTIPLE MYELOMA AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize March as National Multiple

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2699

Myeloma Awareness Month. Myeloma is a cancer of the bone marrow that can have a variety of effects on the body, ranging from bone pain to organ failure. The National Cancer Institute estimates that over 22,000 new cases will be diagnosed and 11,000 deaths will occur due to myeloma this year.

While myeloma is not curable, it is treatable. I thank my colleagues, Congressman BACHUS and Congressman RANGEL, for drafting a resolution to establish March as National Multiple Myeloma Awareness Month and the International Myeloma Foundation for raising awareness of the disease year-round.

Additionally, as Congress begins to develop a budget, I encourage strong support for medical research, increasing funding to the National Institutes of Health to \$32 billion.

Finally, I urge the House leadership to bring the Cancer Drug Coverage Parity Act to the floor, a bill I introduced to make sure that patients with myeloma and other cancers who are prescribed oral chemotherapy by their doctors will have the insurance coverage they need to treat their illness and to get healthy.

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE

(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 to shed some light on a very serious issue facing more than 15 million Medicare Advantage recipients across the country, including more than 300,000 seniors in my home State of Georgia.

Medicare Advantage provides care and support to the constituents of every Member of this body. It reduces the need for hospitalization and reduces health care costs by focusing on prevention and disease management. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services recently proposed a 5.9 percent cut to this program which will reduce benefits and increase premiums by \$35 to \$75 per month for beneficiaries all across the country.

This month, my colleague from the other side of the aisle, Dr. BILL CASSIDY, and I led an effort with over 200 Members of this body to urge the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to prevent these devastating cuts to this program.

I urge this body and our friends in the Senate to do all we can to preserve this critical program. We simply cannot place the country's financial burdens on the back of seniors by undermining Medicare Advantage.

HONORING DR. FRANK KITAMOTO

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Frank Kitamoto

and offer my condolences to his family and friends in light of his recent passing.

At the age of 2, Dr. Kitamoto and his family were among the 277 Bainbridge Island, Washington, residents forced from their homes during World War II and taken to a war relocation center in California. In total, 12,000 Japanese American Washingtonians were forced out of their homes for the duration of the war.

Dr. Kitamoto returned to Bainbridge Island after the end of the war and he began an oral history project. He traveled the country to educate others about Japanese American history and forced relocation during World War II. He served as president of the Bainbridge Island Japanese American Community for more than 25 years. Dr. Kitamoto also played an integral role in the installation of the Bainbridge Island Exclusion Memorial.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Kitamoto for his dedication to ensuring that the stories of this difficult period in American history are told. I am pleased to honor his legacy in the United States Congress today.

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE CUTS PROPOSED FOR 2015 WOULD BE SHORTSIGHTED AND COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with all the questions surrounding health insurance today, it is vital that seniors can keep the health care coverage on which they depend. I remain committed to working in a bipartisan manner to address the long-term drivers of our debt. I also understand we must consider the impact the decisions we make have on real Americans.

Recent efforts to bring Medicare Advantage payments in line with traditional Medicare makes sense if you think of the budget solely as numbers on a spreadsheet; but we are seeing these cuts resulting in smaller networks of doctors, cuts to add-on benefits, and higher out-of-pocket limits, shifting the cost and burden onto our Nation's seniors on fixed incomes.

The Medicare Advantage cuts proposed for 2015 would be shortsighted and counterproductive if it meant elimination of health care innovations and led to hospital readmissions and worse health outcomes.

I add my voice to the growing bipartisan chorus calling for no more cuts to seniors on Medicare Advantage. I urge the administration to keep the rates flat for this year, protecting seniors' continued access to health care choices that they have earned after a lifetime of hard work.

RECESS

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

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0942

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 9 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PROTECTING ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4302) to amend the Social Security Act to extend Medicare payments to physicians and other provisions of the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4302

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MEDICARE EXTENDERS

- Sec. 101. Physician payment update.
- Sec. 102. Extension of work GPCI floor.
- Sec. 103. Extension of therapy cap exceptions process.
- Sec. 104. Extension of ambulance add-ons.
- Sec. 105. Extension of increased inpatient hospital payment adjustment for certain low-volume hospitals.
- Sec. 106. Extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program.
- Sec. 107. Extension for specialized Medicare Advantage plans for special needs individuals.
- Sec. 108. Extension of Medicare reasonable cost contracts.
- Sec. 109. Extension of funding for quality measure endorsement, input, and selection.
- Sec. 110. Extension of funding outreach and assistance for low-income programs.
- Sec. 111. Extension of two-midnight rule.
- Sec. 112. Technical changes to Medicare LTCH amendments.

TITLE II—OTHER HEALTH PROVISIONS

- Sec. 201. Extension of the qualifying individual (QI) program.

- Sec. 202. Temporary extension of transitional medical assistance (TMA).
- Sec. 203. Extension of Medicaid and CHIP express lane option.
- Sec. 204. Extension of special diabetes program for type I diabetes and for Indians.
- Sec. 205. Extension of abstinence education.
- Sec. 206. Extension of personal responsibility education program (PREP).
- Sec. 207. Extension of funding for family-to-family health information centers.
- Sec. 208. Extension of health workforce demonstration project for low-income individuals.
- Sec. 209. Extension of maternal, infant, and early childhood home visiting programs.
- Sec. 210. Pediatric quality measures.
- Sec. 211. Delay of effective date for Medicaid amendments relating to beneficiary liability settlements.
- Sec. 212. Delay in transition from ICD-9 TO ICD-10 code sets.
- Sec. 213. Elimination of limitation on deductibles for employer-sponsored health plans.
- Sec. 214. GAO report on the Children's Hospital Graduate Medical Education Program.
- Sec. 215. Skilled nursing facility value-based purchasing.
- Sec. 216. Improving Medicare policies for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests.
- Sec. 217. Revisions under the Medicare ESRD prospective payment system.
- Sec. 218. Quality incentives for computed tomography diagnostic imaging and promoting evidence-based care.
- Sec. 219. Using funding from Transitional Fund for Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) Reform.
- Sec. 220. Ensuring accurate valuation of services under the physician fee schedule.
- Sec. 221. Medicaid DSH.
- Sec. 222. Realignment of the Medicare sequester for fiscal year 2024.
- Sec. 223. Demonstration programs to improve community mental health services.
- Sec. 224. Assisted outpatient treatment grant program for individuals with serious mental illness.
- Sec. 225. Exclusion from PAYGO scorecards.

TITLE I—MEDICARE EXTENDERS

SEC. 101. PHYSICIAN PAYMENT UPDATE.

Section 1848(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (15)—
(A) in the heading, by striking “JANUARY THROUGH MARCH OF”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “for the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on March 31, 2014”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—
(i) in the heading, by striking “REMAINING PORTION OF 2014 AND”; and
(ii) by striking “the period beginning on April 1, 2014, and ending on December 31, 2014, and for”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
“(16) UPDATE FOR JANUARY THROUGH MARCH OF 2015.—
“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (7)(B), (8)(B), (9)(B), (10)(B), (11)(B), (12)(B), (13)(B), (14)(B), and (15)(B), in lieu of the update to the single conversion factor established in paragraph (1)(C) that would otherwise apply for 2015 for the period beginning

on January 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2015, the update to the single conversion factor shall be 0.0 percent.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON COMPUTATION OF CONVERSION FACTOR FOR REMAINING PORTION OF 2015 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—The conversion factor under this subsection shall be computed under paragraph (1)(A) for the period beginning on April 1, 2015, and ending on December 31, 2015, and for 2016 and subsequent years as if subparagraph (A) had never applied.”.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF WORK GPCI FLOOR.

Section 1848(e)(1)(E) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(e)(1)(E)) is amended by striking “April 1, 2014” and inserting “April 1, 2015”.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF THERAPY CAP EXCEPTIONS PROCESS.

Section 1833(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)(A), in the first sentence, by striking “March 31, 2014” and inserting “March 31, 2015”; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(A)—
(A) by striking “March 31, 2014” and inserting “March 31, 2015”; and
(B) by striking “2012, 2013, or the first three months of 2014” and inserting “2012, 2013, 2014, or the first three months of 2015”.

SEC. 104. EXTENSION OF AMBULANCE ADD-ONS.
(a) GROUND AMBULANCE.—Section 1834(l)(13)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(l)(13)(A)) is amended by striking “April 1, 2014” and inserting “April 1, 2015” each place it appears.

(b) SUPER RURAL GROUND AMBULANCE.—Section 1834(l)(12)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(l)(12)(A)) is amended, in the first sentence, by striking “April 1, 2014” and inserting “April 1, 2015”.

SEC. 105. EXTENSION OF INCREASED INPATIENT HOSPITAL PAYMENT ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN LOW-VOLUME HOSPITALS.

Section 1886(d)(12) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(12)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “in the portion of fiscal year 2014 beginning on April 1, 2014, fiscal year 2015, and subsequent fiscal years” and inserting “in fiscal year 2015 (beginning on April 1, 2015), fiscal year 2016, and subsequent fiscal years”;

(2) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013, and the portion of fiscal year 2014 before” and inserting “fiscal years 2011 through 2014 and fiscal year 2015 (before April 1, 2015),” each place it appears; and
(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking “fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013, and the portion of fiscal year 2014 before April 1, 2014,” and inserting “fiscal years 2011 through 2014 and fiscal year 2015 (before April 1, 2015),”.

SEC. 106. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICARE-DEPENDENT HOSPITAL (MDH) PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1886(d)(5)(G) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(5)(G)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “April 1, 2014” and inserting “April 1, 2015”; and
(2) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “April 1, 2014” and inserting “April 1, 2015”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) EXTENSION OF TARGET AMOUNT.—Section 1886(b)(3)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(b)(3)(D)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “April 1, 2014” and inserting “April 1, 2015”; and
(B) in clause (iv), by striking “through fiscal year 2013 and the portion of fiscal year 2014 before April 1, 2014” and inserting “through fiscal year 2014 and the portion of fiscal year 2015 before April 1, 2015”.

(2) PERMITTING HOSPITALS TO DECLINE RECLASSIFICATION.—Section 13501(e)(2) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1395ww note) is amended by striking “through the first 2 quarters of fiscal year 2014” and inserting “through the first 2 quarters of fiscal year 2015”.

SEC. 107. EXTENSION FOR SPECIALIZED MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS FOR SPECIAL NEEDS INDIVIDUALS.

Section 1859(f)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-28(f)(1)) is amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 108. EXTENSION OF MEDICARE REASONABLE COST CONTRACTS.

Section 1876(h)(5)(C)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm(h)(5)(C)(ii)) is amended, in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “January 1, 2015” and inserting “January 1, 2016”.

SEC. 109. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR QUALITY MEASURE ENDORSEMENT, INPUT, AND SELECTION.

Section 1890(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395aaa(d)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “For purposes”; and
(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) For purposes of carrying out this section and section 1890A (other than subsections (e) and (f)), the Secretary shall provide for the transfer, from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841, in such proportion as the Secretary determines appropriate, to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account of \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and \$15,000,000 for the first 6 months of fiscal year 2015. Amounts transferred under the preceding sentence shall remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 110. EXTENSION OF FUNDING OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE FOR LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS.
(a) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR STATE HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAMS.—Subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 119 of the Medicare Improvements for Patients and Providers Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 1395b-3 note), as amended by section 3306 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), section 610 of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-240), and section 1110 of the Pathway for SGR Reform Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67), is amended—
(1) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;
(2) by striking clause (iv); and
(3) by adding at the end the following new clauses:
“(iv) for fiscal year 2014, of \$7,500,000; and
“(v) for the portion of fiscal year 2015 before April 1, 2015, of \$3,750,000.”.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.—Subsection (b)(1)(B) of such section 119, as so amended, is amended—
(1) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;
(2) by striking clause (iv); and
(3) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clauses:
“(iv) for fiscal year 2014, of \$7,500,000; and
“(v) for the portion of fiscal year 2015 before April 1, 2015, of \$3,750,000.”.

(c) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR AGING AND DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTERS.—Subsection (c)(1)(B) of such section 119, as so amended, is amended—
(1) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;
(2) by striking clause (iv); and
(3) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clauses:
“(iv) for fiscal year 2014, of \$7,500,000; and
“(v) for the portion of fiscal year 2015 before April 1, 2015, of \$3,750,000.”.

(d) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR AGING AND DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTERS.—Subsection (c)(1)(B) of such section 119, as so amended, is amended—
(1) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;
(2) by striking clause (iv); and
(3) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clauses:
“(iv) for fiscal year 2014, of \$5,000,000; and
“(v) for the portion of fiscal year 2015 before April 1, 2015, of \$2,500,000.”.

(d) ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR CONTRACT WITH THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR BENEFITS AND OUTREACH ENROLLMENT.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section 119, as so amended, is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by striking clause (iv); and

(3) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clauses:

“(iv) for fiscal year 2014, of \$5,000,000; and

“(v) for the portion of fiscal year 2015 before April 1, 2015, of \$2,500,000.”

SEC. 111. EXTENSION OF TWO-MIDNIGHT RULE.

(a) CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN MEDICAL REVIEW ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may continue medical review activities described in the notice entitled “Selecting Hospital Claims for Patient Status Reviews: Admissions On or After October 1, 2013”, posted on the Internet website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, through the first 6 months of fiscal year 2015 for such additional hospital claims as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall not conduct patient status reviews (as described in such notice) on a post-payment review basis through recovery audit contractors under section 1893(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ddd(h)) for inpatient claims with dates of admission October 1, 2013, through March 31, 2015, unless there is evidence of systematic gaming, fraud, abuse, or delays in the provision of care by a provider of services (as defined in section 1861(u) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(u))).

SEC. 112. TECHNICAL CHANGES TO MEDICARE LTCH AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subclauses (I) and (II) of section 1886(m)(6)(C)(iv) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(m)(6)(C)(iv)) are each amended by striking “discharges” and inserting “Medicare fee-for-service discharges”.

(b) MMSEA CORRECTION.—Section 114(d) of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Extension Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 1395ww note), as amended by sections 3106(b) and 10312(b) of Public Law 111-148 and by section 1206(b)(2) of the Pathway for SGR Reform Act of 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-67), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “January 1, 2015,” and inserting “on the date of the enactment of paragraph (7) of this subsection”;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking “January 1, 2015,” and inserting “on the date of the enactment of paragraph (7) of this subsection”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) ADDITIONAL EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN LONG-TERM CARE HOSPITALS.—The moratorium under paragraph (1)(A) shall not apply to a long-term care hospital that—

“(A) began its qualifying period for payment as a long-term care hospital under section 412.23(e) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, on or before the date of enactment of this paragraph;

“(B) has a binding written agreement as of the date of the enactment of this paragraph with an outside, unrelated party for the actual construction, renovation, lease, or demolition for a long-term care hospital, and has expended, before such date of enactment, at least 10 percent of the estimated cost of the project (or, if less, \$2,500,000); or

“(C) has obtained an approved certificate of need in a State where one is required on or before such date of enactment.”

(c) ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 1206(a) of the Pathway for SGR Reform Act

of 2013 (division B of Public Law 113-67) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “Assessment” and inserting “Advisory”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “shall not apply to a hospital that is classified as of December 10, 2013, as a subsection (d) hospital (as defined in section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(1)(B))” and inserting “shall only apply to a hospital that is classified as of December 10, 2013, as a long-term care hospital (as defined in section 1861(ccc) of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1395x(ccc))”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section are effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—OTHER HEALTH PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF THE QUALIFYING INDIVIDUAL (QI) PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1902(a)(10)(E)(iv) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(E)(iv)) is amended by striking “March 2014” and inserting “March 2015”.

(b) EXTENDING TOTAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION.—Section 1933(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u-3(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (T), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (U)—

(i) by striking “March 31, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2014”; and

(ii) by striking “\$200,000,000.” and inserting “\$485,000,000.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(V) for the period that begins on October 1, 2014, and ends on December 31, 2014, the total allocation amount is \$300,000,000; and

“(W) for the period that begins on January 1, 2015, and ends on March 31, 2015, the total allocation amount is \$250,000,000.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “or (T)” and inserting “(T), or (V)”.

SEC. 202. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE (TMA).

Sections 1902(e)(1)(B) and 1925(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(1)(B), 1396r-6(f)) are each amended by striking “March 31, 2014” and inserting “March 31, 2015”.

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF MEDICAID AND CHIP EXPRESS LANE OPTION.

Section 1902(e)(13)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(13)(I)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 204. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM FOR TYPE I DIABETES AND FOR INDIANS.

(a) SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAMS FOR TYPE I DIABETES.—Section 330B(b)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-2(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

(b) SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAMS FOR INDIANS.—Section 330C(c)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-3(c)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 205. EXTENSION OF ABSTINENCE EDUCATION.

Subsections (a) and (d) of section 510 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 710) are each amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 206. EXTENSION OF PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION PROGRAM (PREP).

Section 513 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 713) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1)(A) and (4)(A) of subsection (a), by striking “2014” and inserting “2015” each place it appears;

(2) in subsection (a)(4)(B)(i), by striking “and 2014” and inserting “2014, and 2015”; and

(3) in subsection (f), by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 207. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR FAMILY-TO-FAMILY HEALTH INFORMATION CENTERS.

Section 501(c)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 701(c)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking at the end “and”;

(2) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon and by moving the margin to align with the margin for clause (iii); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

“(v) \$2,500,000 for the portion of fiscal year 2014 on or after April 1, 2014; and

“(vi) \$2,500,000 for the portion of fiscal year 2015 before April 1, 2015.”

SEC. 208. EXTENSION OF HEALTH WORKFORCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS.

Section 2008(c)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397g(c)(1)) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 209. EXTENSION OF MATERNAL, INFANT, AND EARLY CHILDHOOD HOME VISITING PROGRAMS.

Section 511(j) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 711(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (D);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on March 31, 2015, an amount equal to the amount provided in subparagraph (E).”; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by inserting “(or portion of a fiscal year)” after “for a fiscal year” each place it appears.

SEC. 210. PEDIATRIC QUALITY MEASURES.

(a) CONTINUATION OF FUNDING FOR PEDIATRIC QUALITY MEASURES FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF CHILDREN’S HEALTH CARE.—Section 1139B(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-9b(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Of the funds appropriated under this subsection, not less than \$15,000,000 shall be used to carry out section 1139A(b).”

(b) ELIMINATION OF RESTRICTION ON MEDICAID QUALITY MEASUREMENT PROGRAM.—Section 1139B(b)(5)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-9b(b)(5)(A)) is amended by striking “The aggregate amount awarded by the Secretary for grants and contracts for the development, testing, and validation of emerging and innovative evidence-based measures under such program shall equal the aggregate amount awarded by the Secretary for grants under section 1139A(b)(4)(A).”

SEC. 211. DELAY OF EFFECTIVE DATE FOR MEDICAID AMENDMENTS RELATING TO BENEFICIARY LIABILITY SETTLEMENTS.

Effective as if included in the enactment of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67), section 202(c) of such Act is amended by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “October 1, 2016”.

SEC. 212. DELAY IN TRANSITION FROM ICD-9 TO ICD-10 CODE SETS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services may not, prior to October 1, 2015, adopt ICD-10 code sets as the standard for code sets under section 1173(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d-2(c)) and section 162.1002 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 213. ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION ON DEDUCTIBLES FOR EMPLOYER-SPONSORED HEALTH PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1302(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 42 U.S.C. 18022(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2); and
 (2) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “paragraphs (1)(B)(i) and (2)(B)(i)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(B)(i)”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2707(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-6(b)) is amended by striking “paragraphs (1) and (2)” and inserting “paragraph (1)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall be effective as if included in the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148).

SEC. 214. GAO REPORT ON THE CHILDREN’S HOSPITAL GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case that the Children’s Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013 is enacted into law, the Comptroller General of the United States shall, not later than November 30, 2017, conduct an independent evaluation, and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report, concerning the implementation of section 340E(h) of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 3 of the Children’s Hospital GME Support Reauthorization Act of 2013.

(b) CONTENT.—The report described in subsection (a) shall review and assess each of the following, with respect to hospitals receiving payments under such section 340E(h) during the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2017:

- (1) The number and type of such hospitals that applied for such payments.
- (2) The number and type of such hospitals receiving such payments.
- (3) The amount of such payments awarded to such hospitals.
- (4) How such hospitals used such payments.
- (5) The impact of such payments on—
 - (A) the number of pediatric providers; and
 - (B) health care needs of children.

SEC. 215. SKILLED NURSING FACILITY VALUE-BASED PURCHASING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1888 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395yy) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SKILLED NURSING FACILITY READMISSION MEASURE.—

“(1) READMISSION MEASURE.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the Secretary shall specify a skilled nursing facility all-cause all-condition hospital readmission measure (or any successor to such a measure).

“(2) RESOURCE USE MEASURE.—Not later than October 1, 2016, the Secretary shall specify a measure to reflect an all-condition risk-adjusted potentially preventable hospital readmission rate for skilled nursing facilities.

“(3) MEASURE ADJUSTMENTS.—When specifying the measures under paragraphs (1) and (2), the Secretary shall devise a methodology to achieve a high level of reliability and validity, especially for skilled nursing facilities with a low volume of readmissions.

“(4) PRE-RULEMAKING PROCESS (MEASURE APPLICATION PARTNERSHIP PROCESS).—The application of the provisions of section 1890A shall be optional in the case of a measure specified under paragraph (1) and a measure specified under paragraph (2).

“(5) FEEDBACK REPORTS TO SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.—Beginning October 1, 2016, and every quarter thereafter, the Secretary shall provide confidential feedback reports to skilled nursing facilities on the performance

of such facilities with respect to a measure specified under paragraph (1) or (2).

“(6) PUBLIC REPORTING OF SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary shall establish procedures for making available to the public by posting on the Nursing Home Compare Medicare website (or a successor website) described in section 1819(i) information on the performance of skilled nursing facilities with respect to a measure specified under paragraph (1) and a measure specified under paragraph (2).

“(B) OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW.—The procedures under subparagraph (A) shall ensure that a skilled nursing facility has the opportunity to review and submit corrections to the information that is to be made public with respect to the facility prior to such information being made public.

“(C) TIMING.—Such procedures shall provide that the information described in subparagraph (A) is made publicly available beginning not later than October 1, 2017.

“(7) NON-APPLICATION OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995’) shall not apply to this subsection.”

(b) VALUE-BASED PURCHASING PROGRAM FOR SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES.—Section 1888 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395yy), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) SKILLED NURSING FACILITY VALUE-BASED PURCHASING PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the succeeding provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall establish a skilled nursing facility value-based purchasing program (in this subsection referred to as the ‘SNF VBP Program’) under which value-based incentive payments are made in a fiscal year to skilled nursing facilities.

“(B) PROGRAM TO BEGIN IN FISCAL YEAR 2019.—The SNF VBP Program shall apply to payments for services furnished on or after October 1, 2018.

“(2) APPLICATION OF MEASURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall apply the measure specified under subsection (g)(1) for purposes of the SNF VBP Program.

“(B) REPLACEMENT.—For purposes of the SNF VBP Program, the Secretary shall apply the measure specified under (g)(2) instead of the measure specified under (g)(1) as soon as practicable.

“(3) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish performance standards with respect to the measure applied under paragraph (2) for a performance period for a fiscal year.

“(B) HIGHER OF ACHIEVEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT.—The performance standards established under subparagraph (A) shall include levels of achievement and improvement. In calculating the SNF performance score under paragraph (4), the Secretary shall use the higher of either improvement or achievement.

“(C) TIMING.—The Secretary shall establish and announce the performance standards established under subparagraph (A) not later than 60 days prior to the beginning of the performance period for the fiscal year involved.

“(4) SNF PERFORMANCE SCORE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop a methodology for assessing the total performance of each skilled nursing facility based on performance standards established under paragraph (3) with respect to the measure applied under paragraph (2). Using such methodology, the Secretary shall provide for an assessment (in this subsection re-

ferred to as the ‘SNF performance score’) for each skilled nursing facility for each such performance period.

“(B) RANKING OF SNF PERFORMANCE SCORES.—The Secretary shall, for the performance period for each fiscal year, rank the SNF performance scores determined under subparagraph (A) from low to high.

“(5) CALCULATION OF VALUE-BASED INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a skilled nursing facility, based on the ranking under paragraph (4)(B) for a performance period for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall increase the adjusted Federal per diem rate determined under subsection (e)(4)(G) otherwise applicable to such skilled nursing facility (and after application of paragraph (6)) for services furnished by such facility during such fiscal year by the value-based incentive payment amount under subparagraph (B).

“(B) VALUE-BASED INCENTIVE PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The value-based incentive payment amount for services furnished by a skilled nursing facility in a fiscal year shall be equal to the product of—

“(i) the adjusted Federal per diem rate determined under subsection (e)(4)(G) otherwise applicable to such skilled nursing facility for such services furnished by the skilled nursing facility during such fiscal year; and

“(ii) the value-based incentive payment percentage specified under subparagraph (C) for the skilled nursing facility for such fiscal year.

“(C) VALUE-BASED INCENTIVE PAYMENT PERCENTAGE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall specify a value-based incentive payment percentage for a skilled nursing facility for a fiscal year which may include a zero percentage.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—In specifying the value-based incentive payment percentage for each skilled nursing facility for a fiscal year under clause (i), the Secretary shall ensure that—

“(I) such percentage is based on the SNF performance score of the skilled nursing facility provided under paragraph (4) for the performance period for such fiscal year;

“(II) the application of all such percentages in such fiscal year results in an appropriate distribution of value-based incentive payments under subparagraph (B) such that—

“(aa) skilled nursing facilities with the highest rankings under paragraph (4)(B) receive the highest value-based incentive payment amounts under subparagraph (B);

“(bb) skilled nursing facilities with the lowest rankings under paragraph (4)(B) receive the lowest value-based incentive payment amounts under subparagraph (B); and

“(cc) in the case of skilled nursing facilities in the lowest 40 percent of the ranking under paragraph (4)(B), the payment rate under subparagraph (A) for services furnished by such facility during such fiscal year shall be less than the payment rate for such services for such fiscal year that would otherwise apply under subsection (e)(4)(G) without application of this subsection; and

“(III) the total amount of value-based incentive payments under this paragraph for all skilled nursing facilities in such fiscal year shall be greater than or equal to 50 percent, but not greater than 70 percent, of the total amount of the reductions to payments for such fiscal year under paragraph (6), as estimated by the Secretary.

“(6) FUNDING FOR VALUE-BASED INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reduce the adjusted Federal per diem rate determined under subsection (e)(4)(G) otherwise applicable to a skilled nursing facility for services furnished by such facility during

a fiscal year (beginning with fiscal year 2019) by the applicable percent (as defined in subparagraph (B)). The Secretary shall make such reductions for all skilled nursing facilities in the fiscal year involved, regardless of whether or not the skilled nursing facility has been determined by the Secretary to have earned a value-based incentive payment under paragraph (5) for such fiscal year.

“(B) APPLICABLE PERCENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘applicable percent’ means, with respect to fiscal year 2019 and succeeding fiscal years, 2 percent.

“(7) ANNOUNCEMENT OF NET RESULT OF ADJUSTMENTS.—Under the SNF VBP Program, the Secretary shall, not later than 60 days prior to the fiscal year involved, inform each skilled nursing facility of the adjustments to payments to the skilled nursing facility for services furnished by such facility during the fiscal year under paragraphs (5) and (6).

“(8) NO EFFECT IN SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—The value-based incentive payment under paragraph (5) and the payment reduction under paragraph (6) shall each apply only with respect to the fiscal year involved, and the Secretary shall not take into account such value-based incentive payment or payment reduction in making payments to a skilled nursing facility under this section in a subsequent fiscal year.

“(9) PUBLIC REPORTING.—

“(A) SNF SPECIFIC INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall make available to the public, by posting on the Nursing Home Compare Medicare website (or a successor website) described in section 1819(i) in an easily understandable format, information regarding the performance of individual skilled nursing facilities under the SNF VBP Program, with respect to a fiscal year, including—

“(i) the SNF performance score of the skilled nursing facility for such fiscal year; and

“(ii) the ranking of the skilled nursing facility under paragraph (4)(B) for the performance period for such fiscal year.

“(B) AGGREGATE INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall periodically post on the Nursing Home Compare Medicare website (or a successor website) described in section 1819(i) aggregate information on the SNF VBP Program, including—

“(i) the range of SNF performance scores provided under paragraph (4)(A); and

“(ii) the number of skilled nursing facilities receiving value-based incentive payments under paragraph (5) and the range and total amount of such value-based incentive payments.

“(10) LIMITATION ON REVIEW.—There shall be no administrative or judicial review under section 1869, section 1878, or otherwise of the following:

“(A) The methodology used to determine the value-based incentive payment percentage and the amount of the value-based incentive payment under paragraph (5).

“(B) The determination of the amount of funding available for such value-based incentive payments under paragraph (5)(C)(i)(III) and the payment reduction under paragraph (6).

“(C) The establishment of the performance standards under paragraph (3) and the performance period.

“(D) The methodology developed under paragraph (4) that is used to calculate SNF performance scores and the calculation of such scores.

“(E) The ranking determinations under paragraph (4)(B).

“(11) FUNDING FOR PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary shall provide for the one time transfer from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund established under section 1817 to the Centers for Medicare & Med-

icaid Services Program Management Account of—

“(A) for purposes of subsection (g)(2), \$2,000,000; and

“(B) for purposes of implementing this subsection, \$10,000,000.

Such funds shall remain available until expended.”

(c) MEDPAC STUDY.—Not later than June 30, 2021, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall submit to Congress a report that reviews the progress of the skilled nursing facility value-based purchasing program established under section 1888(h) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (b), and makes recommendations, as appropriate, on any improvements that should be made to such program. For purposes of the previous sentence, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission shall consider any unintended consequences with respect to such skilled nursing facility value-based purchasing program and any potential adjustments to the readmission measure specified under section 1888(g)(1) of such Act, as added by subsection (a), for purposes of determining the effect of the socio-economic status of a beneficiary under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act for the SNF performance score of a skilled nursing facility provided under section 1888(h)(4) of such Act, as added by subsection (b).

SEC. 216. IMPROVING MEDICARE POLICIES FOR CLINICAL DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 1834 (42 U.S.C. 1395m) the following new section:

“SEC. 1834A. IMPROVING POLICIES FOR CLINICAL DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TESTS.

“(a) REPORTING OF PRIVATE SECTOR PAYMENT RATES FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF MEDICARE PAYMENT RATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning January 1, 2016, and every 3 years thereafter (or, annually, in the case of reporting with respect to an advanced diagnostic laboratory test, as defined in subsection (d)(5)), an applicable laboratory (as defined in paragraph (2)) shall report to the Secretary, at a time specified by the Secretary, applicable information (as defined in paragraph (3)) for a data collection period (as defined in paragraph (4)) for each clinical diagnostic laboratory test that the laboratory furnishes during such period for which payment is made under this part.

“(2) DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE LABORATORY.—In this section, the term ‘applicable laboratory’ means a laboratory that, with respect to its revenues under this title, a majority of such revenues are from this section, section 1833(h), or section 1848. The Secretary may establish a low volume or low expenditure threshold for excluding a laboratory from the definition of applicable laboratory under this paragraph, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(3) APPLICABLE INFORMATION DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In this section, subject to subparagraph (B), the term ‘applicable information’ means, with respect to a laboratory test for a data collection period, the following:

“(i) The payment rate (as determined in accordance with paragraph (5)) that was paid by each private payor for the test during the period.

“(ii) The volume of such tests for each such payor for the period.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Such term shall not include information with respect to a laboratory test for which payment is made on a capitated basis or other similar payment basis during the data collection period.

“(4) DATA COLLECTION PERIOD DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘data collection pe-

riod’ means a period of time, such as a previous 12 month period, specified by the Secretary.

“(5) TREATMENT OF DISCOUNTS.—The payment rate reported by a laboratory under this subsection shall reflect all discounts, rebates, coupons, and other price concessions, including those described in section 1847A(c)(3).

“(6) ENSURING COMPLETE REPORTING.—In the case where an applicable laboratory has more than one payment rate for the same payor for the same test or more than one payment rate for different payors for the same test, the applicable laboratory shall report each such payment rate and the volume for the test at each such rate under this subsection. Beginning with January 1, 2019, the Secretary may establish rules to aggregate reporting with respect to the situations described in the preceding sentence.

“(7) CERTIFICATION.—An officer of the laboratory shall certify the accuracy and completeness of the information reported under this subsection.

“(8) PRIVATE PAYOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘private payor’ means the following:

“(A) A health insurance issuer and a group health plan (as such terms are defined in section 2791 of the Public Health Service Act).

“(B) A Medicare Advantage plan under part C.

“(C) A medicare managed care organization (as defined in section 1903(m)).

“(9) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that an applicable laboratory has failed to report or made a misrepresentation or omission in reporting information under this subsection with respect to a clinical diagnostic laboratory test, the Secretary may apply a civil money penalty in an amount of up to \$10,000 per day for each failure to report or each such misrepresentation or omission.

“(B) APPLICATION.—The provisions of section 1128A (other than subsections (a) and (b)) shall apply to a civil money penalty under this paragraph in the same manner as they apply to a civil money penalty or proceeding under section 1128A(a).

“(10) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, information disclosed by a laboratory under this subsection is confidential and shall not be disclosed by the Secretary or a Medicare contractor in a form that discloses the identity of a specific payor or laboratory, or prices charged or payments made to any such laboratory, except—

“(A) as the Secretary determines to be necessary to carry out this section;

“(B) to permit the Comptroller General to review the information provided;

“(C) to permit the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to review the information provided; and

“(D) to permit the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission to review the information provided.

“(11) PROTECTION FROM PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—A payor shall not be identified on information reported under this subsection. The name of an applicable laboratory under this subsection shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code.

“(12) REGULATIONS.—Not later than June 30, 2015, the Secretary shall establish through notice and comment rulemaking parameters for data collection under this subsection.

“(b) PAYMENT FOR CLINICAL DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TESTS.—

“(1) USE OF PRIVATE PAYOR RATE INFORMATION TO DETERMINE MEDICARE PAYMENT RATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3) and subsections (c) and (d), in the case of a clinical diagnostic laboratory test furnished on or after January 1, 2017, the payment amount under this section shall be equal to the weighted median determined for the test under paragraph (2) for the most recent data collection period.

“(B) APPLICATION OF PAYMENT AMOUNTS TO HOSPITAL LABORATORIES.—The payment amounts established under this section shall apply to a clinical diagnostic laboratory test furnished by a hospital laboratory if such test is paid for separately, and not as part of a bundled payment under section 1833(t).

“(2) CALCULATION OF WEIGHTED MEDIAN.—For each laboratory test with respect to which information is reported under subsection (a) for a data collection period, the Secretary shall calculate a weighted median for the test for the period, by arraying the distribution of all payment rates reported for the period for each test weighted by volume for each payor and each laboratory.

“(3) PHASE-IN OF REDUCTIONS FROM PRIVATE PAYOR RATE IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Payment amounts determined under this subsection for a clinical diagnostic laboratory test for each of 2017 through 2022 shall not result in a reduction in payments for a clinical diagnostic laboratory test for the year of greater than the applicable percent (as defined in subparagraph (B)) of the amount of payment for the test for the preceding year.

“(B) APPLICABLE PERCENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘applicable percent’ means—

“(i) for each of 2017 through 2019, 10 percent; and

“(ii) for each of 2020 through 2022, 15 percent.

“(C) NO APPLICATION TO NEW TESTS.—This paragraph shall not apply to payment amounts determined under this section for either of the following.

“(i) A new test under subsection (c).

“(ii) A new advanced diagnostic test (as defined in subsection (d)(5)) under subsection (d).

“(4) APPLICATION OF MARKET RATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), once established for a year following a data collection period, the payment amounts under this subsection shall continue to apply until the year following the next data collection period.

“(B) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS NOT APPLICABLE.—The payment amounts under this section shall not be subject to any adjustment (including any geographic adjustment, budget neutrality adjustment, annual update, or other adjustment).

“(5) SAMPLE COLLECTION FEE.—In the case of a sample collected from an individual in a skilled nursing facility or by a laboratory on behalf of a home health agency, the nominal fee that would otherwise apply under section 1833(h)(3)(A) shall be increased by \$2.

“(c) PAYMENT FOR NEW TESTS THAT ARE NOT ADVANCED DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TESTS.—

“(1) PAYMENT DURING INITIAL PERIOD.—In the case of a clinical diagnostic laboratory test that is assigned a new or substantially revised HCPCS code on or after the date of enactment of this section, and which is not an advanced diagnostic laboratory test (as defined in subsection (d)(5)), during an initial period until payment rates under subsection (b) are established for the test, payment for the test shall be determined—

“(A) using cross-walking (as described in section 414.508(a) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation) to the most appropriate existing test under the fee schedule under this section during that period; or

“(B) if no existing test is comparable to the new test, according to the gapfilling process described in paragraph (2).

“(2) GAPFILLING PROCESS DESCRIBED.—The gapfilling process described in this paragraph shall take into account the following sources of information to determine gapfill amounts, if available:

“(A) Charges for the test and routine discounts to charges.

“(B) Resources required to perform the test.

“(C) Payment amounts determined by other payors.

“(D) Charges, payment amounts, and resources required for other tests that may be comparable or otherwise relevant.

“(E) Other criteria the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(3) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION.—In determining the payment amount under crosswalking or gapfilling processes under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider recommendations from the panel established under subsection (f)(1).

“(4) EXPLANATION OF PAYMENT RATES.—In the case of a clinical diagnostic laboratory test for which payment is made under this subsection, the Secretary shall make available to the public an explanation of the payment rate for the test, including an explanation of how the criteria described in paragraph (2) and paragraph (3) are applied.

“(d) PAYMENT FOR NEW ADVANCED DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TESTS.—

“(1) PAYMENT DURING INITIAL PERIOD.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an advanced diagnostic laboratory test for which payment has not been made under the fee schedule under section 1833(h) prior to the date of enactment of this section, during an initial period of three quarters, the payment amount for the test for such period shall be based on the actual list charge for the laboratory test.

“(B) ACTUAL LIST CHARGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘actual list charge’, with respect to a laboratory test furnished during such period, means the publicly available rate on the first day at which the test is available for purchase by a private payor.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR TIMING OF INITIAL REPORTING.—With respect to an advanced diagnostic laboratory test described in paragraph (1)(A), an applicable laboratory shall initially be required to report under subsection (a) not later than the last day of the second quarter of the initial period under such paragraph.

“(3) APPLICATION OF MARKET RATES AFTER INITIAL PERIOD.—Subject to paragraph (4), data reported under paragraph (2) shall be used to establish the payment amount for an advanced diagnostic laboratory test after the initial period under paragraph (1)(A) using the methodology described in subsection (b). Such payment amount shall continue to apply until the year following the next data collection period.

“(4) RECOURPMENT IF ACTUAL LIST CHARGE EXCEEDS MARKET RATE.—With respect to the initial period described in paragraph (1)(A), if, after such period, the Secretary determines that the payment amount for an advanced diagnostic laboratory test under paragraph (1)(A) that was applicable during the period was greater than 130 percent of the payment amount for the test established using the methodology described in subsection (b) that is applicable after such period, the Secretary shall recoup the difference between such payment amounts for tests furnished during such period.

“(5) ADVANCED DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TEST DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘advanced diagnostic laboratory test’ means a clinical diagnostic laboratory test covered

under this part that is offered and furnished only by a single laboratory and not sold for use by a laboratory other than the original developing laboratory (or a successor owner) and meets one of the following criteria:

“(A) The test is an analysis of multiple biomarkers of DNA, RNA, or proteins combined with a unique algorithm to yield a single patient-specific result.

“(B) The test is cleared or approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

“(C) The test meets other similar criteria established by the Secretary.

“(e) CODING.—

“(1) TEMPORARY CODES FOR CERTAIN NEW TESTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall adopt temporary HCPCS codes to identify new advanced diagnostic laboratory tests (as defined in subsection (d)(5)) and new laboratory tests that are cleared or approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

“(B) DURATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the temporary code shall be effective until a permanent HCPCS code is established (but not to exceed 2 years).

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may extend the temporary code or establish a permanent HCPCS code, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(2) EXISTING TESTS.—Not later than January 1, 2016, for each existing advanced diagnostic laboratory test (as so defined) and each existing clinical diagnostic laboratory test that is cleared or approved by the Food and Drug Administration for which payment is made under this part as of the date of enactment of this section, if such test has not already been assigned a unique HCPCS code, the Secretary shall—

“(A) assign a unique HCPCS code for the test; and

“(B) publicly report the payment rate for the test.

“(3) ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIQUE IDENTIFIER FOR CERTAIN TESTS.—For purposes of tracking and monitoring, if a laboratory or a manufacturer requests a unique identifier for an advanced diagnostic laboratory test (as so defined) or a laboratory test that is cleared or approved by the Food and Drug Administration, the Secretary shall utilize a means to uniquely track such test through a mechanism such as a HCPCS code or modifier.

“(f) INPUT FROM CLINICIANS AND TECHNICAL EXPERTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consult with an expert outside advisory panel, established by the Secretary not later than July 1, 2015, composed of an appropriate selection of individuals with expertise, which may include molecular pathologists, researchers, and individuals with expertise in laboratory science or health economics, in issues related to clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, which may include the development, validation, performance, and application of such tests, to provide—

“(A) input on—

“(i) the establishment of payment rates under this section for new clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, including whether to use crosswalking or gapfilling processes to determine payment for a specific new test; and

“(ii) the factors used in determining coverage and payment processes for new clinical diagnostic laboratory tests; and

“(B) recommendations to the Secretary under this section.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH FACAs.—The panel shall be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

“(3) CONTINUATION OF ANNUAL MEETING.—The Secretary shall continue to convene the annual meeting described in section 1833(h)(8)(B)(iii) after the implementation of

this section for purposes of receiving comments and recommendations (and data on which the recommendations are based) as described in such section on the establishment of payment amounts under this section.

“(g) COVERAGE.—

“(1) ISSUANCE OF COVERAGE POLICIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A medicare administrative contractor shall only issue a coverage policy with respect to a clinical diagnostic laboratory test in accordance with the process for making a local coverage determination (as defined in section 1869(f)(2)(B)), including the appeals and review process for local coverage determinations under part 426 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

“(B) NO EFFECT ON NATIONAL COVERAGE DETERMINATION PROCESS.—This paragraph shall not apply to the national coverage determination process (as defined in section 1869(f)(1)(B)).

“(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This paragraph shall apply to coverage policies issued on or after January 1, 2015.

“(2) DESIGNATION OF ONE OR MORE MEDICARE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTORS FOR CLINICAL DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TESTS.—The Secretary may designate one or more (not to exceed 4) medicare administrative contractors to either establish coverage policies or establish coverage policies and process claims for payment for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(h) IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—There shall be no administrative or judicial review under section 1869, section 1878, or otherwise, of the establishment of payment amounts under this section.

“(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to information collected under this section.

“(3) FUNDING.—For purposes of implementing this section, the Secretary shall provide for the transfer, from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841, to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account, for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, \$4,000,000, and for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, \$3,000,000. Amounts transferred under the preceding sentence shall remain available until expended.

“(i) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this section and ending on December 31, 2016, with respect to advanced diagnostic laboratory tests under this part, the Secretary shall use the methodologies for pricing, coding, and coverage in effect on the day before such date of enactment, which may include cross-walking or gapfilling methods.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1833(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 13951(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(D)—

(i) by striking “(i) on the basis” and inserting “(i)(I) on the basis”;

(ii) in subclause (I), as added by clause (i), by striking “subsection (h)(1)” and inserting “subsection (h)(1) (for tests furnished before January 1, 2017)”;

(iii) by striking “or (ii)” and inserting “or (II) under section 1834A (for tests furnished on or after January 1, 2017), the amount paid shall be equal to 80 percent (or 100 percent, in the case of such tests for which payment is made on an assignment-related basis) of the lesser of the amount determined under such section or the amount of the charges billed for the tests, or (ii)”;

(iv) in clause (ii), by striking “on the basis” and inserting “for tests furnished before January 1, 2017, on the basis”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(D)—

(i) by striking “(i) on the basis” and inserting “(i)(I) on the basis”;

(ii) in subclause (I), as added by clause (i), by striking “subsection (h)(1)” and inserting “subsection (h)(1) (for tests furnished before January 1, 2017)”;

(iii) by striking “or (ii)” and inserting “or (II) under section 1834A (for tests furnished on or after January 1, 2017), the amount paid shall be equal to 80 percent (or 100 percent, in the case of such tests for which payment is made on an assignment-related basis or to a provider having an agreement under section 1866) of the lesser of the amount determined under such section or the amount of the charges billed for the tests, or (ii)”;

(iv) in clause (ii), by striking “on the basis” and inserting “for tests furnished before January 1, 2017, on the basis”;

(C) in subsection (b)(3)(B), by striking “on the basis” and inserting “for tests furnished before January 1, 2017, on the basis”;

(D) in subsection (h)(2)(A)(i), by striking “and subject to” and inserting “and, for tests furnished before the date of enactment of section 1834A, subject to”;

(E) in subsection (h)(3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “fee schedules” and inserting “fee schedules (for tests furnished before January 1, 2017) or under section 1834A (for tests furnished on or after January 1, 2017), subject to subsection (b)(5) of such section”;

(F) in subsection (h)(6), by striking “In the case” and inserting “For tests furnished before January 1, 2017, in the case”;

(G) in subsection (h)(7), in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “and (4)” and inserting “and (4) and section 1834A”;

(ii) by striking “under this subsection” and inserting “under this part”.

(2) Section 1869(f)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ff(f)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) LOCAL COVERAGE DETERMINATIONS FOR CLINICAL DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TESTS.—For provisions relating to local coverage determinations for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, see section 1834A(g).”

(c) GAO STUDY AND REPORT; MONITORING OF MEDICARE EXPENDITURES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR LABORATORY TESTS.—

(1) GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW PAYMENT RATES FOR CLINICAL DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY TESTS.—

(A) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States (in this subsection referred to as the “Comptroller General”) shall conduct a study on the implementation of section 1834A of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a). The study shall include an analysis of—

(i) payment rates paid by private payors for laboratory tests furnished in various settings, including—

(I) how such payment rates compare across settings;

(II) the trend in payment rates over time; and

(III) trends by private payors to move to alternative payment methodologies for laboratory tests;

(ii) the conversion to the new payment rate for laboratory tests under such section;

(iii) the impact of such implementation on beneficiary access under title XVIII of the Social Security Act;

(iv) the impact of the new payment system on laboratories that furnish a low volume of services and laboratories that specialize in a small number of tests;

(v) the number of new Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) codes issued for laboratory tests;

(vi) the spending trend for laboratory tests under such title;

(vii) whether the information reported by laboratories and the new payment rates for laboratory tests under such section accurately reflect market prices;

(viii) the initial list price for new laboratory tests and the subsequent reported rates for such tests under such section;

(ix) changes in the number of advanced diagnostic laboratory tests and laboratory tests cleared or approved by the Food and Drug Administration for which payment is made under such section; and

(x) healthcare economic information on downstream cost impacts for such tests and decision making based on accepted methodologies.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2018, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the study under subparagraph (A), including recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

(2) MONITORING OF MEDICARE EXPENDITURES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR LABORATORY TESTS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) publicly release an annual analysis of the top 25 laboratory tests by expenditures under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; and

(B) conduct analyses the Inspector General determines appropriate with respect to the implementation and effect of the new payment system for laboratory tests under section 1834A of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 217. REVISIONS UNDER THE MEDICARE ESRD PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM.

(a) DELAY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ORAL-ONLY POLICY.—Section 632(b)(1) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 1395rr note) is amended—

(1) by striking “2016” and inserting “2024”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Notwithstanding section 1881(b)(14)(A)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(b)(14)(A)(ii)), implementation of the policy described in the previous sentence shall be based on data from the most recent year available.”

(b) MITIGATION OF THE APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENT TO ESRD BUNDLED PAYMENT RATE TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN THE UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1881(b)(14)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(b)(14)(I)) is amended by inserting “and before January 1, 2015,” after “January 1, 2014.”

(2) MARKET BASKET.—Section 1881(b)(14)(F)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(b)(14)(F)(i)) is amended—

(A) in subclause (I)—

(i) by striking “subclause (II)” and inserting “subclauses (II) and (III)”;

(ii) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In order to accomplish the purposes of subparagraph (I) with respect to 2016, 2017, and 2018, after determining the increase factor described in the preceding sentence for each of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Secretary shall reduce such increase factor by 1.25 percentage points for each of 2016 and 2017 and by 1 percentage point for 2018.”

(B) in subclause (II), by striking “For 2012” and inserting “Subject to subclause (III), for 2012”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(III) Notwithstanding subclauses (I) and (II), in order to accomplish the purposes of subparagraph (I) with respect to 2015, the increase factor described in subclause (I) for 2015 shall be 0.0 percent pursuant to the regulation issued by the Secretary on December 2, 2013, entitled ‘Medicare Program; End-Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System, Quality Incentive Program, and Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies; Final Rule’ (78 Fed. Reg. 72156).”

(c) DRUG DESIGNATIONS.—As part of the promulgation of annual rule for the Medicare end stage renal disease prospective payment system under section 1881(b)(14) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(b)(14)) for calendar year 2016, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the “Secretary”) shall establish a process for—

(1) determining when a product is no longer an oral-only drug; and

(2) including new injectable and intravenous products into the bundled payment under such system.

(d) QUALITY MEASURES RELATED TO CONDITIONS TREATED BY ORAL-ONLY DRUGS UNDER THE ESRD QUALITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—Section 1881(h)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395rr(h)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(C) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

“(iii) for 2016 and subsequent years, measures described in subparagraph (E)(i); and”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “(A)(iii)” and inserting “(A)(iv)”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) MEASURES SPECIFIC TO THE CONDITIONS TREATED WITH ORAL-ONLY DRUGS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The measures described in this subparagraph are measures specified by the Secretary that are specific to the conditions treated with oral-only drugs. To the extent feasible, such measures shall be outcomes-based measures.

“(ii) CONSULTATION.—In specifying the measures under clause (i), the Secretary shall consult with interested stakeholders.

“(iii) USE OF ENDORSED MEASURES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (I), any measures specified under clause (i) must have been endorsed by the entity with a contract under section 1890(a).

“(II) EXCEPTION.—If the entity with a contract under section 1890(a) has not endorsed a measure for a specified area or topic related to measures described in clause (i) that the Secretary determines appropriate, the Secretary may specify a measure that is endorsed or adopted by a consensus organization recognized by the Secretary that has expertise in clinical guidelines for kidney disease.”

(e) AUDITS OF COST REPORTS OF ESRD PROVIDERS AS RECOMMENDED BY MEDPAC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct audits of Medicare cost reports beginning during 2012 for a representative sample of providers of services and renal dialysis facilities furnishing renal dialysis services.

(2) FUNDING.—For purposes of carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide for the transfer from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund established under section 1841 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t) to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account of \$18,000,000 for fiscal year 2014. Amounts transferred under this paragraph

for a fiscal year shall be available until expended.

SEC. 218. QUALITY INCENTIVES FOR COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY DIAGNOSTIC IMAGING AND PROMOTING EVIDENCE-BASED CARE.

(a) QUALITY INCENTIVES TO PROMOTE PATIENT SAFETY AND PUBLIC HEALTH IN COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY DIAGNOSTIC IMAGING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(p) QUALITY INCENTIVES TO PROMOTE PATIENT SAFETY AND PUBLIC HEALTH IN COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY.—

“(1) QUALITY INCENTIVES.—In the case of an applicable computed tomography service (as defined in paragraph (2)) for which payment is made under an applicable payment system (as defined in paragraph (3)) and that is furnished on or after January 1, 2016, using equipment that is not consistent with the CT equipment standard (described in paragraph (4)), the payment amount for such service shall be reduced by the applicable percentage (as defined in paragraph (5)).

“(2) APPLICABLE COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY SERVICES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable computed tomography service’ means a service billed using diagnostic radiological imaging codes for computed tomography (identified as of January 1, 2014, by HCPCS codes 70450–70498, 71250–71275, 72125–72133, 72191–72194, 73200–73206, 73700–73706, 74150–74178, 74261–74263, and 75571–75574 (and any succeeding codes)).

“(3) APPLICABLE PAYMENT SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable payment system’ means the following:

“(A) The technical component and the technical component of the global fee under the fee schedule established under section 1848(b).

“(B) The prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under section 1833(t).

“(4) CONSISTENCY WITH CT EQUIPMENT STANDARD.—In this subsection, the term ‘not consistent with the CT equipment standard’ means, with respect to an applicable computed tomography service, that the service was furnished using equipment that does not meet each of the attributes of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) Standard XR-29-2013, entitled ‘Standard Attributes on CT Equipment Related to Dose Optimization and Management’. Through rulemaking, the Secretary may apply successor standards.

“(5) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable percentage’ means—

“(A) for 2016, 5 percent; and

“(B) for 2017 and subsequent years, 15 percent.

“(6) IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(A) INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall require that information be provided and attested to by a supplier and a hospital outpatient department that indicates whether an applicable computed tomography service was furnished that was not consistent with the CT equipment standard (described in paragraph (4)). Such information may be included on a claim and may be a modifier. Such information shall be verified, as appropriate, as part of the periodic accreditation of suppliers under section 1834(e) and hospitals under section 1865(a).

“(B) ADMINISTRATION.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to information described in subparagraph (A).”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR HOSPITAL OUTPATIENT DEPARTMENT SERVICES.—Section 1833(t) of the Social Security Act (42

1395l(t)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(20) NOT BUDGET NEUTRAL APPLICATION OF REDUCED EXPENDITURES RESULTING FROM QUALITY INCENTIVES FOR COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY.—The Secretary shall not take into account the reduced expenditures that result from the application of section 1834(p) in making any budget neutrality adjustments this subsection.”

(B) PHYSICIAN FEE SCHEDULE.—Section 1848(c)(2)(B)(v) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)(2)(B)(v)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(VIII) REDUCED EXPENDITURES ATTRIBUTABLE TO APPLICATION OF QUALITY INCENTIVES FOR COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY.—Effective for fee schedules established beginning with 2016, reduced expenditures attributable to the application of the quality incentives for computed tomography under section 1834(p).”

(b) PROMOTING EVIDENCE-BASED CARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(q) RECOGNIZING APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA FOR CERTAIN IMAGING SERVICES.—

“(1) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to promote the use of appropriate use criteria (as defined in subparagraph (B)) for applicable imaging services (as defined in subparagraph (C)) furnished in an applicable setting (as defined in subparagraph (D)) by ordering professionals and furnishing professionals (as defined in subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively).

“(B) APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate use criteria’ means criteria, only developed or endorsed by national professional medical specialty societies or other provider-led entities, to assist ordering professionals and furnishing professionals in making the most appropriate treatment decision for a specific clinical condition for an individual. To the extent feasible, such criteria shall be evidence-based.

“(C) APPLICABLE IMAGING SERVICE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable imaging service’ means an advanced diagnostic imaging service (as defined in subsection (e)(1)(B)) for which the Secretary determines—

“(i) one or more applicable appropriate use criteria specified under paragraph (2) apply;

“(ii) there are one or more qualified clinical decision support mechanisms listed under paragraph (3)(C); and

“(iii) one or more of such mechanisms is available free of charge.

“(D) APPLICABLE SETTING DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable setting’ means a physician’s office, a hospital outpatient department (including an emergency department), an ambulatory surgical center, and any other provider-led outpatient setting determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(E) ORDERING PROFESSIONAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘ordering professional’ means a physician (as defined in section 1861(r)) or a practitioner described in section 1842(b)(18)(C) who orders an applicable imaging service.

“(F) FURNISHING PROFESSIONAL DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘furnishing professional’ means a physician (as defined in section 1861(r)) or a practitioner described in section 1842(b)(18)(C) who furnishes an applicable imaging service.

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF APPLICABLE APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 15, 2015, the Secretary shall through rulemaking, and in consultation with physicians,

practitioners, and other stakeholders, specify applicable appropriate use criteria for applicable imaging services only from among appropriate use criteria developed or endorsed by national professional medical specialty societies or other provider-led entities.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In specifying applicable appropriate use criteria under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall take into account whether the criteria—

“(i) have stakeholder consensus;

“(ii) are scientifically valid and evidence based; and

“(iii) are based on studies that are published and reviewable by stakeholders.

“(C) REVISIONS.—The Secretary shall review, on an annual basis, the specified applicable appropriate use criteria to determine if there is a need to update or revise (as appropriate) such specification of applicable appropriate use criteria and make such updates or revisions through rulemaking.

“(D) TREATMENT OF MULTIPLE APPLICABLE APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA.—In the case where the Secretary determines that more than one appropriate use criterion applies with respect to an applicable imaging service, the Secretary shall apply one or more applicable appropriate use criteria under this paragraph for the service.

“(3) MECHANISMS FOR CONSULTATION WITH APPLICABLE APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA.—

“(A) IDENTIFICATION OF MECHANISMS TO CONSULT WITH APPLICABLE APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall specify qualified clinical decision support mechanisms that could be used by ordering professionals to consult with applicable appropriate use criteria for applicable imaging services.

“(ii) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with physicians, practitioners, health care technology experts, and other stakeholders in specifying mechanisms under this paragraph.

“(iii) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN MECHANISMS.—Mechanisms specified under this paragraph may include any or all of the following that meet the requirements described in subparagraph (B)(ii):

“(I) Use of clinical decision support modules in certified EHR technology (as defined in section 1848(o)(4)).

“(II) Use of private sector clinical decision support mechanisms that are independent from certified EHR technology, which may include use of clinical decision support mechanisms available from medical specialty organizations.

“(III) Use of a clinical decision support mechanism established by the Secretary.

“(B) QUALIFIED CLINICAL DECISION SUPPORT MECHANISMS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, a qualified clinical decision support mechanism is a mechanism that the Secretary determines meets the requirements described in clause (ii).

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements described in this clause are the following:

“(I) The mechanism makes available to the ordering professional applicable appropriate use criteria specified under paragraph (2) and the supporting documentation for the applicable imaging service ordered.

“(II) In the case where there is more than one applicable appropriate use criterion specified under such paragraph for an applicable imaging service, the mechanism indicates the criteria that it uses for the service.

“(III) The mechanism determines the extent to which an applicable imaging service ordered is consistent with the applicable appropriate use criteria so specified.

“(IV) The mechanism generates and provides to the ordering professional a certifi-

cation or documentation that documents that the qualified clinical decision support mechanism was consulted by the ordering professional.

“(V) The mechanism is updated on a timely basis to reflect revisions to the specification of applicable appropriate use criteria under such paragraph.

“(VI) The mechanism meets privacy and security standards under applicable provisions of law.

“(VII) The mechanism performs such other functions as specified by the Secretary, which may include a requirement to provide aggregate feedback to the ordering professional.

“(C) LIST OF MECHANISMS FOR CONSULTATION WITH APPLICABLE APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA.—

“(i) INITIAL LIST.—Not later than April 1, 2016, the Secretary shall publish a list of mechanisms specified under this paragraph.

“(ii) PERIODIC UPDATING OF LIST.—The Secretary shall identify on an annual basis the list of qualified clinical decision support mechanisms specified under this paragraph.

“(4) CONSULTATION WITH APPLICABLE APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA.—

“(A) CONSULTATION BY ORDERING PROFESSIONAL.—Beginning with January 1, 2017, subject to subparagraph (C), with respect to an applicable imaging service ordered by an ordering professional that would be furnished in an applicable setting and paid for under an applicable payment system (as defined in subparagraph (D)), an ordering professional shall—

“(i) consult with a qualified decision support mechanism listed under paragraph (3)(C); and

“(ii) provide to the furnishing professional the information described in clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (B).

“(B) REPORTING BY FURNISHING PROFESSIONAL.—Beginning with January 1, 2017, subject to subparagraph (C), with respect to an applicable imaging service furnished in an applicable setting and paid for under an applicable payment system (as defined in subparagraph (D)), payment for such service may only be made if the claim for the service includes the following:

“(i) Information about which qualified clinical decision support mechanism was consulted by the ordering professional for the service.

“(ii) Information regarding—

“(I) whether the service ordered would adhere to the applicable appropriate use criteria specified under paragraph (2);

“(II) whether the service ordered would not adhere to such criteria; or

“(III) whether such criteria was not applicable to the service ordered.

“(iii) The national provider identifier of the ordering professional (if different from the furnishing professional).

“(C) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (B) and paragraph (6)(A) shall not apply to the following:

“(i) EMERGENCY SERVICES.—An applicable imaging service ordered for an individual with an emergency medical condition (as defined in section 1867(e)(1)).

“(ii) INPATIENT SERVICES.—An applicable imaging service ordered for an inpatient and for which payment is made under part A.

“(iii) SIGNIFICANT HARDSHIP.—An applicable imaging service ordered by an ordering professional who the Secretary may, on a case-by-case basis, exempt from the application of such provisions if the Secretary determines, subject to annual renewal, that consultation with applicable appropriate use criteria would result in a significant hardship, such as in the case of a professional who practices in a rural area without sufficient Internet access.

“(D) APPLICABLE PAYMENT SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable payment system’ means the following:

“(i) The physician fee schedule established under section 1848(b).

“(ii) The prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services under section 1833(t).

“(iii) The ambulatory surgical center payment systems under section 1833(i).

“(5) IDENTIFICATION OF OUTLIER ORDERING PROFESSIONALS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to applicable imaging services furnished beginning with 2017, the Secretary shall determine, on an annual basis, no more than five percent of the total number of ordering professionals who are outlier ordering professionals.

“(B) OUTLIER ORDERING PROFESSIONALS.—The determination of an outlier ordering professional shall—

“(i) be based on low adherence to applicable appropriate use criteria specified under paragraph (2), which may be based on comparison to other ordering professionals; and

“(ii) include data for ordering professionals for whom prior authorization under paragraph (6)(A) applies.

“(C) USE OF TWO YEARS OF DATA.—The Secretary shall use two years of data to identify outlier ordering professionals under this paragraph.

“(D) PROCESS.—The Secretary shall establish a process for determining when an outlier ordering professional is no longer an outlier ordering professional.

“(E) CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS.—The Secretary shall consult with physicians, practitioners and other stakeholders in developing methods to identify outlier ordering professionals under this paragraph.

“(6) PRIOR AUTHORIZATION FOR ORDERING PROFESSIONALS WHO ARE OUTLIERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning January 1, 2020, subject to paragraph (4)(C), with respect to services furnished during a year, the Secretary shall, for a period determined appropriate by the Secretary, apply prior authorization for applicable imaging services that are ordered by an outlier ordering professional identified under paragraph (5).

“(B) APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA IN PRIOR AUTHORIZATION.—In applying prior authorization under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall utilize only the applicable appropriate use criteria specified under this subsection.

“(C) FUNDING.—For purposes of carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall provide for the transfer, from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841, of \$5,000,000 to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2021. Amounts transferred under the preceding sentence shall remain available until expended.

“(7) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as granting the Secretary the authority to develop or initiate the development of clinical practice guidelines or appropriate use criteria.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1833(t)(16) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(t)(16)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) APPLICATION OF APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA FOR CERTAIN IMAGING SERVICES.—For provisions relating to the application of appropriate use criteria for certain imaging services, see section 1834(q).”.

(3) REPORT ON EXPERIENCE OF IMAGING APPROPRIATE USE CRITERIA PROGRAM.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that includes a description of the extent to which appropriate use criteria could be used for other services under part B of

title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395j et seq.), such as radiation therapy and clinical diagnostic laboratory services.

SEC. 219. USING FUNDING FROM TRANSITIONAL FUND FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE (SGR) REFORM.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “\$2,300,000,000” and inserting “\$0”.

SEC. 220. ENSURING ACCURATE VALUATION OF SERVICES UNDER THE PHYSICIAN FEE SCHEDULE.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO COLLECT AND USE INFORMATION ON PHYSICIANS’ SERVICES IN THE DETERMINATION OF RELATIVE VALUES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1848(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(M) **AUTHORITY TO COLLECT AND USE INFORMATION ON PHYSICIANS’ SERVICES IN THE DETERMINATION OF RELATIVE VALUES.**—

“(i) **COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may collect or obtain information on the resources directly or indirectly related to furnishing services for which payment is made under the fee schedule established under subsection (b). Such information may be collected or obtained from any eligible professional or any other source.

“(ii) **USE OF INFORMATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to clause (v), the Secretary may (as the Secretary determines appropriate) use information collected or obtained pursuant to clause (i) in the determination of relative values for services under this section.

“(iii) **TYPES OF INFORMATION.**—The types of information described in clauses (i) and (ii) may, at the Secretary’s discretion, include any or all of the following:

“(I) Time involved in furnishing services.

“(II) Amounts and types of practice expense inputs involved with furnishing services.

“(III) Prices (net of any discounts) for practice expense inputs, which may include paid invoice prices or other documentation or records.

“(IV) Overhead and accounting information for practices of physicians and other suppliers.

“(V) Any other element that would improve the valuation of services under this section.

“(iv) **INFORMATION COLLECTION MECHANISMS.**—Information may be collected or obtained pursuant to this subparagraph from any or all of the following:

“(I) Surveys of physicians, other suppliers, providers of services, manufacturers, and vendors.

“(II) Surgical logs, billing systems, or other practice or facility records.

“(III) Electronic health records.

“(IV) Any other mechanism determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(v) **TRANSPARENCY OF USE OF INFORMATION.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subclauses (II) and (III), if the Secretary uses information collected or obtained under this subparagraph in the determination of relative values under this subsection, the Secretary shall disclose the information source and discuss the use of such information in such determination of relative values through notice and comment rulemaking.

“(II) **THRESHOLDS FOR USE.**—The Secretary may establish thresholds in order to use such information, including the exclusion of information collected or obtained from eligible professionals who use very high resources (as determined by the Secretary) in furnishing a service.

“(III) **DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall make aggregate information available under this subparagraph but shall not disclose information in a form or manner that identifies an eligible professional or a group practice, or information collected or obtained pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement.

“(vi) **INCENTIVE TO PARTICIPATE.**—The Secretary may provide for such payments under this part to an eligible professional that submits such solicited information under this subparagraph as the Secretary determines appropriate in order to compensate such eligible professional for such submission. Such payments shall be provided in a form and manner specified by the Secretary.

“(vii) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to information collected or obtained under this subparagraph.

“(viii) **DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE PROFESSIONAL.**—In this subparagraph, the term ‘eligible professional’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (k)(3)(B).

“(ix) **FUNDING.**—For purposes of carrying out this subparagraph, in addition to funds otherwise appropriated, the Secretary shall provide for the transfer, from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841, of \$2,000,000 to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account for each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 2014. Amounts transferred under the preceding sentence for a fiscal year shall be available until expended.”.

(2) **LIMITATION ON REVIEW.**—Section 1848(i)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(i)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) the collection and use of information in the determination of relative values under subsection (c)(2)(M).”.

(b) **AUTHORITY FOR ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO ESTABLISHING PRACTICE EXPENSE RELATIVE VALUES.**—Section 1848(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)(2)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(N) **AUTHORITY FOR ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO ESTABLISHING PRACTICE EXPENSE RELATIVE VALUES.**—The Secretary may establish or adjust practice expense relative values under this subsection using cost, charge, or other data from suppliers or providers of services, including information collected or obtained under subparagraph (M).”.

(c) **REVISED AND EXPANDED IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIALLY MISVALUED CODES.**—Section 1848(c)(2)(K)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)(2)(K)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) **IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIALLY MISVALUED CODES.**—For purposes of identifying potentially misvalued codes pursuant to clause (i)(I), the Secretary shall examine codes (and families of codes as appropriate) based on any or all of the following criteria:

“(I) Codes that have experienced the fastest growth.

“(II) Codes that have experienced substantial changes in practice expenses.

“(III) Codes that describe new technologies or services within an appropriate time period (such as 3 years) after the relative values are initially established for such codes.

“(IV) Codes which are multiple codes that are frequently billed in conjunction with furnishing a single service.

“(V) Codes with low relative values, particularly those that are often billed multiple times for a single treatment.

“(VI) Codes that have not been subject to review since implementation of the fee schedule.

“(VII) Codes that account for the majority of spending under the physician fee schedule.

“(VIII) Codes for services that have experienced a substantial change in the hospital length of stay or procedure time.

“(IX) Codes for which there may be a change in the typical site of service since the code was last valued.

“(X) Codes for which there is a significant difference in payment for the same service between different sites of service.

“(XI) Codes for which there may be anomalies in relative values within a family of codes.

“(XII) Codes for services where there may be efficiencies when a service is furnished at the same time as other services.

“(XIII) Codes with high intra-service work per unit of time.

“(XIV) Codes with high practice expense relative value units.

“(XV) Codes with high cost supplies.

“(XVI) Codes as determined appropriate by the Secretary.”.

(d) **TARGET FOR RELATIVE VALUE ADJUSTMENTS FOR MISVALUED SERVICES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1848(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)(2)), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(O) **TARGET FOR RELATIVE VALUE ADJUSTMENTS FOR MISVALUED SERVICES.**—With respect to fee schedules established for each of 2017 through 2020, the following shall apply:

“(i) **DETERMINATION OF NET REDUCTION IN EXPENDITURES.**—For each year, the Secretary shall determine the estimated net reduction in expenditures under the fee schedule under this section with respect to the year as a result of adjustments to the relative values established under this paragraph for misvalued codes.

“(ii) **BUDGET NEUTRAL REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS IF TARGET MET AND COUNTING OVERAGES TOWARDS THE TARGET FOR THE SUCCEEDING YEAR.**—If the estimated net reduction in expenditures determined under clause (i) for the year is equal to or greater than the target for the year—

“(I) reduced expenditures attributable to such adjustments shall be redistributed for the year in a budget neutral manner in accordance with subparagraph (B)(ii)(II); and

“(II) the amount by which such reduced expenditures exceeds the target for the year shall be treated as a reduction in expenditures described in clause (i) for the succeeding year, for purposes of determining whether the target has or has not been met under this subparagraph with respect to that year.

“(iii) **EXEMPTION FROM BUDGET NEUTRALITY IF TARGET NOT MET.**—If the estimated net reduction in expenditures determined under clause (i) for the year is less than the target for the year, reduced expenditures in an amount equal to the target recapture amount shall not be taken into account in applying subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) with respect to fee schedules beginning with 2017.

“(iv) **TARGET RECAPTURE AMOUNT.**—For purposes of clause (iii), the target recapture amount is, with respect to a year, an amount equal to the difference between—

“(I) the target for the year; and

“(II) the estimated net reduction in expenditures determined under clause (i) for the year.

“(v) **TARGET.**—For purposes of this subparagraph, with respect to a year, the target is calculated as 0.5 percent of the estimated

amount of expenditures under the fee schedule under this section for the year.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1848(c)(2)(B)(v) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)(2)(B)(v)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(VIII) REDUCTIONS FOR MISVALUED SERVICES IF TARGET NOT MET.—Effective for fee schedules beginning with 2017, reduced expenditures attributable to the application of the target recapture amount described in subparagraph (O)(iii).”.

(e) PHASE-IN OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIVE VALUE UNIT (RVU) REDUCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1848(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) PHASE-IN OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIVE VALUE UNIT (RVU) REDUCTIONS.—Effective for fee schedules established beginning with 2017, for services that are not new or revised codes, if the total relative value units for a service for a year would otherwise be decreased by an estimated amount equal to or greater than 20 percent as compared to the total relative value units for the previous year, the applicable adjustments in work, practice expense, and malpractice relative value units shall be phased-in over a 2-year period.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1848(c)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(ii)(I), by striking “subclause (II)” and inserting “subclause (II) and paragraph (7)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (K)(iii)(VI)—

(i) by striking “provisions of subparagraph (B)(ii)(II)” and inserting “provisions of subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) and paragraph (7)”; and

(ii) by striking “under subparagraph (B)(ii)(II)” and inserting “under subparagraph (B)(ii)(I)”.

(f) AUTHORITY TO SMOOTH RELATIVE VALUES WITHIN GROUPS OF SERVICES.—Section 1848(c)(2)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)(2)(C)) is amended—

(1) in each of clauses (i) and (iii), by striking “the service” and inserting “the service or group of services” each place it appears; and

(2) in the first sentence of clause (ii), by inserting “or group of services” before the period.

(g) GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON RELATIVE VALUE SCALE UPDATE COMMITTEE.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States (in this subsection referred to as the “Comptroller General”) shall conduct a study of the processes used by the Relative Value Scale Update Committee (RUC) to provide recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding relative values for specific services under the Medicare physician fee schedule under section 1848 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(h) ADJUSTMENT TO MEDICARE PAYMENT LOCALITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1848(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) USE OF MSAS AS FEE SCHEDULE AREAS IN CALIFORNIA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the succeeding provisions of this paragraph and notwithstanding the previous provisions of this subsection, for services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, the fee schedule areas used for payment under this section applicable to California shall be the following:

“(i) Each Metropolitan Statistical Area (each in this paragraph referred to as an ‘MSA’), as defined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget as of December 31 of the previous year, shall be a fee schedule area.

“(ii) All areas not included in an MSA shall be treated as a single rest-of-State fee schedule area.

“(B) TRANSITION FOR MSAS PREVIOUSLY IN REST-OF-STATE PAYMENT LOCALITY OR IN LOCALITY 3.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For services furnished in California during a year beginning with 2017 and ending with 2021 in an MSA in a transition area (as defined in subparagraph (D)), subject to subparagraph (C), the geographic index values to be applied under this subsection for such year shall be equal to the sum of the following:

“(I) CURRENT LAW COMPONENT.—The old weighting factor (described in clause (ii)) for such year multiplied by the geographic index values under this subsection for the fee schedule area that included such MSA that would have applied in such area (as estimated by the Secretary) if this paragraph did not apply.

“(II) MSA-BASED COMPONENT.—The MSA-based weighting factor (described in clause (iii)) for such year multiplied by the geographic index values computed for the fee schedule area under subparagraph (A) for the year (determined without regard to this subparagraph).

“(i) OLD WEIGHTING FACTOR.—The old weighting factor described in this clause—

“(I) for 2017, is $\frac{5}{6}$; and

“(II) for each succeeding year, is the old weighting factor described in this clause for the previous year minus $\frac{1}{6}$.

“(iii) MSA-BASED WEIGHTING FACTOR.—The MSA-based weighting factor described in this clause for a year is 1 minus the old weighting factor under clause (ii) for that year.

“(C) HOLD HARMLESS.—For services furnished in a transition area in California during a year beginning with 2017, the geographic index values to be applied under this subsection for such year shall not be less than the corresponding geographic index values that would have applied in such transition area (as estimated by the Secretary) if this paragraph did not apply.

“(D) TRANSITION AREA DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘transition area’ means each of the following fee schedule areas for 2013:

“(i) The rest-of-State payment locality.

“(ii) Payment locality 3.

“(E) REFERENCES TO FEE SCHEDULE AREAS.—Effective for services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, for California, any reference in this section to a fee schedule area shall be deemed a reference to a fee schedule area established in accordance with this paragraph.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF FEE SCHEDULE AREA.—Section 1848(j)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(j)(2)) is amended by striking “The term” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (e)(6)(D), the term”.

(i) DISCLOSURE OF DATA USED TO ESTABLISH MULTIPLE PROCEDURE PAYMENT REDUCTION POLICY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make publicly available the information used to establish the multiple procedure payment reduction policy to the professional component of imaging services in the final rule published in the Federal Register, v. 77, n. 222, November 16, 2012, pages 68891–69380 under the physician fee schedule under section 1848 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4).

SEC. 221. MEDICAID DSH.

(a) MODIFICATIONS OF REDUCTIONS TO ALLOTMENTS.—Section 1923(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-4(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “2016 through 2020” and inserting “2017 through 2024”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking subclauses (I) through (IV), and inserting the following:

“(I) \$1,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(II) \$4,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(III) \$4,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2019;

“(IV) \$4,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2020;

“(V) \$4,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2021;

“(VI) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2022;

“(VII) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2023; and

“(VIII) \$4,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2024.”;

and

(2) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

“(8) CALCULATION OF DSH ALLOTMENTS AFTER REDUCTIONS PERIOD.—The DSH allotment for a State for fiscal years after fiscal year 2024 shall be calculated under paragraph (3) without regard to paragraph (7).”.

(b) MACPAC REVIEW AND REPORT.—Section 1900(b)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396(b)(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking “MACPAC shall consult” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—MACPAC shall consult”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) REVIEW AND REPORTS REGARDING MEDICAID DSH.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—MACPAC shall review and submit an annual report to Congress on disproportionate share hospital payments under section 1923. Each report shall include the information specified in clause (ii).

“(ii) REQUIRED REPORT INFORMATION.—Each report required under this subparagraph shall include the following:

“(I) Data relating to changes in the number of uninsured individuals.

“(II) Data relating to the amount and sources of hospitals’ uncompensated care costs, including the amount of such costs that are the result of providing unreimbursed or under-reimbursed services, charity care, or bad debt.

“(III) Data identifying hospitals with high levels of uncompensated care that also provide access to essential community services for low-income, uninsured, and vulnerable populations, such as graduate medical education, and the continuum of primary through quaternary care, including the provision of trauma care and public health services.

“(IV) State-specific analyses regarding the relationship between the most recent State DSH allotment and the projected State DSH allotment for the succeeding year and the data reported under subclauses (I), (II), and (III) for the State.

“(iii) DATA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary regularly shall provide MACPAC with the most recent State reports and most recent independent certified audits submitted under section 1923(j), cost reports submitted under title XVIII, and such other data as MACPAC may request for purposes of conducting the reviews and preparing and submitting the annual reports required under this subparagraph.

“(iv) SUBMISSION DEADLINES.—The first report required under this subparagraph shall be submitted to Congress not later than February 1, 2016. Subsequent reports shall be submitted as part of, or with, each annual report required under paragraph (1)(C) during the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2024.”.

SEC. 222. REALIGNMENT OF THE MEDICARE QUARTER FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

Paragraph (6) (relating to implementing direct spending reductions) of section 251A of

the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) Notwithstanding the 2 percent limit specified in subparagraph (A) for payments for the Medicare programs specified in section 256(d), the sequestration order of the President under such subparagraph for fiscal year 2024 shall be applied to such payments so that—

“(i) with respect to the first 6 months in which such order is effective for such fiscal year, the payment reduction shall be 4.0 percent; and

“(ii) with respect to the second 6 months in which such order is so effective for such fiscal year, the payment reduction shall be 0.0 percent.”

SEC. 223. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS TO IMPROVE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) **CRITERIA FOR CERTIFIED COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CLINICS TO PARTICIPATE IN DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—**

(1) **PUBLICATION.—**Not later than September 1, 2015, the Secretary shall publish criteria for a clinic to be certified by a State as a certified community behavioral health clinic for purposes of participating in a demonstration program conducted under subsection (d).

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.—**The criteria published under this subsection shall include criteria with respect to the following:

(A) **STAFFING.—**Staffing requirements, including criteria that staff have diverse disciplinary backgrounds, have necessary State-required license and accreditation, and are culturally and linguistically trained to serve the needs of the clinic's patient population.

(B) **AVAILABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF SERVICES.—**Availability and accessibility of services, including crisis management services that are available and accessible 24 hours a day, the use of a sliding scale for payment, and no rejection for services or limiting of services on the basis of a patient's ability to pay or a place of residence.

(C) **CARE COORDINATION.—**Care coordination, including requirements to coordinate care across settings and providers to ensure seamless transitions for patients across the full spectrum of health services including acute, chronic, and behavioral health needs. Care coordination requirements shall include partnerships or formal contracts with the following:

(i) Federally-qualified health centers (and as applicable, rural health clinics) to provide Federally-qualified health center services (and as applicable, rural health clinic services) to the extent such services are not provided directly through the certified community behavioral health clinic.

(ii) Inpatient psychiatric facilities and substance use detoxification, post-detoxification step-down services, and residential programs.

(iii) Other community or regional services, supports, and providers, including schools, child welfare agencies, juvenile and criminal justice agencies and facilities, Indian Health Service youth regional treatment centers, State licensed and nationally accredited child placing agencies for therapeutic foster care service, and other social and human services.

(iv) Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers, independent outpatient clinics, drop-in centers, and other facilities of the Department as defined in section 1801 of title 38, United States Code.

(v) Inpatient acute care hospitals and hospital outpatient clinics.

(D) **SCOPE OF SERVICES.—**Provision (in a manner reflecting person-centered care) of

the following services which, if not available directly through the certified community behavioral health clinic, are provided or referred through formal relationships with other providers:

(i) Crisis mental health services, including 24-hour mobile crisis teams, emergency crisis intervention services, and crisis stabilization.

(ii) Screening, assessment, and diagnosis, including risk assessment.

(iii) Patient-centered treatment planning or similar processes, including risk assessment and crisis planning.

(iv) Outpatient mental health and substance use services.

(v) Outpatient clinic primary care screening and monitoring of key health indicators and health risk.

(vi) Targeted case management.

(vii) Psychiatric rehabilitation services.

(viii) Peer support and counselor services and family supports.

(ix) Intensive, community-based mental health care for members of the armed forces and veterans, particularly those members and veterans located in rural areas, provided the care is consistent with minimum clinical mental health guidelines promulgated by the Veterans Health Administration including clinical guidelines contained in the Uniform Mental Health Services Handbook of such Administration.

(E) **QUALITY AND OTHER REPORTING.—**Reporting of encounter data, clinical outcomes data, quality data, and such other data as the Secretary requires.

(F) **ORGANIZATIONAL AUTHORITY.—**Criteria that a clinic be a non-profit or part of a local government behavioral health authority or operated under the authority of the Indian Health Service, an Indian tribe or tribal organization pursuant to a contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or compact with the Indian Health Service pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), or an urban Indian organization pursuant to a grant or contract with the Indian Health Service under title V of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(b) **GUIDANCE ON DEVELOPMENT OF PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR TESTING UNDER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.—**Not later than September 1, 2015, the Secretary, through the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, shall issue guidance for the establishment of a prospective payment system that shall only apply to medical assistance for mental health services furnished by a certified community behavioral health clinic participating in a demonstration program under subsection (d).

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.—**The guidance issued by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall provide that—

(A) no payment shall be made for inpatient care, residential treatment, room and board expenses, or any other non-ambulatory services, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) no payment shall be made to satellite facilities of certified community behavioral health clinics if such facilities are established after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **PLANNING GRANTS.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.—**Not later than January 1, 2016, the Secretary shall award planning grants to States for the purpose of developing proposals to participate in time-limited demonstration programs described in subsection (d).

(2) **USE OF FUNDS.—**A State awarded a planning grant under this subsection shall—

(A) solicit input with respect to the development of such a demonstration program

from patients, providers, and other stakeholders;

(B) certify clinics as certified community behavioral health clinics for purposes of participating in a demonstration program conducted under subsection (d); and

(C) establish a prospective payment system for mental health services furnished by a certified community behavioral health clinic participating in a demonstration program under subsection (d) in accordance with the guidance issued under subsection (b).

(d) **DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—**

(1) **IN GENERAL.—**Not later than September 1, 2017, the Secretary shall select States to participate in demonstration programs that are developed through planning grants awarded under subsection (c), meet the requirements of this subsection, and represent a diverse selection of geographic areas, including rural and underserved areas.

(2) **APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—**

(A) **IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary shall solicit applications to participate in demonstration programs under this subsection solely from States awarded planning grants under subsection (c).

(B) **REQUIRED INFORMATION.—**An application for a demonstration program under this subsection shall include the following:

(i) The target Medicaid population to be served under the demonstration program.

(ii) A list of participating certified community behavioral health clinics.

(iii) Verification that the State has certified a participating clinic as a certified community behavioral health clinic in accordance with the requirements of subsection (b).

(iv) A description of the scope of the mental health services available under the State Medicaid program that will be paid for under the prospective payment system tested in the demonstration program.

(v) Verification that the State has agreed to pay for such services at the rate established under the prospective payment system.

(vi) Such other information as the Secretary may require relating to the demonstration program including with respect to determining the soundness of the proposed prospective payment system.

(3) **NUMBER AND LENGTH OF DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—**Not more than 8 States shall be selected for 2-year demonstration programs under this subsection.

(4) **REQUIREMENTS FOR SELECTING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—**

(A) **IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary shall give preference to selecting demonstration programs where participating certified community behavioral health clinics—

(i) provide the most complete scope of services described in subsection (a)(2)(D) to individuals eligible for medical assistance under the State Medicaid program;

(ii) will improve availability of, access to, and participation in, services described in subsection (a)(2)(D) to individuals eligible for medical assistance under the State Medicaid program;

(iii) will improve availability of, access to, and participation in assisted outpatient mental health treatment in the State; or

(iv) demonstrate the potential to expand available mental health services in a demonstration area and increase the quality of such services without increasing net Federal spending.

(5) **PAYMENT FOR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDED BY CERTIFIED COMMUNITY BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CLINICS.—**

(A) **IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary shall pay a State participating in a demonstration program under this subsection the Federal

matching percentage specified in subparagraph (B) for amounts expended by the State to provide medical assistance for mental health services described in the demonstration program application in accordance with paragraph (2)(B)(iv) that are provided by certified community behavioral health clinics to individuals who are enrolled in the State Medicaid program. Payments to States made under this paragraph shall be considered to have been under, and are subject to the requirements of, section 1903 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b).

(B) FEDERAL MATCHING PERCENTAGE.—The Federal matching percentage specified in this subparagraph is with respect to medical assistance described in subparagraph (A) that is furnished—

(i) to a newly eligible individual described in paragraph (2) of section 1905(y) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(y)), the matching rate applicable under paragraph (1) of that section; and

(ii) to an individual who is not a newly eligible individual (as so described) but who is eligible for medical assistance under the State Medicaid program, the enhanced FMAP applicable to the State.

(C) LIMITATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Payments shall be made under this paragraph to a State only for mental health services—

(I) that are described in the demonstration program application in accordance with paragraph (2)(iv);

(II) for which payment is available under the State Medicaid program; and

(III) that are provided to an individual who is eligible for medical assistance under the State Medicaid program.

(ii) PROHIBITED PAYMENTS.—No payment shall be made under this paragraph—

(I) for inpatient care, residential treatment, room and board expenses, or any other non-ambulatory services, as determined by the Secretary; or

(II) with respect to payments made to satellite facilities of certified community behavioral health clinics if such facilities are established after the date of enactment of this Act.

(6) WAIVER OF STATEWIDENESS REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall waive section 1902(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(1)) (relating to statewideness) as may be necessary to conduct demonstration programs in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

(7) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the first State is selected for a demonstration program under this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report on the use of funds provided under all demonstration programs conducted under this subsection. Each such report shall include—

(i) an assessment of access to community-based mental health services under the Medicaid program in the area or areas of a State targeted by a demonstration program compared to other areas of the State;

(ii) an assessment of the quality and scope of services provided by certified community behavioral health clinics compared to community-based mental health services provided in States not participating in a demonstration program under this subsection and in areas of a demonstration State that are not participating in the demonstration program; and

(iii) an assessment of the impact of the demonstration programs on the Federal and State costs of a full range of mental health services (including inpatient, emergency and ambulatory services).

(B) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than December 31, 2021, the Secretary shall submit to Congress recommendations concerning whether the demonstration programs under this section should be continued, expanded, modified, or terminated.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERALLY-QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTER SERVICES; FEDERALLY-QUALIFIED HEALTH CENTER; RURAL HEALTH CLINIC SERVICES; RURAL HEALTH CLINIC.—The terms “Federally-qualified health center services”, “Federally-qualified health center”, “rural health clinic services”, and “rural health clinic” have the meanings given those terms in section 1905(l) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(l)).

(2) ENHANCED FMAP.—The term “enhanced FMAP” has the meaning given that term in section 2105(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(b)) but without regard to the second and third sentences of that section.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given such term for purposes of title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(f) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Secretary—

(A) for purposes of carrying out subsections (a), (b), and (d)(7), \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2014; and

(B) for purposes of awarding planning grants under subsection (c), \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 224. ASSISTED OUTPATIENT TREATMENT GRANT PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a 4-year pilot program to award not more than 50 grants each year to eligible entities for assisted outpatient treatment programs for individuals with serious mental illness.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall carry out this section in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, the Attorney General of the United States, the Administrator of the Administration for Community Living, and the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

(c) SELECTING AMONG APPLICANTS.—The Secretary—

(1) may only award grants under this section to applicants that have not previously implemented an assisted outpatient treatment program; and

(2) shall evaluate applicants based on their potential to reduce hospitalization, homelessness, incarceration, and interaction with the criminal justice system while improving the health and social outcomes of the patient.

(d) USE OF GRANT.—An assisted outpatient treatment program funded with a grant awarded under this section shall include—

(1) evaluating the medical and social needs of the patients who are participating in the program;

(2) preparing and executing treatment plans for such patients that—

(A) include criteria for completion of court-ordered treatment; and

(B) provide for monitoring of the patient's compliance with the treatment plan, including compliance with medication and other treatment regimens;

(3) providing for such patients case management services that support the treatment plan;

(4) ensuring appropriate referrals to medical and social service providers;

(5) evaluating the process for implementing the program to ensure consistency with the patient's needs and State law; and

(6) measuring treatment outcomes, including health and social outcomes such as rates of incarceration, health care utilization, and homelessness.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than the end of each of fiscal years 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the grant program under this section. Each such report shall include an evaluation of the following:

(1) Cost savings and public health outcomes such as mortality, suicide, substance abuse, hospitalization, and use of services.

(2) Rates of incarceration by patients.

(3) Rates of homelessness among patients.

(4) Patient and family satisfaction with program participation.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “assisted outpatient treatment” means medically prescribed mental health treatment that a patient receives while living in a community under the terms of a law authorizing a State or local court to order such treatment.

(2) The term “eligible entity” means a county, city, mental health system, mental health court, or any other entity with authority under the law of the State in which the grantee is located to implement, monitor, and oversee assisted outpatient treatment programs.

(3) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(g) FUNDING.—

(1) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—A grant under this section shall be in an amount that is not more than \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018. Subject to the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall determine the amount of each grant based on the population of the area, including estimated patients, to be served under the grant.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018.

SEC. 225. EXCLUSION FROM PAYGO SCORECARDS.

(a) STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I sorely wish I were here getting ready to vote on a bill that would permanently repeal and replace the sustainable growth rate. In this Chamber, we passed a bill that would do that and that would have fully offset the cost of the repeal by delaying a provision of the Affordable Care Act that the administration just keeps delaying itself. In fact, it was partially delayed again just yesterday. Unfortunately, we have reached another doc fix deadline. I believe that we must act to protect America's seniors and ensure that they can continue to see the doctors whom they know and trust.

That is why I have introduced legislation that represents a bipartisan-bicameral agreement that will give us additional time to work out our differences and pass permanent repeal. We are closer than ever to reaching that goal. We have an agreement on policy. We need to overcome our differences about the responsible way to pay for those new policies. I hope that we can act before we reach the new deadline of March 31, 2015. In fact, we should try to reach a bicameral agreement before the end of this Congress.

I am glad that Speaker BOEHNER has offered his continuing support to this effort. With the House's having acted, we hope that the Senate can also pass an SGR repeal that has real pay-fors. Then we can begin the process of working through our differences in a conference committee. I am sponsoring this bill today because it is my earnest hope that this is the last patch we will have to pass, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am sorry, but I simply cannot support yet another temporary SGR patch. This bill is bad for seniors, and it is bad for doctors. We want to achieve a permanent solution to this ongoing problem. This bill does nothing to achieve that goal. In fact, it sets back months and months of hard work. What we should be considering today is the bipartisan-bicameral agreement that my colleagues and I developed. That bill is what doctors' groups and patients' groups support. That bill can also be offset without robbing one provider to pay another provider.

What is before us today doesn't fix the problem. It exacerbates it. We had a true opportunity to finally accomplish what our constituents have asked us to do for a decade, and that is to pass a permanent repeal of the SGR, but the Republican leadership is letting that opportunity slip away. I respect my colleague from Pennsylvania, but I don't believe that if we pass another patch that we are going to go back and do a permanent fix. My fear is, by doing this, we will lose the opportunity to do the permanent fix and that it will simply slip away.

Two weeks ago, the Republicans brought to the floor our agreement, and they added a poison pill offset that

they knew the President and the Senate would never accept, a delay of critical Affordable Care Act provisions. All that accomplished was wasting time, which has led us to this scenario of spending another nearly \$20 billion on a patch. Meanwhile, this bill includes health policies that have never seen the light of day. Some have been used as offsets, others as sweeteners, to get Members to vote for it, but I am not falling for it. That is no way to govern. The Senate is actually poised to vote on our bipartisan agreement that is fully offset. It does so without cutting from the health care system, and that is the bill we should be considering here today.

Seniors do not want us to kick the can again for another year. The doctor community spoke loudly and clearly yesterday—no more patches. So I say to my colleagues: let's not go down this road again. Instead, let's come together and pass a permanent solution. Let's get the job done. Vote "no" on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), an important member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the SGR cuts would reduce doctors' compensation for treating Medicare patients by 24 percent. Seniors and physicians cannot afford that, and Congress cannot let it happen in 5 days.

The legislation before us would patch the SGR for a year. I support this legislation—of course, reluctantly. Two weeks ago, the House passed a permanent repeal and replacement of the SGR that was fully paid for. The fix provided certainty for doctors who treat Medicare patients—that is what they need—and it incentivized and rewarded doctors to keep seniors healthy.

The Senate needs to negotiate, Mr. Speaker. If they don't like the House pay-for, come up with one. Let's come together and get this done. A patch isn't the best solution. We can replace the SGR, but the Senate has to work with us. Again, let's get this done. Let's work together, and let's get it done for our seniors.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, apparently, Winston Churchill once said:

Americans will always do the right thing but only after they have tried everything else.

Then again, Churchill never tried to get the doc fix passed in the United States Congress.

For 10 years, we have been trying to fix the sustainable growth rate in Medicare, and for 10 years, we have kicked the can down the road with 17 different short-term patch votes. The Protecting Access to Medicare Act of

2014 is a mixed bag of some important compromises, like ensuring that there is an accurate valuation of services of the Physician Fee Schedule; some problematic provisions, such as the end-stage renal disease policy; and some provisions that have never been vetted in front of the Congress, in front of committees—at all. More importantly, this bill represents our 18th failure to rebuild the bedrock of the Medicare program, our 18th failure to provide America's seniors with the safety and security of a permanent fix to the SGR.

That is why the AMA is voting "no" on this bill. That is why most physicians' groups are strongly opposed to this bill. Last night, my office was flooded with messages from various physician groups.

I, for one, still believe in finding the will to do what is right. I, for one, am dedicated to the principle of seizing the moment and accomplishing big things on behalf of the American people. We thought we were going to do it this time.

When it comes to this mixed-bag piece of legislation, cooked up in the dead of night, put on the Web at 2 minutes before midnight a couple of days ago, revised several times since—not much more than 48 hours ago this stuff started—I vote "no." Enough with trying everything else. It is time to do what is right—a permanent doc fix that is argued, debated, agreed upon. It is what our seniors need. It is what our doctors need to help them manage their practices. It is what our Nation needs and deserves.

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

We have groups who have expressed support for this bill: the American Clinical Laboratory Association; the American College of Radiology; Easter Seals; the Family Research Council; the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation; the Medical Imaging and Technology Alliance, MITA; the National Abstinence Education Association; the Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children; the Pew Charitable Trusts; the ZERO to THREE: National Center on Infants, Toddlers, and Families; AdvaMed, among others.

I would urge Members to seriously consider this.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the distinguished chair of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, here we are at the very end of when the doc fix expires, March 31. That is next week. We have tried in a very responsible way for many months to try and resolve this issue, and I commend my friend Mr. WAXMAN and others for passing our bill out of committee last summer at 51-0. I think it was Speaker BOEHNER who said he

didn't think we could honor Mother Teresa for sainthood with a vote like that.

I commend my good friend Mr. CAMP from Michigan and SANDY LEVIN, the gentleman from Michigan, who is on the floor now, as we worked together and worked with the Senate as well to actually lock in place a bill on literally the last day that Chairman BAUCUS was in the United States Senate in order to try and resolve this, and we knew all along that we were going to have to have a pay-for. Here in the House a couple weeks ago, we passed a bill, somewhat on partisan lines, I know—it was not 100 percent on either side—but we passed a 10-year fix with a pay-for.

Now, I had a great ninth grade civics teacher, Mr. Denekas, who is no longer with us. He is with the Lord. I will tell you, as I sit down with my students as I did this week—a lot of them are here in town, my Close Up groups and others—and as I speak to my high schools and colleges, they know there is never such a thing, maybe, as a perfect bill. One of the first lessons in civics is that you pass a bill in the House, and you pass a bill in the Senate, and they are always different. You go to conference, and you work out the differences, and it comes back.

Nobody wants this expiration of the doc fix—nobody. It hurts our physician community. They care about the folks that they treat. Literally, they are going to have almost a 30 percent reduction cut as early as next week in the services that they provide. Let's think about our most vulnerable, too—our seniors. They have got those doctor appointments, and they want to be there. Maybe, with a 30 percent cut, those physicians will say: Gosh, we just can't do this. That appointment is canceled. We are going to just stop serving Medicare patients—period—those over 65.

We don't want that. We don't want that hurting our most vulnerable. So we passed here in the House a couple of weeks ago a 10-year bill. The response from the Senate is—nothing. Yes, we have had some discussions. We have talked with Senator WYDEN, a former member of our committee. He is diligently trying to get something done, but they have got no bill ready for passage on the Senate floor that matches what we did to go to conference. They have got nothing. There is a lot of talk about maybe just doing a bill without a pay-for or some phony savings. That is not what this House is about. It is a lot of money, and we have some rules in the House that you have got to have a pay-for for it, and that is the real difficulty in trying to get things done.

So here we are at the end of the week. The cuts come in next Tuesday, April 1, so we are trying to send another offer to the Senate. If you are not going to take the 10-year fix, let's try a 1-year fix. It is paid for. It is about \$20 billion, and there are a number of little provisions that are in there that, I think, are important, again, in

working with all sides. Last night, we were somewhat surprised that a number of groups came out against it, but the alternative is that the door gets shut. We don't have a backup plan, all right?

This is the bill. If we can get 290 votes—everybody is here—a two-thirds vote, that is great. We will send yet another offer to the Senate, and they can choose either one. They can take our 10-year bill. They can take a 1-year bill. They can pass something different, and we can go to conference. I must say that this bill is now a 1-year bill, but it doesn't stop us from still trying to negotiate something for a permanent fix, because that is what every one of us wants. It doesn't stop us from getting that done, but at least it stops what otherwise will be the denial of services to the most vulnerable, our seniors, who may not understand what is happening. It continues the process moving forward.

We have got a couple of options that we are teeing up, but, obviously, we have to pass it today, here, with a two-thirds vote. Then let the Senate decide which alternative or it can pass something else, but pass something so that we can go to conference; but if that happens, then the doc fix is not fixed, and for however long that period is the cuts go into place. It would be nice if we could actually pass this by voice. What do you think? It will get us off the dime, and, again, we will toss it to the Senate to try and get it done. No one wants it to expire, but without one of these two bills, it expires, and we don't want that to happen.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—my friend Mr. PALLONE, my friend Mr. WAXMAN, and others—because, yes, we need to get this done. It is the best that we can do right now, and there is not a plan B for next week.

Mr. Speaker, the specter of physician cuts under Medicare, or SGR, has been an unwelcome threat to seniors' access to quality health care well for over a decade. I rise in support of Chairman PITTS' H.R. 4302, the Protecting Access to Medicare Act, so we can ensure that seniors' access to quality health care is not jeopardized as we continue the effort to permanently resolving this broken system.

While we're not yet over the finish line, we are closer than ever before. Republicans and Democrats of the House and Senate have agreed to the policy of a permanent solution, and this chamber has already passed a bipartisan, fully paid-for bill that would make it a reality.

We understand that our colleagues in the Senate may have a different vision for next steps, and we'd be happy to meet with them to find a package of true offsets that we can all get behind. But, while we wait for the Senate to join us, it is important for us to keep the promises we have made to seniors who depend on the Medicare program.

By coming together with this patch, we will ensure that care will be there when Medicare beneficiaries need it. This package prevents the scheduled 24 percent cut in payment

rates, updates the rate through the end of the year, and maintains many of the so-called extenders programs for another year, including the Special Diabetes Program and abstinence program. Finally, it includes important mental health provisions like the Assistant Outpatient Treatment program from Chairman MURPHY'S H.R. 3717, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013. All of this is achieved in a fiscally responsible manner, saving \$1.2 billion while we continue to strive for our permanent solution.

Our work is far from done, but today we restore some certainty to our seniors that their trusted doctor will be available when they are in need of care.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1000

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot express my disappointment with the proposed additional temporary patch to the sustainable growth rate, or the SGR—the “doc fix.”

This was a contrived solution from the very beginning, and it has morphed into a shameful annual ritual, disrupting the provision of medical services in this country, as the parade of medical professionals come to Washington, D.C., to plead with us to not do something crazy.

It is simply, today, an accounting sleight of hand. It is a power play and a fundraising tool, to be sure, that disrupts the practice of medicine.

We have absolutely no intention of ever having the SGR cut occur, but we are not going to allow a reduction on that order of magnitude. We will find some sort of adjustment, as we always have, that will not be satisfactory and will continue the uncertainty and the indignity that is inflicted on people in the health care space and, more important, on the people that they serve.

If you want to actually cut health care spending, we could do so. And if we would stop this charade of meaningless gestures of repealing the Affordable Care Act and actually get down to cases, fine-tuning, and moving forward, we could be there.

There are a range of potential savings within the health care space that is acknowledged by virtually everybody in the industry and every expert that has looked at it. But it can't be done in a cavalier fashion according to some ritualistic formula, and it can't be done overnight, and it is going to require a steady hand, including politicians acting like grownups.

In the meantime, I think it is important to stop this travesty.

Remember, when we had a similar pointless exercise with the alternative minimum tax, realizing that the supposed savings were not real, that the full bite would never take effect, what did we do? We didn't “pay for it,” we finally reset the budget baseline and moved on.

That is exactly what we should do with the SGR, and then deal meaningfully with the adjustments in accelerating health care reform, not a 54th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

We should be rewarding people who are providing high-value care and finding ways to be more efficient, and adjusting the system to slowly squeeze out our areas of inefficiency. It won't be easy, but it is definitely within our capacity—and it is already starting around the country.

Maybe Congress should consider debating this issue with an open rule, allowing everybody to come to the floor to speak, to offer amendments, to debate it fully, and see what we can come up with. It won't be any worse.

Let's end this charade, give the health care space some certainty, and get down to work being a full partner in the reform and enhancement of our health care system.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire of the minority how many speakers they have left?

Mr. PALLONE. I have at least two left.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today, Congress will vote on yet another patch to the Medicare physician payment system. But it should not be that way. We need a permanent fix.

Earlier this year, we seemed on track for a permanent fix. We reached a bipartisan agreement on what a permanent fix should look like. That bill was introduced by both Republican and Democratic leaders: Mr. CAMP, Mr. UPTON, Dr. BURGESS, Mr. LEVIN, myself, Mr. PALLONE, Senator BAUCUS, and Senator HATCH. That bipartisan bill is broadly supported by physician and patient groups.

That bill would not cut providers or beneficiaries to fix payments to physicians, and that bill would fix this problem permanently. The bill before us today is not a permanent fix. It is a short-term fix.

Two weeks ago, Republicans brought up a bipartisan bill with a poison pill offset for the permanent fix that undermines reform for low-income families. That was 2 weeks wasted, where we could have worked towards a permanent solution.

I have heard my Republican colleagues say it is too hard to find offsets or we don't have enough time to come up with the offsets to get a permanent

bill done. Let's not forget, Republicans do not insist on offsets for things they really care about. Trillions in tax cuts for the wealthy? No need to offset that. A Medicare prescription drug bill that costs far more than this permanent fix to the SGR? No need to offset that. But when we talk about protecting seniors' access to their doctors, their answer is different.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that, in the end, this is a vote Members will need to make up their own minds on. We may end up being forced to support a short-term patch, but I am not ready to concede that yet.

I am not ready to support this bill that is before us. Let's keep working on getting a permanent solution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, let me describe briefly the challenge before us.

This bill is very disappointing. The three committees have worked on a bipartisan basis to put together a bill that would address once and for all SGR and would reform the payment system. Indeed, it would transform this bill that we worked on on a bipartisan basis—the physician payment system—into one that is more acceptable for high quality care, rewards value, and provides needed stability for providers and beneficiaries.

The bill has a much larger cost than this patch, though patches themselves are expensive.

In response to the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I want to make a few comments.

There has been no serious discussion all of these weeks about how we would pay for the permanent fix. There has been a dereliction of responsibility.

Also, what has happened here is this patch is a product that hasn't gone through the legislative process. Instead, it is a complex \$20 billion bill with no public hearing, no committee hearings, and no regular order.

The draft of the bill became publicly available at midnight Tuesday, and there were flaws, so it was refiled, and we got this bill just 24 hours ago.

This present legislation contains a completely new, unvetted lab payment system. It undermines delivery system reforms for dialysis patients. It includes promising policy to hold nursing homes accountable for patient care but fails to include key protections to minimize discrimination against certain patients.

In a few words, we deserve better, and we need to do better.

As a result, a large number of physician groups have expressed their opposition to this.

What this bill does today is miss the opportunity to do full-scale repeal and replace the physician payment system.

The Senate still needs to vote on a permanent fix. The chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee said, We passed that kind of bill. Yes, the 10-year fix was a partisan bill that had no chance of passage in the Senate. It has zero chance of passage. The Senate still plans, as I understand, to vote on a permanent fix. We should let the Senate process unfold. We have more time to get this right.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is not correct that, if we don't act today, there will be any impact on seniors. We could let the Senate act to try to do something permanently and come back next week, if we have to, and take up this bill.

So this is the challenge before us. We are here once again doing something that is very temporary, that is very, very expensive, and we are failing to step up to the plate on permanent reform and a permanent fix, and doing it with a legislative process with a product that has not gone through committee, has had no public hearings, has had no real airing. We should not be acting blindly.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank him for his leadership on issues that relate to the health and well-being of the American people. I also commend the leadership of the previous speaker, Mr. WAXMAN, and our ranking member on the Ways and Means committee, Mr. LEVIN. They have been two champions on the subject of health care in America—and doing so in a fiscally sound way.

While I appreciate and share the concerns here—and I will speak to that—I do think that we have to think carefully about the decision that we make. I know that they have.

The leadership is bringing this bill to the floor on a short fuse, with an expiration date of March 31, without most people in this room having ever seen what is in the bill, which is a missed opportunity.

We should be considering right now a bill that would permanently speak to the SGR. For those in the public, I know it is inside baseball talk, SGR. That is the rate that docs are compensated for treating Medicare patients.

So don't think of SGR—think of the patients. That is what we are doing here. Think of the certainty that they need in terms of their health care, and that is our seniors. Think of the certainty that a permanent fix, paid for or not—but let's say paid for—would mean to remove the uncertainty from this debate.

The American Medical Association is opposed to this bill that is on the floor today because it is a patch.

How many times have you heard people talk about a Band-Aid? We are just putting a Band-Aid on it. We are not getting to the underlying challenge that we face. This is a Band-Aid, and that is why the docs oppose this patch.

I did hear the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) say, If you don't like these pay-fors, suggest your own. Well, we have suggested our own. It is called OCO. It is the Overseas Contingency Operations. The Republicans said that is a gimmick, but it wasn't a gimmick when you put it in the Ryan budget. It is in the Ryan budget. So it works for you where it works for you, but you don't want to put it to work for America's seniors.

□ 1015

So here is the thing. The Senate majority and the House majority came together to produce this patch—this Band-Aid. It is the wrong way to go. It does not address the underlying problem.

We could have done that. We have been trying to do it for 10 years, and it is always, always, always something that the Republican majority has backed away from and limited and done on a short fuse.

There are so many things that are wrong with this bill, but the simple fact is that the clock is ticking, and on March 31, it is bad news for seniors and for the doctors who treat them and the Medicare program.

Our seniors depend on Medicare. They depend on Medicare, and this is a weakening of it. It is just the same old-same old let's see what we can do to find some pay-fors that really undermine the health and well-being of the American people.

Those same pay-fors, done properly, could be part of a permanent fix, but instead, they are part of the Band-Aid. So this is all to say to my colleagues: you are going to have to make your decision as you weigh the equities.

Is it better to just succumb to what we have, no matter how mediocre and how missed an opportunity it is? Or is it better to say: Let's hold out until our Republican colleagues agree to the full SGR, essentially, a fix forever, paid for by OCO?

It is really important to note the following: the shorter the fix, the more expensive it is. We have been seeing that year in and year out. If we had dealt with this, say, 6, 7 years ago, it would have cost much less than it is to patch 1 year to the next, sometimes less than a year to the next.

This is not about reducing the deficit. It is not about the good health of the American people. It is just an ideological reality that we have to deal with from the Republican side of the aisle.

So when the docs—the AMA—says, We are opposed to this, vote it down, that is important to us. I say to them, Talk to your Republican friends, they have the power to do a permanent fix paid for by OCO; they refuse to do it.

So we have something less good that we can do for the American people, and if this sounds a little confusing, it is because it is; and Members have to make the decision as to whether they will vote for this, just because we are forced into it, or whether they want to hold out for something much better.

This would be a more appropriate debate a month ago, where the clock does not run out over the weekend, but this is a tactic. It is a technique used by the majority to force the hand without the proper weighing of equities in all of it.

So, my colleagues, I just urge you to try to weigh those equities. I, myself, come down on the side of supporting the legislation because, frankly, I believe that any uncertainty in the minds of our seniors about their ability to see their doctors will certainly be—the Republicans will say this is because of the Affordable Care Act, and I just don't want to give them another opportunity to misrepresent what this is about.

If the Affordable Care Act never existed, we would still be here debating SGR. They are two separate subjects; but as we know, any excuse will do to undermine the great legislation that the Affordable Care Act was about, life, a healthier life, the liberty of people to pursue their happiness because they had the freedom to do so—better quality, lower cost, more accessibility.

So that is how I come to the conclusion of let's not give them another false claim. Let's just get this done, but let us not give up on the prospect, even before this expires, of having a long-term, permanent fix to SGR.

It makes all the sense in the world. It has no partisanship about it. It is sensible, and it will cost less to do more for our seniors. The challenge is there. The solution is clear. The Republicans have rejected it, so we are at their mercy.

My conclusion is to vote "yes." Members will have to come to their own conclusions on it. I, frankly, wish that the Republicans, in their power, would have brought the bill to the floor under a rule, so we could have a proper debate on it, instead of requiring a 290-vote requirement to pass it.

With the shortness of receiving this information, only this morning, Members are finding out what it is. It is really hard to predict who will vote pro, who will vote con, who will vote "aye," who will vote "no." This is really a silly decision to bring this to the floor in this form when we know the path that is much better.

I am not going to give you another reason to go out there and make your claims about the Affordable Care Act, which have no basis in fact.

With that, I urge my colleagues to pray over it, as I will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the minority how many speakers they have left?

We are prepared to close.

Mr. PALLONE. At this time, I have one more speaker.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to follow up on a point that Leader PELOSI just made regarding the OCO account, the Overseas Contingency Operations account, which, at Armed Services, we are dealing with actually right now.

The President came over with his OCO request for this year of \$80 billion. This funds the troops over in Afghanistan, the 34,000 that are still fighting courageously to defend our country.

At the end of this year, the projection is that that troop level will be brought down to, at the highest level of 10,000, possibly even lower, and combat missions, for all intents and purposes, are going to come to an end.

As the Congressional Budget Office has demonstrated over and over again, they will score savings with the OCO drawdown that is going to happen at the end of this year. Indeed, the Ryan budget has used those OCO savings to help balance its own priorities, so this is not funny money. This is not hypothetical.

Anyone who has been on a CODEL over to Afghanistan knows we are spending money over there, and starting next year, we are going to spend a lot less money because of the change in our deployments over in Afghanistan.

The cost of the permanent fix to SGR is \$135 billion over the next 10 years. You only need a portion of the OCO account to permanently fix SGR, and everybody who has even come close to discussing this issue knows that in this building.

Hopefully, the Senate, when they take this up next week, are going to move forward with a permanent fix using totally valid, verified savings by the Congressional Budget Office in the OCO account.

It is a peace dividend, in terms of drawing down from Afghanistan, that we can finally stabilize the Medicare system by making sure that fees are not going to be subjected to this annual cliff that, again, denies access in far too many cases in doctors' offices all across the country.

So, again, I just want to emphasize the point that it is not like we are powerless here to come up with an SGR fix for which there is bipartisan support, using verifiable, valid savings by the Congressional Budget Office in the OCO account.

Our brave soldiers are going to be drawing down closer to the end of this year to zero. We can use those savings to fix America's health care system.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, do I still have 3 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining.

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out and I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from the American Medical Association and many, many other physicians' groups, as well as State medical societies, in opposition to the legislation.

Let me just read the first paragraph. It is addressed to the Speaker and to the Democratic leader. It says:

On behalf of the undersigned physician organizations, we are writing to express our strong opposition to H.R. 4302, and we urge you to vote against the bill when it is considered on the floor.

Again, that is from the AMA, many specialty doctor groups, and a number of State medical societies.

I would also point out that it is my strong belief—and I know that my chairman of the subcommittee disagrees on this, but it is my strong belief that if this bill passes, that we will not have an opportunity to bring up the larger permanent fix. We will not negotiate that. I doubt very much that that would be the case.

MARCH 26, 2014.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND REPRESENTATIVE PELOSI: On behalf of the undersigned physician organizations, we are writing to express our strong opposition to H.R. 4302, the "Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014," and we urge you to vote against the bill when it is considered on the floor.

Instead of reforming the Medicare physician payment system, Congress seems intent on imposing yet another round of arbitrary provider payment reductions to maintain a corrosive policy that essentially every Member of Congress says should be scrapped. Importantly, by selectively choosing cost savings proposals that were included in the bipartisan, bicameral policy framework set forth in H.R. 4015 and S. 2000, the bill being considered would undermine future passage of that framework and add to the instability that now impedes the development and adoption of health care delivery and payment innovations that can strengthen the Medicare program.

It appears that an unprecedented, bipartisan agreement on Medicare reform is on the verge of being cast aside because elected leaders are unwilling to make tough choices to strengthen programs serving 50 million Americans. We strongly urge Members to vote against this legislation and renew our call for all parties to engage in good faith, bipartisan efforts to enact the physician payment and delivery system reform policy contained in H.R. 4015/S. 2000, the SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act. The endless cycle of short-term remedies that serve to support a failed policy are no longer acceptable.

Sincerely,

American Medical Association; American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology; American Academy of Dermatology Association; American Academy of Neurology; American Academy of Ophthalmology; American Academy of Otolaryngology—Head

and Neck Surgery; American Academy of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation; American Academy of Sleep Medicine; American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry; American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons; American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons; American College of Emergency Physicians; American College of Gastroenterology; American College of Mohs Surgery; American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine; American College of Osteopathic Family Physicians; American College of Osteopathic Internists; American College of Osteopathic Surgeons; American College of Phlebology; American College of Physicians.

American College of Surgeons; American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; American Gastroenterological Association; American Geriatrics Society; American Orthopaedic Foot and Ankle Society; American Osteopathic Association; American Pediatric Surgical Association; American Society for Dermatologic Surgery Association; American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy; American Society for Reproductive Medicine; American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery; American Society of Disability Evaluating Physicians; American Society of General Surgeons; American Society of Hematology; American Society of Nephrology; American Urogynecologic Society; American Urological Association; College of American Pathologists; Infectious Diseases Society of America; Medical Group Management Association.

National Association of Medical Examiners; North American Spine Society; National Association of Spine Specialists; Renal Physicians Association; Society of Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions; Society of Critical Care Medicine; Society of Gynecologic Oncology; Society of Hospital Medicine; Society of Thoracic Surgeons; Alaska State Medical Association; Arkansas Medical Society; Connecticut State Medical Society; Medical Society of the District of Columbia; Medical Association of Georgia; Hawaii Medical Association; Idaho Medical Association; Illinois State Medical Society; Indiana State Medical Association; Iowa Medical Society; Kentucky Medical Association; Maine Medical Association.

Massachusetts Medical Society; Michigan State Medical Society; Minnesota Medical Association; Mississippi State Medical Association; Missouri State Medical Association; Montana Medical Association; Nebraska Medical Association; Nevada State Medical Association; Medical Society of the State of New York; North Dakota Medical Association; Ohio State Medical Association; Oregon Medical Association; Pennsylvania Medical Society; Rhode Island Medical Society; South Dakota State Medical Association; Utah Medical Association; Vermont Medical Society; Medical Society of Virginia; Washington State Medical Association; Wisconsin Medical Society; Wyoming Medical Society.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we ought to have a criteria of everybody who has read this bill can vote on it. My bet is there would be very few Members who would be able to vote on this bill.

This is an 8-page summary of this bill with probably 50 paragraphs in it about changes that have been effected in the Medicare system. None of us know what the substance of this bill is.

We had a lot of rhetoric in 2010 about reading the bills. I challenge any Mem-

ber to come up here and say: I have read this bill.

I am for a permanent fix in the sustainable growth rate for doctors. I have pledged that for the last 4 or 5 years. We have a bipartisan agreement to effect that exact end; but, as so often is the case, we do not have the courage to rationally fund that agreement. That is why America is in trouble fiscally. This is a game unworthy of this institution and of the American people.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. It is unfortunate that we have been put in this position with less than 48 hours' notice of what is in this bill to do something that all of us know needs to be done.

The doctors of America, at least the organized doctors of America, have said vote "no" on this bill because they know, we know, The Wall Street Journal knows, we have to fix this permanently, not patch it every year. It is a fraud. Both sides have committed that fraud, and we ought to stop it.

We ought to fix this. Americans ought to expect us to fix it. The doctors expect us to fix it. Seniors expect us to fix it. What a lamentable fact that we cannot summon the courage and the judgment and the wisdom to do just that.

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

I want to read out the title of a blast that I just received from The Heritage Foundation. Some of our Members might be interested in this. "A temporary SGR patch is better than permanent deficits in support of the bill."

My colleagues, this morning, seniors are watching. This is not a game. We are thinking of seniors and certainty for them. A vote "no" today is a vote against seniors. We are not voting for the AMA today. We are voting for or against seniors today.

We will continue to work with all of our might for a permanent repeal of SGR. We have worked on this for 3 years. We must get there as soon as possible, but we are at a deadline, and this is the last vote we will have.

If you vote "no" on this bill, you are voting for more uncertainty. You are voting for a cut to doctor reimbursement. You are voting against seniors.

Let us vote for seniors this morning. Vote for H.R. 4302.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4302, the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014. It is embarrassing that a year of hard work on a permanent replacement for the Sustainable Growth Rate is being thrown in the trash can for yet another politically motivated short-term fix. The American people sent us here to solve our nation's problems, not kick the can down the road yet again. Now is the time for a permanent solution to this annual problem, and the legislation before us today does nothing to give our seniors and our doctors any certainty moving forward.

Everyone in this body agrees that we need to start rewarding our doctors for the quality of their work rather than the quantity of their work. After months of hearings in the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in conjunction with our colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance, we put our heads together and came up with a common-sense proposal to pay our doctors under Medicare for the next decade. Everyone agrees that this policy makes sense and should be adopted. We have work to do to find pay-fors for the legislation, but that is not an insurmountable task. Congress should be moving full steam ahead to find offsets for the policy we all agree on, rather than doing yet another short-term patch that will make a permanent fix more expensive and ultimately harder to attain.

Our constituents are tired of gimmickry and want real results. We should not have to deal with this issue on an annual basis. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 4302 and instead come together to find the necessary offsets to make a permanent fix to the Sustainable Growth Rate a reality.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because we need to provide a permanent solution rather than just a band-aid approach to maintaining seniors' access to quality health care.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 4302, the so-called "Protecting Access to Medicare Act," which extends current Medicare physician reimbursement rates for one year.

I strongly support providing adequate compensation to our physicians who serve Medicare patients. Medicare patients in every state make up 10% or more of those who have health insurance.

I oppose H.R. 4302 because it does not provide a long-term fix for Medicare payments to physicians, and the misvalued services under the physician payment system has not been addressed.

The core purpose of the bill is found in its name, the "Sustainable Growth Rate," but that purpose is not being met because the reimbursement rate to physicians is not sustainable for a robust medical care safety net for our nation's seniors.

CMS has made changes to the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule and other Medicare payment policies to improve efficiency and accuracy in Medicare payment and the quality of care for our beneficiaries.

CMS has improved payment for primary care services, while enhancing efforts to address payment for misvalued services under the physician payment system.

CMS has begun to implement important delivery system reforms included in the Affordable Care Act, which includes the value-based payment modifier that provides incentives for physicians and physician groups to furnish high-quality, efficient care.

Congress needs to do its part in implementing a reimbursement rate that reflects the reality of providing the care our nation's seniors need and expect.

Medicare patients and the medical payments made to their physicians and medical service providers' is critical to our nation's health care economy.

It is important for our seniors to know that Medicare will be there when they need it. But

it is equally important that there are physicians who are willing to attend to them without going broke.

That is why we have a Sustainable Growth Rate or "SGR." Medicare reimbursement enables rural physicians and hospitals to remain open for business.

This bill should not impose another round of arbitrary provider payment reductions to maintain a dysfunctional policy that many members of this House knows should be ended.

This bill undermines the future passage of the framework that was part of the original bipartisan SGR bill that the House had the chance to vote on earlier this month.

We should return to that bill and pass it without any gimmicks so that the modernization of the Medicare health care delivery and payment innovations that can strengthen the program can be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I have always strongly supported providing adequate compensation to our physicians who serve Medicare patients because it is important for our seniors to know that Medicare will be there when they need it.

Thus, it is critical that we not disrupt timely and adequate payment to Medicare providers.

The bill before us will provide payment certainty for one year, but only for one year. This is not acceptable—if we do not press the issue of reform now—when will it be addressed?

This is better than nothing but what must really be done to provide our seniors and physicians the certainty and security they deserve is to reach an agreement on a permanent replacement for the SGR that is fair, responsible, and fiscally sustainable.

Instead of wasting time trying to repeal, impede, or undermine the Affordable Care Act, or making it more difficult for physicians who care for the elderly we should be working together to reach an agreement on a permanent replacement for the SGR and the \$138 billion in offsets needed to pay for that legislation.

That is what the American people sent us here to do.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4302, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

UKRAINE SUPPORT ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4278) to support the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4278

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Ukraine Support Act".

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

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. United States policy.

TITLE I—ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Support for democratic governance and civil society in Ukraine.
Sec. 102. Economic reform in Ukraine.
Sec. 103. United States international programming to Ukraine and neighboring regions.
Sec. 104. Overseas Private Investment Corporation.
Sec. 105. Enhanced assistance for law enforcement and the judicial system in Ukraine.
Sec. 106. Enhanced security cooperation among Central and Eastern European NATO member states.
Sec. 107. United States-Ukraine security assistance.
Sec. 108. Recovery of assets linked to corruption in Ukraine.
Sec. 109. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
Sec. 110. Offset.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Continuation in effect of sanctions with respect to the blocking of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine.
Sec. 202. Imposition of additional sanctions on persons responsible for violence or who undermine the independence, sovereignty, or territorial or economic integrity of Ukraine.
Sec. 203. Imposition of additional sanctions on persons complicit in or responsible for significant corruption in the Russian Federation.
Sec. 204. Report on certain foreign financial institutions.
Sec. 205. Sense of Congress on human rights in the Russian Federation.
Sec. 206. Certification described and submission to Congress.
Sec. 207. Sense of Congress on suspension of all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council.
Sec. 208. Definitions.

TITLE III—REPORTING PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Annual report on security developments in the Russian Federation and their effects on Ukrainian sovereignty.
Sec. 302. Presidential determination and report on compliance by Russian Federation of its obligations under INF Treaty.
Sec. 303. Report on geopolitical impact of energy exports.
Sec. 304. Amendment to the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

(2) to support the people of Ukraine in their desire to address endemic corruption,

consolidate democracy, and achieve sustained prosperity;

(3) to support the efforts of the Government of Ukraine to bring to justice those responsible for the acts of violence against peaceful protestors and other unprovoked acts of violence related to the anti-government protests that began on November 21, 2013;

(4) to support the efforts of the Government of Ukraine to identify, investigate, recover, and return to the Ukrainian state assets unaccounted for under the leadership and departure from Ukraine of former President Yanukovich, his family, and other current and former members of the Ukrainian government, along with others legitimately charged by government authorities with similar offenses;

(5) to assist the Government of Ukraine in preparations for the presidential election scheduled for May 25, 2014, and to participate in efforts to ensure that this election is conducted in accordance with international standards;

(6) to promote democratic values, transparent and accountable government institutions, and advance United States national security interests through United States international broadcasting, including the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), Incorporated;

(7) to support needed economic structural reforms in Ukraine, including in the fiscal, energy, pension, and banking sectors, among others;

(8) to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy supplies to Ukraine and other European countries, including United States promotion of increased natural gas exports to, and energy efficiency in, Ukraine, which could be enhanced by advances in new energy technologies;

(9) to condemn the armed intervention of the Russian Federation in Ukraine, including its continuing political, economic, and military aggression against that country;

(10) to work with United States allies and partners in Europe and around the world, including at the United Nations, to ensure that all nations refuse to recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation and reaffirm the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(11) to refuse to recognize the legitimacy of the illegal referendum in Crimea on March 16, 2014, on the status of that region of Ukraine, which was held under conditions of occupation and coercion by Russian forces;

(12) to support the deployment of international monitors to Ukraine to assess the current status of its territorial integrity and the safety of all people in Ukraine;

(13) to encourage the Government of Ukraine to continue to respect and protect the rights of all ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities;

(14) to encourage the Government of Ukraine to promote and protect the human rights, as recognized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of all individuals as they seek freedom, democracy, and equality under the law;

(15) to work with United States allies and partners to condemn any violation by Russian Federation occupation forces or their proxies of the rights of ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities in Crimea, including the region's Tatar population;

(16) to call on all Ukrainians to respect the legitimate government authorities, as well as all Ukrainian laws and the Constitution of Ukraine in all regions of Ukraine, including Crimea;

(17) to maintain existing sanctions against and consider all available options for further

sanctions on the Russian Federation until Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity are not being violated by the Russian Federation; and

(18) to honor and abide by its commitments undertaken pursuant to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, on April 4, 1949, and entered into force on August 24, 1949.

TITLE I—ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized and encouraged to provide assistance to support democracy and civil society, including community-based and faith-based organizations, in Ukraine by undertaking the activities described in subsection (b).

(b) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—The activities described in this subsection are—

(1) improving democratic governance, transparency, accountability, rule of law, and anti-corruption efforts;

(2) supporting Ukrainian efforts to foster greater unity among people and regions of the country, combat anti-Semitism and discrimination, and promote respect for religious freedom;

(3) supporting the people and Government of Ukraine in preparing to conduct and participate in free and fair elections, including through domestic and international election monitoring;

(4) assisting Ukraine in diversifying its economy, trade, and energy supplies, including at the national, regional, and local levels;

(5) strengthening democratic institutions and political and civil society organizations; and

(6) expanding free and unfettered access to independent media of all kinds in Ukraine and assisting with the protection of journalists and civil society activists who have been targeted for free speech activities.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the President \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 to carry out this section.

SEC. 102. ECONOMIC REFORM IN UKRAINE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Ukrainian economy is weak and vulnerable, as evidenced by short-term debt interest rates as high as 15 percent, a high proportion of foreign exchange-denominated government debt that will mature in 2014 and 2015, a banking sector with non-performing loans at the high level of 14 percent, a financing gap which the Government of Ukraine has estimated will amount to \$35 billion over the next two years, and a large underground economy. This economic condition undermines democratic prospects in Ukraine.

(2) Years of poor economic management and performance have undermined and may continue to undermine political stability and unity within Ukraine.

(3) On March 6, 2014, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4152, to redirect previously appropriated funds to cover the cost of roughly \$1 billion in loan guarantees for Ukraine.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to work with other countries and international institutions to stabilize the Ukrainian economy, while promoting critically needed structural economic reforms in Ukraine, including—

(1) cutting the massive natural gas subsidies that have led to market inefficiencies;

(2) reducing the bloated public sector;

(3) maintaining a market-determined exchange rate;

(4) strengthening the vulnerable banking sector;

(5) promoting a robust, independent, and impartial judiciary, due process, and uniform application of law; and

(6) reducing corruption, such as by supporting reform efforts of the Government of Ukraine to pass legislation related to greater accountability for government officials, greater protection of private property, and increased transparency of government funds.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that loan guarantees provided by the United States for Ukraine should be used to promote government, banking and energy sector reform, and anti-corruption efforts in Ukraine.

SEC. 103. UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMING TO UKRAINE AND NEIGHBORING REGIONS.

(a) FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) The Russian Government has deliberately blocked the Ukrainian people's access to uncensored sources of information and has provided alternative news and information that is both inaccurate and inflammatory.

(2) United States international programming exists to advance the United States interests and values by presenting accurate and comprehensive news and information, which is the foundation for democratic governance.

(3) The opinions and views of the Ukrainian people, especially those people located in the eastern regions and Crimea, are not being accurately represented in Russian dominated mass media.

(4) Russian forces have seized more than five television stations in Crimea and taken over transmissions, switching to a 24/7 Russian propaganda format; this increase in programming augments the already robust pro-Russian programming to Ukraine.

(5) United States international programming has the potential to combat this anti-democratic propaganda.

(b) PROGRAMMING.—Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), Incorporated, and the Voice of America service to Ukraine and neighboring regions shall—

(1) provide news and information that is accessible, credible, and accurate;

(2) emphasize investigative and analytical journalism to highlight inconsistencies and misinformation provided by Russian or pro-Russian media outlets;

(3) prioritize programming to areas where access to uncensored sources of information is limited or non-existent, especially populations serviced by Russian supported media outlets;

(4) increase the number of reporters and organizational presence in eastern Ukraine, especially in Crimea;

(5) promote democratic processes, respect for human rights, freedom of the press, and territorial sovereignty; and

(6) take necessary preparatory steps to continue and increase programming and content that promotes democracy and government transparency in Russia.

(c) PROGRAMMING SURGE.—RFE/RL, Incorporated, and Voice of America programming to Ukraine and neighboring regions shall—

(1) prioritize programming to eastern Ukraine, including Crimea, and Moldova, and to ethnic and linguistic Russian populations, as well as to Tatar minorities;

(2) prioritize news and information that directly contributes to the target audiences' understanding of political and economic developments in Ukraine and Moldova, including countering misinformation that may originate from other news outlets, especially Russian supported news outlets;

(3) provide programming content 24 hours a day, seven days a week to target populations, using all available and effective distribution outlets, including—

(A) at least 8 weekly hours of total original television and video content in Ukrainian, Russian, and Tatar languages, not inclusive of live video streaming coverage of breaking news, to be distributed on satellite, digital, and through regional television affiliates by the Voice of America; and

(B) at least 14 weekly hours the total audio content in Ukrainian, Russian, and Tatar languages to be distributed on satellite, digital, and through regional radio affiliates of RFE/RL, Incorporated;

(4) expand the use, audience, and audience engagement of mobile news and multimedia platforms by RFE/RL, Incorporated, and the Voice of America, including through Internet-based social networking platforms; and

(5) partner with private sector broadcasters and affiliates to seek and start co-production for new, original content, when possible, to increase distribution.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2014, in addition to funds otherwise made available for such purposes, up to \$10,000,000 to carry out programming in the Ukrainian, Balkan, Russian, and Tatar language services of RFE/RL, Incorporated, and the Voice of America, for the purpose of bolstering existing United States programming to the people of Ukraine and neighboring regions, and increasing programming capacity and jamming circumvention technology to overcome any disruptions to service.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall submit to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations of the Senate a detailed report on plans to increase broadcasts pursuant to subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 104. OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the Overseas Private Investment Corporation should prioritize investments in Ukraine.

SEC. 105. ENHANCED ASSISTANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM IN UKRAINE.

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to assist Ukraine to eliminate the human rights abuses associated with the Berkut forces in order to foster a democratically reformed police force with strong public oversight, which is critical to fostering political unity and stability throughout Ukraine; and

(2) to assist Ukraine to develop a robust, independent, and impartial judicial system at national, regional, and local levels, which is essential to ensure that the rights of all citizens are respected, and maintain appropriate checks and balances between the co-equal branches of government.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$8,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 to enhance United States efforts to assist Ukraine to strengthen law enforcement capabilities and maintain the rule of law.

SEC. 106. ENHANCED SECURITY COOPERATION AMONG CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN NATO MEMBER STATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate United States departments and agencies, shall seek to provide enhanced security cooperation with Central and Eastern European North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member states by undertaking the activities described in subsection (b).

(b) **ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.**—The activities described in this subsection are—

(1) enhancing existing security cooperation, including defense and military-to-military cooperation, among Central and Eastern European NATO member states;

(2) enhancing security relationships among the United States, the European Union, and Central and Eastern European NATO member states;

(3) providing defense articles, defense services, and military training to Central and Eastern European NATO member states;

(4) expanding the scope and frequency of military exercises among Central and Eastern European NATO member states; and

(5) supporting greater reform, professionalism, and capacity-building efforts within the military, intelligence, and security services in Central and Eastern European NATO member states.

SEC. 107. UNITED STATES-UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) in fiscal year 2013 the United States provided Ukraine with nearly \$2,000,000 in assistance under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.; relating to International Military Education Training) and nearly \$7,000,000 in assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763; relating to the Foreign Military Financing Program); and

(2) Ukraine has been a longstanding member of NATO's Partnership for Peace.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) United States assistance to Ukraine under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act should be increased;

(2) consistent with section 506(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2318(a)), the President is encouraged to draw down defense articles from the stocks of the Department of Defense, in order to provide security assistance, which could include communication equipment, clothing, fuel and other forms of appropriate assistance, to the Government of Ukraine; and

(3) the Government of Ukraine should make greater efforts to secure the protection of classified information and military equipment.

(c) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It shall be the policy of the United States, in consultation with the Government of Ukraine, to enhance Ukraine's self defense, including through appropriate assistance to improve the capabilities of the country's armed forces.

(d) **REVIEW OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate United States departments and agencies, shall submit to Congress a report on the results of a review of all United States security assistance to the Government of Ukraine.

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

SEC. 108. RECOVERY OF ASSETS LINKED TO CORRUPTION IN UKRAINE.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Administration should provide expedited assistance to the Government of Ukraine through appropriate United States Government and multilateral programs, including the Department of Justice's Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative, the Egmont Group, the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative, the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network, and the Asset Recovery Focal Point Initiative, to identify, investigate, secure, and recover assets missing

from the Government of Ukraine or linked to purported acts of corruption by former President Viktor Yanukovich, members of his family, other former or current senior foreign political figures of the Government of Ukraine, and their accomplices in any jurisdiction.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term "senior foreign political figure" has the meaning given the term in section 208.

SEC. 109. EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Article 1 of the Agreement Establishing the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) states that the EBRD should support investments in countries that are committed to and applying the principles of multiparty democracy, pluralism, and market economics, and the EBRD has recognized that Russian "progress in the application of these principles . . . has been uneven".

(2) Russia received 21 percent of the investments made by the EBRD in 2013, which is more than any other country received from the EBRD in that year, and has received an inordinate ratio of investment from the EBRD since the 2006 Capital Resources Review.

(b) **SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) should increase investments in Ukraine and cease new investments in the Russian Federation, and the United States Government should press the EBRD to support new investment in Ukraine and halt consideration of new investment in Russia.

SEC. 110. OFFSET.

Section 102(a) of the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 8412(a); Public Law 111-73; 123 Stat. 2068) is amended by striking "\$1,500,000,000" and inserting "\$1,430,000,000".

TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. CONTINUATION IN EFFECT OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE BLOCKING OF CERTAIN PERSONS CONTRIBUTING TO THE SITUATION IN UKRAINE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—United States sanctions described in subsection (b), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect until the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 90 days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in subsection (a) of section 206 in accordance with subsection (b) of such section; or

(2) the date that is 30 days after any date subsequent to January 1, 2020, on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a determination that the termination of such sanctions imposed is in the vital national security interests of the United States.

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—United States sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions imposed under the following executive orders:

(1) Executive Order 13660 (March 6, 2014; relating to blocking property of certain persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

(2) Executive Order 13661 (March 16, 2014; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

(3) Executive Order 13662 (March 20, 2014; relating to blocking property of additional persons contributing to the situation in Ukraine).

SEC. 202. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS ON PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR VIOLENCE OR WHO UNDERMINE THE INDEPENDENCE, SOVEREIGNTY, OR TERRITORIAL OR ECONOMIC INTEGRITY OF UKRAINE.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to impose sanctions with respect to those individuals within and outside of the Government of the Russian Federation whom the President determines wield significant influence over the formation and implementation of Russian foreign policy, in particular with respect to the violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, democracy, and territorial integrity.

(b) CRITERIA FOR IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—A foreign person or an alien is subject to sanctions under subsection (c) in accordance with the provisions of such subsection if the foreign person or alien, on or after November 21, 2013—

(1) is knowingly responsible for or complicit in, or engaged in, directly or indirectly—

(A) actions that significantly undermine democratic processes or institutions in Ukraine;

(B) actions that significantly threaten the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(C) acts of significant corruption in Ukraine, or the seizure or expropriation of significant economic assets from Ukraine, including the expropriation of private or state assets for personal gain, or the facilitation or transfer of the proceeds of such expropriation to foreign jurisdictions; or

(D) the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Ukraine or citizens of the Russian Federation;

(2) is a current or former senior foreign political figure of the Government of the Russian Federation who has engaged in any activity described in paragraph (1);

(3) operates in the arms or related materiel sector in the Russian Federation that has engaged in any activity described in paragraph (1);

(4) is a current or former senior foreign political figure of an entity that has, or whose members have, knowingly engaged in any activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) or of an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section;

(5) has knowingly materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) or of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section;

(6) is owned or controlled by, or has 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 this section.

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—With respect to a foreign person who the President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with the Secretary of State (or their designees), determines meets the requirements described in subsection (b) (and, if the President determines such foreign person is a senior foreign political figure, such foreign person is not included in the classified annex of a report submitted to the appropriate congressional committees under subsection (e)(1)), the President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with the Secretary of State (or their designees), shall to the extent necessary investigate, block during the pendency of an investigation, regulate, direct and

compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property or interests in property of such person to the extent such property or interests in property are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, pursuant to the applicable provisions of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(B) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(1) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) knows, or has reason to believe, meets any of the criteria described in subsection (b) is—

(I) inadmissible to the United States;

(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(i) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien who meets any of the criteria described in subsection (b), regardless of when issued.

(II) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under subclause (I)—

(aa) shall take effect immediately; and

(bb) shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(3) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this section.

(4) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President to impose additional sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), relevant executive orders, regulations, or other provisions of law.

(d) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (c) with respect to a foreign person or alien if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is vital to the national interest of the United States; and

(2) not less than 15 days after the waiver takes effect, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice of the waiver and a justification for such waiver.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at least once every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 2 years, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report with respect to senior foreign political figures of the Russian Federation that have been determined to have engaged in activities described in subsection (b).

(B) FORM.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(2) REQUESTS BY CHAIRPERSON AND RANKING MEMBER OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after receiving a written request from the chairperson and ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees with respect to whether a senior foreign political figure of the Russian Federation is responsible for engaging in activities described in subsection (b), the President shall submit a response to the chairperson and ranking member of the committee which made the request with respect to the status of the person.

(B) FORM.—The President may submit a response required by subparagraph (A) in classified form if the President determines that it is necessary for the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMITTED.—The term “admitted” has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(13)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(13)(A)).

(2) ALIEN.—The term “alien” has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(3)).

(3) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means—

(A) an individual who is not a United States person;

(B) a corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental entity which is not a United States person; or

(C) any representative, agent or instrumentality of, or an individual working on behalf of a foreign government.

(5) PAROLED.—The term “paroled” means paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)).

(6) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

(g) TERMINATION.—This section and any sanction imposed by this section shall remain in effect until the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 90 days after the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in subsection (a) of section 206 in accordance with subsection (b) of such section; or

(2) the date that is 30 days after any date subsequent to January 1, 2020, on which the

President submits to the appropriate congressional committees in writing a determination that the termination of this section and the sanctions imposed by this section is in the vital national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 203. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS ON PERSONS COMPLICIT IN OR RESPONSIBLE FOR SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On March 20, 2014, the Department of the Treasury designated four individuals and one financial institution for acting for or on behalf of or materially assisting, sponsoring, or providing financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, a senior official of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(2) Widespread corruption at senior levels of the Government of the Russian Federation, in combination with the suppression of political freedoms and the concentration of enormous wealth in the hands of individuals exercising extensive influence over government policy, has contributed to the establishment of an authoritarian system that does not respect the rights of the Russian people.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with the Secretary of State (or their designees), is authorized to impose sanctions described in paragraph (1)(A) of section 202(c) in accordance with the provisions of such section against a foreign person if the foreign person is a senior foreign political figure or a close associate of such senior foreign political figure with respect to whom the President, acting through the Secretary of the Treasury and in consultation with the Secretary of State (or their designees), determines meets one or more of the criteria described in subsection (c).

(2) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—The Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) is authorized to impose sanctions described in paragraph (1)(B) of section 202(c) in accordance with the provisions of such section against an alien if the alien is a senior foreign political figure or a close associate of such senior foreign political figure with respect to whom the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) knows, or has reason to believe, meets one or more of the criteria described in subsection (c).

(c) CRITERIA FOR IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The criteria described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The foreign person or alien is responsible for, or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, acts of significant corruption in the Russian Federation, including the expropriation of private or public assets for personal gain, corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources, bribery, or the facilitation or transfer of the proceeds of corruption to foreign jurisdictions.

(2) The foreign person or alien has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, an act described in paragraph (1).

(d) WAIVER.—The waiver provisions of subsection (d) of section 202 shall apply with respect to this section and any sanction imposed by this section to the same extent and in the same manner as such waiver provisions apply to section 202 and any sanction imposed by such section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “foreign person” and “alien” have the meanings given such terms in section 202(f).

SEC. 204. REPORT ON CERTAIN FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) On February 26, 2014, the Department of the Treasury’s Financial Crimes Enforcement Network advised United States financial institutions of their responsibility to take reasonable, risk-based steps regarding the potential suspicious movement of assets related to Viktor Yanukovich departing Kyiv and abdicating his responsibilities and other senior officials resigning from their positions or departing Kyiv.

(2) United States financial institutions are required to apply enhanced scrutiny to private banking accounts held by or on behalf of senior foreign political figures and to monitor transactions that could potentially represent misappropriated or diverted state assets, the proceeds of bribery or other illegal payments, or other public corruption proceeds.

(3) On March 3, 2014, the Government of Ukraine announced that it had initiated criminal proceedings against a number of former Ukrainian officials or close associates of former Ukrainian officials.

(4) On March 5, 2014, the European Union, based on information from Ukraine’s Prosecutor General, issued a Council Regulation requiring the European Union to freeze the funds and economic resources of various former Ukrainian officials and their close associates.

(5) The Government of Canada has taken similar action against the same individuals.

(6) The measures being taken against these former Ukrainian officials and their close associates increase the risk that they will seek to move their assets in a deceptive fashion.

(7) Foreign financial institutions should apply similar, enhanced due-diligence and reporting requirements.

(8) The United States has a strong interest in seeing the international financial system protected from illicit financial activity, including money laundering, terrorism and proliferation financing, transnational organized crime, and the misappropriation of state assets, and international sanctions evasion, among others.

(9) The Department of the Treasury possesses a range of authorities to insulate the United States financial system from entities or jurisdictions that pose an illicit financing risk.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to use all of its regulatory and statutory authorities to closely scrutinize all foreign financial institutions, including those in the Russian Federation, that may be complicit in enabling foreign persons and transnational criminal enterprises to evade or otherwise circumvent United States and international sanctions, launder the proceeds of criminal activity, finance acts of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or any other illicit activity that presents risks and vulnerabilities to the United States financial system.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed 2 years, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on—

(A) foreign financial institutions that are in direct control of Government of Ukraine state-owned or controlled assets in a manner determined by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to be contrary

to the interests of the Government of Ukraine;

(B) foreign financial institutions determined by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to be complicit in illicit financial activity, including money laundering, terrorism and proliferation financing, transnational organized crime, or misappropriation of state assets, that are—

(i) organized under the laws of the Russian Federation; or

(ii) owned or controlled by a foreign person described in section 202(b); and

(C) foreign financial institutions that are directly or indirectly assisting or otherwise aiding the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, including the Crimea.

(2) FORM.—The report required to be submitted under this subsection shall be submitted in an unclassified form, to the extent appropriate, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 205. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should greatly expand the list of 18 Russian officials and others published on April 12, 2013, who were engaged in actions described in section 404 of the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112-208; 22 U.S.C. 5811) regarding the death of Sergei Magnitsky, illegal activity by officials of the Government of the Russian Federation, or violations of human rights and other offenses in Russia.

SEC. 206. CERTIFICATION DESCRIBED AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A certification described in this section is a certification of the President to Congress that Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity is not being violated by the Russian Federation or any other state actor.

(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit the certification described in subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees in writing and shall include a justification for the certification.

(2) FORM OF CERTIFICATION.—The certification described in subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 207. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SUSPENSION OF ALL ACTIVITIES AND MEETINGS OF THE NATO-RUSSIA COUNCIL.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States should work to temporarily suspend all activities and meetings of the NATO-Russia Council.

SEC. 208. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Except as otherwise provided, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(B) Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(2) SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.—The term “senior foreign political figure” has the meaning given the term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

TITLE III—REPORTING PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. ANNUAL REPORT ON SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND THEIR EFFECTS ON UKRAINIAN SOVEREIGNTY.**

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than September 30, 2014, and September 30 of each year thereafter through 2020, the Secretary of State shall submit to the specified congressional committees a report, in both classified and unclassified form, on the current and future security and foreign policy posture of the Russian Federation (in this section referred to as “Russia”).

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the security situation in regions neighboring Russia, including Crimea.

(2) The goals and factors shaping the security strategy of the Government of Russia, including potential annexation of non-Russian territory.

(3) Trends in Russian security behavior that would be designed to achieve, or that are consistent with, the goals described in paragraph (2).

(4) An assessment of the global and regional security objectives of the Government of Russia, including objectives that would affect the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Middle East, or the People’s Republic of China.

(5) A detailed assessment of the sizes, locations, and capabilities of the nuclear, special operations, land, sea, and air forces of the Government of Russia and how they affect neighboring countries, including Ukraine.

(6) Developments in Russian military doctrine and training and whether the developments have differed from before the annexation of Crimea.

(7) Other security developments involving Russia that the Secretary of State considers relevant to United States national security.

(c) **SPECIFIED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “specified congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

SEC. 302. PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND REPORT ON COMPLIANCE BY RUSSIAN FEDERATION OF ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER INF TREATY.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that there are reports that the Russian Federation is in material breach of its obligations under the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that includes a determination as to whether or not the Russian Federation is in material breach of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(2) **ADDITIONAL MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—If the President determines that the Russian Federation is in material breach of its obligations under the INF Treaty, the report shall also include the following:

(A) A description of the measures taken to hold the Russian Federation accountable for its violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(B) A description of the measures being taken to ensure that the Russian Federation completely and verifiably eliminates any military system that constitutes a material breach of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(3) **FORM.**—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 303. REPORT ON GEOPOLITICAL IMPACT OF ENERGY EXPORTS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of State’s Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed, quantitative, and substantive report on the potential short, medium, and long-term impacts of increased United States natural gas and oil exports on Russia’s economic and political influence over Ukraine and other European countries.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

SEC. 304. AMENDMENT TO THE IRAN, NORTH KOREA, AND SYRIA NONPROLIFERATION ACT.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Iran continues its longstanding effort to obtain banned components for its nuclear and missile programs in violation of its obligations under successive United Nations Security Council Resolutions.

(2) Russian entities, including Rosoboroneexport, have been sanctioned with respect to proliferation activities, particularly sanctions under the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106-178; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(3) The Department of State must expeditiously restore the deterrent effect of the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act by fully applying and enforcing such Act.

(b) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 2 of the Iran, North Korea, and Syria Nonproliferation Act (Public Law 106-178; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **PLAN TO EXPEDITE REPORTS AND SANCTIONS UNDER THIS ACT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Ukraine Support Act, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate, a plan, to include specific timetables, to expedite the implementation of this Act with respect to submission of reports required under subsection (a) and the application of measures to certain foreign persons under section 3.

“(2) **SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON SYRIA.**—In the submission of reports required under subsection (a) and in accordance with the plan required under paragraph (1), the President is encouraged to place a special emphasis on any foreign person in Russia, including any Russian Federation official, that is engaged in any activity described in subsection (a) with respect to the government of President Bashar al-Assad and any affiliates thereof.

“(3) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to preclude or exempt the President from fulfilling or otherwise deviating from the requirements under subsection (b).”

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

California (Mr. **ROYCE**) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. **ENGEL**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Vladimir Putin’s decision to forcibly annex Crimea was based on his calculation that the price would be bearable.

Now, in fact, Russia is susceptible to pressure. Seventy percent of all the exports from Russia are from oil and gas; 52 percent of the budget that goes to the power behind Mr. Putin’s military and his government comes from that monopoly pricing on natural gas. That supplies the budget for Russia. That is what gives him the power to manipulate the situation, the monopoly over gas that he has in Eastern Europe, to manipulate this situation with respect to Ukraine.

If we want to check aggression from Russia, we must push back, and we must work together quickly, not only to confront this monopoly circumstance that exists there, but also to quickly impose tough sanctions on President Putin and on those who have been his accomplices in carrying out this aggression.

Diplomatically, our European allies have helped to eject Russia from the G8 and have suspended all other engagement with Russia until this crisis is peacefully resolved. Economically, they have also imposed sanctions, including asset freezes and visa bans, against many Russian leaders. Our targets must include government officials as well as those who hold no formal position but who, nevertheless, exercise great influence over President Putin’s policy and have supported aggression. That includes the so-called oligarchs and others who have amassed enormous wealth through corruption and through other illegitimate means.

We must make clear that if they do not end this crisis—which they have deliberately created, by the way—or if they choose to go even further, then we and our allies will ratchet up the sanctions pressure.

We must also move quickly to strengthen Ukraine by reinforcing its sovereignty, its independence and territorial integrity, and assist the new government in meeting the enormous challenges it faces.

This bill provides assistance to strengthen civil society in Ukraine, to combat corruption, to help recover assets stolen by former Ukrainian officials, to reform the police and the justice sector, to promote the independent

media, to strengthen Ukraine's defense, and to help prepare for the run-up to the Presidential election, which is scheduled now on May 25.

And I will add that, in several weeks, I will be leading a bipartisan delegation from this House, with the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), to Ukraine. And I will add that his forefathers, in fact, come from Ukraine. We will be there to meet with the Parliament, the leadership, and the electoral commission in advance of that election.

This bill also directs the assistance already approved by the House to help get the Ukrainian economy back on its feet, including by promoting fundamental economic reforms in the country. Those tough reforms will be essential.

Mr. Speaker, Moscow is using propaganda to sow confusion and fear and unrest inside Ukraine right now, which it then exploits to justify its actions. To counter that effort, this legislation enhances funding for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and the Voice of America to expand broadcasting in the Russian language, in Ukrainian, in Tatar in order to provide the accurate news and information on the ground across Ukraine. No amount of aid will help Ukraine if Russian propaganda rules the day.

Another priority must be to end Russia's ability to use its energy reserves to blackmail Ukraine and other countries, including many of our NATO allies. Russia supplies 100 percent of Lithuania's natural gas. Well, it might not be that surprising, then, that Lithuania pays the highest price for gas of any country in Eastern Europe. And it supplies two-thirds of Poland's gas.

Energy sales earn Russia not only dollars, but they earn Russia influence because Russia, in the dead of winter, has turned off the valves. Russia's state-controlled gas company, Gazprom, threatened to cut off supplies to Ukraine earlier this month, as it did during the winters of 2006 and 2009. Gazprom has stated that it is preparing to double the price Ukraine pays for its natural gas, which could cripple the country's already weak economy.

Now, we have a powerful tool to counter this pressure, one that is just waiting to be used, and that is our own energy reserves. We must remove restrictions on the export of U.S. crude oil and natural gas into Eastern Europe. We have, in fact, a letter to the Speaker of the House from the heads of state of Poland, of the Czech Republic, of Slovakia, of Hungary, asking us—asking us—to direct resources, to sell resources.

Listen, at the end of the day, if we do this, we end the flaring of gas here in the United States because of the glut. We are able to help our balance of payments. It will help to reduce our deficits. It increases Russia's deficits, frankly. It produces jobs here in the United States. But it comes at a time when Vladimir Putin has a grip on the

necks of the decisionmakers in Eastern Europe with respect to his power on monopoly over gas.

Lifting, frankly, these self-imposed sanctions on ourselves in terms of not exporting our excess gas would not only boost the U.S. economy and create American jobs, as I indicated, but would reduce the energy revenues that comprise 52 percent of the budget for the military and the government in Russia. We must break Putin's energy grip over Ukraine and Eastern Europe. This is a strategic issue.

I am pleased, by the way, to have worked closely with Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of New York and with all of the members of the committee to produce this strong, effective, and much-needed bipartisan bill, and I look forward to its passage today and to working with our Senate colleagues to have the President sign the bill into law as soon as possible.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC., March 26, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 4278, the "Ukraine Support Act," which the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered reported favorably on March 25, 2014. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 4278 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 4278 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4278, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 4278.

Sincerely,
BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC., March 26, 2014.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 4278, the Ukraine Support Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill. The suspension text contains edits to portions of the bill within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary that were requested by your committee.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way dimin-

ish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 4278 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Judiciary as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,
EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC., March 26, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: On March 25, 2014, the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered H.R. 4278, the Ukraine Support Act, and ordered it, as amended, to be reported favorably to the House. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction both before and since your markup, I agree not to seek a sequential referral of the measure to my committee so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing a request for a sequential referral of H.R. 4278, as amended, at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may continue to address any issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4278, as amended, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation and/or in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,
JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC., March 26, 2014.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 4278, the Ukraine Support Act, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request on that bill. The suspension text contains edits to portions of the bill within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services that were requested by your committee.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I

would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 4278 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Financial Services as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC., March 26, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 4278, the "Ukraine Support Act," which was favorably reported out of your Committee on March 25, 2014.

Given that certain provisions in the bill are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I appreciate that you have addressed these provisions in response to the Committee's concerns. As a result, in order to expedite floor consideration of the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means will forgo action on H.R. 4278. Further, the Committee will not oppose the bill's consideration on the suspension calendar, based on our understanding that you will work with us as the legislative process moves forward to ensure that our concerns continue to be addressed. This is also being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4278, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC., March 26, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 4278, the Ukraine Support Act, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request on that bill. The suspension text contains edits to the bill related to the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Ways and Means that were requested by your committee.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 4278 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Ways and Means as

this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 4278, the Ukraine Support Act.

Let me begin by thanking the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ROYCE, for his strong leadership on Ukraine. As always, he is working with us in a bipartisan and constructive manner on this very important and timely bill. I am very pleased to be the lead Democratic cosponsor. I would also like to thank my other Democratic and Republican colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee for their important contributions.

The United States has long been a steadfast supporter of a democratic, prosperous, and independent Ukraine, and with the people of Ukraine now in dire need of assistance and under imminent threat, there has never been a more critical moment to show our support.

President Putin's invasion of Crimea is a flagrant violation of international law and Russia's commitments to its neighbor. The phony and illegal referendum Putin orchestrated at the barrel of a gun has resulted in the first outright annexation of territory in Europe since the end of World War II. And now Putin is amassing troops on Ukraine's border, threatening to seize more Ukrainian territory and incite further violence and conflict.

Putin's destabilizing and dangerous moves threaten not only Ukraine, but other states in the region, including Moldova and Georgia and, indeed, all of Europe. The United States, our European partners, and the entire international community must take a stand against Putin's naked aggression.

This legislation reaffirms our strong support for the people of Ukraine at this critical time. It authorizes assistance for Ukraine as it attempts to right its struggling economy, increase energy security, strengthen civil society, and prepare for democratic elections this spring. It supports Ukraine's efforts to recover missing assets, to bolster the rule of law, and to professionalize its law enforcement. It supports additional broadcasting to Ukraine—and Chairman ROYCE has been a champion of that—and other countries in the region to counter the dangerous and hateful propaganda coming from the Kremlin and its media outlets. And it endorses the deployment of significant numbers of international monitors throughout Ukraine to help reduce tensions and ensure the security of all Ukrainians.

The legislation also sends a clear message to Putin and his cronies that their landgrab and reckless actions will have serious consequences. Specifically, it supplements the President's efforts to sanction those responsible for violating Ukraine's sovereignty and

international integrity, looting Ukraine's economy, and violating human rights in Ukraine.

And here I would like to applaud President Obama for imposing measures which have already impacted Putin's inner circle, for taking the lead in suspending Russia's participation in the G8, and for rallying support and coordinating actions with our European partners and others throughout the world.

Finally, the bill expresses support for continuing U.S. security assistance to Ukraine and reaffirms our commitment to the security of NATO, the security of our NATO partners in Eastern and Central Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the coming days, weeks, and months will be very difficult for Ukraine. Its leaders must continue the process of reconciliation and reach out to all regions of the country. They must scrupulously respect minority and human rights, and they must make the hard decisions and take the difficult steps that will return their country to political and economic health. And they must do all of this in the face of opposition and likely provocations from Putin and his cronies.

But as they do so, they and the people of Ukraine should know that they have our support. By passing this bill, we are making clear that the United States stands with Ukraine, that we are committed to helping its people build a more democratic, prosperous, secure, and just state for themselves and their children.

You know, if we continue to work with Ukraine and continue to help Ukraine and turn them westward, rather than eastward, then Putin will have lost. He may have a landgrab in Crimea, but he will lose the rest of Ukraine. And we should be doing everything possible to make sure that our European allies are working closely with Ukraine, offering them the incentives they need so that they will look westward and not eastward.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Finally, I want to say, foreign policy should be bipartisan whenever possible. I think this is bipartisanship as its best.

□ 1045

We send a clear message to the people of Ukraine that the United States stands with them. It is not a Republican or a Democratic stand. It is an American stand, and I am proud to be part of it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), our respected majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Ukraine Support Act. Vladimir Putin's recent military invasion and illegal annexation of Crimea

stand in direct violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and international law. His aggression may only continue unless we in America, along with our allies, respond with strength.

Newspaper reports indicate that Putin may not be content with swallowing Crimea whole and that he is now amassing troops on the border with eastern Ukraine and may soon have his eyes on Moldova.

The eyes of the world are on the United States and our EU and NATO partners. Adversaries and allies around the world are watching to see how we respond to this outrageous provocation, to see whether we mean it when we say Putin's actions are unacceptable.

It is vitally important that the United States, in conjunction with our EU and NATO allies, send an unmistakable signal that this aggression will not be tolerated. Together we must be prepared to exact a significant cost for Russia's behavior and that Mr. Putin's actions will be met with the firmest of resolve.

This bill is a first step towards supporting the Ukrainians and our Central and Eastern European partners and imposing truly significant costs on Moscow—but it is only a first step. We must fundamentally reassess our assumptions about Russia and acknowledge that Putin himself scrapped the administration's "reset" policy a long time ago. We need a new strategy that understands Putin for who he is, not who we wish him to be.

We need a new grand strategy. We need a foreign policy that stands up for our allies and stands up to our adversaries. We need to prioritize defense in our budget so that we maintain a military that can respond promptly to contingencies around the world and that instills fear in our enemies while reassuring our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill, modest though it may be, will prove to be the first step on a long march to restore America's defenses and alliances. Now, more than ever, the threats to the very fabric of the international system require an America that leads.

I want to thank very much the gentleman from California, Chairman ROYCE, and Ranking Member ENGEL and the rest of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for their bipartisan work and for all of their efforts on this issue. I urge my colleagues in the House to support our friends in Ukraine by passing this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a very distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. I also congratulate the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, and the chairman, Mr. ROYCE, for their bipartisan leadership on this critical, critical resolution.

Mr. Speaker, apparently, once a KGB agent, always a KGB agent. Mr. Putin seems to have learned nothing from

history other than that there is power at the end of the barrel of a gun. To cite the fact that there are Russian speakers in Crimea as a rationale for one of the most audacious power grabs of the 21st century—in Europe, no less—forgets history.

Let us not forget that Crimea was settled by Stalin when he expelled and executed the native Tatars, and this recent so-called referendum in Crimea was also done at the end of the barrel of a gun.

Russian interests were never threatened in the Crimea after the revolution in Kiev. The new government in Kiev never abrogated the treaty that allowed Russia naval privileges through 2042. The Ukrainians didn't occupy military stations in Crimea and around the region. It was the other way around.

For the United States and its allies to allow this naked aggression to go unaddressed would be truly an abrogation of our moral responsibility and would be to turn our backs on the very lessons we should have learned from the 20th century's tragic history.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stop talking about the he-better-not-go-further argument. I am stuck at Crimea, and I hope my colleagues are, too. It is wrong. It cannot be allowed to stand, and we must make him pay a price.

The difference between now and Stalin's time is that his economy is integrated into the global economy. The ruble will fall. The stock market in Russia will pay a price, and investment will suffer because we will help make it so unless he relents, until they pay a price that is so great—systematic and comprehensive—that he will understand that we no longer operate by the rule of the jungle in Europe or, indeed, anywhere else on this planet, not with our blessing and not with our apology.

So I strongly support the legislation before us and urge my colleagues to join with all of us in telling Mr. Putin we will not stand idly by with history doomed to repeat itself.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Ukraine Support Act. I want to thank my friends and colleagues, Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, for introducing this comprehensive legislation to support Ukraine in its urgent effort to meet its current crisis, including by building up its democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, Russia's landgrab in Crimea violates the core principles of several bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties between Ukraine and Russia, the Budapest Memorandum, and the United Nations Charter, as well as the Helsinki Final

Act. This legislation includes strong sanctions against Russians directly responsible for the aggression.

H.R. 4278 also authorizes targeted sanctions against Ukrainians involved in undermining the democratic processes and provides assistance to the Ukrainian Government for identifying and recovering stolen assets. It is, after all, these criminal officials, including and especially Yanukovich and his cronies, who have so harmed the Ukrainian people and placed the country in the vulnerable position which Russia has exploited.

Another key provision of the bill provides support for Ukraine's democracy and civil society; and I want to here recognize the importance of supporting, as well, the faith-based groups and organizations that played such a prominent role, particularly on the humanitarian side, in supporting the movement for democracy and the rule of law.

The Ukrainian democracy movement is, in large part, a religious movement. Orthodox and Catholic clergy, for example, were prominent in the protests, and the drama of priests carrying icons confronting soldiers became as much a symbol of the democratization movement as anything else. And, again, when people were wounded and when people were being dragged away, it was the clergy that tried to step in to mitigate the violence against them.

Let me also point out a Catholic News Service article that just hit the wire that points out that members of the Ukrainian Catholic Church are fleeing Crimea to escape threats of arrest and property seizures.

Father Milchakovskiy, a parish rector in Crimea, said:

The situation remains very serious, and we don't know what will happen—the new government here is portraying us all as nationalists and extremists.

The article also says:

Officials from Russia's Federal Security Service, or FSB, had called him in for questioning about his community and to ask whether or not he "recognized the new order."

He pointed out that one priest in particular was actually beaten by Russian forces. And, again, Members will recall, and I remember during the 1980s when I first came here, how so many within the church, including the orthodox church, were beaten and sent to the gulag because of their religious faith. This could be the harbinger of a new wave of repression against people of faith. The Ukrainian Catholic Church, by way of reminder, was one of those churches that was outlawed during Soviet times, and now we see the same kind of repetition of that kind of repression.

This legislation is a clear step in the right direction. No piece of legislation will do it all. We have to appeal to the Russians to stop this, but, again, to cease their persecution of people in the Crimea.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the

gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL from New York, and I thank Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of the committee, for bringing this bill to the floor and working in a bipartisan fashion to effect an objective that I strongly support. I thank both of them for their work.

Mr. Speaker, the ongoing Russian aggression against Ukraine is unacceptable and a gross violation of international law. I agree with President Obama that Russia is acting from a position of weakness, however. Strong nations do not invade and annex territory from their smaller neighbors by force, and strong nations do not suppress the free expression of ideas and the voices of dissent within their own society. Those are the hallmarks not of a great nation but of an insecure bully.

Great nations are those that stand together to reaffirm the principles of liberty and international order. Great nations are those that commit to peaceful diplomacy while protecting free and open debate among our citizens.

The American people continue to stand with the people of Ukraine, Mr. Speaker, because we believe they have a right to join the nations of the world that are free and able to shape their own future. That is why, through this bill, we pledge our support as the new government in Kiev works to stabilize its economy, provide security to its citizens, and ensure that all Ukrainians are afforded the opportunities that come with vibrant, democratic institutions and basic freedoms. That is what this bill offers the people of Ukraine.

What it offers President Putin and his associates is an opportunity to end their misguided, unjustified, and the illegal incursion into Ukraine's internal affairs, because it affords them a choice, Mr. Speaker: adhere to international law and end their aggression or face increasingly punitive sanctions that will further isolate Russia from the global community.

The one item missing from this otherwise strong bill, unfortunately, is ratification of IMF quota reform, and I hope the House will take action on that piece soon.

However, this is a good bill. We ought to support this bill. We ought to pass this bill and send Mr. Putin a clear message that the United States Congress and the Nation we represent will not stand for Russia's actions and that we are ready to help Ukraine reach for the future it so richly deserves.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, and I realize that I am a lone voice—or almost a lone voice—in this discussion today.

I see this legislation as a bipartisan green light to reigniting the cold war. Unfortunately, many of my friends and colleagues, both colleagues today and my friends from the time when I spent in the Reagan White House, 7 years, many of these people feel that the cold war is not over, that it never did end. They are more comfortable with treating Russia as if it were still under Communist rule. Well, Putin is not a Communist leader. Putin is a nationalist who loves his country and he is looking out for the national interests of his country. For us to try to demonize him and to try to suggest that he is doing this as he did in the cold war and he is still KGB, et cetera, is not doing the cause of peace any good.

This is what started this whole slide in the wrong direction toward the type of confrontation we are having today. In Ukraine, a democratically elected President was removed from power, and that was a democratically elected President who is more inclined towards better relations with Russia. He was removed from power. And then the Russian Government, under Mr. Putin, decided to ensure the people of Crimea the right to self-determination. Because even Secretary of State Kerry has verified and testified before our committee that the people of Crimea obviously want to be part of Russia, this is not a power grab.

□ 1100

This is defending their right to self-determination, and certainly the people of Crimea have the right to make that determination just as the people of Kosovo had their right to leave Serbia behind.

Our military action there to try to protect the right of self-determination of the Kosovars, it cost many, many lives. This Russian military move, with all this power grab, et cetera, has resulted in the loss of one life. That is in stark contrast to when we bombed Belgrade, we bombed Serbia.

No, we should not permit ourselves to reignite a cold war. We should make sure that we realize that the actions we are taking here suggesting the United States must rush in and be the arbiter in every one of these type of conflicts is always stretching our budget. But in this particular bill, we are going to put our name on a loan of \$800 billion to a country that we are going have to borrow the money from China to get.

The United States can no longer afford to right every wrong in the world and be the arbiter. In this case we would be arbitrating in the wrong direction.

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

Mr. Speaker, part of our problem here is with President Putin's definition of what is the Russian Nation in his speech to the Duma. When he says the Russian Nation is divided by borders, he is sending a message that, with respect not just to Crimea but other

areas throughout Europe, Russia may be staking a claim.

Here is the difficulty. In Crimea, yes, the population today is majority ethnic Russian, but there was a time when, before Joe Stalin moved a wide segment of the Tatars population into Siberia and before the forced collectivization, there was a time when the majority population was very different than it is today. Fifty-six percent of that ethnic group perished. But this is a problem that we also have in Eastern Europe and in eastern and southern Ukraine, because you had some 8 million Ukrainians also perish during Stalin's rule, and ethnic Russians came into that area as a consequence.

The thing we need to remember is that it is, in fact, the Russian-speaking population in the east, as well as the Ukrainians speaking in the west, that voted for independence for Ukraine, that voted strongly to have a separate state. And if this issue is allowed to stand without the world responding, the question is: Is that argument then made in Latvia and Estonia? Is that argument then made in Latvia and Estonia? Is that argument made in all of the former Russian states?

I do not think in any way this is comparable to Kosovo. In Kosovo, NATO responded to a brutal campaign of ethnic cleansing by former Yugoslavian forces. In Crimea, Russia attempted to justify its actions by fabricating the myth of widespread violence against the ethnic Russian population, even going as far as to equate it to the bloodshed occurring in Syria. Clearly, this is not true. We know it is not true.

In terms of the election itself, opponents were silenced. International monitors were barred. Crimean Tatars themselves boycotted the very election. Voters were not given the option of preserving Crimea's current status within Ukraine. Independence and de facto independence were the only options, and the bogus vote there was also unnecessary because the Ukrainian Government had made it clear that it was willing to discuss increased autonomy for Crimea.

Now, here is the problem going forward. We know the view taken internationally on this subject. The U.N. Security Council condemned Russia's unprovoked aggression against Ukraine, and Russia stood alone—stood absolutely alone in this case—because even Ukrainians themselves have gone to the sites of the Russian media-reported attacks against ethnic Russian minorities to show that that is not occurring. That is, in fact, propaganda. We can't let this stand.

One of the other things we are doing in this bill is improving our broadcasting into Ukraine and the region to dispel these myths and spread the truth about the situation there.

So I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the managers of this legislation, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for their leadership and for their commitment, as I acknowledge the other body as well.

This morning, a bright announcement came from Mr. Putin that he was drawing Russians to a program of exercise in the name of labor and defense. Someone said it is reminiscent of past history, when other despots drew their Nation together in massive public exercises to show the world that they were not going to be part of the world order.

I believe in peace. I believe that we should be engaged, that diplomacy is right. I also don't believe in condemnation of a Nation purely for its ideological disagreement.

In this instance, it is important for the United States to make a public stand. As a member of the Inter-Parliamentary Exchange, meeting with Europeans over the years, I know that they are proud of the democracy that they have maintained since the horrors of World War II.

Today, the United States, with the passage of this legislation, and ultimately hopefully the signing by the President, will tell the world that the United States stands firmly with its own democratic principles. But the people of Ukraine, those in Kiev and places around, will still have the knowledge that America stands by it economically, with loan guarantees, but it also stands against a despot who has illegally moved into a sovereign Nation, with no provocation, undermining the military base of Ukraine. So I would ask my colleagues to join against a despot and for a people and support the underlying legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time, and I also thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this legislation to the floor in a very speedy and efficient manner.

I will also say I have great respect for my friend from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER). He knows a lot about foreign affairs, but we disagree on what the evidence shows in this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said that, "History doesn't repeat itself, but it does rhyme." Well, Russia is quite the poet these days.

In 2008, Russia invaded Georgia and confiscated one-third of that Nation's territory. The world watched, complained a little bit. The world moved on. There were no consequences. And the Russians, Mr. Speaker, are still there. Again, second verse, same as the first.

The "Napoleon of Siberia" has invaded Ukraine and seized Crimea.

Putin is bent on establishing a Soviet-style empire and allegedly uniting Russian-speaking people throughout the world. Well, who knows who his next target will be. It could be our friends in Moldova, the rest of Ukraine, or Estonia.

Russia has been able to maintain dominance over the region because of its vast energy sources, especially natural gas. Six countries in Europe rely 100 percent on Russia for their natural gas. Russia uses gas as a political and economic weapon to manipulate these countries.

I was in Ukraine in winter when Russia turned off the gas for political reasons. It was cold. It was dark. This bill helps disarm that hostage tactic. It includes my amendment that commits the U.S. to helping Ukraine use American natural gas.

There must be consequences for the bully, Putin, for invading other Nations like Ukraine. Justice requires there be consequences. Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about how much time each of us has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California's time has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be allowed to control 3 minutes of my remaining time.

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

There was no objection.

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

What we are doing this morning is the Congress at its best. What we are doing this morning is standing up to a bully and telling him that his actions will not stand. What we are doing is saying that in the 21st century it is no longer acceptable for dictators to invade other countries.

What we are saying to the people of Ukraine is that we stand behind you, we are with you, we haven't forgotten you, and we are going to do everything possible to make you whole again. We are going to do everything possible to let you know the West wants to partner with you. We are going to do everything possible to stand up for freedom and democracy with you.

I think that is a very noble cause. It is not pie in the sky. No one is advocating a war with boots on the ground against Russia, but we are advocating that there have to be some standards in the world.

If we let Putin get away with this, then it sends a green light to Putin that he can continue to do this and to every other despot and dictator around the world that they can do whatever they like and the world is just indifferent or too afraid to act.

I think this is an opportunity, and I think that this is a time when one day

we will be able to say to our grandchildren that we acted together.

I want to again commend Chairman ROYCE for working with me in a bipartisan fashion. We will be going to Ukraine together in a few short weeks to show the Ukrainian people that America stands with them.

I urge my colleagues again to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important bipartisan bill. I commend Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for bringing this measure forward.

Today's legislation makes clear that, as a Nation, we speak with one voice regarding Russia's aggression.

The situation in Ukraine is undoubtedly complex. The history between Crimea and Russia dates back centuries. Close to 60 percent of the population identifies as ethnic Russians.

Several facts are clear: Russia has massed troops and perpetrated a breach of international law with its unwarranted aggression.

The elections in Crimea took place under an illegal occupation. It did not resemble anything close to a real election. Consequently, the results should not and cannot be recognized.

Lastly, there is little doubt that if the world does not act, Russia's territorial aggression will expand and continue. Whatever the complexities, this invasion of a sovereign country is not justified, period.

Today's bill makes clear America will not tolerate Russia's territorial aggression in Ukraine or elsewhere. I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1115

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill.

As Ukraine is fighting for its independence and the people of Ukraine are fighting to preserve and to deepen their democracy, we must stand squarely with them. It has been said here, including by the majority leader, that this is a first step.

I would like to make very clear, we really should be taking, in this bill, another step; we should be providing, in this bill, as was proposed in the Senate and by many of us, some assistance to make sure that the IMF can perform its fullest role.

That was the preference of President Obama. He made it clear we should act, the U.S. We should also be able to help the IMF to act as fully and effectively as possible.

So I think, today, instead of anybody here coming and criticizing the President, they should essentially be supporting him in his efforts to have the fullest array of assistance to Ukrainian democracy.

If this is only the first step, let's take some additional steps and stand together on a bipartisan basis, instead of at times, I think, taking partisan shots verbally at the President of the United States.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the esteemed ranking member of New York (Mr. ENGEL), a dear friend, for yielding time in support of the Ukraine Support Act, H.R. 4278, and for his leadership from the time we traveled to Ukraine together well over a decade ago; and to Congressman ROYCE, the chairman of the committee, to reaffirm America's strong support for liberty and the people of Ukraine at this really critical time in world history and the history of Central and Eastern Europe.

The assistance that is contemplated here is in the form of a loan guarantee and will aid Ukraine's efforts to recover its own missing assets to pay the money back. Ukraine is fully capable of earning its way forward. It is already the third largest grain exporter in the world, so this is nothing that can't be repaid.

In addition, the bill authorizes \$10 million for international broadcasting to Ukraine. I can guarantee you—I did an interview with Voice of America about a week ago—I received emails from people in Ukraine. They are waiting to hear the song of liberty.

Let us sing it loudly by passing this legislation quickly on a bipartisan basis and stand for freedom when it matters most.

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

In closing, let me, again, say what a pleasure it is to work with Chairman ROYCE on a bipartisan basis. You can see, again, strong bipartisan support for this bill.

Ms. KAPTUR didn't mention that she was cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus. We have Members on both sides of the aisle all standing together to say the United States stands with the people of Ukraine. Please vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This is not a new cold war. President Reagan ended the cold war. The way he

did that, frankly, was by leading, but also with a strategy which drove down the price of oil and gas, which was the stranglehold, which not only Russia had over Eastern Europe, but also funded the ability of the former Soviet Union militarily to carry out an expansion program.

Today, you have the circumstance where President Putin relies almost solely—70 percent of the exports, 52 percent of the budget, as I indicated—from a monopoly position on oil and gas.

That is why I think it is very important that we understand what the polls and what the Hungarians understood when they exported 2 billion cubic yards of gas last year to Ukraine in order to try to keep the ability of Russia from manipulating the situation into leading to the very chaos that was brought about.

We need to understand, when the U.S.-EU annual summit just occurred and the EU asked us to be part of a program to ship gas into that market in order to offset this monopoly control and pricing by Russia, that we should be part of this. This is part of this bill.

Also part of the bill is the important consequence of communicating to the people in that region and offsetting the propaganda that Russia right now is sending into the country.

We address that issue, as well, in this legislation, as well as good governance issues, and the steps that are needed in order to reform the economy inside Ukraine in order to set up the rule of law, independent courts.

The polls are on the ground working on this issue right now. The United States needs to support that effort. This sends one last message that, if you are in the business of helping to invade a country, there will be consequences.

I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4278, the "Ukraine Support Act." I support this legislation because I stand in solidarity with the freedom loving people of Ukraine, who are under siege from Russian encroachment.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4278 authorizes \$70 million in aid to Ukraine, including \$50 million for democracy and civil society efforts.

The bill also codifies and expands sanctions imposed this month by the Obama Administration against certain Russian officials and calls on President Obama to sanction Russian officials, corporations and those engaged in the Russian arms sector who have undermined the Ukrainian government or committed human rights abuses. The President is also authorized to examine whether Russia has violated a 1988 arms treaty and permits him to freeze assets and deny visas.

Specifically, the bill authorizes \$50 million for the President to provide assistance to support democracy and strengthen civil society in Ukraine. This assistance is to be used to improve transparency, rule of law, and anti-corruption efforts; strengthen political organizations; and protect independent media as Ukraine prepares for free and fair elections in May.

Additionally, up to \$10 million is authorized for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and Voice of America to increase broadcasts into eastern Ukraine (including Crimea), Moldova and other nearby ethnic Russian communities. The broadcasts should, in particular, counter misinformation from Russia-supported news outlets.

In addition to this direct aid, the bill also supports the people of Ukraine in the following ways:

1. Encourages the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) to prioritize investments in Ukraine;

2. Authorizes \$8 million to help Ukraine develop an independent judiciary and eliminate human rights abuses by law enforcement authorities;

3. Encourages increased U.S. security cooperation among NATO states in Central and Eastern Europe through military training, exercises and the exchange of defense articles, and directs the Secretary of State to report to Congress within 30 days of enactment with a review of U.S. security assistance to that country;

4. Expresses the sense of Congress that the administration should provide expedited assistance to the Ukrainian government to identify and recover assets stolen from the government or linked to corruption by former officials, including former President Viktor Yanukovich; and

5. Offsets the cost of assistance to Ukraine by reducing the \$1.5 billion authorized for Pakistan in the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2009 by \$70 million.

That is why I strongly support the codification of three Presidential executive orders issued in March sanctioning individuals involved in the violence in Ukraine or who undermine the independence, sovereignty, or territorial or economic integrity of Ukraine. Such sanctions could include the seizure of financial assets, the denial of visas, and other penalties.

The sanctions could be ended if the President certifies to Congress that Ukrainian sovereignty, independence or territorial integrity is not being violated by Russia or any other state actor, or after Jan. 1, 2020, if the President certifies that their termination is in the national security interest of the United States.

Finally, the bill requires the President, within 30 days of enactment and within 180 days thereafter for at least two years, to report to Congress on senior Russian political figures who are engaged in such activity.

It also requires the President, along identical timelines, to report to Congress on foreign financial institutions (especially Russian banks) to determine whether they are involved in the confiscation of Ukrainian assets; money laundering, terrorist or proliferation financing, or actively helping to skirt sanctions; or helping to annex Crimea.

The bill expresses the sense of Congress that the President should expand the list of Russian officials—currently at 18—sanctioned for gross human rights violations under the Magnitsky Act of 2012.

Mr. Speaker, it is right that the civilized world, led by the United States, opposes aggression and the violation of territorial sovereignty by the Putin regime.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass H.R. 4278.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 4278, the Ukraine

Support Act. One of the many important initiatives included in this legislation is language urging the President to greatly expand the list of Russian officials and others who have been sanctioned for gross human rights violations. Until this past week, only eighteen had been sanctioned. This is unacceptable. After the recent actions of the Russian Federation, we must expand this list beyond those involved in the death of the Russian anti-corruption lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, whose imprisonment and subsequent death was the impetus for the creation of these sanctions. I am glad to hear that the President just sanctioned 20 additional individuals, freezing their assets and barring U.S. travel. However, more must be done.

Others who deserve to be held accountable for their human rights abuses include militant anti-Westerner Dmitry Kiselyov—head of the Russian government-owned news agency and called the “Kremlin’s New Chief Propagandist” by the Moscow Times—who was recently sanctioned by the European Union, and Maxim Martsinkevich, head of Neo-Nazi extremist group “Occupy Pedophilia” which has engaged in kidnapping and torture. There are others who are allies and friends of Vladimir Putin whom the Administration seems to have avoided placing on the list to avoid Russian retaliation—but it is clear a policy of appeasement has done nothing to deter Putin’s government.

Last month, the State Department released its 2013 county report on human rights practices in Russia, which documented widespread human rights abuses under the Russian government. The report found that “[t]he government continued its crackdown on dissent that began after Vladimir Putin’s return to the presidency,” seeking “to harass, pressure, discredit, and/or prosecute individuals and entities that had voiced criticism of the government.” It depicted a suppressive environment where “law enforcement personnel engaged in torture, abuse, and violence to coerce confessions from suspects,” politically motivated disappearances continued to occur, and conditions in prisons could be harsh or life-threatening. The State Department noted that Russia had adopted several laws discriminating against LGBT individuals, continued to prosecute some religious minorities, and found some authorities “discriminated against ethnic minorities, arbitrarily detaining thousands of migrant workers amid a wave of anti-immigrant sentiment. Laws, actions, and official rhetoric restricting the rights of the LGBT community, migrants, and other minorities coincided with a marked increase in violent attacks against these groups.”

This scathing report makes clear there are more Russian individuals who belong on the sanctioned list. I strongly urge the President to hold these human rights abusers accountable for their crimes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4278, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 24 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1131

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 11 o’clock and 31 minutes a.m.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 32 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1207

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 12 o’clock and 7 minutes p.m.

PROTECTING ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 4302) to amend the Social Security Act to extend Medicare payments to physicians and other provisions of the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UKRAINE SUPPORT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4278) to support the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 19, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—399

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

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

NAYS—19

Amash	Grayson	Rohrabacher
Bentivolio	Jones	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Labrador	Stockman
Burgess	Massie	Yoho
DesJarlais	Mulvaney	Young (AK)
Duncan (TN)	O'Rourke	
Gibson	Posey	

NOT VOTING—13

Amodei	Gutiérrez	Rush
Butterfield	Honda	Schwartz
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Wenstrup
Coble	Miller, Gary	
DelBene	Negrete McLeod	

□ 1233

Messrs. ROKITA and YOHO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. PALAZZO, McNERNEY, and WEBER of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes today. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 148.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 and Thursday, March 27th, 2014 I was unable to be in Washington, DC and vote on the legislative business during these two days. Unfortunately, the tragic

mudslide in Snohomish County, Washington required me to return to my district to help my constituents in the aftermath of this disaster.

I would now like to submit how I would have voted had I been present.

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 142: On Ordering the Previous Question for consideration of H. Res. 524, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted “no.”

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 143: On Adoption of H. Res. 524, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1459, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted “no.”

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 144: On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1228, Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building in Green Bay, Wisconsin. Had I been present I would have voted “yes.”

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 145: On Agreeing to the Tsongas Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted “yes.”

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 146: On the Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted “yes.”

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 147: On Passage of H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted “no.”

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 148: On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4278, Ukraine Support Act. Had I been present I would have voted “yes.”

□ 1245

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, and I am pleased to yield to my friend, Mr. CANTOR, the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, 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. In addition, the House will consider an important bill next week to address the mid-

dle class squeeze by making sure that government policies do not provide incentives for employers to cut hours for their employees. H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act, sponsored by Representative TODD YOUNG of Indiana, will protect hardworking Americans from losing up to 25 percent of their wages as a direct result of ObamaCare’s 30-hour rule.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I expect the House to consider the first of three budget process reform bills next week to help reduce out-of-control spending and improve accountability to the taxpayers. Representative TOM PRICE’s Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, H.R. 1874, will require CBO to provide detailed information on the economic impacts of major legislation as a supplement to CBO cost estimates.

With that, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

The gentleman released an agenda memo about a week ago and talked about a budget coming to the floor of the House of Representatives. My understanding is that the budget will be marked up in committee next week, and my presumption is when we come back, the budget will be on the floor. Is that correct? And if the gentleman can give me maybe some week that it will be on the floor, if not the day.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and he is correct. The Budget chairman, Mr. RYAN, intends to hold a markup next week in his committee, and the expectation is, once that markup occurs next week, that we will have the budget on the floor the following week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Further, it is my understanding, Mr. Leader, that the budget number that the committee will mark to is the budget number that was included in the Ryan-Murray agreement that was adopted by the Congress and signed by the President at \$1.014 trillion in discretionary spending. Is that accurate?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate that that is being honored. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not the firewall that is also included in the Ryan-Murray agreement will be honored as well? The firewall, just an explanation, and I know the majority leader knows, but the firewall between discretionary defense spending and discretionary nondefense spending.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I have not had discussion with the chairman on that particular issue. I am aware of the gentleman’s concern, and I think the gentleman represents his caucus in the desire, unfortunately, to limit the defense spending. I think the question is probably aimed at the fact that we have differences on that because, given what is going on in the world right now, I feel very strongly for the need

for American military power and our ability to project that, not always necessarily to use it, but necessary in our diplomatic role as well, so I don't have an answer to the gentleman on that and refer him to the Budget chair. I am glad to engage in any conversation with him going forward.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Just to make it clear, as I know he would want me to do: I am opposed to the sequester because I think the sequester damages our national security and domestic investments. Frankly, although the 1.014 number is not the sequester number, as the gentleman knows, the following year will be the sequester number because the agreement only lasts for 2 years. My own view is that the number that we are marking to in 2015 is not substantive enough, not sufficient funds to fund the kind of national security that we need in this country, so I am in agreement with the gentleman, but it is a direct consequence, in my view, of the fiscal policies that we have been pursuing. So I want to say to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side—certainly me for 33 years, I have been a very strong supporter of a robust national security because I believe that is essential if we are going to maintain freedom around the world, as well as safety here at home. I know the gentleman and I share that view, and I appreciate his view on that.

Unless he wants to respond, I will go to another issue.

As you know, we filed a discharge petition on H.R. 15, which is the comprehensive immigration bill that we have introduced that reflects, we think, a fix of a broken system, which the majority leader has made clear he shares the view that the system is broken. We would hope that that bill could be brought to the floor. We would hope that at least 218 Members would sign that. We have approximately 235 Members who have said publicly to the press and to the public that they are for comprehensive immigration reform. We would hope that that would lead them to sign the discharge petition so we in fact could bring that bill to the floor.

Does the gentleman have any idea when or if some immigration reform legislation will be brought to this floor so that we can deal with a system that is obviously causing a great deal of difficulty in our country and is, in fact, a broken system?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, and he knows and he and I have spoken, that most of our conference feels strongly that the existing system is broken. We have got to do something about maintaining the enforcement and implementation of the law. We have to do something about the antiquated system of legal immigration to address the needs of our country.

The problem has been, Mr. Speaker, that there is a serious deterioration in

the trust factor with what is going on in terms of the White House and its execution and implementation of the laws. I recall, Mr. Speaker, a prior conversation that my friend, the Democratic whip, and I have had on this floor about the trust factor. I in one instance even indicated to the gentleman that the comprehensive health care law that was passed, now in the vernacular known as ObamaCare, is an example of where we have seen that the White House has by whim, seemingly, chosen to either waive provisions, extend deadlines without consultation with Congress, seemingly without awareness of what the law says. That is not a good way to operate. It is not something that increases the confidence and trust of the American people. So I would say to the gentleman, there is no interest in picking up a comprehensive bill like that if we can't trust that once the law is set, that the White House is going to necessarily implement the law as it stands.

So I am sorry to say to the gentleman that the situation of trust is how it is, but perhaps he could do some good by talking to the White House and telling the White House the law is the law, and for their unilateral actions taking place and failing to implement the law is a very troubling thing for a lot of us and a lot of the constituents that we represent.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when I ask this question we usually do change the subject to get on the Affordable Care Act. There is hardly any subject that motivates my friends on the other side of the aisle more to say something than the Affordable Care Act.

If the gentleman believes that trust is the issue and that we can't trust the President to do any of the laws that we pass, then we ought to just stop doing things. As a matter of fact, that is just about what we have done, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that is the strategy—to pass message bills with no expectation that they will pass either the Senate and be signed by the President, and maybe all we are doing is treading water.

My own view would be that the American public expects more than that. If it is broken, as the gentleman says it is, and he says just now a significant number, I don't know if it is a majority of his caucus, believe it is broken, then they have passed out bills out of their committee. This is not a question of trust; this is a question of can this House act. We can't control what the President does. We can't control what the United States Senate does. But as the majority leader well knows, Mr. Speaker, in times past I have said what we can control is what we do. What we can do is pass policy that we think is good policy, or at least that a majority of us think is a good policy, to fix a system.

We believe strongly that a comprehensive immigration bill is good for this country. Not only do we believe it is morally right to do, but we also be-

lieve that economically it is right to do. In fact, CBO scores the passage of a comprehensive immigration bill as a substantial help to the budget deficit. That we take people, put them on the tax rolls, make sure they are paying the taxes that are due, and make sure that our country is getting the revenues that it should be getting from those who are working in our country.

In fact, of course, in addition to that, if you talk to many people in industry, that is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has urged us to pass a comprehensive reform bill, it is why the AFL-CIO has urged us to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill, and it is why the agricultural community, the growers of America, have urged us to pass a comprehensive immigration bill, and it is why farm-worker representatives have urged us to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill, and why most faith-based organizations in America have urged us to pass a comprehensive immigration bill.

I know there are some Members who would vote against it, but I urge my friend, the majority leader: bring it to the floor. I have said this before, but the Speaker made it very clear that he was going to lead this House in a way that would allow the House to work its will. If the majority of this House doesn't trust the President and they don't want to vote for H.R. 15, so be it. They will do that; they will vote "no."

But I believe there are the votes on the floor to pass comprehensive immigration reform, and the only reason it is not passing is because it is not brought to the floor. For that reason, Mr. Majority Leader, I would ask you, as respectfully as I can, to put the bill on the floor. You may well be right. Your party, which if it all votes together, could defeat a comprehensive immigration bill. If your party believes that is good policy and because of a lack of trust of the President, that should be the road that you go down, then fine. Let the American people see that.

If, however, there are at least very close to half of this House who are going to be signing that discharge petition, believe that it is good policy, and if, in fact, Speaker BOEHNER meant what he said, that he was going to allow the House to work its will, I would urge the majority leader to let the House work its will and bring that bill to the floor. Open it up for amendments. If the gentleman's party wants to offer amendments or my side wants to offer amendments, let that be the case. But let us let the House at least have the opportunity to work its will on this very, very important bill that we think is one of the most critical issues that we ought to be addressing.

I yield to my friend if he would like to respond.

□ 1300

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, all I would like to say to the gentleman is

he and I disagree that there would be a majority of votes for H.R. 15. It is a reflection of the comprehensive Senate bill, and I don't believe we have a majority in this House for that bill.

I would furthermore ask the gentleman whether he thinks—or I would just say that perhaps it would be more constructive that we sit down and begin to talk about where we can go in a direction that we have in common, that we feel that we can agree on things rather than differences; rather than filing discharge petitions, perhaps it would be a little more constructive to sit down, instead of demanding our way or the highway.

Again, too much of that has been the way this town has worked over the last several years, and it is unfortunate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. He and I have a difference of opinion. We discussed this the last time, as I recall. We have a difference of opinion. He thinks it would not pass. I think it would pass.

The good news for America is there is a very easy way to determine who is right and who is wrong. Put the bill on the floor, give the House a vote, give America a vote. If I am wrong, I will stand up on the floor of the House and say I was wrong.

I am sure that my friend, the majority leader, will do the same if, in fact, he is wrong, but we have an easy way in America to resolve such differences because we all have differences of opinion.

In a democracy, you vote. In a democracy, you resolve differences by coming together. I look forward to sitting down with the gentleman on this issue. I would reiterate I look forward to dealing with him on other issues as we have been able to do in many instances. I thank him for that opportunity.

We can resolve this difference by simply bringing the bill to the floor, giving America a vote, and letting the House work its will. Unless the gentleman wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

HR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, April 1, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

HONORING KIM RUBIN

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extremely important person. Today marks 25 years that Kim Rubin has worked here on Capitol Hill.

In the 1980s, Kim Rubin accepted an internship with former Congressman Jack Kemp from her home State of New York. She has come a long way since then. She has been with me, I am proud to say, since day one that I served in the United States Congress.

I have never met anyone more loyal, more dependable, or more organized. Not only does Kim coordinate our office's schedule and those of our entire staff, she works diligently as our office manager.

Somehow, she still has the time and energy to be a dedicated wife to her loving husband, Howie, and also to her two beautiful daughters, Lexi and Livi. She is also a volleyball coach, and her nickname is Coach K.

As Kim says, her life is centered on faith, family, and pursuing what makes you happy. I don't know how Kim does it all, but it has been an honor to work with Kim Rubin for these past 8 years.

While we will part ways after we both retire this year, I know I will have a lifelong friend in the indomitable Kim Rubin.

Congratulations and thank you, Kim Rubin.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

(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, the Endangered Species Act was signed into law in 1973, in order to preserve, protect, and recover key domestic species.

The ESA also contains a citizen lawsuit provision, which allows private citizens—and, in many cases, special interest organizations—to sue Federal agencies and private landowners for allegedly failing to comply with ESA. Taxpayers are on the hook, even when the Federal Government prevails.

The Forest Service, which I had the privilege of holding jurisdiction over as chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, must comply with ESA before engaging in any kind of forest management activity, which is the agency's most basic and fundamental role.

Protecting species is our goal, but unfortunately, this provision has been used as a tool by those who would like to halt land management activities.

The financial impact of these activities in the Forest Service is significant, posing a threat to the forest health, the economic well-being of local communities, and also the species we are aiming to protect.

We must replace this flawed policy with one that protects taxpayers and species restoration, but also the health of our forests and our local economies.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Orders speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

WEEK IN REVIEW

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a surprising twist today: Who says there is nothing surprising in Washington? We were told there was potential for a bill to come to the floor today to deal with the issue of the SGR, sustainable growth rate, or the doc fix, as it is sometimes called.

There has been some disagreement in our party what would be the best way to handle it. We had a bill. It was a 1-year extension, 1 year that included some other things that some of the people that are providing the care that haven't been properly treated in reimbursement areas we are not happy about.

So it appeared we didn't have—or our leaders may not have had the votes, and so it is quite a surprise that was voice-voted. No one asked for a recorded vote because normally, see, we trust our leaders that, if there is an important bill, that part of the leadership understand, someone here, part of the bill will request a recorded vote, and we will get a recorded vote, and we will all be able to either vote for or vote against.

Otherwise, we have to keep people here all the time, and it did bring back to mind the time that was not so fond back in 2007, 2008, sometimes 2009 and 2010, when on the first day back in Washington, whether it was a Monday or a Tuesday, the first day, there is suspension bills.

Those are bills that are expected to pass and have two-thirds of the body vote for them, naming courthouses, naming Federal buildings, recognizing some important person or deed, those type of things.

They are generally agreed to, and despite all the negativity in Washington, those are things that we agreed to constantly; and both sides of the aisle worked together getting it accomplished.

We saw very quickly, after Republicans lost the majority in November of 2006, sometimes Republican leadership would agree to allow some suspensions to go when it was extremely important. It should never have been brought to the floor on suspension, which means it doesn't go through subcommittee, it doesn't go through committee.

It just comes to the floor, without having gone through Rules Committee,

and that is why it takes two-thirds of a vote, because it bypassed the normal procedure.

There were a handful of us who decided back in 2007, since Republican leadership at that time were agreeing to things that we knew our other friends in the Republican side, some friends on the Democratic side would never vote for, if it was a recorded vote, where everyone had a chance to vote—I started flying back early. I know TOM PRICE did at times; LYNN WESTMORELAND did at times.

I got to where I was flying back, even if I thought somebody else was covering the floor. The reason was to make sure that, since we couldn't trust that our leadership would not agree to some bill that we thought was hurtful to the country, was hurtful to the Constitution or to our constituents, we had to be here to ask for a recorded vote.

It went unnoticed except by leadership staff on both sides, and it got to where, when I came to the floor and would sit here for 3 or 4 hours, I would have staff come up, usually Democratic staff, since they were in the majority, and say: Well, obviously, you are concerned about some issue.

Sometimes, I was just here to observe, to make sure nothing was brought to the floor without any notice. Sometimes, there was a particular suspension that I felt should have a recorded vote, so I would show up, and I would, after the voice vote, request a recorded vote.

That is why staff started coming up and saying: Look, which one are you going to demand a recorded vote on or are you going to object to?

Sometimes, I would get up and speak against the bill. It got to where if I had an objection, they knew—because I'd done it between the time of the call for a recorded vote—I would go back to my office; I would type up a notice on why a bill was not a good bill.

I would be standing at the door, get a few other people to stand at other doors to hand out little fliers to Members of Congress as they came to the floor explaining why it wasn't a good bill.

Sometimes, I won; sometimes, I lost, but all you had to get was one more than one-third of the votes to bring down a suspension. So we were able to deal with that issue and make sure that, you know, people knew if you are going to try to pull that stuff, we are going to have people sit here, so that you can't just pass something on a voice vote without it being called for a recorded vote.

I was very surprised today with us in the majority, our own leadership in charge, with something as important as the doctor fix would be brought to the floor on a voice vote.

I would have come over earlier, except it was in recess, back in session, recess, back in session. I didn't know how long the recesses were going to be, but now, I know that I need to get with some other Members and make sure we

have people on the floor, since we won't be sure what our own leadership is going to do.

That is very unfortunate. It is unfortunate. You need to be able to trust your own leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's, on another matter, very important that we note that this year's Margaret Sanger Award would go to former Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

I have an article here from American Thinker, dated yesterday. Jeannie DeAngelis wrote the article. I won't read the whole article, but it points out that any woman willing to call late term abortion "sacred ground" and make false accusations that the opposing political party voting for the Protect Life Act would leave pregnant women "dying on the floor" deserves an award named after eugenicist Margaret Sanger.

NANCY PELOSI will be given the Margaret Sanger Award, which Planned Parenthood considers its "highest honor."

Further down, it says:

A committed socialist, Margaret Sanger once said, "My own personal feelings drew me toward the individualist anarchist philosophy, but it seemed necessary to approach the idea by way of the socialism." Sanger said.

□ 1315

She also said this:

This is the great day of social planning. We have come to believe in planning the production and distribution of goods. We plan methods of governing cities, States, and the Nation. We plan jobs and leisure time activities and vacations. We plan almost everything, big and little, except families.

Sanger goes on to say:

It can scarcely do any harm—and it may do a vast amount of good—to engage in the thoughtful planning of our population, a population with a still larger percentage of happy families.

An active worker for the Socialist Party, Sanger believed:

The more radical the ideas, the more conservative you must be in your dress.

Saul Alinsky said:

Dresses his crusades in vestments of morality.

The article says:

For Margaret Sanger, eugenics was an avenue to improve the human race by discouraging people with genetic defects or undesirable traits—Blacks, immigrants, and poor people—whom she called "human weeds, reckless breeders, spawning human beings who never should have been born."

Further down, it points out another irony, which is that Italian American NANCY PATRICIA D'ALESSANDRO PELOSI had grandparents named Maria and Tommaso, who immigrated to America from Italy. If Margaret Sanger had had her eugenic way with Maria Foppiani-Petronilla, Ms. PELOSI wouldn't be here, let alone be receiving an award.

In February of 1919, in the Birth Control Review, Sanger published an article entitled, "Birth Control and Racial Betterment."

In 1934, Sanger wrote an article entitled, "America Needs a Code for Ba-

bies: Plea for Equal Distribution of Births." Ms. Sanger's baby code said that people with bad genes, or dysgenic groups, should be given a choice between sterilization and segregation. Those who willingly chose sterilization should be rewarded by contributing to a superior race.

In article 6, Sanger suggested issuing parenthood permits that would be valid for no more than one birth.

Despite being lionized by socialist liberals, Margaret "every child a wanted child" Sanger's legacy is one of murder, racism, revulsion for the handicapped, intrinsic disgust for the male gender, and a form of twisted radicalism that viewed God-ordained marriage and the miracle of life with contempt.

Margaret Sanger's life was committed to curing what she viewed as the "urgent problem" of how to "limit and discourage the overfertility of the mentally and physically defective."

It should be noted that, in the past, our former Secretary of State, Secretary Clinton, received the same Margaret Sanger Award, who believed in eugenics, who believed it was a good thing to limit the births of races who, perhaps, were too poor, who she thought were dysgenic.

This article from, actually, March 31, 2009, Catholic Online, points out:

A day before receiving the Planned Parenthood Federation of America's highest honor, the Margaret Sanger Award, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton paid a visit to the basilica of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Mexico City, leaving a bouquet of white flowers "on behalf of the American people."

When leaving the basilica a half an hour later, Secretary Clinton told some of the Mexicans who were gathered outside to greet her, "You have a marvelous virgin."

The following day, Friday, March 27, Clinton was in Houston to receive the Margaret Sanger Award, named for the organization's founder, a noted eugenicist. Secretary Clinton, according to a State Department transcript of Secretary Clinton's remarks, said this:

I admire Margaret Sanger enormously—her courage, her tenacity, her vision. When I think about what she did all those years ago in Brooklyn, taking on archetypes, taking on attitudes and accusations flowing from all directions, I am really in awe of her.

Another article points out, from The Weekly Standard, April 15, 2009, that Secretary Clinton stands by her praise of eugenicist Margaret Sanger.

Secretary Clinton points out:

Now, I have to tell you that it was a great privilege when I was told I would receive this award. I admire Margaret Sanger enormously—her courage, her tenacity, her vision.

It is probably worth looking at exactly what Margaret Sanger stood for since she is so admired by our former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who could end up being President, and our former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI. Let's look at exactly what Margaret Sanger said. Here are some quotes from Margaret Sanger.

The most merciful thing that the large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it.

That is Margaret Sanger. That is Margaret Sanger, whose name adorns

an award that was so revered by Secretary Clinton and now by our former Speaker PELOSI. It is unbelievable that anybody would be held in high esteem who would make that statement:

The most merciful thing that the large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it.

For heaven's sake. That is not all. She had plenty more to say.

We should apply a stern and rigid policy of sterilization and segregation to that grade of population whose progeny is tainted or whose inheritance is such that objectionable traits may be transmitted to offspring.

That was from "A Plan for Peace," from the Birth Control Review in April of 1932. The first quote I read was "Woman and the New Race" from chapter 6, "The Wickedness of Creating Large Families."

Then from "America Needs a Code for Babies," in March of 1934, article 1:

The purpose of the American baby code shall be to provide for a better distribution of babies and to protect society against the propagation and increase of the unfit.

You see, it is important to note here that what this kind of code does is say that we need a governing body that will decide who they think is fit and who they think is unfit. Gee, how about that? In ObamaCare, we have a panel that will decide. You get a pacemaker. You don't get a pacemaker. We know your hip is giving you a lot of pain, but you are just not worth a new hip. Do you need a new knee? Ah, we have looked at your life, and we have looked at your age. You don't get a new knee. You just suffer and die.

I mean, it is unbelievable that a bill would pass that sets up a board that will decide who can get a pacemaker to allow him to live and who will not, who will get the lifesaving medication and who will not. I don't want an insurance company making that decision, and I don't want the government making that decision. I had a bill that would have avoided that kind of thing, but of course, it didn't come to the floor when Democrats were in the majority. They brought, instead, ObamaCare, setting up that board.

Let's go back to quotes from Margaret Sanger.

Article 4, from her "America Needs a Code for Babies," says:

No woman shall have the legal right to bear a child—and no man shall have the right to become a father—without a permit.

Hey, there is good news. All you have to do is be politically ingratiated enough with the government under Margaret Sanger's code and they will give you a permit to have a baby, because they will consider you fit. Chances are, if you are of an opposing political view of those who are handing out the permits, you won't get a permit because you may have a child that disagrees with the people handing out the permits.

It quotes article 6:

No permit for parenthood shall be valid for more than one birth.

This was Margaret Sanger.

She also said, in 1932, in the April Birth Control Review:

Give dysgenic groups—that's people with bad genes—in our population their choice of segregation or compulsory sterilization.

In 1922, she said:

Birth control must lead, ultimately, to a cleaner race.

Gee, the Nazis were pretty good about pushing a cleaner race, but thank God they were completely wrong about the White superhuman race. I always loved that about Jesse Owens. He went there, to the heart of the Nazis, and showed them they were wrong about their superhuman race, and yet here we have a woman, Margaret Sanger, being held in such great, high esteem, who thinks we need a cleaner race, according to her whims.

Here is another quote from the esteemed Margaret Sanger. This is from "The Need for Birth Control in America." It is quoted by Angela Franks:

Such parents swell the pathetic ranks of the unemployed. Feeble-mindedness perpetuates itself from the ranks of those who are blandly indifferent to their racial responsibilities, and it is largely this type of humanity we are now drawing upon to populate our world for the generations to come. In this orgy of multiplying and replenishing the Earth, this type is *pari passu* multiplying and perpetuating those direct evils in which we must, if civilization is to survive, extirpate by the very roots.

Here is another quote. This is from "Family Limitation," Margaret Sanger's eighth edition, in 1918:

Women of the working class, especially wage workers, should not have more than two children at most. The average working man can support no more, and the average working woman can take care of no more in decent fashion.

So that is Margaret Sanger. She is there to tell the world repeatedly that we need a government that will restrict the feeble-minded or maybe, according to her, these disgusting women who work for wages. Ah, we can't let them have many children. Yet some have the nerve to say that Republicans have a war on women when you look at the heroine of the left, and she was for eugenics. She was a racist. She was a classist—a divider—who wanted and thought the best thing a large family could do was to kill a baby. We consider her a hero?

Forbid it, Almighty God.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle don't have a single person on this side of the aisle who want children to go hungry or who want children to have a worse life than we have. I know that, but it is all about the way of getting there.

□ 1330

So there are those of us who think the best thing a person could have for their own self-respect and their own freedom and their own ability to remove themselves from the ties and chains, the strings that come with money from the government, is to get them a job. Grow the economy so they can have a job and the self-respect and the freedom that comes from that.

I know they have the best of intentions on the other side of the aisle, but I don't think that you help individuals by paying them not to work. Let's get the economy going so they can work and be free from all the strings and entanglements that come from handouts from the government.

I would never call somebody on the other side of the aisle a racist or a hater of the poor. So it gets a little disgusting when I hear that about people on my side of the aisle. We don't want anybody to suffer.

We have seen the likes of Margaret Sanger who think they know better. Get the government in charge, and then we will order people to be sterilized. And we will give you money if you will be sterilized. That is what government does.

Strings come with the money. They always do. We need the government to give out less money because people need less money because they are able to earn it for themselves with all the freedom that means. That is what we want for America. That is what the Founders wanted. And that makes for a much more free America.

In that regard, when it comes to freedom, I know the people that voted for ObamaCare thought it was going to be a great idea, even though most of them had never read it like I did. Because I could see it was a threat to all kinds of freedoms, and I could see before the vote there were provisions in there that allowed for clinics to get Federal money to provide abortion and to have insurance policies that would end up providing abortion.

So I was shocked this week at the Supreme Court. I wasn't in the courtroom. I was listening in a side room for members of the Supreme Court Bar. I was shocked to hear somebody on the Supreme Court actually take the position, Well, just pay the tax and then you can have your religious views.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. Our Founders knew that. Taxation helped cause a revolution. And in fairness to the people of the District of Columbia, they are the only group who, under the Constitution, are not allowed to have a full voting Member of Congress, and who are required nonetheless to pay Federal income tax. Puerto Rico, Samoa, Mariana Islands, all of those that are territories, under the Constitution they are not entitled to a full voting Representative and do not pay Federal income tax.

Franklin made clear during the Revolution that if we do not get to elect one member of the parliament, then that parliament has no right to put taxes on us. I agree. So when Democrats were in charge, I had a bill. They wouldn't bring my bill to the floor. Now the Republicans are in the majority. They haven't so far—or our leaders haven't. I think it is only fair. They don't get to vote for a full voting Member of the House. So in fairness, the way to fix that legislatively is just to do for the District of Columbia what

we do for Puerto Rico, Guam, Samoa, and the Mariana Islands. You don't pay Federal income tax. That would be fair.

There are all kinds of things that aren't fair. But when it comes to intrusions by the government onto religious beliefs, the line cannot be drawn so that it excludes religious beliefs and the ability to practice them.

For anyone, especially a Supreme Court Justice, and even someone who worked for President Obama as Solicitor General, who said—and I am paraphrasing because she didn't say these words—I never did my job when it came to ObamaCare. I didn't talk to the administration about it. I didn't talk to them about what would help them when it came before the Supreme Court. So I didn't do my job as Solicitor General, and that is why I am qualified to be on the Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, the Senate bought that. That is the implied position. They bought that. She is on the Supreme Court. She lights into the Hobby Lobby attorney immediately. But to come around and say, Just pay the tax, then you can have your religious beliefs, you can practice your religious beliefs, it is not that expensive—what's next?

As a judge who has signed death penalty orders, I have struggled with that issue. I believe in some cases it is appropriate. I thought it was totally appropriate in Jasper, Texas, after three people were convicted of dragging an African American behind their truck. Once they had a fair trial, fair appeal, properly convicted, I wouldn't have had a problem with a law that said the victim's family gets to choose the truck and the terrain over which they drag the defendants to their deaths.

When we give the power to decide who gets to practice firmly held religious beliefs to a Supreme Court or to a 218-vote majority in the House, this Republic and the freedoms it has provided more than any Nation in history can't be much longer for the world—not those freedoms—not when Congress will stand by and allow those to be taken.

I think everybody that was here for that vote on ObamaCare knows good and well that if the intention of this government had been made clear that they were going to force people to go against firmly held Catholic beliefs, Christian beliefs, that bill would have never passed. And now they seek to enforce what would never have passed if their intentions had been made clear—it is before the Supreme Court. And who knows what they will do.

Mr. Speaker, my hopes and prayers are still for ongoing religious freedom promised under the First Amendment, and that they will not be taken away on our watch. But that kind of depends on the American people and the people they put in office and the people they allow to serve on the Supreme Court.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4152. An act to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1827. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the American Fighter Aces, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service and defense of our country's freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the history of our country, our economic development, is predicated on our infrastructure development. Early in our history, canals, ports, postal roads, and 152 years ago, the transcontinental railroad—audacious at the time—proved to be a critical element of tying our nation together, fueling economic growth and communication.

Later, we had the interstate freeway system, which had its genesis going back over a century, nurtured in the basement of Franklin Roosevelt's White House, signed into law, and advocated by President Eisenhower.

One wonders: Could this Congress in Washington, D.C., today have produced the transcontinental railroad, the interstate highway system, provided the resources, the resolve, the research to send humans to the Moon? You have to pay for it. You have to take a risk. You have to have a plan and a design.

Sadly, it appears that that is lacking at this point.

I spent years on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, which I finally left to go to Ways and Means and to serve on the Budget Committee to try and deal with the financing issue.

In 187 days, the highway trust fund is exhausted. It is not just that the reauthorization extension expires on September 30, but we have drawn the trust fund balances down to zero. It is already starting to be felt around the country. Because you cannot manage the multibillion-dollars worth of commitments that the Federal Government has made in partnership with State and local communities and the private sector without having some range of a financial cushion, probably on the order of \$4 billion.

So that means that the Federal Government is going to start delaying the release of funding and having to choose which obligations it honors well before

September 30. That means cutting back funding this summer is going to make a difference for local communities later this spring. Already, States are dealing with this uncertainty and making decisions, putting at risk, in some cases, construction seasons.

I think we have reached the point that there are no more cans to kick over or seat cushions to reach behind. If that doesn't make sense to you, sleight of hand, to use another general fund fix.

We have transferred outright over \$50 billion to the general fund since 2008, and we have backfilled by using the Recovery Act, or the so-called stimulus funding. We made an adjustment in the Tax Code dealing with provisions for retirement benefits that were adjusted that somehow gave us a little headroom that enabled us to fund a 27-month extension.

But we are running out of these fixes, and we are not giving the certainty that the private sector, local governments, State governments, that our communities need to be able to deal with the more complicated, more expensive, longer-term projects, especially those that may involve more than one State, those that may be multimodal in nature. These expensive and complicated projects require steady, stable sources of funding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 21 years since the Federal Government last adjusted the gas tax. It was 1993. That is back when gasoline was \$1.08 a gallon. It is back when there were fewer demands in terms of the highway trust fund, when cars were less fuel-efficient.

In the course of that time, we have watched inflation eat away at the value of that 18.4 cents a gallon that people pay for their Federal gas tax, and because people are using more fuel-efficient cars and because the vehicle miles traveled have been reduced for 9 consecutive years, the amount that the individual pays per mile to support our Federal transportation infrastructure has been cut by more than 50 percent. And Congress has been dancing around this issue.

□ 1345

I have proposed that we adopt the recommendation of the Simpson-Bowles Commission that was so widely heralded 3 years ago, to have a phased 3-year increase in the gas tax.

I would note that it is supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, by the AFL-CIO, by local governments, by transit agencies, environmentalists, by professional groups and organizations, local officials.

It is interesting that the AAA, representing auto users, and the trucking industry have both said: Federal Government, you should raise the fuel tax—not that we are wild about the fuel tax, but because the costs of not doing it are going to cost our motorists, going to cost our trucking industry and the American economy far more than the few cents per gallon that would be paid.

I have also introduced legislation that would extend the vehicle mile traveled experiment that Oregon has been doing over the course of the last 10 years. That would allow States to experiment with a different approach that wouldn't be based on gallons of fuel consumed, but based on actual road use, so that people can experiment for themselves to see if this is a promising solution.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 15 years, I have watched blue ribbon commissions come forward impeded by Republicans and Democrats.

I have listened to the testimony from the business community, from organized labor, from local government, from experts all across the scale who have recommended that we step up and adequately fund the highway trust account, so that we can provide the certainty and the capacity to be able to rebuild and renew America.

I, for one, am open to all sorts of suggestions; but it is interesting to note, when my friend DAVE CAMP introduced his tax reform proposal that would have allowed some space for the highway trust fund, which was announced on the same day that President Obama—who I think sincerely is interested in infrastructure—a proposal for \$300 billion—over \$300 billion—that both proposals were pronounced dead on arrival, that they had no political backing, they had very little likelihood of being passed.

When they made their announcements, they were not joined by labor, by business, by local government, by the professions, by people in both parties who are concerned with getting on with business.

I will have more to say, but I have been joined by a couple of my colleagues who are concerned about this, who have been working in this arena, who have some proposals, and I would turn first to my colleague from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), who has been working in this space, adding to the conversation in a way to help us move forward. I am happy to yield to him for some comments.

Mr. DELANEY. I thank my good friend from Oregon for your really singular leadership on this issue and your unwavering commitment to make sure these problems get solved.

Mr. Speaker, every 2 years, the American Society of Civil Engineers does an analysis of the U.S. infrastructure needs and an assessment of our infrastructure as it relates to our competitors around the world.

In this last analysis they did, they produced a report card, where they graded each component of U.S. infrastructure. They also gave us a composite grade, and that grade was a D-plus. A D-plus, Mr. Speaker, was the grade that the U.S. infrastructure received from the American Society of Civil Engineers.

They estimated further that the amount of investment we would need to make as a country to bring our in-

frastructure up to a high standard is \$3 trillion to \$4 trillion. \$3 trillion to \$4 trillion, Mr. Speaker, is the gap, the investment gap in the infrastructure in the United States of America.

This creates a very significant challenge for us as a Nation, as we look to compete in a global and technology-enabled world. To successfully compete in a global and technology-enabled world, you need world-class transportation, energy, communications, and infrastructure to be able to compete successfully.

It also creates a great opportunity for us, as a Nation, because investing in our infrastructure is proven to be one of the great jobs programs in this country. It creates middle-skilled jobs. Infrastructure disproportionately creates middle-skilled jobs, which is what we need in this country.

We are actually creating high-skilled jobs at a decent rate, we are creating low-skilled jobs at a decent rate; but we are not creating middle-skilled jobs for middle-class Americans, the kind of Americans that built this country, saved this country, and saved the world, and that is a great tragedy. Investing in our infrastructure will do that.

It also happens to pencil out, Mr. Speaker. Across time, the data strongly suggests that for every dollar we spend on infrastructure, we get \$1.92 of economic benefit as a Nation.

It will create jobs in the short term, it will make us more competitive in the long term, and it is a fundamentally good investment for us to make as a country.

As we think about filling this infrastructure hole, we should analyze how we actually invest in infrastructure in this country, and there are really four ways we do it.

First, government. Federal Government, State governments, and local governments actually grant money to build infrastructure, particularly infrastructure that is used for the public or common good. That is an important role of government, and government is unique in its ability to do that.

The second way we build infrastructure is through financing it with user fees. Things like the highway trust fund that my colleague referred to have largely been financed through our gas tax. There are other examples, at airports, et cetera, where we charge user fees, and that money is collected, and we build infrastructure with it.

The third way we build infrastructure in this country is through public-private partnerships, where we go to the private sector, and for certain types of infrastructure, we get the private sector to build the infrastructure.

Finally, the fourth way we build infrastructure is we finance it. In other words, State governments and local governments borrow money to build infrastructure.

These are the four ways we build infrastructure in this country. If we actually want to close this infrastructure

investment gap that we have, if we actually want to close this \$3 trillion to \$4 trillion gap, if we want to bring our infrastructure from a D-plus grade to something we would be more proud of, like an A grade, we need to be bolstering all four of these methods.

The good news, Mr. Speaker, is that there are bipartisan ways of doing all of these things, and that is what we need to focus on. One example of a bipartisan solution to this problem is a piece of legislation that I introduced with several colleagues almost a year ago. It is called the Partnership to Build America Act.

The Partnership to Build America Act, as of today, has 29 House Republicans on it and 29 House Democrats on it. It was also introduced in the Senate about a month ago with a dozen Senators, also bipartisan.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, the Partnership to Build America Act is the most significant piece of bipartisan economic legislation in the whole of the Congress, and what it does is it creates a large-scale infrastructure financing vehicle called the American infrastructure fund, which will be capitalized for 50 years and be used by States and local governments to build and finance infrastructure.

The money in the American infrastructure fund, Mr. Speaker, is not put in by the Federal Government, but it is put in by corporations who invest and buy very low-cost bonds to finance the American infrastructure fund over 50 years.

As an incentive to get them to put this money in, we allow them to bring back a certain amount of their overseas earnings—their overseas cash back to the United States tax-free.

Almost half of corporate tax is sitting overseas because of flaws in our international tax system. This allows for over \$200 billion of that money to come back, a quarter of which would have to be invested in the American infrastructure fund, and create a 50-year revolving financing vehicle to help close this gap.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Partnership to Build America Act is a real example of bipartisan progress to solve an important problem facing this Nation, to get Americans to work, make us more competitive in the long term, and use our precious resources in a wise and prudent manner that pencils out. It will be the category killer for the financing challenge we have around infrastructure.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will close by reminding everyone of the importance of this issue. Investing in our infrastructure should be our top domestic economic priority. It should be our top jobs program.

We should be bolstering all the ways we have in this Nation to build our infrastructure; and the good news, Mr. Speaker, is we can do it in a bipartisan way.

I yield back to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman joining us and couldn't agree more about the critical nature of investing in our economy and putting people to work. Millions of jobs are at stake, jobs that won't be outsourced overseas. I appreciate your joining in that conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like next to turn to the dean of the Oregon delegation, someone with whom I have been privileged to work for over 3 decades. Congressman PETER DEFAZIO is a senior member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, ranking member of Natural Resources, somebody who I have found to be tireless in his promotion of infrastructure investment, creative in terms of ways to approach it.

Mr. Speaker, I think a number of us would be open to any mechanism that provides steady, predictable resources that would be able to meet the needs because, before you can have public-private partnerships so you can deal with financing, you have got to have the underlying funding.

There is nobody who has spent more time and creativity and taken more risks to advance that than my friend and colleague, PETER DEFAZIO.

I am very pleased that you have joined us to be a part of this conversation and can't say enough for your tireless efforts to try and make sure that we realize the promise of infrastructure investment and that we actually do it.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman. I thank Congressman BLUMENAUER for his leadership, a former member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

We have sent him over to the Ways and Means Committee because we can put forward the need, we can document what we need to build and rebuild; but, in the end, someone has got to be responsible for raising the money, and, ultimately, it is going to be Ways and Means, and Earl has certainly taken a point position there.

We are at an unprecedented point. We haven't been here before since the creation of the national highway program under President Dwight David Eisenhower.

On October 1—or before then even, the trust funds established by Eisenhower, financed by user fees, gas tax, diesel tax, and some other fees on excise taxes, et cetera—but, principally, the fuel tax—is going to be depleted to the point where, if we don't act before October 1, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the obligation authority, that is, the amount of money the Federal Government could invest, beginning next October 1, in any and all transportation projects across the United States of America—roads, bridges, highways, transit—will drop to zero—zero.

Now, this is not one of these other phony cliffs around here that have been

created by an intransigent majority and a bunch of grandstanders. This is real. This is real.

Think of what that means to the States. To my State, it means a loss of about \$450 million of Federal aid to fund our Federal highway system in the State of Oregon.

It means that all across America, you are talking about millions of jobs and incredible lost opportunities in terms of creating new jobs and dealing with a crumbling infrastructure, which has already been discussed a little bit before me.

So Congress has to get serious about this. You can't whistle by the graveyard on this one. You can't pretend it is not a fake crisis. It is a real crisis.

Congressman BLUMENAUER explained how it has happened over the years. We haven't raised the gas tax since 1993.

Now, a lot of people look at 4 bucks a gallon at the pump come Memorial Day, and they say: that damn government taking all that money.

No. 18.4 cents went to the Federal Government in 1993 when gas was about a buck a gallon, and in 2014, when ExxonMobil jacks it up over \$4 for the Memorial Day holiday, 18.4 cents will go to the Federal Government.

□ 1400

I would be a lot happier at those higher prices if I knew some of it was going to rebuild our crumbling bridges, some of it was going to fill in the potholes and deal with the failing pavement, some of it was going to the deficit in our transit infrastructure, which is about \$70 billion. The nice thing, if we make those investments which have already been mentioned, it creates about 20,000 jobs for every \$1 billion dollars we spend—and not just construction jobs. You have engineering jobs. You have technical support jobs. You have small business suppliers. In transit, you have manufacturing jobs. You have even high-tech jobs, computer-driven transit vehicles, and et cetera. All across the economy, it would create jobs, 20,000 jobs per \$1 billion dollars.

And we have the strongest Buy America requirements of any part of the Federal Government, way stronger than the Pentagon. So when we invest those dollars, Americans go to work or go back to work.

But guess what, the other side works. If we stop spending that money on October 1, hundreds of thousands, millions of people will lose their jobs across many sectors in this country, and we will become the laughingstock of the world. The greatest nation on Earth can't afford to invest in its future, in its competitiveness, in rebuilding the Eisenhower-era infrastructure and building an infrastructure suitable for the 21st century to make us more competitive? It is not too hard. One simple way to do it would be to take the existing gas tax and index it.

What does that mean? Well, part of the reason that we are in this pickle is

because the gas tax has remained 18.4 cents a gallon since 1993. That means, with inflation, it has been eroded. And as cars and fleets become more efficient, people are driving more miles with fewer gallons of gas, which is a good thing. So if you indexed it and said, okay, we will index the gas tax for construction cost, inflation, and fleet fuel economy, you would see a big increase in gas, about 1.4 to 1.7 cents a gallon next year. Wow.

Well, guess what. Just when I was home recently, I drove to work; and when I came home, gas was up a nickel a gallon because of the crisis in Ukraine. Where did that go? That went into the pockets of ExxonMobil.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If the gentleman will yield.

Like you, I am on the plan going home every week. But for a weekend, I was at a conference, and so I missed being home for 10 days. In the space of 10 days, gasoline went up 19 cents a gallon at my corner gas station; and the next weekend, it had gone up 30 cents a gallon in 3 weeks. That didn't fill one pothole, didn't put one person to work. Thirty cents in 3 weeks.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman. I think it is an excellent point.

If we fully implemented Dodd-Frank and reined in some of the commodities speculators, it wouldn't be quite so volatile. But the point is, if we took a tiny fraction of the way they jack it up when you are driving to work every week and invested it, your friends, your neighbors would go to work, your commutes would be better, there would be less damage to your car, the country would be more efficient, and we would lose less jobs overseas.

So, if we indexed it and we paid it back over 15 years, we could put somewhere between \$120 and \$150 billion into the trust fund that would be paid for and paid back over a 15-year period.

Another alternative would be to put \$1 on a barrel of crude oil. For every \$1 you tax a barrel of crude oil today—Texas is at \$101.70, I think, when I last checked—that would be less than 1 percent. That raises \$4 billion a year to invest in the future of America, its infrastructure, and putting people back to work in this country. It would also help to rein in some of the speculation on the price of crude oil. And it would also help because OPEC and other suppliers would have to be paying a part of rebuilding our infrastructure.

The proposal I put forward exempts all manufacturing; it exempts all heating oil; it exempts all agricultural uses; it exempts school buses and other things that are currently exempt. So it would only be the fraction of the barrel that goes to current taxable transportation use as \$1 dollar a barrel, which is \$4 billion a year. Again, we could use that future cash flow to bond and fill in the giant pothole in the trust fund.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you.

Well, I deeply appreciate, again, your partnership and your leadership; and what you just demonstrated, a series of

ways that we could have adjustments to transportation finance that would be predictable, sustainable, and, as you have pointed out, at a time of record-low interest rates, having a steady revenue stream would permit us to be able to take advantage of that favorable borrowing environment to get multiple benefits. Essentially, if we had done that earlier, as you and I had suggested during the Recovery Act, essentially, we would have had free money because the interest rates were so low. But I appreciate your tenacity and creativity.

We have been joined by another of our colleagues.

Congresswoman TITUS, I must say, I deeply appreciated your hospitality when we visited Nevada, looked at transportation needs, met with people in your community who rely on being able to have this infrastructure work. You have been on a roller coaster in Nevada in terms of boom and bust, but I deeply appreciated your being able to help me understand those dynamics. Your leadership in this arena is welcomed, and I yield to you to join into the conversation.

Ms. TITUS. Well, thank you very much, Congressman BLUMENAUER. You are always welcome to come to my district in Las Vegas. We were very glad to have you there, and you brought your leadership. And I appreciate your wearing your bicycle, because that is one of the things I want to talk about.

A part of infrastructure is safe streets and the ability for our pedestrians and our bicyclists to be safe, as well as through other means of transportation. I certainly respect Congressman DEFAZIO's leadership on this. And I appreciate hearing some of the creative ideas you have for moving infrastructure forward because it is so important that we fund it, and having this hour to talk about the critical role of government and maintaining and enhancing our infrastructure I think is not only timely, but is critical.

As you heard earlier, the most recent report card from the American Society of Civil Engineers clearly illustrates the dismal condition of our Nation's infrastructure. Now, the good news is we moved up a grade, but the bad news is we went from D to D-plus. So that is not too much to brag about. If that were one of my students, I wouldn't be too proud of that level of accomplishment.

Well, if you look in more detail at the findings of that report, you would find that more than half of the Nation's roads are in poor or mediocre condition. One out of every four bridges is in need of significant repair or can't handle the traffic that relies on it.

We have seen the price of this crumbling infrastructure not just in a loss of jobs but also in a loss of lives. For one out of every three traffic fatalities, the condition of the road was a factor. So we have got to do better than that.

We recently received an update on the fiscal situation of the highway

trust fund—the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) was referencing this—and if the projections hold, that trust fund will be insolvent by the end of July. Now, that is at the height of the construction season when we should be moving forward with these infrastructure projects. All of them will come to a standstill across the country, and that immediately threatens 660,000 jobs—direct jobs, not counting the extra industries that rely on that construction as well.

Now, our construction sector was hit very hard already by the great recession, and it continues to see unemployment levels twice the national average. So we simply cannot afford to let this trust fund lapse.

We need to take immediate action to shore it up and remove the insolvency because it not only halts progress, but it injects uncertainty into our State capitals, our city halls, and all of the transit agencies across the country who don't know whether to move forward with projects or not because the money just may not be there.

If you look at the cities, like Las Vegas, you can see how this is especially hard-hitting because infrastructure is at the heart of our local economy. We have world-class hotels and casinos and restaurants and retail, but we rely on infrastructure to bring to us people and goods from around the world, whether it is rail or air or highways. We import everything, from tourists to lobster. We don't make it in there. We have to bring it in. And if you don't have good infrastructure, that system is not going to work.

So as we turn our attention to the next surface transportation authorization, I want us to invest in a number of things, and one of them is existing and future freight corridors. On that list, I hope to see the development of I-11. That interstate has been designated, but we need to move forward with it. It would go from Las Vegas to Phoenix. Eventually, it would connect all points north and south. But right now, Phoenix and Las Vegas are the only two major metropolitan areas in the country that are not connected by an interstate highway.

So this would create new freight corridors. It would relieve the congestion on the narrow road that exists there now. It would save lives. It would increase the connection between the roughly 8 million people who live in that area, and it would foster tourism, which would be a good thing for our economy. So I hope that we can move forward on that because it would be very important for moving freight in the kind of post-Panamax economy.

In addition to this, I am concerned about the safety of the travelling public in the urban areas. And this is where you and I have had many discussions about pedestrians and cyclists.

We have seen marginal improvements in highway safety. That has been going in the right direction. But pedestrian safety has been going in the

wrong direction. That has been getting much worse if you look at the statistics. And more and more people are using that kind of transportation, for recreation, to get to work, to go shopping, for exercise. So that population is going to increase, and yet the fatalities have increased as well. In fact, nearly 16 percent of traffic deaths in 2012 were people who were walking or bicycling, and yet less than 1 percent of safety funding goes to infrastructure to protect those travelers.

And that trend is really true in southern Nevada. My district has the most dangerous crossings of any because it is metropolitan Las Vegas. In 2011, there were 23 pedestrian fatalities, but that jumped to 42 in 2012; and last year, 51 men, women, and children lost their lives in pedestrian accidents.

So I hope that as we move forward with infrastructure funding that we provide resources and services to address that issue. And part of that can be encouraging local governments to do planning policies, like the Complete Streets program. I know you are well aware of that, very familiar with it and involved in it. That takes into account the needs of all users when it comes to transportation. There are lots of possible improvements, like bus rapid transit, dedicated transit bike lanes, safer crosswalks. All of those will help users reach their destinations more quickly and more safely.

So as we look at infrastructure, let's remember that it is bridges, it is roads, it is railroads, it is airports, but also, we need to do what we can for those using bicycles and just walking on their own two feet.

I am committed to working on this. It is very important for our country and for our local economies. So count me in, and thank you for your leadership.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you so much, Representative TITUS.

It was fascinating, when we visited with your constituents, how passionate they were identifying the problems; and I commend you for working with them to try to squeeze what you could out of inadequate Federal, State, and local funding, but worked to try to help with the design, help with the advocacy. They were truly fired up and had lots of ideas about things to do.

And you are right. It would be a travesty if, when we are urging people to be able to do more walking and cycling, to reduce energy, to improve air quality and improve their health, if, in turn, we are putting more families at risk. And being able to have safe routes to school, being able to deal with pedestrian safety and making it part of the mix, I can't say enough about how much I admire your commitment to balanced transportation, to be able to tie those pieces together, and how you worked with your local constituents. It is truly a model, and I look forward to continuing with you on that in the future.

Ms. TITUS. Thank you.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I do want to say that I also appreciate the reference to the economic impact in terms of the men and women who work in this arena. We have millions of tradespeople, men and women in the construction industry who have the necessary skills to rebuild and renew America, who want to work, and in too many of our communities have suffered disproportionate unemployment as a result of the near meltdown of the economy and the too slow recovery.

□ 1415

Being able to tap that energy, that excitement and that commitment I think is very, very important. I have been so impressed as we go around the country looking at the people there who are willing to put those skills to work, and it is an opportunity for a wide range of employment opportunities.

There are opportunities for people who are primarily just working with their hands where there is a lot of manual labor involved. There are a number of skilled opportunities in terms of what has happened in the trades in terms of equipment operation that adds increasing sophistication. There are jobs that are pencil ready where there is design, planning, and management. So there is a wide range.

My colleague mentioned the 20,000 jobs per billion dollars, and that 20,000 jobs includes lots of bedrock, middle class American, family-wage job opportunities, but for a wide range of skill sets and for people to get their feet on the ground to be able to build skills and move further in the advancement of their careers.

I really appreciate your advocacy there and would yield to the gentleman for further comment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Let me just give one example. I have a company in my district called Johnson Rock Crushers. They produce a wide range of rock crushers. They are a major exporter from the U.S., and they are competitive in the world market. They are employing skilled labor and also engineers and others to design these materials. They are sourcing virtually all of their components in the United States for these very large pieces of equipment.

So there is an incredible multiplier effect. They are employing people who are in niche manufacturing somewhere making one big gear or making parts for the conveyor or the giant tires that go on these things. They are employing engineers to make the future designs. They just have finished a major contract for the Seabees with affordable equipment for the Seabees. So they are just covering an extraordinary range of things.

They showed me a chart, and the chart is what happens to their business when the future funding for the highway trust fund comes into question. They can show me what happened back when we did the SAFETEA-LU bill,

how much business fell off. They can show me recently a fall-off in domestic business. They are doing pretty well internationally because other countries—somehow other countries can figure out how to invest in their infrastructure. They are concerned about becoming more competitive in the world economy, and they are making massive investments in China, Brazil, and in many of our competitor nations.

In fact, I recall once when my colleague, Mr. BLUMENAUER, heard me giving a speech. I was saying how I kind of thought the U.S. was becoming a Third World nation because of the deterioration of our infrastructure, which we have already talked about tonight. He came up to me afterwards and he said: Hey, you know, that was kind of insulting. And I'm like: Earl, what do you mean? You know how bad it is. I mean, at that point we were at a D, and now we are up to a D-plus for our infrastructure. And he said: No. No. It was insulting to Third World countries, because they are investing a higher percentage of their gross domestic product in their infrastructure than the United States of America.

We can afford these investments. In fact, we cannot afford to forgo these investments because we will lose more ground internationally; we will waste more fuel; people will spend more time in congestion; and we will kill more people on obsolete mass transit units like they did right here in Washington, D.C. These are investments we must make.

We have, in the past, led the world. We have been number one, number two after World War II up through near the nineties sometime. We are now number 26 in the world in terms of the state of our infrastructure. We are duking it out with Romania these days, I think. This is embarrassing. It is embarrassing for us not to be pushing forward with solutions now and not creating another cliff and eking it out to the end.

As Representative TITUS pointed out, some States are already cutting back their construction program for this construction year. Kansas is one I know of. They have said: Look, the way we run our State, we have got to be sure that the Federal reimbursement is going to be there when the project is done. We can't wait. Our constitution doesn't allow us to borrow money for these things. We can't go into deficit, unlike the Federal Government.

Therefore, just the prospect that the money might not be there is causing many States to say: Well, wait a minute. We are going to pull back here on these projects this coming year, and then if it actually happens on October 1, it will be a massive cutback next year.

I don't know what happens to transit. There is no transit system in the world, except maybe Hong Kong, that makes money. So to say we are going to withdraw all Federal support from

transit would mean one heck of a loss of options for people in the United States.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your detailing the difference it made with that company in your district and the multiplier effect for the employment for the various aspects of that product. It has been exciting for me to look at the range of people who are adding their voice to the cry for the Federal Government to step up and for Congress not to be AWOL on this and not have the collapse of the trust fund.

The range of people who have a keen interest in our being responsible and who are adding their voices is fascinating. There are big equipment manufacturers, like the Catapillars of this world, and smaller. There are people who lease heavy equipment. There are people who are involved with design and construction, people who are there with the materials, asphalt and concrete, sand and gravel; people who are there with the iron and steel that is necessary, the concrete.

You go through the range of people who are vitally interested in our meeting our responsibilities and who have the capacity of making huge economic contributions and who are ready, willing, and able to do so, and the vast majority of these jobs are right here in the United States. They are not going to be outsourced. Lots of equipment, manufacturing, and materials are right here. It is cost prohibitive for us not to. So it provides that local economic spark. Then there is the multiplier effect of the coffee shop across the street from the project and the people who are providing materials and supplies, people who benefit from this in dramatic ways.

I do appreciate your reminding us of how we have lost track of where we are in terms of global leadership. We were leaders in the development of our canals and the steam engine. We were leaders with our transcontinental railroad. Nobody did anything on that order of magnitude. We had the finest passenger rail system in the world up until about 70 years ago. We had the finest highway system. You can go through the list of areas that we were justifiably proud of being a global leader. And it was not just prestige. It was health, it was safety, and it was economic impact that made a difference. We appear to have lost our way.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, there was no high-speed rail in China. And in 6 years, they have grown a high-speed rail system that will next year carry more passengers than the entire American aviation system. Other countries are building ports and highways and upgrading water and sewer. And we are stuck, we are losing ground, and it is Congress that has failed to step up for over two decades.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The problem here in D.C. is that a lot of people, particularly the Congress, don't discriminate between investments, capital investments, and expenditures. You know, if

you buy fuel for the Federal fleet or a battleship or something, okay, that is an expenditure; it is consumed. But if you build a bridge that lasts 100 years, we count that the same as buying something that will be consumed in 1 day. That doesn't make any sense, but that is the way Congress works.

So they treat needed investments in the future mobility of the American people and saving fuel as being competitive, moving goods and people safely, they treat that exactly the same as a consumptive, 1-day expenditure for fuel for the Federal fleet or something else. That makes no sense. We need capital budgets. That is probably a longer term project around here. They need to at least recognize the need for these investments.

What I hear from a lot of naysayers is: Hey, you already did that. You did the stimulus, and that didn't work, did it?

Well, actually, if you look at the so-called stimulus, under the most generous interpretation of infrastructure, 4 percent went into traditional surface transportation infrastructure—4 percent, 4 percent of the \$800 billion—and it created a heck of a lot more than 4 percent of the jobs that that bill created; a really generous infrastructure interpretation, you are up to 7 percent.

So I say, no, that was not a test. That money was well invested and spent, but it was totally insufficient for the job to repair and rebuild our infrastructure and bring it up to a good state of repair for the 20th century, let alone to begin to build out an efficient 21st century infrastructure. That is no test. That money was well spent and well invested.

There are some prominent commentators who say, oh, I don't know where that money went. I had a debate with one of them on television, actually. We can show exactly where that money went and exactly how many jobs were created, and it was certainly a net large return compared to many of the other things that were in that legislation. No, that wasn't a test.

A test would be if we made a commitment now to build a 21st century infrastructure and to rise from 26th in the world back to number one in the world within 10 years just like JFK said we will put us on the Moon in 10 years. Well, in 10 years, we could go back to having the number one infrastructure in the world, and in the meantime we would create a few million more jobs, and the long-term impact of that creates sustainable jobs of untold numbers over the years.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Absolutely. I have really appreciated your laser focus. At the time, you and I both wanted more investment in infrastructure. Something in the neighborhood of 40 percent were tax cuts that people didn't even think they got, that didn't have the multiplier effect, that we would have been well served to double or triple the amount of investment in infrastructure.

But I have been struck—and I know you have—that even though it was inadequate, that we could have done more and should have done more. I am struck by the number of businesses that have told me that that investment was the difference of whether or not their business was going to go under. We had people making bids at that time basically just to cover payroll. We got some of the most favorable bids that were offered up because people were desperate for that work, and so it stretched even further.

If we had had the foresight to invest more and then take advantage of the fact that the world was basically giving us their money for free, we could have had a tremendous impact. But the truth is that people were desperate for it. It made a difference, and it is a hint of what we could do if we did this right.

I am going to turn to my colleague for a moment for the last word, but I wanted to just say one thing in terms of my concluding observation.

I have been struck, in the 3 months since we have advanced these proposals, by the breadth of editorial support, by the unions, local governments, and elected officials in both parties who are stepping up at the State level to do this. Wyoming, I think, was the latest State that went ahead and raised a gas tax. We are hearing from engineers, and we are hearing from advocacy groups like truckers and Triple A that are doing the right thing and making a difficult recommendation because they know it is the right thing, and they think it is time to have an adult conversation with the American public.

I think it is time for us to listen to the people out there who don't just want, they are insisting that we meet our obligation as a full partner in infrastructure investment in this country, as we have done for years with State and local government, with the private sector, and with local communities.

□ 1430

I am convinced that it is one of those areas that once we get there and take the step, that it will bring the country together.

Mr. Speaker, historically, infrastructure has been an area that has rallied public support. People came together for these projects. I am convinced that if we step up and do our job, listening to people and giving that support, that it can be that same sort of rallying point. I don't want to be involved in a conversation about whether it is the Republicans' fault or the Democrats' fault, or it is the House versus the Senate or the legislative versus the executive. There has been enough foot-dragging over the last 20 years to go around.

So my hope is we can use this going forward to make a difference. I cannot thank you enough, Congressman DEFAZIO, for your insistence, your leadership, your persistence, your creativity,

and your courage on this. It really makes a difference for those of us who are pushing for the path you have blazed and your continued, ongoing zeal to make this work.

Mr. DEFAZIO. To just boil it down to something pretty simple, I would say let's think about the future. Let's think about today, and let's think about the future. And those who would disinvest or devolve our obligations to create a national transportation system that is world class, devolve that duty to the 50 States assembled, or just ignore altogether that obligation, they really are showing that they don't take a long-term view for America, they don't have much faith in our future.

I have a heck of a lot of faith in our future, and it is going to take some leadership to get to that future. Doing simple things like maintaining the existing purchasing power of the gas tax through indexation and then using the future income to bond, and make a heck of a lot of investments now, will return more in the long term than it will cost, and it won't add a penny to the deficit. Just like the Federal highway trust fund has not been a net contributor to the deficit over time; it has been funded through user fees. We need to continue that principle.

In the future, we can probably evolve to something more high tech, vehicle miles traveled or things like that. We are not ready today to get there, and we sure as heck can't get there by October 1, so we have to work off the basics that we already have, that we have had since Dwight David Eisenhower, a Republican President, and it was Ronald Reagan who added mass transit into the highway trust fund. This has been truly a bipartisan issue over the years. We lost our way for a bit here, and it should become bipartisan again. We should all join together, and we should show that we really believe in America's future and make the investments that are necessary to get us there on a better national transportation system.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Well said, and I have nothing to add to that eloquence.

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

HUNTERDON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY, CELEBRATES TRICENTENNIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the tricentennial of Hunterdon County, New Jersey, the county I have proudly called home my entire life and where my family has lived since 1739. The celebration this year is led by former State Senator Marcia Karrow and a hardworking committee of exemplary county residents.

The 300-year history of Hunterdon County is an excellent example of the

journey in the advancement of the English colonies in North America to the present day status of the United States of America throughout the world. To this day, Hunterdon County maintains its natural beauty and rural charm, as has been the case throughout its history.

The county is proud to be named for Robert Hunter, the distinguished royal governor of New York and New Jersey who sailed to America with 3,000 Palatinate German refugees in 1710. They, and thousands of others like them, yearned for religious freedom and a better life for themselves and their descendants. Hunterdon County was formed when it separated from Burlington County 300 years ago this month, in March of 1714.

From the first reading of the Declaration of Independence on the steps of what was then the Hunterdon County Courthouse in Trenton to General Washington's historic Delaware River crossing and decisive victory at the Battle of Trenton, Hunterdon's link to the 1776 birth of the United States is significant. I was personally inspired as a child by the tales of Captain Daniel Bray and the Hunterdon County militia who collected the boats on our western border that were used in Washington's crossing on Christmas night in that fateful year of our Nation's birth. The county boasts several sites associated with the Revolution, including the 1759 Vought House in Clinton Township, a Loyalist homestead that still exists with its architecturally distinguished serpentine ceiling.

The county is also proud of its agricultural heritage. The county seal originally included a hay wagon and now features a bountiful sheaf of wheat. Farming was the story of most county residents, from Native Americans through the earliest colonial settlers to those who lived at the beginning of the 20th century. Many barns dot the county landscape, and this heritage is celebrated annually at the Hunterdon County 4-H and Agricultural Fair.

A century and a half ago general stores and hotels, including several owned by my ancestors, were common in the towns that sprouted across the 400 square acres of the county. From Clinton in the north to Lambertville in the south, to Frenchtown in the west, to Flemington, the county seat, in the middle, they were the centers of life where Hunterdon families came to market, to socialize, and to worship.

The nature of Hunterdon has changed as the population increased from the mid-20th century forward. The large agricultural townships have become more heavily populated as farmland has been transformed to houses for new residents, who demanded improvements, including establishment of a system of regional schools and construction of the Hunterdon County Medical Center. After World War II, Hunterdon was the only county in the State still without a hospital. County

leaders, including the Board of Agriculture, were responsible for the building of the medical center that opened in 1953. Since then, this health care facility has become one of the premier medical institutions in New Jersey. Public-spirited men and women created five distinguished regional high schools that would become leaders in the State in academics, athletics, and extracurricular activities.

The 300-year history of Hunterdon County has been captured in writings, photographs, and memories telling the compelling story of its sheer natural beauty, its people, and the larger community of churches, nonprofit groups, and civic organizations, with neighbor helping neighbor.

Our ancestor have striven for 300 years to make Hunterdon what it is today, a 21st century exemplar of the United States as a whole: free, self-governed, prosperous, and dedicated to the advancement of the Nation. We, the 130,000 current residents, have a responsibility to those who will come after us to preserve and improve the county we love.

Truly, Hunterdon County has always been and will always be in my heart.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WENSTRUP (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a death in the family.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 25, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 3771. To accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines

H.R. 2019. To eliminate taxpayer financing of political party conventions and reprogram savings to provide for a 10-year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 28, 2014, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5100. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communica-

tions, AMTRAK, transmitting a letter regarding the general and legislative annual report; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5101. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take Off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30943; Amdt. No. 3577] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5102. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30944; Amdt. No. 3578] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5103. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Stage 3 Helicopter Noise Certification Standards [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0948; Amdt. No. 36-29] (RIN: 2120-AJ96) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5104. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30942; Amdt. No. 3576] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5105. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30941; Amdt. No. 3575] received March 14, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5106. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Helicopter Air Ambulance, Commercial Helicopter, and Part 91 Helicopter Operations [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0982; Amdt. Nos. 91-330; 120-2; 135-129] (RIN: 2120-AJ53) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5107. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0770; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-057-AD; Amendment 39-17771; AD 2014-04-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5108. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0090; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-003-AD; Amendment 39-17761; AD 2014-04-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5109. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V.

Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0699; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-198-AD; Amendment 39-17751; AD 2014-03-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5110. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A Model Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0964; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-035-AD; Amendment 39-17757; AD 2014-03-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5111. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0831; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-125-AD; Amendment 39-17763; AD 2014-04-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5112. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Slingsby Aviation Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0997; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-044-AD; Amendment 39-17759; AD 2014-04-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5113. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0670; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-081-AD; Amendment 39-17756; AD 2014-03-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5114. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0886; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-067-AD; Amendment 39-17738; AD 2014-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5115. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters (Type Certificate Currently Held by Agusta Westland S.p.A) (Agusta Westland) [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0643; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-096-AD; Amendment 39-17773; AD 2014-04-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5116. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0695; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-264-AD; Amendment 39-17726; AD 2014-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AMODEI,

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 4315. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require publication on the Internet of the basis for determinations that species are endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 4316. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve the disclosure of certain expenditures under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 4318. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to conform citizen suits under that Act with other existing law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 4319. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require the Secretary of the Interior to publish and make available for public comment a draft economic analysis at the time a proposed rule to designate critical habitat is published; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SALMON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4320. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON

of South Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SALMON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4321. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 4322. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the payment to affected producers and their employees of duties that are collected pursuant to countervailing and antidumping duty orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 4323. A bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COLE, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. ENYART):

H.R. 4324. A bill to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. ESTY (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY):

H.R. 4325. A bill to prohibit the marketing of electronic cigarettes to children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit against income tax to assist individuals with high residential energy costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 4327. A bill to prohibit the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from issuing certain decisions that will raise costs for ratepayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 4328. A bill to establish a program to award contracts to certain tribal organizations, Indian corporations, public school districts, and States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 4329. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. VELA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. GALLEGOS):

H.R. 4330. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to ensure that the treatment

of illiquid swaps does not disadvantage certain non-financial end users who use them to manage business risk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 4331. A bill to require a 50 percent reduction in the number of limousines in the Federal fleet; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LONG, and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 4332. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the dollar limitation on the de minimis safe harbor from treatment as a capital expenditure for taxpayers without applicable financial statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. KIND, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 4333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4334. A bill to allow homeowners facing foreclosure to avoid deficiency judgments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 4335. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify that the estate of a deceased veteran may receive certain accrued benefits upon the death of the veteran, to ensure that substituted claims are processed timely, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 4336. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the highway safety improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4337. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Pierre L'Enfant from the District of Columbia and to provide for the permanent display of the statue in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4338. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require gas pipeline facilities to accelerate the repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of high-risk pipelines used in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. RANGEL (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4339. A bill to establish State revolving loan funds to repair or replace natural gas distribution pipelines; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 4340. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to passenger motor vehicle crash avoidance information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 4341. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to submit to Congress a report on the use, in advertising and other media for the promotion of commercial products, of images that have been altered to materially change the physical characteristics of the faces and bodies of the individuals depicted; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BARTON, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 4342. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibility over the Internet domain name system until the Comptroller General of United States submits to Congress a report on the role of the NTIA with respect to such system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4343. A bill to end the unconstitutional delegation of legislative power which was exclusively vested in the Senate and House of Representatives by Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to issue a report to Congress detailing the extent of the problem of unconstitutional delegation to the end that such delegations can be phased out, thereby restoring the constitutional principle of separation of powers set forth in the first sections of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4344. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of service connection for mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4345. A bill to reauthorize the weatherization and State energy programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MICA, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 4346. A bill to encourage continued enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. BARBER, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr.

LEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.J. Res. 113. A joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VELA, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CARDENAS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. REED, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H. Res. 526. A resolution recognizing the important work of the Meals On Wheels Association of America and its member programs throughout the country in addressing senior hunger and improving the quality of life for millions of our nation's seniors each year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HAHN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. VELA):

H. Res. 527. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BYRNE):

H. Res. 528. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 2014 as "National Multiple Myeloma Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona,

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FARR, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H. Res. 529. A resolution recognizing March 31 as César Chávez Day in honor of the accomplishments and legacy of César Estrada Chávez; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

178. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 305 supporting a complete hydrologic separation of the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basins; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

179. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 300 memorializing the Congress and the Department of Veterans Affairs to take a stronger role in investigating and eliminating delays in veterans' health care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 4315.

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

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

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 4316.

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

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

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 4317.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

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

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 4318.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for

carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4319.

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 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 4320.

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. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4321.

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. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4322.

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

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign nations.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 4323.

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, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4324.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make all laws 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, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 4325.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4326.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4327.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 4328.

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

- This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

- This bill is enacted pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 in order to enforce treaties made between the United States and several Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4329.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4330.

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

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

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 4331.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 4332.

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

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution 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 Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 4333.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 4334.

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

Article One of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 4335.

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

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 4336.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4337.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 2 of section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4338.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4339.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 4340.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States that states “The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 4341.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 4342.

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.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4343.

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

(a) Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution vests the legislative powers enumerated therein in the United States Congress, consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives, subject only to the veto power of the President as provided in Article I, Section 7, Clause 2.

(b) Article II, Section 1 of the United States Constitution vests the executive power of the United States in a President of the United States, except as enumerated in Article II, Section 2.

(c) Article III, Section 1 of the United States Constitution vests the judicial power of the United States in "one supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," subject only to the jurisdictional limitations set forth in Article III, Section 2.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 4344.

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, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4345.

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

Article I, Section 1.

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

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 4346.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14 and 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.J. Res. 113.

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 1, Section 8 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. 182: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 312: Mr. TIERNEY and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 401: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 482: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 494: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 594: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 645: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 648: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SRES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 769: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 795: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1146: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1176: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1239: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1240: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1313: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1502: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1563: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1603: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1629: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1652: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1779: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1812: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1996: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2001: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2146: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2366: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2377: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 2452: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 2527: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2591: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2662: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2663: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2697: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2737: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 2750: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2892: Mr. PITTEMBERGER.

H.R. 2901: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CHU, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2932: Mr. BERA of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 2939: Mr. SALMON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 2959: Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2994: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3086: Mr. ISSA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 3162: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3179: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 3371: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3481: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3508: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 3563: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3583: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 3600: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3601: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 3602: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3610: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3658: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. ESTY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3670: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3673: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 3681: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3698: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 3708: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 3717: Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3725: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3782: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 3793: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3852: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 3930: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4012: Mr. FLORES and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 4031: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 4041: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 4060: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 4107: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4119: Ms. HAHN and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 4139: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 4149: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4157: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 4158: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 4167: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 4183: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 4187: Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 4200: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 4225: Mr. COTTON, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 4227: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4229: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 4250: Mr. FARR, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 4257: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 4261: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 4269: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 4285: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4286: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 4304: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 4305: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.J. Res. 101: Mr. SANFORD.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. LATTA.

H. Con. Res. 94: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. COOK.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. COBLE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 284: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 412: Ms. TSONGAS.

H. Res. 456: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 480: Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Res. 494: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. ESTY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 505: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

74. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Cudahy, California, relative to Resolution No. 14-07 endorsing comprehensive immigration reform in the United States House of Representatives during the current legislative year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.