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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, April 10, 2014.
I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

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

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

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people’s House to encourage them in their official tasks. As the Members approach the votes they are making today, may they be imbued with courage and leadership that looks to the health and vibrancy of our great Nation.

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

As the Congress looks to the upcoming holy celebrations of millions of Americans, may they, and may we all, be mindful of God’s love for us. May we be faithful stewards, not only of Your creation, but also Your desire that all people would be free from whatever inhibits them to be fully alive.

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 her approval thereof.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam 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, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILMER 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 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE BATTLING BOYS OF BENGHAZI
(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I want to share with the American people a poem written by a Marine Corps officer. It is about two former Navy SEALs: Ben Doherty and Ty Woods. They were killed in Benghaz. It is called “The Battling Boys of Benghaz”:

We’re the battling boys of Benghaz! No fame, no glory, no paparazzi. Just a fiery death in a blazing hell, defending our country we loved so well. It wasn’t our job, but we answered the call, fought to the Consulate and scaled the wall. We pulled 20 countrymen from the jaws of fate. Led them to safety, and stood at the gate. Just the two of us, and foes by the score, but we stood fast to bar the door. Three calls for reinforcement, but all were denied, so we fought, and we fought, and we fought ‘til we died. We gave our all for our Uncle Sam, but our leaders didn’t give a damn. Just two dead SEALs, who carried the load, no thanks to us, we were just “Bumps in the Road.”

These two Navy SEALs did their jobs. Let’s do our jobs and bring those thugs who killed them to justice.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK
(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a very simple principle: equal pay for equal work. It turns out I am not the only one in my household who supports equal pay. One morning last month, on my way out the door, my 8-year-old, Sophie, asked me my plans for the day. I said I was having an event called “When
Women Succeed, America Succeeds” focused on economic opportunity for women, including good jobs and good pay.

She said, Dad, that’s my agenda. I said, You have an agenda? She said, Yeah, she showed me her “Diary of a Wimpy Kid” book. At the top of one of the pages it says, When I am elected President, the laws I pass will be—and number one, she wrote, in penmanship we are going to work on. Women should get paid the same as men.

This shouldn’t be hard, Madam Speaker. My 8-year-old gets it, and the American people are waiting for Congress to get it too.

So let’s stand up for equal pay for equal work and bring the Paycheck Fairness Act up for a vote.

**HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT TIMOTHY OWEN**

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of United States Army Sergeant Timothy Owens, who lived in Rolla, Missouri, in the Eighth Congressional District.

Sergeant Owens was killed in senseless act of violence at Fort Hood, Texas, last week. Sergeant Owens deployed to Iraq with the 396th Transportation Company. During his military service, Sergeant Owens earned numerous awards, including the Army Commendation Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, and four Certificates of Achievement.

Additionally, Sergeant Owens served as a counselor to his fellow soldiers at Fort Hood. In addition to his service to our Nation, Sergeant Owens was a devoted husband and a loving father of three. He will be greatly missed by his wife, Billy, his children, and his numerous family and friends.

Madam Speaker, we honor the service and life of Sergeant Timothy Owens, and we lift his family in prayers.

**CLIMATE CHANGE**

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, last week in the Natural Resources Committee, one of my esteemed colleagues from the non-partisan National Science Board, recently completed an update to his survey of peer-reviewed literature on climate change.

As it points out, in the year 2013, there were 10,885 peer-reviewed articles and only two rejected human contributions towards climate change. That is less than two hundredths of 1 percent. Madam Speaker, this is not disagreement. This is not a divided scientific community, case closed. Congress must stop denying the science and take action. Future generations are depending upon us.

**EASTER IN IRAN**

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker. Good Friday and Easter are right around the corner. For some Christians in the Middle East, specifically in Iran and Egypt, these holidays can only be observed and celebrated in fear. Madam Speaker, Christians continue to be persecuted for their religious beliefs across the globe by intolerant, oppressive regimes and governments that seek to impose strict religious rule.

Many of these Christians, if they aren’t killed, tortured to death, or imprisoned, are forced to live in places that they and their ancestors called home, for the simple and single reason that they are Christians.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Easter this year, let us not forget the plight and suffering of those who can’t freely practice the religion of their own choosing. More importantly, Madam Speaker, let us continue to hold those regimes and governments accountable for their systematic targeting and continued oppression of Christians.

**BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SMALL BUSINESS ADVISORY BOARD ACT**

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Madam Speaker. I rise today in steadfast support of small business and H.R. 3493, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection Small Business Advisory Board Act.

Within the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau consumers have a voice. Credit unions have a voice. Community banks have a voice. And appropriately, men and women in uniform have a voice through the Office of Service-member Affairs. These are all important contributors to include.

Yet, one group was left out, and that group was America’s small businesses. While identified as “small,” they are mighty when it comes to our local economy and job creation. As a small business owner, I know they have insight to offer during the development of new rules and regulations.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), I have cosponsored this critical improvement to the CFPB. I ask that our colleagues now join us in this bipartisan effort to allow small businesses in the financial sector to be heard.

**MEDICAL EVALUATION PARITY FOR SERVICEMEMBERS**

(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. Madam Speaker, yesterday afternoon U.S. Senators ROB PORTMAN and JAY ROCKEFLER introduced the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers, or MEPS, Act, companion legislation to the bill that I introduced with the Congressman from Ohio, Mr. TIm RYAN, on March 27 of this year.

Most are aware that incoming soldiers must pass a physical and medical evaluation, which is the case, but so many are shocked that there is no similar evaluation for mental health competency.

Madam Speaker, according to recent studies, nearly half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting. A large number of suicides in the military were individuals who had never been deployed in a combat role.

These studies give us insight into the mental well-being of our military, but what they also show is that we must keep moving forward.

The bipartisan MEPS Act would require a preliminary mental health assessment for military recruits prior to joining the service, which will dramatically improve the way the military identifies and assesses mental health issues.

The bill has no budget impact and has support from a large number of veterans groups. I thank my Senate colleagues for introducing this bill and encourage my colleagues in the House to join the support.

**RECOGNIZING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 45th anniversary of the Minority Business Development Agency. Throughout its history, MBDA has spurred business development and worked tirelessly to advance the growth and global competitiveness of the minority business community.

These businesses fuel the economic engine of our country, revitalising our communities by creating hundreds of new jobs. In my home State of Florida, this agency helped create 2,500 jobs in 2009, including over 800 new jobs in the past year alone.

At a time when many communities blighted by recession continue to struggle, the Minority Development
Business Agency will strengthen businesses on the verge of recovery.
I look forward to seeing this agency continue to create jobs and prosperity both in Florida and across our country.

KELSEY HIRSCH

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we all know that April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month, but what you all may not know is about the amazing accomplishments of a young freshman at South Forsyth High School down in my district. Her name is Kelsey Hirsch.

Having been affected by all of the events that she saw in the media around our part of the world, she founded a group in my neighborhood. It is called Bands4RAINN. RAINN is the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, and she came up with the idea of selling wristbands to raise money for that network.

She set a goal for herself of raising $500. She ended up raising more than $10,000. She ended up winning the HOPE Award for RAINN. She ended up founding a group at her high school called WarEagles4RAINN, and this weekend, she is holding a Concert4Courage and Hoops4Hope, which are two more fundraising events, to draw attention to sexual assault and violence, particularly among young people.

Mr. Speaker, one person can make a difference, and in my district, it is Kelsey Hirsch, a freshman at South Forsyth High School.

LOUIS ZAPATA

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a giant whom we lost in the Fort Worth community—Louis Zapata, the first Hispanic ever elected to the Fort Worth City Council.

Mr. Zapata held the post for 14 years. He was one of the longest-serving city council members in the city’s history.

Mr. Zapata was so proud of the city’s north side, which he represented well. He did so many wonderful things for the community, like advancing the arts and protecting the Rose Marine Theater. Mr. Zapata was also someone who was interested in raising the quality of life for all of our city’s citizens.

In addition to his duties on the Fort Worth City Council, he was also a union member and a union representative at Bell Helicopter, one of the city’s largest employers, where he worked tirelessly to make sure that every man and woman who worked at the plant enjoyed a better quality of life.

I want to thank Mr. Zapata for everything that he did to help make our city better and to help make our community better. He will be missed. He is one of the legends of the Fort Worth City Council, and he is someone who will always be remembered fondly in our city.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

GENRAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material into the RECORD on H. Con. Res. 96.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 544 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. Con. Res. 96.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reads the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 9, 2014, amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–405 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–405.

Mr. WOODALL, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.

(a) Declaration.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2015 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

(b) Table of Contents.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2015.
the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2015: $2,818,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,808,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,840,958,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,901,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,099,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,124,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,153,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,351,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,307,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,405,674,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:
Fiscal year 2015: $286,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $330,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $51,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $11,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $23,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $78,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $104,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $290,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $491,667,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2015: $18,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $20,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $22,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $22,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $21,220,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2015: $13,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $14,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $15,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $15,307,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2015: $597,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $671,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $693,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $724,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $624,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $566,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $584,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $573,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $573,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $565,001,000,000.

(2) New Budget Authority.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of new budget authority are as follows:
Fiscal year 2015: $2,743,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,756,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,848,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,925,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,033,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,162,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,241,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,361,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,414,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,588,006,000,000.

(3) Budget Outlays.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2015: $2,818,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,808,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,840,958,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,901,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,099,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,124,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,153,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,351,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,307,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,405,674,000,000.
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Fiscal year 2016:
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FISCAL YEAR 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

FISCAL YEAR 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

FISCAL YEAR 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

TITLES II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 201. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) In General.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution containing a joint sense or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) Exceptions.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in subsection (c)(1) or identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) Limitations.—For fiscal year 2016, the aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed:

1. $58,662,302,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—
   (i) Medical Services;
   (ii) Medical Support and Compliance; and
   (iii) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration;

2. $39,781,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b).

SEC. 202. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) In General.—In the House, there shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in fiscal year 2016 and any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, making a general or continuing appropriation or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2016.

(b) Definitions.—The term “discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, making a general or continuing appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 203. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPROPRIATE BUDGET LEVELS.

(a) Adjustments of Discretionary and Direct Spending Levels.—If the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution or amendment thereto or conference report thereon providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016 and any fiscal year thereafter may adjust the following level of total new discretionary budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose:

1. $58,662,302,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—
   (i) Medical Services;
   (ii) Medical Support and Compliance; and
   (iii) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration;

2. $39,781,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b).

(b) Special Rule.—For purposes of applying the provisions described in section 203(a)(1) and (b) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the report accompanying the concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the concurrent resolution made by the House to accompany the concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the concurrent resolution made by the House to accompany such concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.
on Oversight and Government Reform that the 
Federal retirement system, if such adjustments do not cause a net increase in the 
deficit for fiscal year 2015 and the pe-
riod of time beginning in 2015 through 2024.
SEC. 206. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AG-
GREGATES.
(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of the 
allocations, aggregates, and other ap-
propriate levels made pursuant to this con-
current resolution shall—
(1) apply while that measure is under con-
sideration;
(2) take effect upon the enactment of that 
measure; and
(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.
(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Any allocations and 
aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as alloca-
tions and aggregates included in this concur-
trent resolution.
(c) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—The consider-
ation of any bill or joint resolution, or 
amendment thereto or conference report 
thereon, for which the chair of the Com-
mmittee on the Budget makes adjustments or 
revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels of this concurrent 
resolution shall not be subject to the points 
of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of 
the Rules of the House of Representatives or 
section 504.
SEC. 207. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTI-
MATES.
(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the fol-
lowing:
(1) Costs of Federal housing loans and loan 
guarantees are treated unequally in the budget, because the Congressional Budget Office uses fair-value accounting to measure the costs of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but determines the cost of other Federal loan and loan-guaran-
tee programs on the basis of the Federal 
Credit Reform Act of 1990 ("FCRA").
(2) The fair-value accounting method uses discount rates which incorporate the risk in-
herent to the type of liability being esti-
mate in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length. In contrast, 
FCRA accounting solely uses the discount rates of the Treasury, failing to incorporate 
all of the risks attendant to these credit ac-
tivities.
(3) The Congressional Budget Office esti-
mates that if fair-value were used to esti-
mate the cost of all new credit activity in 
2014, the deficit would be approximately $50 
billion higher than under the current meth-
odology.
(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the re-
quest of the chair or ranking member of the 
Committee on the Budget, any estimate pre-
pared by the Director of the Congressional 
Budget Office for a measure under the terms 
of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 
1974, as a supplement to such estimate shall, to the extent practi-
table, also provide an estimate of the cur-
rent actual or estimated market values rep-
resenting the “fair value” of assets and li-
abilities affected by the provisions of such 
bill or joint resolution that result in such cost.
SEC. 208. TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGH-
WAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.
For purposes of the Congressional Budget 
Act of 1974 and the Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representa-
tives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amend-
ment thereto or conference report thereon, 
that transfers funds from the general fund of the 
Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority 
and outlays equal to the amount of the 
transfer in the fiscal year the transfer oc-
curs.
SEC. 209. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTEMPORARY OPERATIONS/GLO-
BAL WAR ON TERRORISM.
(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, shall 
be a separate allocation to the Committee on 
Appropriations for overseas contingency op-
erations/global war on terrorism. For pur-
poses of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional 
Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2015. Such sep-
erate allocation shall be the exclusive allo-
cation to military and emergency operations/

SEC. 210. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.
The House adopts the provisions of this title—
(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and
(2) with full recognition of the constitu-
tional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, or to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 301. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE REFORM.
It is the policy of this resolution that the 
Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), and the Health Care 
Education and Affordability Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152) should be repealed.

SEC. 302. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.
(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:
(1) Too many people are trapped at the bot-
tom rungs of the economic ladder, and every 
citizen should have the opportunity to rise, escape from poverty, and achieve their own potential.
(2) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and con-
gressional Republicans enacted reforms that 
have moved families off of Federal programs 
and enabled them to provide for themselves.
(3) According to the most recent projec-
tions, over the next 30 years we will spend approximately $9.7 trillion on means-tested 
welfare programs.
(4) Today, there are approximately 92 Fed-
eral programs that provide benefits specifi-
cally to poor and low-income Americans.
(5) Taxpayers deserve clear and trans-
parent information on how well these pro-
grams are working, and how much the Fed-
eral Government is spending on means-test-
ed welfare.

It is the policy of this resolution that—
(1) the welfare system should be reformed to 
give states flexibility to implement and 
innovate safety net programs and that to be 
eligible for benefits, able bodied adults with-
out dependents should be required to work 
or preparing for work, including enrolling in 
some form of job or job training; contributing 
community service, or participat-
ing in a supervised job search; and
(2) the President’s budget should disclose, 
in the case of any other rule of the House of 
Representatives and as such shall be designated 
under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending 
that counts toward the allocation estab-
lished by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 231(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Bal-
(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for pur-
poses of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2015, no adjustment shall be made under section 
302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation. The 
Committee on Appropriations may provide 
suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending 
that counts toward the allocation establish-
ed by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 231(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Bal-
(c) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—The consider-
ation of any bill or joint resolution, or 
amendment thereto or conference report 
thereon, for which the chair of the Com-
mmittee on the Budget makes adjustments or 
revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels of this concurrent 
resolution shall not be subject to the points 
of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of 
the Rules of the House of Representatives or 
section 504.
SEC. 209. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTEMPORARY OPERATIONS/GLO-
BAL WAR ON TERRORISM.
(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, shall 
be a separate allocation to the Committee on 
Appropriations for overseas contingency op-
erations/global war on terrorism. For pur-
poses of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional 
Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2015. Such sep-
erate allocation shall be the exclusive allo-
cation to military and emergency operations/

SEC. 210. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.
The House adopts the provisions of this title—
(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and
(2) with full recognition of the constitu-
tional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, or to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

It is the policy of this resolution that the 
carbon tax would be detrimental to Amer-
ican families and businesses, and is not in 
the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.

It is the policy of this resolution that 
corporate overhead and the personal 
is not in the best interest of the United States.
It is the policy of this resolution that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and currently unavailable areas of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be open for energy exploration and production. To ensure that efforts are given preference to withdrawal from leasing within certain areas of the OCS. Specifically, a State, through enactment of a State statute, may withdraw from leasing any area within 75 miles of any area currently at its lowest level since 1995. Weak wage and income growth as a result of a subpar labor market not only means lower tax revenues for the government, but it also means higher government spending on income support programs.

A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and growing the economy. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced.

This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy and more job creation.

Reining in government spending and lowering budget deficits has a positive long-term impact on the economy and the budget. According to CBO, a significant deficit reduction package (i.e. $4 trillion), would boost longer-term economic output by 1.7 percent. Their analysis concludes that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

The greater economic output that stems from a large deficit reduction package would have a sizeable impact on the Federal budget. For instance, higher output would lead to greater revenues through the increase in taxable incomes. Lower interest rates, and a reduction in the stock of debt, would lower government spending on net interest.

POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty hindering job creation.

(2) JOBS ACT.—It is the policy of this resolution to create jobs, opportunity, and growth. The jobs plan Jumpstarting Opportunities with Bold Solutions (JOBS) Act, should be enacted. This legislation, introduced by the Republican Study Committee, would unleash North American energy production, reform labor laws, reduce the regulatory burden, and increase access to capital.

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all three counts—it is notoriously complex, patently unfair, and highly inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Over the past decade alone, there have been more than 4,400 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carve outs, special provisions, or exclusions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than $1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and highly complex.

(3) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the tax base and, thus, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(4) It is estimated that American taxpayers spend nearly $66 billion a year complying with the tax code—large enough to finance a one-year in-war.
savings to lower tax rates across the board—not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Tax reform should be revenue-neutral and should not be an excuse to raise taxes on America’s middle class. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through revenue-neutral fundamental tax reform in the following:

(1) Aims for revenue neutrality (relative to the CBO baseline revenue projection) based on a dynamic score that takes into account macroeconomic effects.

(2) Simplifies the individual rates from seven brackets to two, with a top rate of 25 percent.

(3) Simplifies the tax code by ensuring that fewer Americans will be required to itemize their deductions.

(4) Gives equal tax treatment to individual and employer health care expenditures modeled on the American Health Care Reform Act (H.R. 3121).

(5) Repeals the current Earned Income Tax Credit that is given in a yearly lump-sum payment and replaces it with a program that would allow workers to exempt a portion of their payroll taxes every month.

(6) Repeals the death tax or inheritance tax.

(7) Reduces the rate of double taxation by lowering the top corporate rate to 25 percent and setting a maximum long-term capital gains tax rate at 15 percent.

(8) Sets a maximum dividend tax rate at 15 percent.

(9) Encourages (on net) investment and entrepreneurship activity.

(10) Moves to a competitive international system of taxation.

SEC. 315. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The President’s health care law has failed to keep its health care promises. Health care premiums were supposed to decline by $2,500. Instead, according to the 2013 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health insurance premiums have increased by 20 percent for individual plans and 4 percent for family since 2012. Moreover, according to a report from the Energy and Commerce Committee, premiums for individual market plans may go up as much as 50 percent because of the law.

(2) The President pledged that Americans would be able to keep their health care plan if they liked it. But the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 2 million Americans with employment-based health insurance will lose their plans.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi, said that the President’s health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the law will reduce full-time equivalent employment by about 2.6 million jobs in 2017 and 2.5 million jobs in 2024, “compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the ACA.”

(4) The implementation of the law has been a failure. The Administration has announced that insurance companies were supposed to use in purchasing new coverage for patients with pre-existing conditions was broken for over a month. Since the President’s health care law was signed into law, the Administration has announced 23 delays. The President has also failed to submit any nominees to sit on the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of bureaucrats that will cut Medicare by an additional $121 billion over the next ten years, according to the President’s own budget.

(5) The President’s health care law should be repealed and replaced with reforms that make affordable and quality health care coverage available to all Americans.

(6) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently projected to grow 5 percent per year over the next ten years, and according to the Congressional Budget Office’s 2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare capita target growth rate. Prior to 2015, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2015, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW.

(1) The Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2026 and unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(2) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently projected to grow 5 percent per year over the next ten years, and according to the Congressional Budget Office’s 2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.

(3) The President’s health care law created a new Federal Employment Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) empowered with unilateral authority to cut Medicare spending. As a result of that law—

(A) IPAB was tasked with keeping the Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.

(B) IPAB will be tasked with keeping the Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut nearly 25 percent across the board, devastating those current and near retiree beneficiaries and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(4) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of $1.7 trillion over the next 10 years.

(5) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans’ retirement security.

(6) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with permanent disabilities and persons with debilitating and terminal health conditions that will reduce seniors access to care.

(7) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(1) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced.

(2) In 2016, the President pledged that the Medicare Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(3) In 2017, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(4) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut nearly 25 percent across the board, devastating those current and near retiree beneficiaries and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW.

(1) FINDINGS.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should address soon.

(2) If this program is not reformed, family savings to lower tax rates across the board—not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Tax reform should be revenue-neutral and should not be an excuse to raise taxes on America’s middle class. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of $1.7 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans’ retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with permanent disabilities and persons with debilitating and terminal health conditions that will reduce seniors access to care.

(6) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW.

(1) The Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2026 and unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(2) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently projected to grow 5 percent per year over the next ten years, and according to the Congressional Budget Office’s 2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.

(3) The President’s health care law created a new Federal Employment Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) empowered with unilateral authority to cut Medicare spending. As a result of that law—

(A) IPAB was tasked with keeping the Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.

(B) IPAB will be tasked with keeping the Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.

(c) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW.

(1) FINDINGS.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should address soon.

(2) If this program is not reformed, family savings to lower tax rates across the board—not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Tax reform should be revenue-neutral and should not be an excuse to raise taxes on America’s middle class. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of $1.7 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans’ retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with permanent disabilities and persons with debilitating and terminal health conditions that will reduce seniors access to care.

(6) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW.

(1) The Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2026 and unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(2) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently projected to grow 5 percent per year over the next ten years, and according to the Congressional Budget Office’s 2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT’S HEALTH CARE LAW.

(1) The Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2026 and unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(2) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently projected to grow 5 percent per year over the next ten years, and according to the Congressional Budget Office’s 2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percent.
In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes these reforms will include:

(1) Adoption of a more accurate measure for calculating cost of living adjustments.

(2) Adoption of adjustments to the full retirement age to reflect increased life expectancy.

(c) POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income programs with an annual cost of $3.9 billion to address the root drivers of tuition inflation, by—

(1) targeting Federal financial aid to those most in need;

(2) streamlining programs that provide aid to make them more effective;

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at $5,730 each year of the budget window; and

(4) removing regulatory barriers in higher education that restrict flexibility and innovative teaching, particularly as it relates to non-traditional models such as online coursework and competency-based learning.

(f) FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—The House finds the following:

(1) Over ten million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with employers with trained personnel.

(4) According to a 2011 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, in fiscal year 2009, the Federal Government spent $18 billion across 9 agencies to administer 47 Federal job training programs, almost all of which overlapped with another program in terms of offered services and targeted population.

(5) Since the release of that GAO report, the Education and Workforce Committee, which has done extensive work in this area, has identified more than 50 programs.

(3) Without changes, this flawed system will continue to fail those looking for work or to improve their skills, and jeopardize economic growth.

(d) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Congressional committees shall, or cancelling unobligated balances that remain available for expenditure before the fiscal year 2014.

(2) These funds represent direct and discrete unobligated balances that remain available for expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which they are provided.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act, which requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding such funds unless approved by an act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from programs that remain unobligated balances.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Congressional committees shall through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that are not necessary and/or that are the result of the Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans’ affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 320. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is $188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.—It is the policy of this resolution that:

(1) The House of Representatives must be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars and to act to restrict Congress or rescission of unobligated balances that remain available for expenditure in fiscal year 2014. Congress should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending.

(2) The House Administration Committee and oversight committees should provide to Members and committees of the House, and should identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 321. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office ("GAO") is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Comptroller General has stated that address- ing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs "could potentially save tens of billions of dollars."

(3) In 2011, 2012, and 2013 the Government Accountability Office reported savings from Federal programs showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) 209 Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education grants programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of $3 billion annually;

(B) 208 separate Department of Justice crime prevention and community safety grant programs with an annual cost of $3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) 20 different Federal entities administer 16 separate programs with no overlay of Federal assistance for housing with a total cost of $170 billion in 2010;
SEC. 322. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively. Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees’ judgment should continue to receive funding.

SEC. 323. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing our recovery from the economic recession.

(2) In the first two months of 2014 alone, the Administration issued 13,166 pages of regulations imposing more than $3 billion in compliance costs on job creators and adding more than 16 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(3) The Small Business Administration estimates that the total cost of regulations is as high as $1.75 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated over $49 billion in regulations each year, with an estimated $87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111–231) resulted in more than $17 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than $58 million of paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 122.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing a cost of $3.3 billion on the private sector and an $8 billion cost burden on the states.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In September 2013, a rule regulating greenhouse gas emissions from new coal-fired power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, and result in a de facto ban on new coal-fired power plants. Additional regulations for existing coal plants are expected in the summer of 2014.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly forty percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase the cost of electricity, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income families already struggling to pay their bills.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 324. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports would boost the economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every $1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country taxes and United States taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage.

(4) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a “tax loophole,” cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision would essentially eliminate the United States tax advantage for foreign operations like it should harm United States competitiveness.

(5) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and establish business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(6) The status quo of the current tax code undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and lowers the United States economy investment and jobs.

(7) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion leads to “hollowing out” American businesses and falling United States competitiveness is a fallacy. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquarters multinationalshave operations abroad they often lead to more jobs and economic growth in the States.

(8) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(b) POLICY ON TRADE.—It is the policy of this resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system in order to promote job creation in the United States.
In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms the Social Security Disability Insurance program (SNAP).

It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider—

(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit; or

(2) an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this resolution, the terms "congressional earmark", "limited tax benefit", and "limited tariff benefit" have the meaning given those terms in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.
TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 601. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 5.7 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(c) INAPPLICABILITY.—This resolution shall not apply to any authorization of appropriation to a Federal entity if such authorization is not specifically targeted to a State, local, or congressional district.

SEC. 602. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives may not report a rule or other order that would waive the point of order set forth in section 501(a).
which are of protecting those special interest tax breaks for very powerful interests while gutting important investments in our future, investments that have been proven historically to make the United States the leading economic power in the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to thank my friend for his fealty for The Heritage Foundation. I share that and would remind the House that the Heritage action key voting a “yes” vote on the budget before us today.

If he would like to be in line with Heritage, he can vote “yes” with me today. I would welcome that support.

With that, Madam Chair, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman SCALISE, who is the chairman of the Republican Study Committee and a gentleman who has provided huge leadership for us in this conference.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding and for his leadership in bringing forth this budget. As the chairman of the Republican Study Committee's Budget and Spending Task Force, Mr. Woonsocket, let me begin this budget called Back to Basics, and that is really what we are here to talk about right now.

Madam Chair, what are those basics we should talk about? I think they are the basic fundamentals that our Founding Fathers laid out when they created this great Nation. It is still the greatest nation in the history of the world, but it is a nation with serious challenges.

If you look at our economy, our economy is struggling in many ways because of policies coming out of Washington, because of Washington’s failure to confront those challenges.

People across this country are ready to confront those challenges. They are looking to us to finally start laying out a vision that says we are going to start living within our means, that we are going to do the things that families across this Nation do every single year, and that is finally getting back to fiscal discipline.

When my friend on the other side—I guess the person who is tasked with coming and opposing budgets that balance—uses terms like “draconian”—Madam Chair, I will tell you what is draconian. What is draconian is to deny the opportunity to our children and grandchildren that we enjoy today, something that every single generation in the history of our country has.

One of the pure definitions of the American Dream is that every generation in our Nation’s history, since George Washington led us through that Revolution, has had better opportunities than those that we enjoy today; yet most people in this country recognize, in order to get our fiscal house in order, our children—my 7- and 4-year-olds, whom my wife drove to school this morning—won’t have those same opportunities, and they all deserve the opportunities that we enjoy.

So how do we do it? How do we get back to basics? We do it by having really good, strong, bold policy—bold policy that says we ought to live within our means.

Our budget balances by year 4. In 2018, we have a balanced Federal budget. If you compare that with President Obama’s budget, he has got a budget that has over $1 trillion in new taxes.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: oh, you need to stick more taxes on all of these businesses. If anybody is making a profit in America, it seems like they want to put a bull’s-eye on him. If one happens to be successful and make a profit and create jobs in this country, that is somehow a bad thing.

If you take their approach in their budgets—in all of their budgets—they have over $1 trillion in new taxes. President Obama has nearly $2 trillion in new taxes, so you would think: okay, all of those new taxes must be what get you to balance.

In fact, Madam Chair, all of those new taxes just get you more despair. This never gets to balance, but he has all of those tax increases that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about.

In our budget, we don’t have any new taxes, and once you have a good, smart fiscal discipline policy that says let’s get our economy moving again and let’s believe in the American people.

By not raising taxes and by getting our economy moving, you actually get to balance in 4 short years and start creating surpluses, so we can pay back that debt, as my friend from Georgia talked about, so that we don’t have to send all of those interest payments to other countries and to other priorities. Let’s get those priorities in America.

How do we do this? How do we actually get back to balance in such a short period of time?

Number one, we save Medicare from bankruptcy, just as PAUL RYAN does in the House Republican budget that came out of the Budget Committee. We share many of those same principles that get us to fiscal responsibility by saying Medicare, by not letting it go bankrupt, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about for the President’s own budget does.

The President’s own budget allows Medicare to go bankrupt. We don’t think that is responsible, so we take care of those who paid into a system over their lifetimes.

We also invoke smart policy. If you start with health care, in our bill, we actually repeal the President’s health care law and replace it with the American Health Care Reform Act, a bill that actually puts patients back in charge of their own health care and that allows us to, again, have families in charge of those decisions and to lower costs.

It is good, smart policy. We will talk more about it, but this is the right path to getting our economy back on track.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consider necessary.

The gentleman speaks about the importance of fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility, and we agree.

The question we have is: Why do they exempt from the whole practice of fiscal discipline all of these what are called tax expenditures and tax preferences that have been put into the Tax Code many times by very powerful special interests?

What does a tax preference mean? It means in many cases that, because somebody has well-heeled lobbyists, he is able to escape having to pay taxes on something that everybody else has to pay for.

What our Republican colleagues are saying is they don’t want to take away any of those special interest preferences for the purpose of reducing the deficit. They would rather cut deeply into our kids’ education. They would rather charge college students more interest on their loans. They would rather increase class sizes in K–12, which is what happens when you cut Title I and special education.

We talk about opportunity, but the opportunities that they are protecting are those for the special interests who had their lobbyists do very well for them in Washington. Hey, hands off all of that. We don’t want to touch that. But we are coming after everybody else, including, by the way, seniors on Medicare who will immediately see the reopening of the doughnut hole.

So if you are a senior with high prescription drug costs, that is going to cost you $1,200 more per year, on average, immediately. And then they begin to phase in in their budget their Medicare voucher program, which will end the Medicare guarantee.

This is all about priorities. The interesting thing here is that, despite all the talk about fiscal discipline from our Republican colleagues, it is hands off imposing any fiscal discipline on powerful special interests who have succeeded in getting themselves special deals in the Tax Code.

I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), chairman of the Democratic Caucus and a member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has spent a lot of time focusing on these issues.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the ranking member on the Budget Committee for, first, all the work he has done over the years in trying to get America back on track when it comes to what it should do with its budgets.

Budgets are a testament to our values and our priorities, and I believe Mr. VAN HOLLEN has made it very clear what the values and priorities of Members of this side of the aisle are. It is
about making sure that we invest the taxpayer dollars to help our economy grow, help grow jobs, and help our kids grow up and get to college.

But let me remind everyone here of something. Remember those brainless, autopilot cuts, which had been scheduled for last year that led to the Republican shutdown of our government? Well, the Republican budget of 2015 is sequester on steroids.

Remember last year’s autopilot sequester cuts would have kicked over 50,000 children out of Head Start classes? Well, the 2015 Republican budget kicks 170,000 kids out of Head Start classes.

This Republican budget would kill jobs, with 1.1 million Americans likely to lose their jobs as a result of this budget and probably 3 million more the following year are the estimates.

This budget would cut seniors’ Social Security benefits by changing the way we calculate their cost-of-living increases. They would get less each year, even though we know the cost of living for seniors keeps going up.

They would continue to reduce our investments in very important projects that grow our economy because the Republican budget would voucherize Medicare. It would turn it into a privatized version of what we have now, without the guarantees, so that seniors will be paying more for their prescription drugs.

This Republican budget would close not one single wasteful corporate tax loophole and, instead, it actually offers billionaire a $200,000 tax cut at the same time that it is increasing taxes for the middle class by about $2,000.

It should surprise no one that, while we are not closing any tax loopholes in the Republican budget and while we are increasing the taxes for middle class Americans, this Republican budget excludes things that we should do.

Through this budget we could, right now, move to increase the economy’s capacity, increase the number of jobs, and decrease our deficits by finally fixing our broken immigration system.

Our Democratic budget does that; the Republican budget doesn’t. And as a result, we give up, through the Republican budget, an opportunity to reduce our deficits by close to a trillion dollars over the next couple of decades. We give up the opportunity to create close to 3.5 million jobs over the next 10 to 20 years by doing immigration reform, and we give up the chance to strengthen Social Security by doing immigration reform. The Democratic budget makes those investments.

The Republican budget actually invests in early childhood education. The Democratic budget makes it possible for more middle class families to afford to send their kids to college.

The Democratic budget makes those investments because we do close corporate tax loopholes. We do go after those who are evading paying their fair share of taxes. And we can make those investments in early childhood education, in fixing our broken immigration system, in investing in our roads and bridges because we go after those who are evading paying their taxes. We could do that.

But, again, I remind you, this is a budget being presented on this floor from our colleagues on the other side that actually put the brainless cuts under the sequester on autopilot. And we need to defeat that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to just say: Nonsense. Nonsense. This is the only budget that is being presented that includes the Tax Code Termination Act that terminates every single special interest loophole in the entire Tax Code. Both gentlemen know that. Every single special interest exemption, exception in the Tax Code is gone under this budget.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a fantastic member of the Republican Study Committee and a member of my class of 2010.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, over the past 3 years, I have conducted over 200 townhall meetings in my district. I have discussed Federal spending, my constituents do not want to hear about debt-to-GDP ratios or CBO scoring rules when it comes to the budget. What they want to know is why Congress has not balanced the budget, and when we plan to do so. They want to know when Washington will stop spending money we don’t have. They want to know when we will stop piling trillions of dollars of debt on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

This RSC budget would balance the budget the soonest of any of the alternatives before us, Mr. Chairman, and it would begin to pay down our debt the fastest. It is the type of results the American people demand out of Washington.

I am pleased this budget includes some innovative and responsible reforms like Medicaid block grants, food stamp block grants, and a real time-table to save and secure Medicare.

I am also pleased it would repeal ObamaCare. It would call for the passage of a real health care reform act like the American Health Care Reform Act, the JOBS Act, the REINS Act, the Tax and Expenditure Limit, and it would start over, and it would restore work requirements for those on welfare and prohibit funding abortion providers.

In short, this RSC budget is full of the right ideas to get our Nation back on track and encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for the RSC budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. BROWN), a distinguished member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and someone who is focused on investing in America.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The documents that we are debating today are more than just the Republican budget. It is who they are. They constantly quote scripture, yet the Bible says the poor will always be with us. Our job is to help raise the standard.

They remind me of “The Wizard of Oz.” The Republicans have no heart. This is another example of reverse Robin Hood—robbing from the working people and the middle class to give huge tax cuts to the rich.

The latest House Republican goals are to dismantle Medicare by ending the guarantee and replacing it with a voucher program and block grant and cut Medicaid by $732 billion. I was so upset last year when the SNAP program—programs like Meals on Wheels and assistance to children—was cut by $40 billion. Now they cut it by $125 billion.

They want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. But let me just mention that everybody that talks about repealing it has health care. Every single one of them have health care.

They reject the President’s proposal for veterans and Job Corps while aiming to reduce our unemployment rate among veterans. A cut of 24 percent to nondefense appropriations would mean $146 billion cut from veterans’ health care.

They cut transportation and infrastructure projects by $173 billion, phasing out the Essential Air Service programs to 160 small communities.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DENHAM). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 1 minute.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. It eliminates Amtrak operational funds, resulting in 36 States and more than 20 million people losing Amtrak service. The transportation budget assumes no highway or transit investment in 2015.

And while everyone knows that education is critical, they cut billions from programs like Head Start.

To whom God has given much, much is expected. I certainly think more is expected from the Republican leadership in this House.

As I said from the beginning, they remind me of “The Wizard of Oz.” This Republican House has no heart.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), my good friend.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, the RSC budget balances in 4 years. For most Americans, 4 years seems like a very long time. When they see budgets that balance in even 10 years, let alone 26 years, or not at all, they wonder what we are thinking.

In the real world, folks can’t spend money they don’t have. Families have to balance their budgets. They expect Washington to do the same. That is why I applaud this budget. It is full of tough choices, but it demonstrates
that House Republicans aren’t afraid to make the difficult decisions necessary to secure America’s future and preserve the American Dream.

It is called leadership. That means proposing simple answers—even when they are not easy ones. I commend Chairman SCALISE and Mr. WOODALL for crafting a plan that will balance the budget and create a healthy economy sooner than any other budget alternative. The RSC budget proposes a path that embraces the responsibility we have to future generations to leave America better than we found her.

The unwillingness of Congress to make tough choices is putting our country on a road to ruin. Let’s take the road less traveled. It may make all the difference.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I have any speakers remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friend from Maryland if he has any speakers remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. No, I do not.

Mr. WOODALL. I would ask the gentleman if he would like to give me the opportunity to close?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The gentleman is free to lead.

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

We have talked about tax breaks for the rich here. There are no such tax breaks in this budget. We have talked about the preservation of corporate loopholes. There are no such preservation of corporate loopholes in this budget.

I will say again. This is the only budget that we will vote on that includes the Tax Code Termination Act, which admits to one another that the tax system we have today is broken.

Republicans and Democrats alike have riddled it beyond repair with special interest loopholes, exemptions, breaks, and special carve-outs. I, Mr. Chairman, am the co-sponsor, the lead sponsor of the Fair Tax, the only proposal on Capitol Hill that abolishes every single exemption and loophole in the Tax Code. So nonsense, if folks will suggest that this is a budget for special interests.

Let me tell you what this is a budget for. This is a budget for working Americans, because, Mr. Chairman—you saw the chart when the Republican Study Committee held up this chart. The red line represents a pathway of economic ruin contained in the President’s budget.

The President talks about a balanced approach, and yet his approach never balances. The Republican Study Committee budget balances more quickly than any other budget proposal that we will discuss.

Does it have to make tough choices to do it?

Yes, it does. What is the benefit of those tough choices, Mr. Chairman?

The benefit is in interest savings alone. If you support NIH, as I do, with just the interest savings between our budget and the President's budget, we couldn’t just double NIH funding, we could triple it, not just this year but every year in the budget window.

Mr. Chairman, on our current path, by 2017, we are going to be spending more on interest than we spend on the entire Medicaid program to care for our children and our elderly.

By 2020 we will spend more on interest on the national debt under the President’s proposal than we will on all national security concerns combined.

There is not a family in America, Mr. Chairman, that believes they can borrow their way into prosperity.

The interest that we pay on the debt than is the President proposes that this Nation borrow steals opportunities from our children. It is immoral to advance our generation today at the expense of generations tomorrow.

Does this budget make tough choices? It does. There is only one budget that we will be considering today. Mr. Chairman, that takes steps to protect and preserve Social Security. That is the RSC budget.

There are only two budgets that we will be considering today that take steps to ensure the solvency of Medicare for generations to come. That is the RSC budget and the Budget Committee budget.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot talk about a balanced approach that does not balance. You cannot talk about making tough decisions if you are willing to do nothing to save those programs, Medicare and Social Security, that so many of our families back home rely on.

Do you know those programs are headed towards destruction, which is why the RSC has made the very difficult choice to begin saving them today.
Well, it means real things. It means less funds for Head Start and early Head Start. It means a big cut to K–12 education. We have a bipartisan piece of legislation saying that Congress is already failing to meet our commitments to special ed, and we ask our local school jurisdictions to take on the responsibility, it was the right thing to do, to make sure every kid got a good education. That was the right thing to do.

But these guys would cut that program. So this is the wrong choice for America. Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee’s budget proposal.

Now, look, we all agree that we need to impose fiscal discipline. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

The question was taken, and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

The voting was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 291, not voting 7, as follows: [Roll No. 175]
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Sec. 201. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for job creation through investments and incentives.
Sec. 202. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the President’s opportunity, growth, and security initiative.
Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence and security.
Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America’s veterans and service members.
Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for additional tax relief for individuals and families.

Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the extension of expired or expiring tax provisions.
Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicaid and children’s health improvement.
Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Medicare guarantee for seniors and retirees.
Sec. 209. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extension of expiring health care care provisions.
Sec. 211. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for initiatives that benefit children.
Sec. 212. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college affordability and completion.
Sec. 213. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for rural counties and schools.
Sec. 214. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.
Sec. 215. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Sec. 502. Policy of the House on surface transportation.
Sec. 503. Policy of the House on tax reform and fairness for middle-class Americans.
Sec. 504. Policy of the House on increasing the minimum wage.
Sec. 505. Policy of the House on immigration reform.
Sec. 506. Policy of the House on extension of emergency unemployment compensation.
Sec. 507. Policy of the House on the earned income tax credit.
Sec. 508. Policy of the House on women’s empowerment: when women succeed, America succeeds.
Sec. 509. Policy of the House on a national strategy to eradicate poverty and increase opportunity.
Sec. 510. Policy of the House on Social Security reform that protects workers and retirees.
Sec. 511. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors.
Sec. 512. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.
Sec. 513. Policy of the House on Medicaid.
Sec. 514. Policy of the House on national security.
Sec. 515. Policy of the House on climate change science.
Sec. 516. Policy of the House on investments in early childhood education.
Sec. 517. Policy of the House on taking a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

Sec. 518. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the reduction of unnecessary and wasteful spending.
Sec. 519. Policy of the House on the use of taxpayer funds.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:
(a) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $2,992,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,759,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,883,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,000,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,126,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,246,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,420,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,654,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,942,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,138,354,000,000.

(b) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $3,58,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,832,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,89,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $4,109,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,111,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,187,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,125,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,198,126,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,316,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,390,961,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $3,077,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,233,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,405,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,570,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,772,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,966,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,137,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,320,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,520,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,688,170,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $3,070,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,233,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,405,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,570,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,772,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,966,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,137,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,320,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,520,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,688,170,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $5,477,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $5,494,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $5,503,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $5,520,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $5,628,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $5,667,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $5,692,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $6,685,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $5,424,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,779,582,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $18,350,000,000,000.
SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $24,691,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $23,943,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $23,144,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $22,191,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,191,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $20,236,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,489,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $18,060,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,206,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $16,492,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (550):

Fiscal year 2015: $51,734,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $52,181,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $53,172,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $54,111,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $55,513,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $57,798,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $60,440,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $63,798,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $67,688,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $72,188,000,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2015: $36,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $37,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $40,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $44,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $51,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $58,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $65,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $74,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $85,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $99,010,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2015: $11,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $12,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $18,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $22,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $25,411,000,000.

(4) Energy (260):

Fiscal year 2015: $3,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $4,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $5,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $5,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $6,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $6,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $6,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $7,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $7,631,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (350):

Fiscal year 2015: $1,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $1,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $1,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $106,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $46,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (370):

Fiscal year 2015: $46,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $46,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $45,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $45,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $45,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $45,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $45,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $45,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $45,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $45,922,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2015: $13,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $1,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $11,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $4,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $2,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $452,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2015: $108,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $107,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $106,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $105,607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $104,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $103,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $102,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $101,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $100,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $99,001,000,000.

(9) Health (500):

Fiscal year 2015: $84,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $87,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $90,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $93,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $95,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $98,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $101,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $104,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $106,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $109,483,000,000.
(A) New budget authority, $81,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,444,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $92,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,978,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $94,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,980,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $96,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,063,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $34,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,138,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,255,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,941,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $57,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $61,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,361,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $65,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,543,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $69,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $73,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,573,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, $73,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $3,654,000,000.
B) Outlays, $3,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $312,000,000.
B) Outlays, $320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,399,000,000.
B) Outlays, $32,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
A) New budget authority, $936,153,000,000.
B) Outlays, $842,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
A) New budget authority, $500,508,000,000.
B) Outlays, $366,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
A) New budget authority, $33,236,000,000.
B) Outlays, $32,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2023:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2022:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2021:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2020:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2019:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2017:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2016:
A) New budget authority, $0.
B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2015:
B) Outlays, $-98,215,000,000.
A) New budget authority, $-98,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
B) Outlays, $-91,882,000,000.
A) New budget authority, $-91,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
A) New budget authority, $-95,566,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-95,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
A) New budget authority, $-96,215,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-96,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
A) New budget authority, $-101,362,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-101,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
A) New budget authority, $-107,998,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-107,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
A) New budget authority, $-83,956,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-83,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
A) New budget authority, $-83,738,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-83,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
A) New budget authority, $-83,632,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-83,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
A) New budget authority, $-78,532,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-78,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
A) New budget authority, $-83,870,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-83,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
A) New budget authority, $-78,770,000,000.
B) Outlays, $-78,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
A) New budget authority, $685,970,000,000.
B) Outlays, $685,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
A) New budget authority, $500,508,000,000.
B) Outlays, $500,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
A) New budget authority, $30,399,000,000.
B) Outlays, $32,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
B) Outlays, $31,357,000,000.
enhances the delivery of health care to the Nation’s veterans and service members, including the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental illnesses, and reduces the capacity tax that health care needs unique to women veterans;

(2) makes improvements to the Post 9/11 GI Bill to ensure that veterans receive the education and training they need to maximize their employment opportunities;

(3) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(4) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt); or

(5) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans’ dependency and indemnity compensation by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves Medicaid or other health programs, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024. Such improvements may include an expansion of the National Health Service Corps, an extension of the enhanced reimbursement rates to mid-level providers who practice independently.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE EXTENSION OF EXPIRED OR EXPIRING TAX PROVISIONS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional tax relief to individuals and families extending tax relief provided by the refundable child credit, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes improvements to Medicare, including making reforms to the Medicare payment system for physicians that build on delivery reforms underway, such as advancement of new care models, including:

(1) changes incentives to encourage efficiency and higher quality care in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability;

(2) improves payment accuracy to encourage efficient use of resources and ensure that patient-centered primary care receives appropriate compensation;

(3) supports innovative programs to improve coordination of care among all providers serving a patient in all appropriate settings;

(4) holds providers accountable for their utilization patterns and quality of care; and

(5) makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities. Medicine’s need by the amounts provided, together with any savings from ending Overseas Contingency Operations, in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID AND CHILDREN’S HEALTH IMPROVEMENT.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves Medicaid or other children’s health programs, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024. Such improvements may include an expansion of the Medicare program to cover eligible individuals with disabilities at age 21.

SEC. 209. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENSION OF EXPIRING HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves Medicare, Medicaid, or other health provisions, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE HEALTH CARE WORKFORCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the contemporary health care workforce’s ability to meet emerging demands, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 211. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to put the Federal Government on a 10-year path to fulfill its commitment to America’s children and schools by providing 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for special education.

SEC. 212. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY AND COMPLETION.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable and increases college completion, including efforts to: encourage States and higher education institutions to improve educational outcomes and access for low- and moderate-income families, such as expanding tax relief programs that encourage continued full funding for Pell grants; or help borrowers lower and manage their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded payment options, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 213. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A COMPETITIVE WORKFORCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes changes that improve the contemporary workforce, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 214. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-395) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under Public Law 106-395 in the future and would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 215. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FULL FUNDING OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under Public Law 106-395 in the future and would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without additional penalty. When child support payments are passed to the child, rather than to administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

(4) Regular increases in funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to put the Federal Government on a 10-year path to fulfill its commitment to America’s children and schools by providing 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for special education.
TITLe III—Estimates of Direct spending

SEC. 301. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) Means-Tested Direct Spending.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(b) Nonmeans-Tested Direct Spending.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 5.7 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(c) Provisions are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending: For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee of covering health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare. In other areas, the report contains other extension of temporary unemployment compensation, additional funding for surface transportation, a new initiative for early childhood education, and extension of American Opportunity Tax Credit, which assists with higher education expenses.

TITLe IV—Enforcement Provisions

SEC. 401. POINT OF ORDER AGAINst ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) In General.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) Exception—Advance Appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2016 for programs, projects, and activities identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” for an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for, 2017, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for all discretionary programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) Definitions.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making an appropriation for fiscal year 2015 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2015.

SEC. 402. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY BUDGET AUTHORITY

(a) Program Integrity Initiatives Under the Budget Control Act.—

(1) Social Security Administration Program Integrity Initiative.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2015.

(2) Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates $9,445,000,000 for the Health Care Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $480,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2015.

(b) Additional Program Integrity Initiatives.—

(1) Internal Revenue Service Tax Compliance Initiatives.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates $480,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enforcement, the joint expenditure for enforcement, adjusted by the additional amount of budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

(2) Use of Affordable Housing Trust Fund.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates $133,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improvements, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2015.

(c) Procedure for Adjustments.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustment forth with in the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 403. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND DISASTER RELIEF.

(a) Emergencies Needy.—In the House, prior to joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to this subsection, then the new budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority shall not count for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or this resolution.

(b) Overseas Contingency Operations.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for overseas contingency operations and such amounts are designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2015.

(c) Disaster Relief.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as adjusted by subsection (d).

(d) Wildfire Suppression Operations.—

(1) CAP Adjustment.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for wildfire suppression operations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates a base amount equal to 70 percent of the average cost of wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years and provides an additional appropriation of up to but not to exceed $1.4 billion for wildfire suppression operations and such amounts are designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the additional amount of budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority that meets the requirements set forth in this section.

(2) Deficit-Neutral Adjustment.—The total aggregate deficit reduction for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and
Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the sum of allocation increases made pursuant to paragraph (1) in the previous year.

(e) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that bill or joint resolution that meet the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 404. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) In General.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying section 302(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 405. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGRAGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;
(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and
(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall not be subject to the purpose of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 406. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, any adjustment to the 112th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of ‘‘CUTGO’’ rules and principles:

(1) (A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four fiscal years following the budget year; or
(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus of the budget year shall be estimated on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the term ‘‘budget year’’, ‘‘current year’’, and ‘‘direct spending’’ have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term ‘‘direct spending’’ shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make out-year modifications to sub humid grants and contracts that are the subject of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House, and if that measure meets as a new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate measure shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(D) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

(i) a bill or joint resolution;
(ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business; or
(iii) a conference report.

(3) An amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, or an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a provision in a bill or joint resolution under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency in purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Speaker shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

SEC. 407. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and
(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON JOBS: MAKING THE JOB.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the economy entered a deep recession in December 2007 that was worsened by the financial crisis in January 2008; and
(2) the economic recovery has been slow, with the private sector being shedding about 800,000 jobs per month; and
(3) many of our roads, bridges, and transit systems are in disrepair, and fail to move as many goods and people as the economic demands.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) In general.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pursue a ‘‘Make it in America’’ agenda with a priority to consider and enact legislation to help create and retain jobs, remove incentives to out-source jobs overseas and instead support incentives that bring jobs back to the United States, and help middle class families by increasing the minimum wage.

(2) Jobs.—This resolution—

(A) provides funding to support President Obama’s four-year, $302 billion surface transportation reauthorization proposal; and

(B) provides $1 billion for the President’s proposal to establish a Veterans Job Corps; and

(C) establishes a reserve fund that would allow for passage of additional job creation measures, including further infrastructure improvements and support for biomedical research that both creates jobs and advances scientific knowledge and health, or other spending or revenue proposals.

SEC. 502. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Supporting the President’s four-year, $302 billion surface transportation reauthorization proposal will sharpen America’s global competitive edge in the 21st century by allowing infrastructure expansion and modernization.

(2) Many of our roads, bridges, and transit systems are in disrepair, and fail to move as many goods and people as the economy demands.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to provide funding in support of the President’s proposed four-year, $302 billion surface transportation reauthorization that prevents the imminent insolvency of the highway trust fund and increases investment in our highway and transit programs. Such an investment would reduce congestion, improve safety, increase economic growth, create jobs, and creates jobs, and fosters economic growth.

SEC. 503. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM AND FAIRNESS FOR MIDDLE-CLASS AMERICANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) According to the United States Census Bureau, American families lost ground during the 2000s as median income slipped 4.9 percent in real terms, the largest loss since 1969, income fell 9.8 percent during 2008, income fell 1.8 percent during 2009.

(2) According to the Congressional Budget Office, between 1979 and 2007, real after-tax incomes for the top 1 percent of income earners increased about 90 percent, and real after-tax incomes for the bottom 20 percent of families
grow just 25 percent, and incomes of the poorest 20 percent increased by 16 percent.

(3) Past Republican tax plans have made reducing taxes for the wealthiest Americans the top priority. They have been legislated that increased deficits while giving a disproportionate share of any tax cuts to the wealthy.

(4) Recent Republican tax plans, including this year’s House Republican Budget, have emphasized reducing the top marginal rates to 25 percent. Analysis by the non-partisan Tax Policy Center has shown that it is impossible to achieve such a reduction and be revenue-neutral without large reductions in tax benefits for mid-income taxpayers that would lead to a net tax increase on those families.

(5) Analyses of proposals to reduce top rates to 25 percent within a revenue-neutral tax reform plan indicate that the plans would raise taxes on middle-class families with children by an average of at least $2,000.

(6) Such a tax increase would—

(a) Make it even harder for working families to make ends meet;

(b) Cost the economy millions of jobs over the course of the year, reducing worker spending, which will greatly weaken economic growth; and

(c) Further widen the income gap between the wealthiest Americans and the middle class by making the tax code more regressive.

(7) The tax code contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests.

(8) These special tax breaks can greatly complicate the effort to administer the code and the taxpayer’s ability to fully comply with its terms, while also undermining our basic sense of fairness.

(9) They can distort economic incentives for businesses and consumers and encourage businesses to ship American jobs and capital overseas for tax purposes; in many cases, the revenues lost to various tax expenditures can be put to better use for more targeted initiatives.

(b) Policy—

(1) This resolution would accommodate action to simplify the tax code and eliminate special interest tax breaks without increasing the tax burden on middle-class taxpayers.

SEC. 504. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE.

(a) Findings.—The House finds that—

(1) The minimum wage has not been increased since 2009;

(2) The real value of the minimum wage today is less than it was in 1966;

(3) Raising the minimum wage to $10.10 per hour would lift about 800,000 workers out of poverty;

(4) Having the minimum wage to $10.10 per hour would lift about 1,000,000 Americans out of poverty;

(5) Minimum wage workers bring home an average of 50 percent of their family’s total income;

(6) A higher minimum wage would put more money in the pockets of individuals who are likely to spend additional income, which would help expand the economy and create jobs;

(7) In part because of this effect, recent studies have indicated that increases in the minimum wage do not adversely affect job creation as much as had been previously thought, and that modest increases in the minimum wage may actually create jobs;

(8) The higher minimum wage is important to victims of wage discrimination, who are more likely to find themselves in low-paying jobs;

(9) A higher minimum wage will reduce government spending to provide assistance to minimum wage workers; and

(10) A higher minimum wage will benefit businesses by increasing productivity, reducing absenteeism, and reducing turnover.

(b) Policy.—This resolution assumes action on the minimum wage to $10.10 per hour in three annual steps, as proposed in H.R. 1010, the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013.

SEC. 505. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM.

(a) Findings.—The House finds the following:

(1) Fixing the country’s broken immigration system will mean a stronger economy and lower budget deficits.

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, will reduce the deficit by $600 billion over the next two decades, boost the economy by 5.6 percent, and increase productivity by 1.0 percent.

(3) The Social Security Actuary estimates that immigration reform will add up to $300 billion to the Social Security Trust Fund over the next decade and will extend Social Security solvency by up to two years.

(4) The passage of H.R. 15 recognizes that the primary benefits of immigration depend on securing the sovereignty of the United States of America and establishing a coherent and just system for integrating those who seek to join our society.

(5) We have a right, and duty, to maintain and secure our borders, and to keep our country safe and prosperous. As a Nation founded, built, and sustained by immigrants, we also have a responsibility to harness the power of that tradition in a balanced way that secures a more prosperous future for America.

(6) We have always welcomed newcomers to the United States and will continue to do so. But in order to qualify for the honor and privilege of becoming a citizen, civil and legal laws must be followed. The world depends on America to be strong—economically, militarily and ethically. The establishment of a stable, just, and efficient immigration system only supports those goals. As a Nation, we have the right and responsibility to make our borders safe, to establish clear and just rules for immigration, to control the flow of illegal immigration, and to eliminate illegal immigration, which in some cases has become a threat to our national security.

(7) All parties are agreed on the right and need of the United States to achieve these goals, and to protect its borders and maintain its sovereignty.

(b) Policy.—The House finds that the full House vote on comprehensive immigration reform—such as H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act—to boost our economy, lower deficits, establish clear and just rules for citizenship, and secure our borders.

SEC. 506. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) Findings.—The House finds the following:

(1) Since the expiration of emergency unemployment compensation at the end of 2013, over 2,000,000 workers and their families have lost their unemployment benefits. Thousands more are losing benefits each week.

(2) The long-term unemployment rate at the time of the expiration, and still today, was nearly twice as high as it was at the expiration of any previous extended unemployment benefits program.

(3) Extending unemployment is good for the affected workers, families, and the economy as a whole. The CBO has estimated that extending unemployment unemployment compensation will create 200,000 jobs by the end of the year.

(b) Policy.—It is the policy of this resolution that emergency unemployment compensation be extended for 1 year, adding 5 months and future legislation completing the task. Over the full year, this will benefit 5,000,000 Americans and their families as well as their communities and the Nation as a whole.

SEC. 507. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

(a) Findings.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) has long been considered one of our most effective anti-poverty programs. It has generally enjoyed strong, bipartisan support from Members of Congress and Presidents of each party.

(2) The EITC rewards work. Benefits are only available to taxpayers with earned income. Encouraging workforce participation among low earners is generally thought to foster economic growth, the community and the overall economy.

(3) Many of our income security programs target their benefits towards children. The EITC is different; the credit for childless workers is significantly less generous. As a result, low-income childless workers often receive little support from our anti-poverty efforts. Expanding the EITC for childless workers would help close that gap and has been supported by anti-poverty experts with varying ideological perspectives, consistent with the Credit’s bipartisan history.

(4) Expansion of the EITC can be viewed as a tax cut. There is significant room to expand the EITC for childless workers that would leave the rich better off, as net taxpayers, when you include both the employee- and employer-paid portion of their Medicare and Social Security payroll taxes.

(5) A tax cut for these workers is appropriate as very low-income childless workers, because of the limited tax benefits available to them, can, in some circumstances actually fall below the poverty line as a result of their tax burden.

(b) Policy.—It is the policy of this resolution that the House should pass legislation to expand the Earned Income Tax Credit for childless workers. This expansion could take several forms, including larger phase-in and phase-out rates, higher thresholds for beginning the phase-out range, and extension of the credit to older and younger adults.

SEC. 508. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT: WHEN WOMEN SUCCEED, AMERICA SUCCEEDS.

(a) Findings.—The House finds the following:

(1) Wage inequality still exists in this country. Women make only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men, and the pay gap for African American women and Latinas is even larger.

(2) Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women, and the minimum wage has not kept up with inflation over the last 45 years.

(3) More than 40 million private sector workers in this country—including more than 13 million women—who are not able to take a paid sick day when they are ill. Millions more lack paid sick time to care for a sick child.

(4) One in four, over 50 million women in the United States (23 percent) report that they have lost a job or have been threatened with job loss for taking time off due to illness or to care for a sick child.

(5) Fully 89 percent of the United States workforce does not have paid family leave
through their employers, and more than 60 percent of the workforce does not have paid personal medical leave through an employer-provided temporary disability program, which would include:

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should make a positive difference in the lives of women, especially by increasing measures to address economic equality and women’s health and safety. To address economic fairness, Congress should enact the Paycheck Bill. Increase the minimum wage, support women entrepreneurs and small businesses, and support work and family balance through earned paid sick leave, and affordable and expanded family and medical leave. To address health and safety concerns, Congress should increase funding for the prevention and treatment of women’s health issues such as breast cancer and heart disease, support access to family planning, and enact measures to prevent and protect women from domestic violence.

SEC. 509. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ERADICATE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Access to opportunity should be the right of every American.
(2) Poverty is prevented by more than one-third since 1967. More than 40,000,000 Americans are not in poverty today because of programs and tax policies that strengthen the nation’s middle-class and increase opportunity. Continued Federal support is essential to build on these gains.
(3) Anti-poverty programs have increasingly been focused on encouraging and reworking for those who are able. The programs can empower their beneficiaries to rise to the middle class through job training, educational assistance, adequate nutrition, housing and health care.
(4) Social Security has played a major role in reducing poverty for older Americans. Social Security benefits are modest, but they provide a floor for seniors out of poverty during retirement—less expensive beneficiaries, leaving the sick-

SEC. 510. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE: PROTECTS WORKERS AND RETIREES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Social Security is America’s most important safety net for workers, especially for seniors, because it provides an income floor for millions of families. Without these benefits, 2,500,000 more people would have lived in poverty in 2012.
(2) In 2013, 52,000,000 people relied on Medicare to guarantee their health care for coverage of hospital stays, physician services program instead of a private plan in 2013; and
(3) 9 out of 10 individuals 65 and older receive Social Security benefits.

SEC. 511. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security; and
(2) in 2013, 52,000,000 people relied on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services.

SEC. 512. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE, ACCESSIBLE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all is essential to improving families’ health and economic security, which will make the economy stronger;
(2) the Affordable Care Act will expand affordable coverage to 25,000,000 people by the end of the decade, and already, millions of Americans have health insurance under this law—millions of families who have signed up for private health insurance through new health insurance Marketplaces, 3,000,000 young adults have been able to stay on their parents’ health insurance, and 3,000,000 people have new Medicaid coverage;

(3) the Affordable Care Act ensures the right to equal treatment for people who have pre-existing health conditions and for women;

(4) the Affordable Care Act ensures that health insurance coverage will always include basic necessary services such as pre-scription health care and maternity care and that insurance companies cannot impose lifetime or annual limits on these benefits;

(5) the Affordable Care Act increases transparency in health care, helping to reduce health care cost growth by requiring transparency around hospital charges, insurer cost-sharing, and kick-back payments from pharmaceutical companies to physicians;

(6) the Affordable Care Act reforms Federal health entitlements by using nearly every health entitlement program’s existing authority to save money, including, new incentives to re-emphasize efficiency in program delivery and, the elimination of excessive taxpayer subsidies to private insurance plans, and as a result will slow the projected annual growth rate of national health expenditures by 0.3 percent-to private insurance plans, and as a result

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the law of the land should support making affordable health care coverage available to every American family, and therefore the Affordable Care Act should not be repealed.

SEC. 513. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation’s health care safety net, providing health care to 3,000,000,000 Americans, including 1 in 3 children;

(2) Medicaid improves health outcomes, access to health services, and financial security;

(3) senior citizens and people with disabilities account for two-thirds of Medicaid program spending and consequently would be at particular risk for losing health care assistance under any policy to sever the link between Medicaid funding and health care assistance under any policy to which the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization;

(10) weapons technologies should be proven to work reliably before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(11) the Pentagon’s operation and maintenance budget has grown for decades between 2.5 percent and 3.0 percent above inflation each year on a per service member basis, and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this time before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(12) nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 to 2013 is due to increases in climate-related federal programs including programs to manage our security through greater emphasis on prevention and on effective diplomacy and international development;

(13) cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing “loose nukes” and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 should be rescinded and replaced by a deficit reduction plan that is balanced, that makes smart spending cuts, that requires everyone to pay their fair share, and that takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs;

(2) savings can be achieved from the national defense budget without compromising our security through greater emphasis on preventing duplication and overlap in programs, reforming the acquisition process, identifying and constraining unsustainable operating costs, and through careful analysis of our national security needs.

SEC. 515. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) The United States Government Accountability Office described climate change as, “a complex, crosscutting issue that poses many serious environmental, economic, and security risks for the United States and the global community, including economic systems—including agriculture, infrastructure, ecosystems, and human health—and presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government”;

(2) The United States Academy of Sciences and the British Royal Society reported, “It is now more certain than ever, based on all the evidence of extraterrestrial life, that humans are changing Earth’s climate. The atmosphere and oceans have warmed, accompanied by sea-level rise, a strong decline in Arctic sea ice, and other changes that are not consistent with 21st century trends, which should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization;

(10) weapons technologies should be proven to work reliably before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(11) the Pentagon’s operation and maintenance budget has grown for decades between 2.5 percent and 3.0 percent above inflation each year on a per service member basis, and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this time before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(12) nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 to 2013 is due to increases in climate-related federal programs including programs to manage our security through greater emphasis on prevention and on effective diplomacy and international development;

(13) cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing “loose nukes” and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that climate change presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government. The scientific community has reached a consensus regarding climate change science, which provides critical information to preserve economic and environmental systems throughout the world.

SEC. 516. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INVESTMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Investments in early education are among the best investments we can make for children, families, and the economy.
(2) Investments in early childhood benefit the economy as a whole, generating at least $7 in return for every $1 invested by lowering the need for spending on other services—such as remedial education, grade repetition, and special education—and increasing productivity and earnings for those children as adults.

(3) Children who receive high-quality early education benefit directly in both the short term and the long term. They have better educational outcomes, stronger job earnings, and higher in-dustry rates.

(4) Unfortunately, only 3 out of every 10 4-year-olds are enrolled in high-quality early childhood programs in the United States. This low level of participation ranks the United States 28th out of 38 countries in the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development for the share of 4-year-olds enrolled in early childhood education.

(5) In particular, children from low-income families are less likely to have access to high-quality, affordable preschool programs that will prepare them for kindergarten. By third grade, children from low-income families who are not reading at grade level are six times less likely to graduate from high school than students who are proficient.

(b) POLICY.—This resolution provides for enactment of subsection (2), 10-year spending reduction that will provide access to high-quality early education for all 4-year-olds. Early education programs must meet quality benchmarks that can improve long-term outcomes for children, including a rigorous curriculum tied to State-level standards, qualified teachers, small class sizes, and effective evaluation and review of programs.

SEC. 517. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAKING A BALANCED APPROACH TO DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Since 2010, the Congress has enacted several budget measures to reduce the deficit. Most of the savings come from cuts to spending. Revenues represent less than one-quarter of total savings achieved.

(2) Increase in the remaining spending sequester will damage our national security, critical infrastructure, and other important investments.

(3) Each committee has recommended and the majority of Americans agree, that we should take a balanced, bipartisan approach that addresses both revenue and spending.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should develop a balanced plan to address the Nation's long-term fiscal imbalance. The plan should—

(1) prevent job loss and economic drag in the near term as the economy heals;

(2) increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans; and

(3) reduce spending through greater efficiencies within the Government and improving incentives for service providers while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting the retirement system, improving the Social Security net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.

SEC. 518. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office ("GAO") is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of examples.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs "could potentially save tens of billions of dollars".

(3) The Government Accountability Office spends about $90 billion each year for information technology. GAO has identified opportunities for savings and improved efficiencies in the Government's information technology infrastructure.

(4) Federal agencies reported an estimated $108 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2012.

(5) Under clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each session for the purpose of establishing its jurisdiction, dealing with, or reviewing any Federal program.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office, in its 2012 report to the Committee on the Budget, found that Federal programs unnecessarily overlap in Federal programs and that this overlap in Federal programs "could potentially save tens of billions of dollars".

(2) According to the Congressional Budget Office, for fiscal year 2013, 32 laws will expire. Timely reauthorization of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(3) Allowing implementation of the reduction in unnecessary spending sequester will damage our economy and make it harder for American businesses to compete.

(4) Federal agencies reported an estimated $108 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2012.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House lead by example and identify any savings that can be attained through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending.

The Committee on House Administration shall review the policies pertaining to the services rendered by Congress and House Committees, and shall identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, Barbeshop, Saloon, and the Library. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that any tax-payer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 544, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reflects the priorities of veterans. Now, we already provide for the distribution of those health care services, but what we don't fund in advance are the people who have to administer them to make sure that they are delivered to our veterans on time.

So we are very pleased to have a letter from the DAV and other veteran's groups that strongly support this provision in our budget. It is something that they have been requesting. I just want to read one of the paragraphs:

We would like to commend you for presenting an alternate budget proposal that contains a provision for advance appropriations to all VA discretionary programs and services, a critically needed reform that is universally supported by veterans' organizations and is DAV's number one priority.

So whether it is veterans, whether it is our kids' education, or whether it is making our commitment to our seniors, we choose to make sure that we fund the priorities of the country and won't keep off-limits tax preferences for the powerful and the privileged.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair-man, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Chairman RYAN.

As a businessman of 42 years, I know what it means to meet the bottom line and live within my means, both in my business and in my family. Unfortunately, America hasn't lived within its means for years, and we are nearing the tipping point. But President Obama and the Democrats in Congress want to push us nearer to the edge rather than rein us back in by spending more on government run programs like ObamaCare.
Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is right that we do close some special interest tax breaks, but we also have about $400 billion in revenue from pro-growth immigration reform which is in this budget, which at least some of our colleagues on the Republican side recognize as a good thing.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has told us that one thing we could do right now to get the economy moving faster would be to pass comprehensive, bipartisan immigration reform. In fact, they say it will help reduce the deficit by close to $1 trillion over the next 20 years and generate some economic activity. So $400 billion in that revenue is from more economic activity, the kind of pro-growth activity we thought our Republican colleagues liked.

I am now very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, who has been focused on trying to make sure everybody in America gets a fair shake.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member for yielding and for your tireless leadership of our committee. I rise in very strong support of the Democratic alternative to the disastrous Republican budget. Our Democratic alternative closes loopholes and makes smart investments in policies and programs that create jobs, cuts poverty and grows the economy for all.

The Democratic alternative raises the minimum wage to $10.18 which lifts nearly 1 million Americans out of poverty. It also expands the earned income tax credit, and for the millions of Americans still struggling to find a job, it extends the lifetime of unemployment compensation which House Republicans have refused to consider. Nearly 3 million people are living on the edge because Republicans refuse to extend emergency unemployment compensation.

Our alternative protects Medicare, eliminates the sequester, and includes, as our ranking member said, comprehensive immigration reform which lowers our deficit by $900 billion.

Finally, I appreciate some of my Republican colleagues have shown an interest in bringing jobs to our country. However, we have starkly different opinions of how we achieve that goal.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the ranking member.

As I was saying, we must attack poverty, not the poor, as evidenced through the draconian cuts to the safety net in the Ryan budget. Gutting SNAP is not a path out of poverty.

The American people deserve a fighting chance to enter the middle class. They deserve better than the Ryan budget. Let me tell you, the better budget for our country is the Democratic alternative, which provides pathways out of poverty, creates jobs, protects the safety net, and grows the economy for all.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is noteworthy that once again—once this is the fourth budget cycle that I have been through, the fourth Democratic budget offered here, that never balances. It never balances. How do you ever, ever pay back money that you have already borrowed if you never have a surplus and never get to balance? I have said it before and I will say it again: If you borrow money from me and intend to pay it back, that is debt. If you borrow money from me and never intend to pay it back, that is theft. That is what the Democrats are offering here today, Mr. Chairman. They are encouraging us to borrow more and borrow more and borrow more and never lay out any plan whatsoever for paying that money back to the children and grandchildren from whom we are borrowing.

The only plan that will be offered later today that does that is the Republican budget. I strongly encourage a “no” vote on the Democratic plan, a “no” vote on continued generational theft, and a “yes” vote on the Republican plan.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I find this newfound ideology of having to hit a particular target of having to pay $4 trillion in revenue in savings in this Republican budget balanced maybe around the year 2040. And this year, it doesn’t balance if you also claim to be getting rid of the Affordable Care Act, because you have $2 trillion in revenue in savings in this Republican budget from the Affordable Care Act you say you are getting rid of. You just can’t have both things true at the same time.
Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if this budget balances, it balances in an alternative reality, perhaps on Planet Reagan. But it does take a very dystopian view of investments because they prioritize tax cuts for billionaires over investment. They purport or pretend actually will gut all federal investment in roads, bridges, highways, and transit. That is a $52 billion cut. That is a couple of million jobs, and a lot more crumbling bridges.

We have something called the Land Water Conservation Fund. It is funded according to the actuaries in those programs, is going broke. Bankrupt. What does that mean? That means that seniors and individuals in the Medicaid program will no longer be able to receive the benefits, the services, the health care that we have promised them. That is what that means. That is what this program does on the other side of the aisle. That is why in our budget we save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid. We do so by making certain that patients' are in charge of health care, not the Federal Government. The Republican budget is the premier budget that is being offered today. I urge my colleagues to vote down the Democrat budget and vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, look, our Republican colleagues are going to have to choose and tell the American people, either they claim to have a budget that balances in 10 years or they are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act. But right now because they got rid of the entire Affordable Care Act, including the revenues and savings, they don't come close to balancing. I keep hearing balance, and the reality is they have all that revenue from the Affordable Care Act.

The one thing we know is that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says the Republican budget will slow the economy in the next 10 years. And it not only balances the budget, it gets us on a path to pay off the entire debt of the United States.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget flies in the face of the reality of their own budget. It does nothing to deal with the very real, looming crisis of Social Security. They are afraid to inflict their Medicare solution on the seniors that vote today; instead, it will bite long after the people arguing for it will have moved on.

It repeals the Affordable Care Act, but keeps the taxes and fees they railed against. But there is nothing sadder than yesterday's Ryan soliloquy on how America cannot afford to invest in its future.

Well, we don't think having billionaire hedge fund managers pay the same rate as hardworking Americans would be a blow to prosperity. Our budget invests in America's future—in infrastructure, education, innovation—while the Republicans would sentence this rich, great country to perpetual decline. Mercifully, this won't happen. Their budget will not become law.

Someday, America will invest in our future again, close tax loopholes, and work together to solve our problems. Our budget shows how.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguish member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguish member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguish member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.
Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, what we know is old and stale and doesn't work in economics. The idea you just give the folks at the very top a little bit bigger tax break and somehow it is going to benefit everybody else didn't work and made the deficit go up.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a member of the Finance Committee.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

We do live in a great country. Thank God people before this Congress, before Mr. RYAN's budget, understood that investing in our Nation's infrastructure was critical to achieving that greatness.

The budget being offered by the Democrats invests in America, we invest in infrastructure. The Ryan budget does not do that. In fact, we go back. Our country has never been made great. We have never built railroads, we don't think we get there by cutting those necessary programs.

We protect our commitments to seniors. We don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, we do not end the Medicare guarantee, and yes, we significantly bring down the deficits and stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio in the out years. We don't do it by playing games. We don't say we are going to get rid of the Affordable Care Act and then rely on all the revenue and all the savings from the Affordable Care Act to pretend to hit balance in the out years.

As I said earlier, we make sure we learn from our mistakes. In the 16-day shutdown, which was totally unproductive and totally unnecessary and all part of an effort to get rid of the entire Affordable Care Act, a lot of Americans got hurt, including our veterans who are on the edge. So we do in this budget what every veteran organization asked this Congress to do: we made sure we advance-fund those appropriations so that next time, God forbid, someone in this House thinks it is a good idea to shut down the government, at least those who served our country are not put at risk in terms of getting the medical and other support they need.

So yes, we invest in our veterans, we invest in our kids' future, we maintain our commitments to seniors, and we do that by asking the most powerful and the most privileged special interests to contribute a little bit more as we grow our economy through commonsense bipartisan immigration reform.

If you want an America that is going to grow and prosper as one country, where we respect our individual freedoms and liberty and entrepreneurship but also recognize that there are some things that history has taught us we do better by working together, which is what has made us a world economic power, then support the Democratic budget. If you want to continue to support and protect the special interests at the very top on some trickle down theory, that that will help everybody else, then vote for the Republican budget, because that is what they do at the expense of the rest of the country and at the expense of economic growth and prosperity for every American.

Vote "yes" for jobs, opportunity, and security. Vote for the Democratic budget.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First off, let me start off by saying to my friend from Maryland: I am glad we are having this debate, and this is the last time the two of us are doing this, and it has been a pleasure.

I also want to thank the staff. All of our staffs have put so much hard work into this. I want to thank our staff, led by our great staff director, Austin Smythe, for all that he has done. I want to thank the people over at the CBO who work really long hours producing all of these estimates so that we can write these budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD these names to show our thanks.
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we are saying, fundamental comprehensive tax reform, stop picking winners and losers in Washington, lower tax rates.

Second, this House Democrat budget increases spending by $740 billion above what would happen if we did nothing. That is $5.9 trillion more than our budget. They used to call this stimulus. I remember just a few short years ago all these ideas were called stimulating and stimulus. Remember, Mr. Chairman, how the word investment means: tax, borrow, spend in Washington. Take money from hardworking taxpayers, borrow from the next generation, and spend more money in Washington. That means take money from businesses, take money from small businesses, take money from people creating jobs, borrow more money from China, leverage it against the next generation, spend more in Washington.

We will spend $3.5 trillion this year. Spending is slated to go above 5.2 percent on average. We are basically saying let’s get this under control; 3.5 percent is enough.

What they will also say is look at what we are doing on Medicare, all these awful things that we are doing on Medicare. We are saving it for the current generation by preserving it as is, and then we are making sure that it is there for the next generation. Here is the dirty little secret. Look at what they have already done to Medicare. It was ObamaCare that ended Medicare as we know it, it was ObamaCare that raided $700 billion from Medicare to spend on ObamaCare, it was ObamaCare that set up this new rationing board of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats to put price controls on Medicare, which will lead to denied care for seniors.

It is the House democrats’ budget that is complicit with the Medicare trust fund going bankrupt in 2026. Our budget strengthens Medicare, saves it for this generation, and puts reforms in place so that the next generation can count on it without having 15 bureaucrats running the program.

Look at what they are proposing on national security. They track right along with the President’s budget. They are proposing to cut compensations for our men and women in uniform, to hollow out our force, to cut training and readiness and structure, not to lower the deficit, but to fuel more domestic spending. So we will have a Navy smaller than what we have not seen since before World War I, we will have an Air Force smaller than we have ever had before, not for deficit reduction but for more domestic spending. We reject that approach.

Finally, their budget adds $1.3 trillion to our national debt. That is despite this massive tax increase. Their budget never balances, ever.

Under their plan, in 2024, the deficit will be $637 billion. At the end of the day it is just not credible.

We trust the American people to have more control over their lives. We reject the House Democrat budget, grow the economy, create jobs, and pay off our debt, and pass the House Republican budget.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.
Today, Members of the House have a very simple choice. We can continue the status quo, stand in the way of economic progress and new opportunities for working middle class families, or we can accept the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, passing a budget is not only an important step to restoring trust in government and faith in our economy, it is our legal obligation to do so. The House passes a budget every year when our paychecks aren’t on the line. So the least we can do is pass a budget that the American people that sent us here can be proud of.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the Budget Committee, for his continued dedication to reining in wasteful spending and restoring fiscal responsibility and in balancing the budget.

I also want to thank the other members of the Budget Committee for their hard work continuously on this issue.

I urge my colleagues to pass this budget on behalf of the American people.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Pro-Growth Budget Act.

Right now, America is not working for too many people. For years, our economy has remained stagnant and job growth weak.

At the current time, three out of four Americans report that they are living paycheck to paycheck. The ability to climb the economic ladder of success and live the American Dream is becoming much more difficult for millions of people.

Mr. Chairman, this is the status quo in America, but it is a status quo that we must not accept. Our constituents deserve better. Our constituents deserve a government that is focused on turning this economy around and making America work again, and work again for everybody.

In the House, there are some very clear differences on how to solve America’s problems. My Democratic colleagues believe the best way to move the country forward is with $1.8 trillion in new tax hikes so that this government can even spend more. That is not right, and it is not fair. Working Americans deserve a chance to put more of their hard-earned paychecks into their personal savings accounts, to invest that or spend it on their families before they are forced to send it to Washington.

We House Republicans have a better plan, a balanced budget that will begin to provide working families, many of whom are struggling to make ends meet, not just a little relief. This budget before us will create jobs. It will cut wasteful spending. It will re-form our Tax Code and hold Washington more accountable. Plain and simple, this budget is pro-growth. This budget is about making America work again.

Today, Members of the House have a very simple choice. We can continue the status quo, stand in the way of economic progress and new opportunities for working middle class families, or we can accept the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and pass a budget that the American people that sent us here can be proud of.

I urge my colleagues to pass this budget on behalf of the American people.
American jobs, not products, overseas, while our budget invests right here in the United States of America.

Now, we heard the Republican leader say we want a better economy for everybody. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that this Republican budget will slow down economic growth right now for the next couple of years, that it will reduce job growth in the next couple of years, all while doing what? Providing another windfall tax break in millions. Yes, look at their budget. They want to drop the top tax rate, 39 percent to 25 percent, full 30 percent. What does that mean? $200,000 average tax break for millionaires. Who finances it in their budget? Well, math tells you middle-income taxpayers pay more. They pay $2,000 more per, average, in order to finance trickle-down economics, even though we know from experience that that was a dead end for this country.

While our Republican colleagues talk about fiscal responsibility, apparently they don’t care enough about it to close one single special interest tax loophole and reduce the deficit—not one, not a hedge fund owner, not a big oil company, not one. And because they say hands off the most powerful and the most privileged, their budget has to come after everybody else, and it does. So it hits our kids’ education, early education, K-12. College students are asked to pay more interest. In fact, they got $45 billion savings by charging college kids more interest while they are still in college and not working, again, while hands off the powerful special interests.

Seniors, seniors on Medicare see the prescription drug doughnut hole open, the safety net, again, shredded. And all for what purpose?

Now, they claim that they are going to somehow balance the budget at the end of the 10-year window. But you know what? They can’t have it both ways. We have had over 50 votes here in the House of Representatives from our colleagues to repeal the Affordable Care Act. But guess what. They have got $2 trillion in this budget from revenues and savings from the Affordable Care Act. We talk some of those savings. We use those Medicare savings to strengthen Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the final minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader who has been a fighter for America’s priorities.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I congratulate the Budget Committee for their budget that you have done. I wish we had more than 10 minutes on each side to discuss the House Democratic budget, but so it is.

Here we are, about to leave for the holy season of Easter and Passover. It reminds me of the Gospel of Matthew, in which Matthew says: “For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.”

This budget is a statement as to where our treasure is and where our hearts are for the American people. A budget, as our distinguished ranking member said, must be a statement of our national values. What is important to us as a nation should be reflected in our spending priorities and our tax structure.

But you be the judge, I want to say to the American people, but the Speaker will not allow me to address the American people, so their representatives here. Is it a statement of your national budget, to give a $200,000 tax break to people making over $1 million a year at the expense of increasing taxes $2,000 for the middle class? Is that a statement of our values? I didn’t think so.

Is it a statement of our values, in order to finance the special interest privilege that is in the Republican budget, is it a statement of your values to cut over 170,000 children from Head Start? Is that a statement of our values? Children pay parents earning, opportunity, fairness.

Is it a statement of your values to support a budget that says, 3.5 million children in our country, disadvantaged children in economically disadvantaged areas, who will lose their health care? In the budget of Title I? Is that a statement of our values in order to give tax breaks to Big Oil?

Is it a statement of our values to say to aspiring families, some the first in the family, to go to college, that we are going to cut over half a million, maybe over 600,000 kids from Head Start? Is that a statement of values? To say to over half a million young people you will not have opportunity to have higher education? Instead, we are going to give that same amount of money to Big Oil for tax incentives for them to drill. Is that a statement of our values? I don’t think so. I don’t think so.

So where is their treasure and where is their heart?

The treasure in this Republican budget is just as what our ranking member said; it is with the special interests and the wealthiest people in our country. It is a trickle-down approach that has never worked. It has worked for the rich. It has worked for the special interests and their supporters, but it has not worked for the great middle class.

Do we need any more evidence of it, not working, that these same warmed-over policies that existed in the Bush era that took us to the Great Recession, a great recession where we met right before the election in September of 2008, where the Chairman of the Fed said to us, if we do not act immediately, we will not have an economy by Monday? This was a Thursday night. That is where these policies took us at the end of the Bush years, and we are still digging out of that recession.

Instead of having a budget that lifts up our children, to create growth, to invest in science and education, to keep America number one, they call their budget a path to prosperity. It is a road to recession and always has been, and that is what it is now.

So at least we have a few minutes to discuss our value system, where our treasure is, with the richest and the special interests with the middle class and those who aspire to it, and, therefore, where our heart is in terms of budget priorities in this budget.

This is an important budget. Some people want to dismiss it as a joke because it is so outrageous. It is deadly serious. It isn’t funny at all because of the impact that it has in the lives of America’s families, our children, our seniors, voucherizing Medicare, removing the guarantee of Medicare for our seniors.

Is that a statement of our values, to say to our seniors: you are on your own, you are on your own?

I don’t think so. So if our heart is with the middle class, we will put our treasure there and make investments in education and job creation, investments in science.

I will just close. Again, I started with the Bible. Scientific research gives us an almost biblical power to cure. Where there is scientific opportunity, we almost have a moral responsibility and certainly an imperative to invest in it, to improve health, to improve the quality of health in our country, and to make sure that everybody has access to it.

But don’t worry about the access to it because our investments in basic scientific research are seriously impaired by this budget. It does violence to any concept of science that promotes innovation and keeps making America number one, advancing innovation with investments in science and technology.

It undermines investments in how we protect our environment, so that our children can breathe clean air and drink clean water, about how we protect our America by investments in science and technology to do so, and the intelligence to avoid conflict and the investments in job creation that science will enable us to do.

So if you believe in knowledge, if you would believe in fact, if you believe in the country, you must reject the Republican budget. You must reject the Republican budget.

What the Republican leadership is asking Members to do is something that I don’t know that they share that value. Certainly, Republicans across the country do not. Republicans across the country support education, investments in science, and the rest. Any poll will show you that.

Just one other thing: if you really want to reduce the deficit, one of the most powerful and the most privileged, one, not a hedge fund owner, not a big oil company, not one. Where our treasure is and where our heart will be also.
We, on the other hand, trust the people. We are offering a balanced budget that pays down the debt. We are offering patient-centered solutions, so patients are the nucleus of the health care system, not the government.

We are offering a plan to save Medicare now and for future generations. We are offering a stronger safety net with State flexibility to help meet people’s needs and to help people get from welfare to work, to make the most of their lives. We are offering a pro-growth Tax Code. We are offering more energy jobs.

You can boil the differences down to one question: Who knows better, the people or Washington? We have made our choice with this budget. I trust the American people to make theirs.

Mr. Chairman, let’s call the votes.

The CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises. Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) reported the resolution. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

The CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 205, not voting 8, as follows: [Roll No. 177]

[YEAS—219]

[NAYS—205]
So the concurrent resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 177 I was unable to attend. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 2014, I missed roll call vote 177. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today and missed roll Nos. 175 through 177. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on roll No. 176. I would have voted "nay" on roll Nos. 175 and 177.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2377

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as cosponsor of H.R. 2377.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, last week, we learned something shocking and appalling. The Iranian Government wants to appoint a terrorist as their Ambassador to the United Nations, a man who participated in the 1979 terrorist attack on our Embassy in Tehran. This is unconscionable and unacceptable.

Last week, Senator Ted Cruz and I introduced legislation to fix this problem. This bill gives the President the authority he needs to deny this individual a visa. Senator Cruz pushed the bill through the Senate unanimously on Monday.

I have been working with House leadership this week to quickly move this bill forward here in the House so that we do not have an Iranian terrorist walking the streets of New York City and having diplomatic immunity. I am proud to report that we just passed this bill unanimously.

I thank my colleagues and House leadership for passing the Cruz-Lamborn legislation.

DENYING AN IRANIAN TERRORIST DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2377

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as cosponsor of H.R. 2377.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

VISA LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2195) to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage ac-
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tivities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

SECTION 1. VISA LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Section 406(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (8 U.S.C. 1102 note) is amended—

(1) by striking "such individual has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities" and inserting the following: "such individual—"

(1) "has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(ii)))";

(2) by striking "allies and may pose" and inserting the following: "allies; and"

(2) "allies; and"

(3) "may pose":

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution:

RESOLVED BY THE SENATE (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, April 10, 2014, through Thursday, April 24, 2014, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, April 28, 2014, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, April 10, 2014, through Thursday, April 24, 2014, on such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, April 10, 2014, through Thursday, April 24, 2014, on such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first;

SEC. 2. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
them off a cliff. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. I say “no” to this budget. We can do much better.

HONORING THE HOCKADAY SCHOOL’S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Hockaday School’s centennial anniversary. The school will celebrate 100 years of learning and service this weekend.

Hockaday is a world-renowned institution in Dallas, Texas, in my congressional district. The school educates over 1,000 students from pre-K to 12th grade.

Hockaday stands on the same four cornerstones upon which it was founded: character, courtesy, scholarship, and athletics. These four cornerstones were the original vision of the school’s founder, Miss Ela Hockaday. They remain the very fabric of the school and will continue to guide Hockaday students for years to come.

I ask all of my colleagues today to join me in honoring the Hockaday community on this very historic occasion.

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the National Day of Silence.

Tomorrow is the 17th year we have commemorated the National Day of Silence. It is a time when students across the country remain silent for a whole day to draw attention to discrimination towards their LGBT peers.

Our country has made great progress towards more acceptable and tolerance for gay and lesbian individuals; however, gender-expansive students, gender-diverse students, and straight allies still face a lot of fear and discrimination. I want all these students to know they are not alone.

I say this every year, but I continue to be so proud of my young constituents, their parents and families who are working to make the world a better place. I want all people no matter your race, your color, your gender, or your sexual orientation.

For example, Jordan, a ninth grade transgender male student at The Ark in Santa Cruz will be one of the emcees for the 17th Annual Queer Youth Leadership Awards in Capitola. Jordan’s mom, Heidi, is an advisory council ership Awards in Capitola. Jordan’s transgender male student at The Ark sexual orientation.
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HONORING THE HOCKADAY SCHOOL’S CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Hockaday School’s centennial anniversary. The school will celebrate 100 years of learning and service this weekend.

Hockaday is a world-renowned institution in Dallas, Texas, in my congressional district. The school educates over 1,000 students from pre-K to 12th grade.

Hockaday stands on the same four cornerstones upon which it was founded: character, courtesy, scholarship, and athletics. These four cornerstones were the original vision of the school’s founder, Miss Ela Hockaday. They remain the very fabric of the school and will continue to guide Hockaday students for years to come.

I ask all of my colleagues today to join me in honoring the Hockaday community on this very historic occasion.

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the National Day of Silence.

Tomorrow is the 17th year we have commemorated the National Day of Silence. It is a time when students across the country remain silent for a whole day to draw attention to discrimination towards their LGBT peers.

Our country has made great progress towards more acceptable and tolerance for gay and lesbian individuals; however, gender-expansive students, gender-diverse students, and straight allies still face a lot of fear and discrimination. I want all these students to know they are not alone.

I say this every year, but I continue to be so proud of my young constituents, their parents and families who are working to make the world a better place. I want all people no matter your race, your color, your gender, or your sexual orientation.

For example, Jordan, a ninth grade transgender male student at The Ark in Santa Cruz will be one of the emcees for the 17th Annual Queer Youth Leadership Awards in Capitola. Jordan’s mom, Heidi, is an advisory council member to the Trans* Teen Project and a facilitator of the Transfamily Support Group.

Though many LGBT students and their allies are silent tomorrow, we in Congress must never be silent. It is our job to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

TRIBUTE TO JANE TUCKER

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Jane Tucker of Dallastown, Pennsylvania, who was honored at today’s Congressional Victims’ Rights Caucus Awards.

Jane endured years of life-threatening physical and mental abuse at the hands of her first husband in the 1950s. With tenacity and perseverance, she devoted decades of her life to founding ACCESS-York, York County, Pennsylvania’s service provider for victims fleeing domestic violence.

Jane continues to this very day, this very moment, as a volunteer at ACCESS-York, and she serves as the inspiration and motivation to countless victims who turn to ACCESS-York for help, understanding and protection.

She is the epitome of resilience, strength, compassion and integrity. From a battered mother to a founding mother of ACCESS-York, Jane Tucker’s life is a story of triumph over tragedy, and I am absolutely proud and humbled to be part of honoring her accomplishment with the unsung hero award today.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET UNMITIGATED DISASTER

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget put together by Chairman RYAN is one of the world’s worst vanity projects. It doesn’t actually help the American people. It simply fulfills Mr. RYAN’s ideological fantasies.

I want a budget that will grow our economy, create more jobs, and invest in the middle class. Mr. RYAN wants a budget that will make Ayn Rand proud. I want a budget that improves our national education system. Mr. RYAN’s budget will cut funding for nearly 8,000 schools. I want a budget that expands job training. Mr. RYAN’s budget would deny 3.5 million Americans access to job training programs. I want a budget that keeps the promises to our seniors. Mr. RYAN’s budget ends the guarantee of Medicare and turns it into a voucher system.

Mr. Speaker, the Ryan budget is an unmitigated disaster. I opposed it, and I know all my Democratic colleagues opposed it. This budget is at odds with what the American people need.

HONORING WALTER H. KECK, JR.

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and honor Walt H. Keck, Jr., on his retirement after 55 years of public service.

Mr. Keck joined the United States Air Force in 1961. Throughout his 27-year military career, he rose through the ranks to master sergeant before retiring in 1988.

In 1989, Mr. Keck began his law enforcement career as an officer with the Harrison County Sheriff’s Department. Nearly 10 years later, he assisted the city of D’Iberville in creating its own police department while continuing to work for Harrison County. Sworn in as D’Iberville police captain in 2008 and deputy chief of police in 2012, Mr. Keck retires on May 6, 2014, with over 28 years of law enforcement service.

Mr. Keck has been described as a man of integrity, intelligence, dedication, and compassion, and as a man who truly cares about the citizens he serves.

Mr. Keck, on behalf of the United States Congress, thank you for your hard work and commitment to the citizens of the United States and south Mississippi. I wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

HONORING VICTIMS OF RWANDAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, a plane carrying Rwanda’s president was shot down, unleashing a genocide carried out by the country’s dominant Hutu tribe against its Tutsi minority.

Hundreds of thousands of people, estimates of the dead range up to 1 million, were killed in a matter of weeks. Many were butchered with machetes, their mutilated bodies left to rot in the African sun. Women were brutally raped and entire families were slaughtered at once. The goal was simple: to kill every Tutsi in Rwanda. The killing went on for 3 months, wiping out nearly three-fourths of the Tutsi population, until rebel forces toppled the government and took over a deeply traumatized nation.

In the two decades since, Rwanda has made remarkable progress in a broad range of economic, health, and social indicators. It has taken on the delicate task of bringing those responsible for the genocide to justice without tearing the country apart. Rwanda’s saga, even as we mourn the dead, is ultimately a story of triumph and hope.

For us in America and the West, Rwanda stands as mute testimony to our failure to live up to the post-Holocaust promise of “never again.” We cannot undo the past, but we can heed the lessons of Rwanda by acting now to prevent genocide in the Central African Republic. Today’s U.N. Security Council vote is a first step and Congress should act by providing resources. I urge us to do so quickly. Lives are on the line.
FOOD INSECURITY

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, every year we celebrate Easter and Passover, in part, with food. Yet for millions of Americans, food on the table this holiday season is no different than any other day. It is a struggle at best, and a failure at worst. It is a failure of this institution and our government as a whole that we still tolerate incredibly hunger. People are forced to choose between rent and food, clothes and food, utilities and food. We can do better.

We need the White House to step up and own this issue. They can start with a White House conference on food and nutrition. Mr. Speaker, even though millions struggle with hunger, there are good souls out there who are trying to help. I want to highlight one Good Samaritan who paid for the groceries of a young lady named Andrea who was just trying to feed her kids. When Andrea exhausted her SNAP benefits at the grocery store, an unnamed woman in line gave her $17.38 so that she didn’t have to return any of the groceries.

This is House could learn from this example to help our neighbors rather than penalize them simply for being poor. I include for the RECORD Andrea’s letter to this unnamed woman in line at the grocery store.

Dear Woman Behind Me in Line at the Grocery Store: You don’t know me. You have no clue what my life has been like since October 1, 2013. You have no clue that my family has gone through the wringer. You have no clue that we have faced unbelievable hardship. You have no clue we have been humiliated, humiliated, humiliated.

You have allowed me to cry more days than not; that I fight against bitterness taking control of my heart. You have no clue that my husband’s pride was shattered. You have no clue you had the heart of an adult on their shoulders. You have no clue their innocence was snatched from them for no good reason. You know none of this.

What you do know is I tried to buy my kids some food and that the EBT machine was down so I couldn’t buy that food. I didn’t have any cash or my debit card with me. I only had my SNAP card. All you heard was me saying “No, don’t hold it for me. My kids are hungry now and I have no other way of paying for this.” You didn’t judge me. You didn’t say “Maybe you should have kids.” You didn’t say “Well, get a job and learn to support yourself.” You didn’t look away in embarrassment or shame for me. You didn’t make any assumptions at all.

What you did was you paid that $17.38 grocery bill for us. You gave my kids bananas, yogurt, apple juice, cheese sticks, and a peach ice tea for me; a rare treat and splurge. You let me hug you and promise through my tears that I will pay this forward. I will pay someone’s grocery bill for them. Because $17.38 may not have been a lot for you, but it was priceless to us. In the car my kids couldn’t stop gushing about you; our “angel in disguise.” They prayed for you. They would be blessed. You restored some of our lost faith. One simple and small action changed our lives. You probably have forgotten about us by now, but we haven’t forgotten about you. You will forever be a part of us even though we don’t even know your name.

You have not only been great and embarrassed I am that we pay for all our food with SNAP. We eat well thanks to the government. I love that. I love that the government helps make sure that I have one less worry for us. I also struggle with pride and embarrassment. I defiantly tell people we are on SNAP. Daring them to judge us. Only those closest to us know why we are on SNAP. They know my husband is a hard worker who was laid off after 17 years in a management position with his former company. We moved from Texas to a new state only to be left homeless since the house we had came with the job he lost. Only those closest to us know my husband works part time while looking tirelessly for more; that he has submitted more applications than he has received interviews for. Too many jobs are only offering part time work anymore. It is not easy for a 40-something year old to find a job that will support his family of five kids.

You know none of this but you didn’t let that stop you from being compassionate and generous to someone you have never met.

To the woman behind me at the grocery store, you have no idea how much we appreciate you. You have no idea the impact you had on my kids. You have no idea how incredibly thankful I am for you. Your action may have been small, but to us it was monumental. Thank you.

Thank you for giving my kids a snack when they were quite hungry. Thank you. Just thank you.

Forever,

Andrea, the woman in front of you at the grocery store with the cart full of kids who are no longer hungry

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO NATIONAL COMMISSION ON HUNGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to section 743(b)(5) of Public Law 113-76, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Commission on Hunger:

Mr. Jeremy Everett, Waco, Texas
Dr. Susan Finn, Columbus, Ohio
Mr. Robert Doar, Brooklyn, New York

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. Norton) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. Norton. Mr. Speaker, I am eagerly looking forward to seeing the rostrum, but I am waiting for my posters to arrive at the rostrum. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Woodall).

Mr. Woodall. I thank the gentlelady so much for yielding.

You need to rephrase this a little before you correct a grave mistake I made earlier today. I had the great pleasure of carrying theんど бюджет for the floor today. We weren’t able to succeed in passing our balanced budget, but we did succeed in passing the Budget Committee balanced budget. I think that is a great success for this House, but those successes don’t happen by themselves. They happen because we are surrounded by a staff of people, and my own budget associate, Nick Myrs. Without their help, it would have been impossible to put that budget together, and I am so grateful for their commitment to this institution and to the very difficult work that we do.

With that, thank you for your very much for yielding.

Ms. Norton. Mr. Speaker, all this week I have come to the House floor for a very special purpose. I have offered to by some of the residents who live in the Nation’s capital should have the same basic rights as other Americans. All other Americans have achieved these rights through statehood. We have tried to bring the elements of statehood into separate bills, but we have not been able to get those elements recognized by the Congress of the United States either.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am making use of an important day coming up next week when Congress will be out of session. April 16 is commemorated in the District of Columbia because it is the day 152 years ago when Abraham Lincoln freed those slaves who happened to live in the Nation’s capital 9 months before the national Emancipation Proclamation. This week, I have used this upcoming occasion to offer a series of remarks not only, of course, because of this historic occasion in our city but because of the measure for this occasion for has to the residents of the Nation’s Capital here and now, right this moment, not 152 years ago.

Unlike 1862 when African Americans who happened to live in the Nation’s Capital were deprived of freedom, in 2014, every American citizen of every background, of every race, of every color, of every religion, of every ethnic origin, of every sex is equally deprived of equal rights with other Americans. Other Americans, to have obtained full rights, need only be taxpaying citizens who serve in the Nation’s wars. The people I represent have served in the Nation’s wars since our very first war, the war that created the United States of America. And from the moment the Congress imposed Federal income taxes on the people of the United States, the people I represent have paid those taxes to support their government without a voting Member in this Congress, this House of Representatives, or an American citizen in the Senate of the United States.

I do have the vote in committee, but when matters affecting my district, in
particular, or matters affecting the United States in which my jurisdiction, like other Americans, is implicated, like whether to go to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, where our residents have served, I have no vote on this floor. This fact is highlighted by the fact that the votes on the budget raised, the local budget raised in my city, not one penny of which has been contributed by this Congress.

Yet nothing is more important to Americans than the ability to pass your own local laws, to raise your own local money and say how it is to be spent, without interference from the national government.

No others who pay taxes, Federal income taxes—obviously, we pay local taxes—but no others who pay Federal income taxes and who have served in our armed forces are denied their basic rights in our country. This, of course, is an embarrassment to the country itself, but today it is far more serious. It is a violation of international law and a treaty that we have signed.

Late last month, the U.N. Human Rights Committee issued its report for 2014. Its report called our country to account on the denial of congressional voting rights in the National Legislative for the residents of the District of Columbia. In other words, the United States Government is in violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. That is the treaty that our country signed in 1992. The U.N. report recommended: “Provide full voting rights for the residents of the United States with . . .”

I would venture to say that you will not find an American citizen who does not agree that, before the Congress can impose any burden on you, you ought to have the right to raise your hand “yea” or “nay.”

Moreover, this is not the first time that the United Nations has called our country to account. Earlier, in 2006, the Human Rights Committee wrote: “The Committee notes with concern the lack of progress in granting the residents of the District of Columbia full voting rights or qualified representation in the federal legislature.”

That means the United States delegation to the U.N.—heard their responses and said: “. . . remains concerned that the residents of the District of Columbia do not enjoy full representation in Congress, a restriction that does not seem to be compatible with article XXV of the covenant.”

And then it cited articles II, XXV, and XXVI.

Article II, and I won’t quote from the entire article, says: “Adopt such laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to the rights recognized in the present covenant.”

That covenant is a treaty, a treaty we signed in 1992, to which we are, by human rights and international law, bound.

Article XXV says that that right includes: “the right to take part in the conduct of public affairs directly or through freely chosen representatives.”

In our country, we do not have direct democracy. We govern through freely chosen representatives who get to vote on this floor. The residents of the District of Columbia get to choose me, but I do not get to vote even on matters affecting the residents of the District.

The residents have access to public service. I serve as a Member of Congress, but they do not have that right in terms of “equality” because I cannot vote once I become the Member chosen to exercise that service.

Moreover, notably, when my party was in power, using House rules, the District was given the right to vote on behalf of the residents of the District of Columbia on matters in the so-called Committee of the Whole. Imagine, after getting a right that is not the full right to vote on most matters in this Chamber, but when my Republican colleagues came to power, they took even that right, the right to vote in the Committee of the Whole, from the people of the District of Columbia. Is that, my friends, “equality,” or is it discrimination against the residents of the District of Columbia?

The report refers also to article XXVI. That is worth quoting:

“All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination through the equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground . . .”

Then they name some such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth—and here is the one that applies to District of Columbia residents—or other status.

What is the other status of the residents of the District of Columbia? Their status is that they reside in their Nation’s capital, the only Nation in the world to have a capital of its own. The District of Columbia is the one that applies to District of Columbia residents—or other status.

Nor is there any question that there are more than enough American citizens here to be granted statehood or at least equality.

Two States of the Union that have two Senators and one Representative have fewer residents than the District of Columbia. Here is one, the lowest population in the country, Wyoming. Next is Maryland, which grew only 0.7 percent. And finally, with considerably more residents, almost 650,000, the District of Columbia.

We are soon going to overtake a number of other States. The District is growing, so much that there has been an so-called Height Act, which limits how high buildings can be, because of the need to expand housing and office space. That attempt was turned back because residents were more concerned with the low-scale quality and attractiveness of their city.

We are talking, Mr. Speaker, about 650,000 people, about the size of an average congressional district. Look to this chart about how rapidly the District is growing, on an average, more than 2 percent a year for more than 10 years now. In the last couple of years, it has grown by almost 2 percent. Just compare that with population in the United States itself. The United States population grew not by 1 percent or 2 percent, but by 0.7 percent in the last couple of years.

We live in one of the most rapidly growing regions in the country. This is called the national capital region. Maryland and Virginia are the closest States. And yet the District, is growing more than 2 percent compared to Virginia, which grew only 0.9 percent, and Maryland, which grew only 0.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, during my remarks this week on the floor, this week, selected the two most basic obligations of Americans who have won statehood to test whether the District is being denied its rights. I began with taxes because I think people fret most about paying taxes—and almost all of us have to pay taxes—not because taxes are more important.

Who thinks taxes are more important, of course, is the Republican majority. They are obsessed with taxes. So you would think that they would want to do something about people who pay taxes but don’t have representation. Taxes is about the only issue that the Republican majority cares about. But by “taxes,” they mean cutting taxes. Yet they raise taxes by imposing taxes without representation on the people of the District of Columbia. They are happy to take more than $3 billion annually out of the pockets of D.C. citizens with no vote on whether those taxes should be raised or lowered.

But, the most surprising fact about taxes in our country is who, which individuals, pay the most. Well, if I were to ask our citizens, to guess, they probably would say District of Columbia residents. Let me clarify. Of the residents of the 50 States, the residents of the District of Columbia pay more Federal taxes per person than the residents of any of the 50 States.

This chart shows how it goes from the highest to the lowest. The highest in the United States at almost $12,000 per person in Federal taxes annually, resident by resident, live in the District of Columbia. The lowest per capita, per person, live in the State of Mississippi.

So imagine the rage—nobody wants to pay taxes—imagine the rage when you are more taxes than anybody else and still don’t have the vote on the House floor.

Now, I haven’t put all of the States on this poster because they could not be seen, but you see it goes from $12,000—or almost $12,000—to as low as $4,000.

The first 10 States, the top 10 States, end with California. Some of them, you might recognize if you had to guess
them. The second is Connecticut. The third is New Jersey. The 10th is California at about $8,000 per person. Compare that to our almost $12,000 per person. Understand that this doesn’t have to do with the size of the State’s population. It is to do with federal taxes per person and regardless of population size, District residents pay more.

I indicated that Vermont and Wyoming were States we exceeded in population. Wyoming residents pay something close to $4,600, compared to our almost $12,000 per person in taxes. Or just randomly pick out your State. Bear in mind, we are comparing them with D.C.’s almost $12,000 per person in federal taxes that are paying to support the Government of the United States.

Next up of that, about $6,400. Take two others that are close to one another in the amounts they pay, each about $6,000—Arizona and Indiana—compared to D.C.’s $12,000.

There is Idaho. To support the Federal Government, Idaho, which pays $5,440. D.C. pays something over twice what they pay.

When you get to those which pay the least—let’s take the bottom two States, Louisiana at $4,500 and Mississippi at $4,200, you will see D.C. getting to paying three times what these States pay—States which have Representatives and two Senators.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, of all the obligations, perhaps the most poignant is service in the Armed Forces. For the people I represent, there has been service in the Armed Forces ever since there has been a United States of America and even before, when we were fighting in a Revolution to create the United States of America, but that service has often been disproportionate to the number of residents.

Looking to the major wars of the 20th century, you get an idea of what I mean. In World War I, 635 casualties, but that was more than three States. In World War II, now, we are getting to more in casualties than four States.

By the time we got to the Korean war, the District had more casualties than in eight States. So we have gone from three to four, to Korea with eight and, finally, to Vietnam with more casualties than in 10 States.

The District even sometimes has had to fight to get equal respect for D.C. members of our Armed Forces.

A mother wrote me when she recently went to the graduation of her son from boot camp at Naval Station Great Lakes. The family was there, glowing with honor and pride, for a son who had passed up going to college in order to serve in the United States Navy, so passionate was this kid about service.

When each graduate stepped forward, the flag of the State was raised. When Seaman Jonathan Rucker stepped forward, no State flag was raised.

That, my friends, was the last straw. I was immediately in touch with the White House and with the Armed Services Committees, particularly after the senior Members of Congress were forward with more particularly heartbreaking stories.

For example, among the most serious were some veterans who spoke of not having a D.C. flag being displayed at “welcome home” ceremonies, even though the flags of other States were raised. I don’t think anybody meant any disrespect to our residents serving in the Armed Forces.

I just believe that, when you pay taxes without representation—when you don’t have anybody in the Senate who can take care of you and when you have only a nonvoting Representative in the House, who votes in committee, but can’t vote on the floor, it is easy to be disregarded in many ways.

I am very grateful to Senator LEVIN and the Senate Armed Services Committee and to this House and its Armed Services Committee for rectifying this serious slight to our residents, the residents who have given the most to their country.

Mr. Speaker, I read an honor roll, picking out just a few of the very distinguishable Americans who have served in the Armed Forces because some of them stand out in the history of our country.

This was a city which had racial segregation imposed on it by the Congress of the United States until the 1960s, even though, until that time, the majority of the population of the District of Columbia was not African American, but was White; yet even during that period—that period of segregation when African Americans served in the armed services from every part of the country, the first African American Army general was born in this city, the first African American Air Force general born in this city, the first African American graduate born in this city, the first African American Air Force Academy graduate born in this city, and this roster continues to this very day.

The first Deputy Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard is serving as I speak, Vice Admiral Manson Brown, who was born in this city; and the first African American female aviator of the D.C. National Guard, First Lt. Demetria Elodie—60, is a Washingtonian.

Mr. Speaker, I know that statehood is the only way Americans have gotten full and equal rights. That, of course, is why we seek statehood, but don’t think we haven’t tried to get our rights in every single way. We also have tried piece by piece.

There are pending bills before the House and the Senate now. Some contain important elements of statehood—for example budget autonomy—that are not in the budget that is about to go into effect, a local budget after all, once it is passed by the local legislature, the D.C. Council.

Because this Congress insists that we bring our local budget to this national body, which does not fund the District, our city was almost shut down this past year when the Congress shut down the Federal Government for 16 days.

This was a subject of, I think, a subcommittee in the United States Senate, the Senate Appropriations Committee, which did its business in the District of Columbia because we were no part of that fight. We have got a balanced budget, and indeed a surplus, but because we had to bring our budget here and because Congress had not passed a single appropriation, we got shut down, too—or almost.

The mayor kept the city open, and as we were running out of contingent funds, the Republican majority reduced and allowed the government to open, and therefore, the District did not have to close down.

I am pleased that the administration, President Obama, has put into his budget language that would grant the District control over its own budget, allowing the local budget to go into effect as soon as the D.C. City Council passes the local budget. He put that same provision in his budget last year, and the Senate appropriators passed it.

I thought then that D.C. budget autonomy would become law with the budget deal, but when the budget deal came out, it left out the section that would have given the District control over the money they, themselves, and nobody else raises.

I am pleased to say that there are Members of this House who recognize that elementary fairness lies in budget autonomy. I thank Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR for his support for budget autonomy. He is the second in leadership, a Republican leader of this House.

I thank Chairman DARRELL ISSA, who is the chairman of the committee with jurisdiction over matters affecting the District of Columbia, in that he has pressed for budget autonomy as he pressed to keep the District open when the city was almost shut down.

The District also does not have complete control over its local laws. What D.C. has is a costly requirement that delays local bills for months before they can become effective, because they have to come to the Congress, although the Congress never uses this procedure called a “layover procedure” to overturn city laws but finds other means to do so, yet continues to impose the layover requirement of bringing every local law here to the Congress before it becomes effective.

I appreciate that Senator MARK BEGICH, who chairs the subcommittee, and Chairman TOM CARPER, who chairs the full committee with jurisdiction over matters affecting the District of Columbia in the Senate, have introduced bills that would give the District budget and legislative autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House I had the ambition to be able to get almost two-thirds of the Democrats to vote for statehood for the District of Columbia. It was not enough
but it does show you that there were Members then and I believe people now who recognize the unfairness of the unequal status of D.C. residents I have discussed today and earlier this week.

It became more difficult to make progress as the years went by, because most of minority leadership in the Congress has been in the minority. Yet we are making progress.

We were able to get the first statue representing the District of Columbia in the Capitol last year. The reason that is important is that a statue, like those of the states, was denied us because we are not yet a State. We have now been able to break through that with what is surely a symbol of statehood.

And at the ceremony with majority and minority leadership, unveiling the Douglass statue, Majority Leader Reid used the occasion, with great enthusiasm, to indicate that he was cosponsoring the D.C. statehood bill.

The most important, Mr. Speaker, is that the Majority Leader, like the Speaker of this House, cosponsors very few bills. It says something about the importance of correcting unfairness to the District of Columbia that cosponsorship has become a cosponsor of our D.C. statehood bill, one of 17 Senators, but that he did so with great enthusiasm and in a prominent public announcement.

I am pleased that virtually the entire Democratic leadership has sponsored our statehood bill.

Mr. Speaker, Congress continues to deny the American citizens who live in its Nation’s Capital their most basic rights. Today we have discussed how that is a violation of every American principle, and that it is even a violation of international law.

Congress has failed to give D.C. residents even some of the rights associated with statehood, rights that they could give today tomorrow even if they were not prepared to grant us statehood, the right to control our own local funds, funds we raise, funds we then turn over, at a cost of $12,000 per person, to support the government of the United States.

Congress tyrannically overturns locally passed laws and keeps our local laws from going into existence until they have had an opportunity to look at them, except they don’t. They just leave it, costly, delay-ridden requirement in place.

Congress continues to command our taxes to support the national government at a higher per capita rate than the rate paid by any other Americans while denying D.C. residents voting representation in the House. Congress passes laws concerning those taxes or concerning any other matter affecting our country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the name of those who have died in our Nation’s wars, in the name of the living veterans of our wars who are among the 650,000 residents of the District of Columbia today; in the name of D.C. residents who pay $12,000 per person, the highest per capita federal taxes in the country, to support the United States of America; in the name of millions ever since 1801, when the District of Columbia became the Capital, who have died in defense of the benefits of voting representation in the House and Senate and without the full and equal rights of other Americans who died alongside them, I ask this House to grant the residents of their Nation’s Capital statehood. And if you fall short of that, at the very least, our residents are entitled to equal representation and to equal recognition, to equality under law with every other American citizen.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern that protectionism could one day lead to a “war on brats.”

Bratwursts are delicious. They are enjoyed around the world. In Wisconsin, we take our brats seriously. But nowhere more so than in the Sixth District, which includes the Bratwurst Capital of the World, Sheboygan, Wisconsin.

In 1970, the city of Sheboygan battled Bucyrus, Ohio, for the title and won. The battle was ended on August 14, 1970, when Judge John Bolgert issued an official decision bestowing the title upon Sheboygan and barring all other claimants from using it.

Unfortunately, this title could soon be under attack. There is growing concern that the European Union could consider more geographic name restrictions on products including “kielbasa” and Wisconsin’s own “bratwurst.”

This is, frankly, getting ridiculous. If anything, we should be trademarking the name “bratwurst,” not them.

I am currently circulating a letter urging the U.S. trade representatives to reject any attempt to include these provisions in further trade negotiations. I strongly urge my colleagues to consider signing this letter.

WAR ON CONSERVATIVES

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. It is amazing some of the efforts made to rewrite history and cast things in a light that doesn’t exist. So as some people in the administration step up the continued trashing of conservatives in America—we have already seen that assault on conservative groups by the IRS, that does need a special prosecutor, clearly—the assault on people with whom some in the administration disagree, they can’t answer questions, and so they make personal attacks.

Then our Attorney General makes a speech yesterday in which, because he was busy helping, perhaps, terrorists orMarc Rich or things like that he didn’t know, because I am sure he didn’t be untruthful or tell a lie, but he doesn’t even know how bad it gets in Washington if you are a conservative, if you are George W. Bush, if you are John Ashcroft, if you are Alberto Gonzales.

It got pretty brutal here, a lot worse than anything our current Attorney General has seen, and that is even without having to go back and recall the treatment that John Mitchell got. I would say, deservedly so, John Mitchell got the treatment he got. But for any Attorney General to be so ignorant of what has happened in very recent years of the maltreatment and malignment and basically slander of Republicans and a Republican President, the efforts of our current Attorney General is a bit breathtaking.

There is a Web site that is Boycott Liberalism. It has a lot of quotes from people. Senator HARRY REID said: President Bush is a liar. I don’t recall anyone saying that at our hearings with our current Attorney General.

The Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, said: Bush is an incompetent leader. In fact, he’s not a leader.

I don’t recall anyone saying anything of that magnitude of our current Attorney General or President, not in any of our hearings.

Hillary Clinton, former Secretary of State and U.S. Senator, said:

We have a culture of corruption. We have cronyism. We have incompetence.

This actually raises a question about pots and kettles calling each other names.

Other quotes John Edwards, a former U.S. Senator and Democratic Vice Presidential nominee: I would say if you live in the United States of America and you vote for George Bush, you’ve lost your mind.

Senator AL FRANKEN said: I think the President highjacked 9/11 and used it to go to war with Iraq in a way that was very divisive.

The late Ted Kennedy, as Senator, said: No President in American history has done more damage to our country and our security than George W. Bush.

Amazingly, I am not aware of any U.S. President in one party reaching out more to a Senator in the other party than did George W. Bush with Senator Ted Kennedy, and these are the kind of comments he got in response.

Senator Hillary Clinton, former Secretary of State, said: I predict to you that this administration will go down in history as one of the worst that has ever governed our country.

We are just talking about there has never been an Attorney General or
President treated as have been the current ones.

Senator Hillary Clinton, former Secretary of State, said:

There has never been an administration, I don’t believe, in our history more intent on consorting, aiding and abusing power to further their own agenda.

She also said:

I have been absolutely amazed, even shocked, at the combination of arrogance and incompetence that marks this particular administration.

We are just helping those who have short memories or maybe were busy helping terrorists or others get pardons and didn’t notice these kind of statements being made.

Former Senator and former Vice President Al Gore said:

While President Bush likes to project an image of strength and courage, the real truth is that, in the presence of his large financial contributors, he is a moral coward.

Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI said:

Bush is an incompetent leader. In fact, he is not a leader. He is a person who has no judgment, no experience, and no knowledge of the subjects that he has to decide upon.

President treated as have been the current ones.

It would be nice if we could get to the bottom of that. Whether there are big problems in our government, we need to know what they are so we can defund them, or at least bring about accountability, just as my Democratic friends in the Senate repeatedly said, except not so kindly about the Bush administration and John Ashcroft and Alberto Gonzales.

And there were some things I agreed with Senator SCHUMER on in the Gonzales Justice Hearing. It was outrageous that they allowed so many National Security Letters to go out without proper basis. I was outraged about that.

In fact, if someone were to check the RECORD, they can see the way I went after the Bush FBI Director, because I believed then and still believe he did some serious damage to the FBI during the Bush administration.

The only difference is, I never heard him run out and give a speech whining about how he was mistreated as he came before me for questioning. He didn’t do that. And he actually tried to take actions to correct the problems that I got all over him about.

Another difference is, he was a Republican President’s FBI Director. But I didn’t care what his party was. I didn’t care who he was. I thought he was hurting the FBI, and I sounded off. And I was shocked that I have more friends on the Democratic side of the aisle join me in going after the Republican-appointed FBI Director.

And of course, once he held over and became the FBI Director for this administration, the other side of the aisle got even more kind in its questioning. But one of us—I certainly stayed consistent.

But there are many problems in this Justice Department, and it is very clear. There is an article from 2011, August 26, by Christian Adams, a guy that should know. He was in the Justice Department and had a case ready for
judgment against the New Black Panthers who were intimidating voters at a voting place, until the Holder political appointee stepped in and stopped it.

Yes, there is not one judgment, but basically one. They can go intimidate others at other polling places, and there were no legal actions that were really pursued to provide any teeth.

But Christian Adams has an article entitled “The Politicized Hiring of Eric Holder’s Compliance Officer.” He says every single time an attorney hired was a history thick with left-wing activism.

And then he goes through and talks about it in a very long article, very well-documented.

My friend across the building, Ted Cruz, Senator Cruz, invoked Water-gate in blasting DOJ’s probe of the IRS scandal. This was March 20, this year, articles from The Blaze by Fred Lucas.

Senator Cruz said the investigator is a partisan Democrat who has donated over $6,000 to President Obama and Democratic causes. Just as nobody would trust John Mitchell to investigate Richard Nixon, nobody should trust a partisan Obama donor to investigate any potential political targeting of President Obama’s enemies.

But he makes a good point. John Mitchell deserved the criticism he got, but no Attorney General since John Mitchell has the truthful history in their favor. And up and down, no Attorney General has ever been treated worse than I have.

You just have to go back to Alberto Gonzales. Again, I think he deserved some of the criticism he got, especially on the National Security Letter issue, and I am right there thinking it was a disaster, and it shouldn’t have been allowed to happen, and that people needed to be held accountable, which is why I called the White House after it came to light that a report had been on the Attorney General’s desk before he testified before the Senate that there were no known abuses of the National Security Letters.

I told the White House, this is indefensible. This isn’t right. We can’t defend this.

And I wish colleagues across the aisle, when they found similar abuses, problems, fault, would not let party politics or other divisive issues stand in the way. I think if we are to make any changes, they have the right to do that.

There are transcripts of Senators going after Attorney General Gonzales, Attorney General Ashcroft, or even going back to John Mitchell. This Attorney General, compared to them, doesn’t have a lot to complain about.

And one thing is interesting. You know, when I was a freshman, the Bush administration was in power. We had a lot of trouble getting documents from the Bush administration. The difference between that one and this one: they would eventually get us the documents.

The difference here is they have been there 5 years and they still will not produce documents that should be of critical concern to every American.

Some would say, look, there is no other issue than and concern for America when, in May of 2013, as this article points out from Breitbart:

On Wednesday, Attorney General Eric Holder testified in front of the House Judiciary Committee about an investigation regarding reports of a staff member leaking information to the AP about the Associated Press surveillance, the AP claims the Department of Justice was “going to be looking for people who produce documents that should be of critical concern to every American.”

Some would say, look, there is no other issue than and concern for America when, in May of 2013, as this article points out from Breitbart:

On Wednesday, Attorney General Eric Holder testified in front of the House Judiciary Committee about an investigation regarding reports of a staff member leaking information to the AP about the Associated Press surveillance, the AP claims the Department of Justice was “going to be looking for people who produce documents that should be of critical concern to every American.”

On Tuesday, Holder recused himself from the investigation into the AP scandal and held the committee had the leaked information. He could not give the exact date he recused himself, and he never put it in writing. It took quite awhile for the investigation it was on to Deputy Attorney General James Cole who signed the subpoena for the AP phone records.

There are all kinds of reasons to be concerned about what is going on. There are plenty of stories out there.

Oh, gee, how about the speech that my friend across the aisle, Keith Ellison of Minnesota, gave where, as reported here from the Minneapolis Star Tribune, Mr. Ellison said, talking about comparing September 11:

It’s almost like the Reichstag fire, kind of reminds me of that. After the Reichstag was burned, they blamed the communists for it, and it put the leader of that country—Hitler—into power. He could basically have authority to do whatever he wanted.

The fact is that I am not saying September 11 was a U.S. plan or anything like that because, you know how they put you in the nutball box or dismiss you.

But he went on, basically comparing September 11 to Hitler’s Reichstag fire, which was set and then blamed on the communists.

From CNN, a report on this, Keith Oppenheimer had stated:

Well, first of all, Wolf, some of the themes that Keith Ellison is talking about are themes that he has been sounding off for a while.

And then Oppenheimer said:

The Minneapolis Star Tribune, quoting Ellison at the forum, is saying this about the Vice President: “It is beneath his dignity in order for him to answer any question from the citizens of the United States. That is the very definition of totalitariansm, authoritarianism, and dictatorship.”

In response, whether Ellison supports a new investigation of the Department of Justice’s actions, he never resorted to name-calling or twisting the facts—when they found similar abuses, fault, would not let party politics or other divisive issues stand in the way, when they found similar abuses, fault, would not let party politics or other divisive issues stand in the way.

Attorney General has ever been treated worse than I have.

Mitchell has the truthful history in the impeachment Letters.

Candice Lanier, June 26, 2013, where it the Department of “just us”? One of them is the Department of Justice.

Nowadays, it is a different matter. If someone is concerned that your department or their department would provide discovery documents to convicted terrorists that they are refusing to provide to Congress, that is not an issue of anything other than just not doing what the law requires in the way of oversight.

There is so much going on in this country that needs our attention, and one of them is the Department of Justice.

Is it the Department of Justice? Is it the Department of “just us”?

There is an article from Red State by Candice Lanier, June 26, 2013, where she entitles the article, “Sixteen Scandals: The Legacy of Eric Holder,” and then she goes through and cites 16 reasons we should be very concerned about the Department of Justice.

One of them quotes Discover the Networks.

She says:

Holder also took a leadership role with the Student Afro-American Society, which at one point demanded that the school’s abandoned ROTC office be renamed the “Malcolm X Lounge”—“in honor of a man who recognized the importance of territory as a basis for nationhood.” In 1970, Holder was a participant in a 3-day occupation of that office. And, according to some accounts, the occupiers were armed. In addition, Holder and SAAS also occupied the office of Henry Coleman, Dean of Freshmen, until their demands were met.

It would appear the SAAS was an advocate of the Black Panthers because in March 1970, the SAAS released a statement supporting the Black Panthers who were charged with plotting to blow up a police station, department sidewalks, tracks, and the New York Botanical Gardens.

It references the discriminatory hir- ing practices in the Department of Justice. This article points out:

In June 2008, Holder admitted to the American Constitution Society, an organization started as a liberal counterweight to the Federalist Society, that the Justice Department was “going to be looking for people who share our values.”

Then it references Fort Hood and the fact that:

Following the Fort Hood attack on November 5, 2009, not one of the postattack reports issued by the Department of Justice mentioned Nidal Hasan’s Islamist ideology.

It talks further about that, and then it talks about the AP scandal, and the way it went after the Associated Press and cowed them.

Number four, the Department of Justice secretly targets Fox News reporter James Rosen.

There were issues of credibility in comparing our Attorney General’s testimony, saying he didn’t know of any one ever being prosecuted, in essence,
and then his signing off on the pursuit of James Rosen.

Five is the Marc Rich pardon and that Eric Holder played an important role in what was arguably the most infamous of President Clinton’s 176 pardons. He pardoned the millionaire financier and fugitive oil broker who illegally bought oil from Iran.

Anyway, President Clinton signed the pardon, later crediting Holden’s recommendation as one of the factors that had convinced him to issue the pardon.

Number six was the Weather Underground pardon.

Holder, as Deputy Attorney General, “was the gatekeeper for presidential pardons.”

Two of the recipients of Holder’s former Weather Underground members were former Weather Underground members Susan Rosenberg and Linda Evans.

Number seven—and I am not reading off all the information about these—but seven was:

Holder’s DOJ threatens free speech. The American Medical Advisory Council of Tennessee sponsored an event on June 4, called “Public Disclosure in a Diverse Society.” The main speaker of the event was DOJ official Bill Killian, who is the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee, and FBI Special Agent of the Knoxville Division. Kennedy is troubling about the event is that Killian addressed how social media posts and documents deemed inflammatory toward Muslims can be considered a violation of civil rights laws.

He went on and he quoted the law, talking about how anybody critical of Islam could be violating the law. He quotes the law:

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, maim, disfigure, or intimidate any person in any State, territory, commonwealth, possession, or district in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

Talk about a chilling effect.

Number eight, hostility towards conservatives. At an American Constitution Society gathering in 2004, Holder made the following comments—and these are all quotes:

Conservatives have been defenders of the status quo, afraid of the future, and content to allow to continue to exist all but the most blatant inequalities.

Conservatives have made a mockery of the rule of law.

Conservatives are “breathtaking” in their “arrogance,” which manifests itself in such things as “attacks on abortion rights,” “energy price controls” are as sighted as they are ineffective,” and “tax cuts that disproportionately favor those who are well off and perpetuate many of the inequities in our nation.”

The hallmarks of the “conservative agenda” include “social division, mindless tax cutting, and a defensive posture that does not really make us safer.”

Anyway, he got quite a few quotes like that.

But number nine, opposition to Second Amendment rights:

In 2008, Eric Holder claimed that the Second Amendment does not protect an individual’s right to keep and bear arms, but only applied to government militias.

Number 10 was the treatment of terrorists as criminal defendants instead of enemy combatants, as the laws that were passed should have indicated.

Number 11 was the Arizona immigration law, how he went after that and he had not even read it. Filed pleadings in his department if pleadings, and he made statements about how bad the law was, and he had not even read it.

I thought my friend from Texas, Ted Poe, a former judge, had asked one of the stupidest questions I had ever heard in our Judiciary Committee hearing when he asked: Had you read that law before you filed that suit?

And the answer was no. I couldn’t believe that no lawyer would file a suit declaring a law unconstitutional and he hadn’t even read it.

Twelve, New Black Panther intimidation.

Thirteen, opposition to voter ID laws—and by the way, we have evidence—you have places where photo IDs have decreased the voter turnout by 25 percent, and that was actually an increase in minority voting.

Fourteen, Fast and Furious, that we can’t get to the bottom of because they continue to secrete information about the department’s involvement and what they did.

Fifteen, purges references to radical Islam, and we know about the purging of FBI training documents so that we don’t offend people that want to destroy our way of life and not have to be here in Congress.

Sixteen, about the Islamic outreach, when I was grilling FBI Director Mueller about not even pursuing adequately the information about Tsarnaev being radicalized, I said: you didn’t even go to the Muslim mosque in Boston to ask about their radicalization.

He said: oh, yes, we did go to the mosque—and then muttered “in the outreach program.” They never want to talk to anybody that might know whether Tsarnaev had been radicalized.

Then The New York Times has a story blaming the Russians. The Russians and our own intelligence community know anytime you give a heads-up to another country about information that may be helpful to them, you may end up giving away how intelligence is obtained.

So it was wonderful that, twice, Russia gave us a heads-up, and instead, we go to Guantanamo, and渲染 attacks, with our outreach program from the FBI, instead of to investigate how radicalized this young man had become and the damage and the death and mayhem he was about to cause.

If someone wants to say there is another motive for being critical, well, they are living in their own little world.

If somebody wants to bring up race, Mr. Speaker, for the record, let me just say there is one African American I am still furious with. His name is Fred McClure. He was the president of the State of Texas Future Farmers of America. He was the student body president at Texas A&M University, where I attended. He was a good friend. I went to Baylor Law School before him. People say: wow, you really did well, you know, you won an award for a law review article, won best brief award, won moot court.

Fred came in behind me and set the place on fire, figuratively speaking, with how well he did and the things he accomplished.
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But he went to work for President George H. W. Bush, and in 1990, in December, I begged Fred to come back to east Texas where he grew up in San Augustine and that there were a lot of us that loved him and would get him elected to Congress so we could come back up here to Washington and set things right.

And the thing I am still furious at Fred about is, if Fred had taken the encouragement to heart and come back to east Texas to run for Congress, we could have gotten him elected. And if we had done that, I could have been about a normal life and not had to be here in Congress.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, 113th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, April 28, 2014, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5366. A letter from the Associate Administrator of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to Primary Peanut-Pro- ducing States and Adjustment of Membership [Document Number: AMS-FV-13-0042] received April 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 601(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5367. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel Robert G. Armfield and Colonel Christopher J. Short to wear the authorized insignia of the brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5368. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Stanley T. Kresse, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5369. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Weapons Council, transmitting certification of amounts requested for the national Nuclear Security Administration in the President’s Budget for FY 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.
Election to Deduct for the Preceding Taxable Year Losses Atttributable to Colorado Severe Storms, Flooding, Landslides, and Mudslides (Notice 2014-20) received March 27, 2014, pursuant to S. 401(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.


544. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the Evaluation of the Medical Management Performance Demonstration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395b-1 note Public Law 108-173, section 690(g); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

545. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ‘Recovery Auditing in the Medicare and Medicaid Program’; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.


547. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the Millennium Challenge Corporation’s (MCC) activities for fiscal year 2013; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 963. A bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women’s History Museum, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–411 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2657. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal lands in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, previously identified as suitable for disposal, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4632. A bill to exempt the Amendment of the Water Resources Management Act of 1980 to provide for the appointment of certain water transfers by the North Texas Municipal Water District and the Greater Texoma Utility Authority, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–413 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration, H.R. 4032 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. GRAYSON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4451. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the protection of the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 4452. A bill to establish a corporate crime database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. RECHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 4453. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend, for one year, the reduced recognition period for built-in gains of S corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RECHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 4454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent certain rules regarding basis adjustments to stock of S corporations making charitable contributions of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4455. A bill to require Federal agencies to collaborate in the development of freely available open source educational materials in college-level physics, chemistry, and math, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. MATSIU, Mr. GARAMendi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 4456. A bill to determine the feasibility of additional agreements for long-term use of existing or expanded non-Federal storage and conveyance facilities to augment Federal water supply, ecosystem, and operational flexibility benefits in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BUCAYE, Mr. DAVES of Illinois, and Mr. SCHROCK):

H.R. 4457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expiring limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H.R. 4458. A bill to make permanent the withdrawal and reservation of public land previously withdrawn and reserved to support the operations of the Station China Lake, California, and to provide for the withdrawal and reservation of additional public land, to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. MCGovern, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURDOCH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOR顿, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 4459. A bill to secure the Federal vote of persons who were placed in incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 4461. A bill to authorize the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish a Climate Change Education Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. HINOJOSA, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CLOSE, Mr. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MEeks, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GUTŒZJiménez, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HICK of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LEK of California, Ms. JACKSON Lee of Texas, Mr. HERNÉZ of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 4462. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish the Family Affordable Mortgage Insurance Program to establish a single-family mortgage insurance premium to mitigate the risk of homeowner default on FHA single-family mortgage insurance premiums for first-time homebuyers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BONAMICI:

H.R. 4463. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to regulate tax return preparers and refund anticipation payment arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MATHISEN, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 4464. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the look-through response development to discount between related controlled foreign corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 4465. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to require the requirement of catch limits for the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4466. A bill to require certain financial regulators to determine whether new regulations or orders are duplicative or inconsistent with existing Federal regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4467. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for visas for certain advanced STEM graduates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 4468. A bill to require career and technical education for maritime careers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions for one year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate tax return preparers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NORTON, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 4471. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the tax incentives for employer sponsored retirement plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 4472. A bill to provide for the establishment of a grant program to support United States-Lebanon cooperation for neuro-science-related research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. Envart, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 4473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow small employers a credit against income tax for the cost of on-the-job training expenses, to make the research credit permanent, and to increase the simplified research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 4474. A bill to remove the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan from terrorism organization lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 4475. A bill to allow the manufacture, importation, distribution, and sale of investigational drugs and devices intended for use by terminally ill patients who execute an informed consent for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISAAC:

H.R. 4476. A bill to require ingredient labeling of certain consumer cleaning products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McNerny:

H.R. 4477. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for engineering, design, and construction of the Altamont Corridor Rail Project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4478. A bill to require that any new contract to provide project-based rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 have a term of 60 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a renter's credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. PAYNE, Mr. ADAMS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NORTON, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORENHOUT of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. YEAST, Mr. GUTŒZJiménez, Mr. CLAY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SHELTON of Alabama, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 4480. A bill to amend adverse credit history determinations for purposes of Federal Direct PLUS Loan eligibility; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4481. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to authorize block grants to States for prekindergarten education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4482. A bill to prohibit any appropriation of funds for the Science and Technology account of the Environmental Protection Agency for research on climate change; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

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

H.R. 4483. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the tax incentives for employer sponsored retirement plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BAER, Mr. BILIRANSKY, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 4484. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide improvements for Medicare Advantage special needs plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. TURNER (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 4485. A bill to provide for additional enhancements to the sexual assault prevention and response accommodations Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.J. Res. 114. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the election of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. Res. 550. A resolution recognizing caregiving as a profession and the need for increased educational opportunities for both paid and family caregivers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Ms. CRUZ, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SWALWELL, of California, Mr. SUJOYAL, Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mr. TITUS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. BEA of California):

H. Res. 556. A resolution honoring the Sikh American community’s celebration of
Vaisakhi; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. VARJOS, Ms. RASS, Mr. SWALWINE of California, and Mr. LEWIS):

H. Res. 581. A resolution supporting the mission and goals of 2014 National Crime Victims Right Week, which include increasing public awareness of the rights, needs, and concerns of, and services available to, victims of crime in the United States.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GHEM, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 552. A resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the 1964 World's Fair in Queens, New York; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H. Res. 553. A resolution recognizing Line-men, the profession of Linemen, and the contributions of these brave men and women to protect public safety, and expressing support of designation of April 18, 2014, as National Lineman Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HAHN:

H. Res. 554. A resolution recognizing the alarming mortality rate of African-American breast cancer patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 4445. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States... By Mr. SHUSTER:

H. R. 4446. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I Section 8: to provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. PARENTHOLD:

H. R. 4447. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 4448. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause Article I, Section 8, Clause Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H. R. 4449. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. BRILAKIS:

H. R. 4450. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (which states that ‘The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States’) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (which states that ‘The Congress shall have the Power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes”’ of the Constitution of the United States).

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. R. 4451. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. R. 4452. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REICHERT:

H. R. 4453. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Amendment VI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. REICHERT:

H. R. 4454. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FOSTER:

H. R. 4455. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: 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. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H. R. 4456. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that “All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.”

By Mr. MCCARTHY of California:

H. R. 4457. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. R. 4458. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: 1) Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution. This provision permits Congress to make or alter the regulations pertaining to Federal elections;

2) Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision grants Congress the authority to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans;

3) The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision prohibits excessive bail, excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishments.

By Mr. HONDA:

H. R. 4460. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

190. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Resolution No. 340 commending Israel for its cordial and mutually beneficial relationship with the United States and Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

191. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 315 memorializing the Congress and the President to support Michigan’s application for a state-sponsored EB-5 regional center; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

192. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 316 memorializing the Congress and the President to support Michigan’s request for 50,000 EB-2 visas to assist in the recovery of the city of Detroit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

193. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 21 urging the President, Congress, and the Department of Veterans Affairs to take prompt action to reduce the processing time for veterans’ disability benefit claims; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

194. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 14-1007 recognizing the bravery and sacrifice of the crew of the U.S.S. Pueblo; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

195. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 19 urging Congress to repeal Section 5302 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Foreign Affairs.

196. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 316-32 requesting that the Congress and the Department of Health and Human Services further consider and amend the provisions of the PPACA; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

197. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 8003 urging Congress to update and renew the Communications Decency Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

198. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 206 urging Congress to direct the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to enhance safety standards for existing and new tank cars used to transport crude oil and other flammable liquids; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

190. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Resolution No. 340 commending Israel for its cordial and mutu-
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 4473.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEEL:

H.R. 4476.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 4466.

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.

By Mr. CAPITO:

H.R. 4467.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 4468.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 24: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 32: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 184: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 279: Ms. DeLBENE.

H.R. 460: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 485: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 508: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 524: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 551: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 578: Mr. BENJEMI.

H.R. 713: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 718: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 786: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 855: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 863: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 935: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 942: Mr. Posey and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 963: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1020: Mr. MAPFREI and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1070: Mr. WINSTN and Mr. MCKORN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIPPS of Arkansas, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1084: Mr. YARMUCL.

H.R. 1141: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1173: Mr. TIBBS.

H.R. 1229: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1290: Mr. Bishop of Utah.

H.R. 1318: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1331: Mr. PEACE of Georgia.

H.R. 1354: Mr. PCAN and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1462: Mr. THORNBER.

H.R. 1464: Mr. PIERLUSI.

H.R. 1507: Mr. ENYART and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1508: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1563: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1620: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1696: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1726: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1812: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1852: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 1961: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1950: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 2095: Mr. WALTER.

H.R. 2143: Mr. FERLINGHUYDEN.

H.R. 2263: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANGVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LANDFORD, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. SNEHA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POSY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BRAY of Iowa, Mr. COURNEY, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. SCHWIEBERT, Mr. BEYDIVOL, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DISCH, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GOOLATTE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. NGUYEN, Mrs.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 4473.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. BEATTY:

H.R. 4474.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution that 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 this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.J. Res. 114.

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

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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 20: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 24: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 32: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 184: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 279: Ms. DeLBENE.

H.R. 460: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 485: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 508: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 524: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 551: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 578: Mr. BENJEMI.

H.R. 713: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 718: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 786: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 855: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 863: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 935: Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 942: Mr. Posey and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 963: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1020: Mr. MAPFREI and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1070: Mr. WINSTN and Mr. MCKORN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIPPS of Arkansas, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1084: Mr. YARMUCL.

H.R. 1141: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1173: Mr. TIBBS.

H.R. 1229: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1290: Mr. Bishop of Utah.

H.R. 1318: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1331: Mr. PEACE of Georgia.

H.R. 1354: Mr. PCAN and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1462: Mr. THORNBER.

H.R. 1464: Mr. PIERLUSI.

H.R. 1507: Mr. ENYART and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1508: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1563: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1620: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1696: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1726: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1812: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1852: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 1961: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1950: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 2095: Mr. WALTER.

H.R. 2143: Mr. FERLINGHUYDEN.

H.R. 2263: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANGVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LANDFORD, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. SNEHA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POSY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BRAY of Iowa, Mr. COURNEY, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. SCHWIEBERT, Mr. BEYDIVOL, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DISCH, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GOOLATTE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. NGUYEN, Mrs.
Florida, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, and Mr. Serrano.

H.R. 2428: Mr. Jolly, Mr. Scalise, Ms. Herrera Beutler, and Mr. Graves of Georgia.

H.R. 2504: Mr. King of New York, Mr. Peters of California, and Mr. Sires.

H.R. 2543: Mr. Long and Mr. Chabot.

H.R. 2607: Mr. Lance.

H.R. 2619: Mr. Foca, Mr. Rahall, and Mrs. Kildee.

H.R. 2648: Mr. Ellision.

H.R. 2682: Mr. Lance.

H.R. 2707: Mr. Kennedy.

H.R. 2725: Mr. Schrader.

H.R. 2788: Mr. Jeffries.

H.R. 2805: Mr. Frelinghuysen and Mr. Rothfus.

H.R. 2870: Mr. Meek and Ms. Esty.

H.R. 2901: Mr. Courtney and Mr. Gibson.

H.R. 2922: Mr. Engel, Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, Mr. Shockey, Mr. Schneider, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. McClintock, and Mr. Wilson of Florida.

H.R. 2955: Mr. Sires.

H.R. 2957: Mr. McKinley.

H.R. 2969: Mr. Jolly, Mr. Petri, Mr. Daines, and Mr. Roykat.

H.R. 3002: Mr. Cook and Mr. Rangel.

H.R. 3022: Ms. DeGette.

H.R. 3096: Mr. Yarmuth, Mr. Payne, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Ms. Brownley of California, and Mr. Vargas.

H.R. 3150: Mr. McKinley.

H.R. 3155: Mr. Farenthold.

H.R. 3179: Mr. Brooks of Alabama and Mr. Adenholt.

H.R. 3313: Ms. McCollum.

H.R. 3344: Mrs. Walorski and Mr. Frelinghuysen.

H.R. 3361: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina.

H.R. 3367: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

H.R. 3377: Mrs. Eilermers.

H.R. 3494: Mr. Loebsack.

H.R. 3528: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

H.R. 3340: Ms. Frankel of Florida and Mrs. Walorski.

H.R. 3370: Mr. Gutierrez.

H.R. 3381: Mr. Smith of Texas.

H.R. 3410: Mr. Walz.

H.R. 3658: Mr. Jolly, Mr. Bishop of Utah, and Mr. Rogers of Kentucky.

H.R. 3673: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.


H.R. 3707: Mr. Holt and Mr. Payne.

H.R. 3717: Mr. Carter, Mr. Amodei, and Mr. Schrock.

H.R. 3740: Mrs. Bostos.

H.R. 3792: Mr. Cole.

H.R. 3867: Ms. Granger and Mr. Bralley of Iowa.

H.R. 3929: Ms. Fudur and Mr. Holt.

H.R. 3960: Mr. Israeli and Mr. Camp.

H.R. 3969: Mr. McKinley.

H.R. 3991: Mr. Buchson.

H.R. 4008: Mr. Petri.

H.R. 4031: Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Yoho, and Mr. McClintock.

H.R. 4058: Mr. Webster of Florida.

H.R. 4064: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

H.R. 4069: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

H.R. 4119: Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Thompson of California, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Holt, and Ms. Moore.

H.R. 4143: Mr. Sires.

H.R. 4162: Ms. Shearing.

H.R. 4172: Mr. Nolle.

H.R. 4225: Mr. Webster of Florida, Mrs. Lummis, Mrs. Roby, Mr. Poe of Texas, Mr. Reichert, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Graves of Missouri, and Mr. Clay.

H.R. 4228: Mr. Mathis.

H.R. 4250: Mrs. Blackburn, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, and Mr. Griffin of Arkansas.

H.R. 4255: Mr. Michaud and Ms. Tsongas.

H.R. 4265: Mr. Waxman, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. Lowenthal, Ms. Hahn, Ms. Speier, and Ms. Lofgren.

H.R. 4299: Mr. Gene Green of Texas.

H.R. 4305: Mr. Walz.

H.R. 4308: Mr. Desantis.

H.R. 4316: Mr. Walden.

H.R. 4320: Mr. Womack.

H.R. 4325: Mr. Levin.

H.R. 4346: Mr. Smith of New Jersey.

H.R. 4351: Ms. Shearing, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Amodei, Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Mr. Geerlach, Mr. Sires, and Mr. Eshar.

H.R. 4377: Mr. Griffin of Arkansas, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Nunneler, and Mr. Brown of Georgia.

H.R. 4361: Mr. Cohen.

H.R. 4364: Mr. Butterfield.

H.R. 4365: Ms. Norton, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Paulsen, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Kilmer, and Ms. Roybal-Allard.

H.R. 4370: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

H.R. 4411: Mr. Dersanti, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Collins of Georgia, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois, Mr. Saltsman, Ms. Meng, Mr. Dritcher, Mr. Cook, Mr. Westmoreland, Mr. Farenthold, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Higgins, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Long, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Prater, Mr. Rokita, and Mr. Jordan.

H.R. 4425: Mr. Stewart.

H.R. 4433: Mr. Biedenstine.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. Beshear.

H.Con. Res. 86: Mr. Rangel, Mr. Terry, Mr. Smith of Missouri, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Butterfield, Mr. Meeks, and Mr. Tonko.

H.Res. 72: Mr. Goodlatte.

H.Res. 109: Mr. Woodall.

H.Res. 196: Mr. Garamendi.

H.Res. 526: Mr. Huffman.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 2377: Mr. Duncan of South Carolina.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

77. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Township of Parsippany—Troy Hills, New Jersey, relative to Resolution R2014-040 urging the Congress to invest federal dollars in maintaining the highways and improving the transportation infrastructure in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

78. Also, a petition of the County of Sagatoga Board of Supervisors, New York, relative to Resolution 44 urging the passage of H.R. 543; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

79. Also, a petition of the County of Sagatoga Board of Supervisors, New York, relative to Resolution 45 urging the Senate to introduce a companion bill of H.R. 149 and ensure its passage within the 113th Congressional Session; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.
The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana.

**PRAYER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The guest chaplain, Dr. Raphael Warnock, senior pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church of Atlanta, GA, will lead the Senate in prayer.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of love and justice, for this new day with its new possibilities, we are grateful. For the holy covenant we have with You and for the sacred covenant we have with one another as an American people, we are grateful. For the precious ideals of freedom, self-government, radical inclusion, and equal protection under the law, we are grateful. These are Your gifts. Grant that when we, the American people, especially those who serve in this the people’s house, are weighed by the moral balance of history, we will be found worthy.

God, make us mindful that we might be found worthy; mindful that the moral test of government is how it treats those at the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy, the handicapped. O God, make us mindful of our inextricable connections to one another and of our sacred obligation as careful stewards of this global neighborhood we are blessed to share.

To the God who loves us into freedom, and frees us into loving, we offer this prayer. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Presiding Officer 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.

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
WASHINGTON, DC, April 10, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 354, the minimum wage legislation.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 354, S. 223, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

**SCHEDULE**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled. At 10:30 a.m. there will be a vote on the Ninth Circuit judge, whose name is Michelle Friedland. Until cloture is invoked there will be up to 30 hours of debate prior to vote on the confirmation of the nomination. So we have two votes we need to have before we leave here this week. We can have a vote at 4:00 tomorrow afternoon and the second vote would be around 7:00 or thereabouts tomorrow afternoon or tomorrow evening. We have to finish these two matters before we leave this week.

The schedule is up to—not Republicans but a few Republicans—so I would suggest the Republicans deal with their own, and we can finish this morning if we need to. We certainly could.

Mr. President, I would be happy to yield to my friend, the dignified and really superb Senator from Georgia. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the leader for the introduction and I am very pleased to introduce today the Reverend Raphael Warnock, the senior pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta. He is a gifted author, a gifted and prolific preacher, and a great citizen of the great State of Georgia and the great city of Atlanta.

Following in the traditions of the King family and the preachers of Ebenezer Baptist Church, he is the fifth pastor in the history of Ebenezer to carry out the mission of Ebenezer with great humility and great ability and great love, and is a great pastor in our eyes. I am pleased to welcome him to the U.S. Senate, and I know we will all be blessed in his presence today.

I yield back. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

46TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1968

Mr. REID. Tomorrow marks the 46th anniversary of the signing into law the Civil Rights Act of 1968, better known as the Fair Housing Act. This landmark legislation took a stand against
housing discrimination and gave American families a fair shot at finding housing that was suitable to their needs. It is fitting we recognize this anniversary now, especially in light of the equality legislation we have been trying to pass here in the Senate recently.

**The Economic Ladder**

One of the first well-known billionaires we heard a lot about on the planet was the outspoken oil tycoon J. Paul Getty. He once quipped: ‘‘Money, money. You have to spread it around or it smells.’’

Well, Charles and David Koch have certainly spread the money around, but it still stinks. It stinks because of what they do with their money. The Kochs are singlehandedly funding an attack on this Nation’s middle class, instead of concerning themselves with narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor.

Remember, in America today the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and the middle class is getting squeezed. The Koch brothers have a lot to do with that. They are pumping hundreds of millions of dollars into rightwing organizations. And I didn’t make that up when I said hundreds of millions of dollars.

Instead of giving Americans a fighting chance to prosperity, the two richest brothers in the world are focused on getting Republicans elected. These Koch-funded organizations and politicians advocate only for what makes the Koch brothers richer. The two richest brothers in the world want to be richer, and it comes at the expense of the average American.

The Kochs are the classic example of two men at the top of the ladder who would pull that ladder up to make sure no one else can join them. That is exactly what the Koch brothers are trying to do to middle-class families. The only difference, of course, is that Charles and David never even scaled the ladder in the first place. They were born at the top rung. But somehow the Kochs have fooled themselves into thinking they rose to the top by their own merits. They didn’t.

More importantly, the Koch brothers have decided that they want their inherited wealth, this company now they have at the top—they want to make sure this ladder that should be reachable to middle-class families is determined to make that ladder totally unreachable for others. These billionaires do this by rigging the system even more in their favor, making sure the Kochs’ interests are being represented at all costs.

As has been reported—and not by me—the Koch brothers have what some journalists are calling secret banks. Organizations serve as middlemen to fund ultraconservative scare campaigns. Through these secret banks, such as Freedom Partners and others, the multi-billionaire Koch brothers pump money into radical institutions and all these rightwing organizations ultimately come to the same conclusion: America’s best bet for economic prosperity is to help the Koch brothers get richer.

So what do these groups do with the funds they receive from their billionaire benefactors? Groups such as Americans for Prosperity—try that one on for size, the Americans for Prosperity—lie to the American people about ObamaCare, hoping families will not sign up for affordable health care.

Extremely Independent Women’s Forum tell women equal pay for equal work is not necessary because they say wage disparity is a myth.

The Koch-backed Manhattan Institute is another one of their shell organizations that tries to convince the country that out-of-work American families don’t need unemployment benefits. Why? Because they are out of work because they are lazy.

And, of course, the Heritage Foundation on using Koch dollars to say raising the minimum wage is bad for business and will kill the economy.

It is clear that the Kochs are using these puppet organizations in their proxy war on the middle class. But that isn’t just why the Kochs’ radical rightwing groups to keep average Americans from scaling the rungs. They are using Republicans. They are spreading their money around helping Republicans get elected.

Unfortunately, the Republican Congress has shown itself to be in lockstep with the Koch brothers’ radical agenda. The Republicans continue to push repeal of the Affordable Care Act. I watched the speech on the House floor yesterday, where one House Member indicated that he tried almost 60 times to repeal the bill—almost 60 times.

What did Albert Einstein say? The definition of insanity is when someone tries to do something over and over again, they try the same result. They are insane. That is Albert Einstein, not me.

They are doing this regardless of the fact that even the Koch brothers; that is, their business, Koch Industries, benefited from ObamaCare.

Remember that ladder. The Kochs already got what they needed from health care reform. They don’t want other people to do the same. They have benefitted from ObamaCare. I laid that out a few days ago on the Senate floor.

Sen. Republicans have blocked the equal pay amendment three times—three separate Congresses. They won’t even let us discuss it. All but half of Republican Senators voted against the extension of benefits for the long-term unemployed, and turned their back on their own constituents.

As for the minimum wage, my Republican colleagues have given no indication to help struggling families with the minimum wage.

The Koch brothers are being used to squeeze the middle class very much. As long as Charles and David Koch are at the top looking down, who cares about the little people at the bottom, in their estimation.

It is shameful that Koch money has made its way into our Nation’s Capitol, our news, and our homes. It is frustrating that as Senate Democrats look across the aisle, we see many willing partners in defending middle-class families in Nevada and across the Nation. But we are not going to be intimidated by these Koch surrogates in the media or here in this very Chamber.

We will continue to fight even harder to protect Americans from the greedy grasp of these billionaire oil barons and the wrath of their radical minions. Senate Democrats will continue to pull that ladder out from the Koch brothers’ fingers so every American has a fair shot at climbing to the top.

**Recognition of the Minority Leader**

The Acting President pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

**Job Creation**

Mr. McCONNELL. For days now Republicans have been coming to the floor to ask the Democratic majority to work with us on jobs. This is the issue Americans say they care the most about. So it is easier why Senate Democrats seem so allergic to various jobs ideas we have been proposing, not to mention dozens of job-creating bills already passed by the House.

Now, our constituents want us to work together to rebuild the middle class, to help create opportunities for the families struggling out there just to pay the bills. In recent days we have given our Democratic colleagues ample opportunity to do that. We have offered one innovative proposal after another, proposals that haven’t had much of a problem attracting bipartisan support in the past, ideas such as reducing the tax burden on small businesses, freeing them to grow, to hire, to innovate, ideas such as approving the Keystone Pipeline, which would create thousands of jobs right away; ideas such as repealing the medical device tax which even Democrats acknowledge is killing jobs—although they haven’t acted to fix it yet—and ideas such as eliminating ObamaCare’s 30-hour workweek mandate, a rule that cuts people’s hours against their will, that disproportionately affects women and is forcing too many Americans to look for extra work to get by.

But we go even further than just tackling the causes of joblessness. Our ideas go beyond just helping Americans secure jobs with a steady paycheck and the hope of a better future. Because we have also put forward legislation that offers Americans more choices and greater flexibility in the workforce.

This is something a lot of our constituents are asking for, and we are responding to those concerns.

One bill we have proposed would let working moms and dads take more time off to strike a better work-life balance. Another bill would prohibit
union bosses from denying pay increases to an employee who works harder than her coworkers.

These are the kinds of practical, commonsense proposals our constituents sent us here to actually pass. These are the kinds of proposals that would make jobs more plentiful and life a lot easier for men and women across our country. For some reason Senate Democrats are blocking all of these ideas from getting a vote. Maybe it is because they are so single-mindedly focused on an election that is far away.

I mean, they have already conceded that their “agenda” for the rest of the year was drafted by campaign staffers. It is a stunning admission. It explains their near-total lack of interest in practical solutions to the everyday concerns of our constituents. It also explains why the only jobs that Senate Democrats seem to be interested in these days are their own.

This is a big problem. Not only does it reinforce the widespread belief that Democrats are not serious about jobs, it also reinforces a growing impression that Democrats are simply out of their depth when it comes to our economy. Think about it: Washington Democrats are well into their sixth year of trying to get the economy back on track—6 years.

Yet for many in the middle class things only seem to have gotten worse. Average household income has fallen by nearly $3,600. The number of Americans actually working in the labor force has dropped to its lowest level since the Carter era. Millions are looking for work and can’t find it, and the new rules and regulations just keep on coming. They have tried all their usual liberal solutions—higher taxes, “stimulus,” and more regulations. They have tried all the standard stuff and it has not worked. Doing more of it won’t work either.

This may be difficult for Washington Democrats to hear, but it is time they switched from their failed ideological approach. It is time for them to shelve their political games and work with us to pass practical legislation for a change—legislation that can finally rescue the middle class from so many years of economic failure.

I have laid out a number of commonsense proposals already. There is more we can do if Democrats are willing to reach across the aisle and help deliver for the American people. My constituents expect us to do that. I am sure theirs do too. Honestly, there is no reason not to do that.

I yield the floor.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2243 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Michelle Friedland to the Ninth Circuit.

This nomination was approved in the Judiciary Committee on a strong bipartisan vote of 14 to 3, including support from four Republican members: Ranking Member GRASSLEY, and Senators ROSSLE, HAGEL, and FLAKE. She has earned the American Bar Association’s highest rating of “well qualified.”

If she is confirmed, which I very much hope she is, it would mark the first time ever that the Ninth Circuit, the busiest circuit in the country by some measures, has its full complement of 29 active circuit judges.

Michelle Friedland earned her bachelor’s degree, with honors and distinction, from Stanford University in 1994. She was Phi Beta Kappa, and became a Fulbright Scholar from 1995 to 1996, studying at Oxford.

She earned her law degree from Stanford Law School in 2000, where she was second in her class, graduated with distinction, and inducted into the Order of the Coif.

She then had two prestigious clerkships. The first was with Judge David Tatel on the D.C. Circuit. She then clerked for Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, who attended Ms. Friedland’s confirmation hearing this past November.

Although I could not attend that hearing, it said a great deal that Justice O’Connor, the first woman on the Supreme Court and a voice of great moderation and pragmatism on the Court, came to the Judiciary Committee and demonstrated her support in person for this fine nominee.

Ms. Friedland then served as a lecturer at Stanford Law School from 2002 to 2004 and subsequently joined the law firm Munger Tolles & Olsen, where she is now a partner.

She has represented major clients, including Berkshire Hathaway, Boeing, Abbott Laboratories, the University of California, and Solvay Pharmaceuticals. She has worked on issues including criminal defense, class action defense, tax, patent, copyright, and antitrust.

She has also done pro bono work, devoting time, for example, to the Silicon Valley Campaign for Legal Services and Equality California.

She has won the President’s Pro Bono Service Award and the Wiley W. Manuel Award for Pro Bono Legal Services, both from the State Bar of California.

She also has broad support in the legal community. One letter came from 27 individuals who clerked on the Supreme Court—including for Justices Rehnquist, Scalia, and Thomas—when Michelle Friedland clerked for Justice O’Connor. They said that Friedland is “respectful of colleagues, fair-minded to attorneys and litigants, and sharp as a tack.”

A second letter is from Kathryn Haun, who previously served in the Justice Department under Attorney General Mukasey and in the National Security Division. Today she is a Federal prosecutor in Northern California.

Ms. Haun has known Michelle Friedland since they were classmates in the same small section at Stanford Law School. Ms. Haun’s letter says:

I clerked for Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy, am a member of the Federalist Society, and am a registered Republican. Notwithstanding our political differences, I believe [Michelle Friedland] would make an outstanding federal appellate judge if confirmed. This is because Michelle has a deep respect for legal precedent above seeking a particular result in a given case.

A third letter is from the general counsel of Cisco, Edison International, General Electric, Google, Facebook, Amazon, and other companies. It speaks very highly of this nominee, and says, quote: “All parties appearing before her, from individual litigants to small businesses to the nation’s largest corporations, would be confident that she will judge their cases fairly and in accordance with the law.”

The Ninth Circuit is also the busiest circuit. It has over 4,000 pending appeals per panel. This is two and a half times the average across the other circuits.

It comes as no surprise, then, that it takes much longer to resolve an appeal in the Ninth Circuit than in the other circuits. Specifically, the Ninth Circuit takes 13.3 months to resolve an appeal. This is down from 17.4 months in 2011, but it is still 55 percent greater than the average in the other circuits.

Thus, it is very important for businesses, individuals, and others in all States in the Ninth Circuit that nominees to this court are promptly taken up and confirmed.

I will conclude by remarking upon what I see as a real opportunity for the Senate in the coming months.

When I was first sworn in as a Senator in 1992, it was called by some the Year of the Woman. Senator Boxer and I were both elected that year, as were Senator Murray and former Senator Carol Moseley Braun.

Yet after we were all sworn in, there were only six women in the Senate. I became the first woman ever to sit on the Senate Judiciary Committee, after some very divisive hearings for
Justice Clarence Thomas, in which the lack of women on the Judiciary Committee became an issue.

At the time, the Federal courts were mainly the province of men appointed by the two most recent Presidents. After President Reagan’s confirmed judicial nominees were men. That number fell under President George H.W. Bush, but only to 81 percent. Overall, only 12.6 percent of active Federal judges were women when I was sworn in to the Senate.

Although women have been close to half of all law students for decades, even today only 53 of 164 active circuit judges—or 32 percent—are women.

Right now, there are female nominees for the Third, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Circuits pending in the Senate—a total of six nominees, with four simply waiting for a floor vote. To put these numbers in perspective, there were only 6 women confirmed to the circuit courts during all 8 years of the Reagan administration.

If all six of these pending nominees are confirmed, the number of active female circuit judges would grow by over 11 percent. That is a big deal, and it is a real opportunity to increase significantly the number of women on the circuit courts.

Michelle Friedland is well qualified, she has bipartisan support, and her confirmation would give the Ninth Circuit—the busiest circuit—a full complement of 29 judges for the first time. I urge my colleagues to support her.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we are again voting to overcome a Republican filibuster of a highly qualified nominee for a judicial emergency vacancy on the busiest circuit court in the country. For what is already the third time this year, the majority leader has had to file cloture on one of President Obama’s circuit court nominees in order to move the nomination forward. In stark contrast, the Senate confirmed 18 of President Bush’s circuit nominees within a week of being reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Michelle Friedland, nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, is an exceptionally talented attorney, and has an exemplary record of service in the top echelons of the legal profession. She clerked on the United States Supreme Court for Justice Sandra Day O’Connor from 2000 to 2001. She has earned her B.S. with honors and distinction from Stanford University in 1995. She studied at Oxford University from 1995 to 1996 as a Fulbright Scholar and went on to earn her J.D. with distinction from Stanford Law School in 2000.

For over a decade, Ms. Friedland has worked in private practice at Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP, where she was named partner in 2010. She has taught as an adjunct professor at the University of Virginia School Law and as a Lecturer in Law at the Stanford Law School.

If confirmed, Michelle Friedland would increase the gender diversity on the Ninth Circuit of Appeals. She would be the seventeenth female judge to ever sit on the Circuit. In comparison, 83 men have been appointed to the Ninth Circuit over the course of its history. Her confirmation would bring the percentage of active female judges sitting on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to nearly 38 percent. Her confirmation would also mark the first time, since the 29th judgship was added in 2007, that it has had a full complement of active judges despite having the highest number of appeals filed, the highest pending appeals per panel and the highest pending appeals per active judge of any Circuit in the country.

Yet here we are, again voting to overcome a Republican filibuster of an exceptionally talented nominee to a court that desperately needs to be operating at full strength.

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

PLEDGE OF SUPPORT

July 26, 2013—Six Supreme Court Co-Clerks August 26, 2013—Eugene Volokh, Professor of Law at the UCLA School of Law and conservative legal commentator August 25, 2013—Five fellow partners at Munger, Tolles, & Olson LLP September 4, 2013—Brian Fitzpatrick, Professor of Law at Vanderbilt Law School September 9, 2013—Anup Malani, Professor of Law and Medicine at the University of Chicago September 9, 2013—Edward Morrison, Professor of Law at the University of Chicago and Former Law Clerk to Justice Scalia September 12, 2013—Kathryn Haun, Assistant United States Attorney and Former Counsel to Former Attorney General Michael Mukasey September 23, 2013—General Counsels from multiple American companies including Google, Cisco, and Facebook October 2, 2013—27 Supreme Court Co-Clerks November 4, 2013—21 Former Supreme Court Law Clerks October 9, 2013—Nanci A. Fish, director of the American Bar Association’s Women’s Division, and Marcia Greenberger, Co-Presidents of the National Women’s Law Center April 9, 2014—Wade Henderson, President and CEO, and Nancy Joakin, Executive Vice President, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights

CLOTURE MOTION

Cloture Motion

The Acting President pro tempore. The cloture motion has been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie K.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBin. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MarkEY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) would have voted "nay."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Harkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begich</td>
<td>Harkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>Hirono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Johnson (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boozman</td>
<td>Johnson (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxer</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
<td>Klobuchar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Landrieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Leahy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
<td>McCaskill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnelly</td>
<td>Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>Merkley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinstein</td>
<td>Mikulski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franken</td>
<td>Menendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillibrand</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagman</td>
<td>Murray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the ayes are 56 and the nays are 41.

The motion to invoke cloture is agreed to.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, was I necessarily absent from the roll call vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Michelle Friedland to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. Had I been present, I would have supported cloture on the nomination of Michelle Friedland.

The NOMINATION OF MICHELLE T. FRIEDLAND TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

A SHARED COMMITMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I start by making an obvious point that every Member of the Senate is dedicated to helping law enforcement officials get dangerous criminals off the street and deliver justice to victims of sexual assault, every one of us.

As we mark National Crime Victims’ Rights Week and National Sexual Assault Awareness Month, let’s all keep that shared commitment in mind.

Ten years ago I was proud to join with my colleagues and President Bush to introduce the Justice for All Act, which has made it easier for America’s law enforcement agencies to protect the innocent, to identify the guilty, and to bring peace of mind to the victims of violent crime. Justice for All dramatically increased the resources available to law enforcement officials, when there is evidence that is available to law enforcement to exonerate the falsely accused, to make sure the guilty are committed that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime once. They are opportunistic and they will commit that crime one...
and I am confident many of my colleagues have heard from her. All of those folks support the provisions of the bigger bill. But if we can't do that today, they support the Senate's passing the provisions that have passed in the House soon as possible. We now have an opportunity today to do something to support countless victims of sexual assault during National Sexual Assault Awareness Month and National Crime Victims' Rights Week. All of these groups and individuals support this report and reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act.

I am proud to stand here with the heroic people who have dedicated their lives to helping address this backlog scandal of untested rape kits, and even more proud to stand with those who are willing—and spending their time and treasure—to help folks who need to heal, who need justice, and who are asking for our support. In all my years of public service, Debbie Smith is among the most inspiring people I have ever had the privilege of meeting. I sincerely hope my colleagues will keep her in mind and others like her as we move forward with this legislation.

Earlier this week, Debbie reminded me that a rape kit backlog is not just about numbers and DNA samples and scientific testing. It is about people, it is about justice, and it is about recovery. As she so eloquently put it: 'These aren't rape kits that need to be tested. These are lives that need to be given back to their owners. These are fragments of lives that have been torn apart.'

I hope my colleagues will remember those words as they contemplate how we should move forward on the House provisions that have been passed, as well as the larger Justice for All Act, both of which I support. By reauthorizing the Debbie Smith Act—and later, in due course, whenever we can do it, the larger Justice for All Act—Members can continue the long ongoing our part to help people like Debbie Smith heal wounds, repair lives, and make our country a safer place.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I wish to share with my colleagues some recent developments that I believe are important on the immigration front. My office did a report and an analysis recently that pointed out that this administration, unlike what had been done historically, has been counting border apprehensions as ICE deportations from the United States. Basically, before that, ICE officers—the Immigration Customs Enforcement officers—apprehended people inside the border and did removal proceedings and that was what was counted. So they have used those numbers to create the impression that there is a greater number of deportations occurring than actually are. That is not good. The administration should not be doing that, and it has created confusion. It is just one more example of this administration's willingness, unfortunately, to misrepresent and twist numbers to advance an agenda they believe ought to be advanced.

We are a nation of immigrants. We believe in immigration, but we believe in a lawful system of immigration. Most Americans believe the lawlessness should end and we should have a system that creates a mechanism by which people apply and they are admitted based on a fair evaluation of the people most likely to be prosperous in this country and contribute to the economy of the Nation and should be given priority—and we are just not doing that.

So the administration contends and says openly that we will not deport people, except those who commit serious crimes, which apparently does not include DUI's. The crimes almost always have to be a felony, it appears, in order for people to be deported, according to the administration. We will ignore the law for that company down the street in a high unemployment area which has five employees working illegally. They would not be removed. They will be allowed to stay and continue to work unlawfully, while Americans who cannot get a job are drawing unemployment insurance and other subsidies. This is happening all over America.

So getting to this fundamental point: Government is not being operated in ways that it should, conducted by a President who is charged to see that the laws of the United States are faithfully executed. He has issued prosecutorial removal policies that go beyond creating a mechanism to enforce the law but in fact wipe out the law, eliminate the law.

There has never been a requirement in the law that if someone is in the country illegally, they can stay as long as they don't get convicted of some other felony unrelated to an immigration violation. Indeed, under the policy as it is being executed, if an individual has false documents, which is a felony for an American citizen, that doesn't count as a deportable crime. It is only drug dealing or a crime of violence or robbery under the policies that we are carrying out.

They say they are faithfully executing that in part, deporting the individuals who are convicted of serious crimes. A study came out from CIS, Center for Immigration Studies, that found 1 in 3 criminal alien encounters last year resulted in a release. They are being released, in one form or another, and are remaining in the country.

We have so much going on that is very troubling to me. Former ICE Director John Sandweg said recently: 'If you are a run-of-the-mill immigrant here illegally, your odds of getting deported are close to zero—it's just highly unlikely to happen.'

Now that is the truth. I was a Federal prosecutor. I know how the system works and I have worked with ICE officers and Border Patrol officers and prosecuted their cases. This is what the reality is, and it is not right. It should not be.

When we have the Vice President of the United States saying recently he considers the 11 million people here illegally as citizens, as he himself says, that message does not send, to an individual who would like to come to America permanently but has a visa to work so many months or be a student for so many months and the visa is over? What does the statement of the Vice President mean to him? It means he doesn't have to go home. All he has to do is just stay in the country. If he is in the interior and not caught at the border and came in by airplane, flew into Philadelphia or Denver, he gets to stay as long as he hasn't got convicted of a felony, nobody is ever going to bother him. So this is an open border.

If they get past the border, get into the interior, go to St. Louis, go to Salt Lake City, go to Little Rock, Arkansas, then they can stay. That cannot be the policy of the United States of America. It cannot be the policy of a nation that expects its laws to be respected. If someone can get past the border or they can get a visa and they can stay in the country and overstayed, nobody will have any intention of removing them or enforcing the agreement they made or enforcing the law. I feel strongly about this issue.

People are unaware of how this is happening. I see in addition to the fanciful claims about who is being deported or removed, this was on the front page of the Washington Times today. Steven Dinan says the projections of the Washington Times show that federal agents are "... on pace this year to remove the fewest number of immigrants of President Obama's tenure."

It goes on to say: "That slower pace contrasts with the President's argument that he is enforcing the laws to the fullest extent possible by targeting criminals and recent border crossers."

The article goes on to say that the ICE officers are fully funded to remove at least 400,000 people, and at this rate they will be way below that figure. Why? Because it is the policy not to enforce the law. This is what is going on in this country.
On the same page there is the headline of an article that “Sheriffs warn of violence from Mexican cartels deep into interior of U.S.” It goes on to say:

Outmanned and outgunned, local law enforcement agencies are alarmed by the drug and human trafficking, prostitution, kidnapping and money laundering that Mexican drug cartels are conducting in the U.S. far from the border.

Not just at the border but away from the border. It goes on:

U.S. sheriffs say that securing the border is a growing concern to law enforcement agencies throughout the country, not just near the U.S.-Mexico border.

“If we fail to secure our borders, then every sheriff in America will become a border sheriff,” said Sam Paige, sheriff of Rockingham County, NC. “We’re only a two-day drive from the border and have already seen the death and violence that illegal crossings brings into our community.”

Other sheriffs joined in expressing that similar concern.

We are not where we need to be. Since the President took office, interior removals have been cut nearly in half. They have dropped by 44 percent. More than half of the ICE removals since border apprehensions, where they just caught them at the border and sent them back. These are not interior deportations as the statistics used to be focused on. Two-thirds of all ICE removals last year were border apprehensions. So, I said “half” earlier and the two-thirds of the numbers that they are counting as deportations and removal are border deportations that weren’t previously counted as such.

Ninety-four percent of the people removed last year—get this—were either apprehended at the border, which is not attributable to apprehension, or were convicted of a crime while in the United States.

Do you hear that, colleagues? Ninety-four percent of the people who were removed were either people captured at the border or committing a serious crime, and even those who commit serious crimes are not deported. Most of the rest were repeat violators or fugitives.

So 99.9 percent of the 12 million illegal immigrants and visa overstays, without known crimes on their record, including those fleeing from authority, did not face removal last year. So if someone has a visa overstay or an illegal entrant inside the country and did not commit a crime, 99 percent of that—99.92 percent of the 12 million here were not involved or no action was taken to remove them. It just goes to show our law enforcement system is in a state of collapse. It is a deliberate plan by the President of the United States, and it is wrong. People need to be aware of it and need to stand up to it and I think the American people are beginning to do that.

The administration has effectively declared that anyone in the world who illegally gains access to the interior of the United States through a border, through an airport, through a seaport, is free to illegally remain in the United States, free to claim certain tax benefits, free to work and take jobs that unemployed Americans need. This deprives millions of Americans of their jobs, wages and represents a dramatic, breathtaking nullification of Federal law.

This law enforcement collapse is evident everywhere—&72,000 aliens have been ordered removed but haven’t left. So we order people removed. They get released on bail and then they don’t leave. To order removal is to order them to show our law enforcement system is in a state of collapse. It is a deliberate plan by the President’s Assistant and Director of the Department of Defense and a political campaigner. He heads the Department of Homeland Security, which is a political department. He can be counted on to know one thing: He is very close to the President, and he is out to show the President’s wishes. He doesn’t know anything else about running a big, major law enforcement operation such as this. Mr. Perez, the former Assistant Attorney General at the Department of Justice’s Civil Rights Division, was very active with the pro-amnesty group in Maryland before this. Mr. Rodriguez, who has been nominated to be the Director of USCIS—they were installed not to be good and smart law enforcement officers but to say what the President wants. You want to know the truth? That is the truth. They were put in there to carry out the agenda, not to carry out law enforcement.

The morals at Homeland Security is the lowest of any major entity in the U.S. Government. They have actually sued supervisors because they are being blocked from enforcing the law as they have taken oath to do. I love my colleagues are here, and I will yield the floor. First, I will conclude by saying that I hope my colleagues will look at this. These facts are not disputed. This is not acceptable. It cannot be that the U.S. Government would carry on its business in this way. It is dangerous not only on immigration law but any other law that might come up in the future.

Presidents cannot, Attorneys General cannot, and Homeland Security people cannot fail to enforce law to what we are doing here. This is a great American constitutional legal system that has protected us and produced our prosperity. I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMTRAK

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to start this afternoon by thanking Chairman MURRAY for her tireless work on the Budget Committee—which on which I serve—to develop and pass a bipartisan budget that sets us on a path to return to regular order.

Senator MURRAY has also been a tireless advocate for transportation and infrastructure programs, and as chair of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee—which on which I also serve—she fought tirelessly to include adequate funding for Amtrak back in the fiscal year 2014 omnibus and moving forward. I think it would be a good thing to take up today is the role of Amtrak in our country and our communities and its appropriate role as a central piece of
Federal transportation policy going forward.

Senator MURRAY has been a terrific advocate for investing across a wide range of transportation modalities. As a member of the Appropriations Committee and chair Senator Mikulski to make sure we are successful in fighting ardently and steadfastly for Amtrak this year and into the future.

I could talk on the floor today about the importance of our national passenger rail system—Amtrak—because this is not just about getting people from point A to point B. Investing in Amtrak also means creating jobs, making our whole economy more dynamic, and making America more competitive.

Amtrak is performing better and better each and every year. As the Presiding Officer, I look forward to working with other communities across the country that rely on it to connect with other communities and our country's major economic centers.

State-supported services have become a major source of ridership growth for Amtrak as well, with that ridership nearly doubling between 1998 and 2013.

Long-distance ridership across the great heartland of our country has also grown by roughly 20 percent without the introduction of any new services, frequencies, or equipment. In fiscal year 2013, Amtrak's long-distance ridership reached its highest point in 20 years.

However, we are at the proverbial crossroads—or I suppose I should say crossing—now because ridership is soaring. Amtrak is more popular than it has been in decades, and demand will continue to grow, but we are not keeping up with the investment in infrastructure that we need to sustain this growth into the future.

For instance, right now there is nearly $6 billion in outdated, delayed investments that need to be made just in the Northeast corridor to bring it to what is called a state of good repair. I hope from these few examples it is clear that passenger rail is also a critical component of economic development. Passenger rail tends to link downtown urban areas and tends to be absolutely central to anchoring their revitalization, as the Presiding Officer knows so well.

Passenger rail is also critical not just in the Northeast corridor but in communities across the country that rely on it to connect with other communities and our country's major economic centers.

I would like to mention “Irish” John, who is a good friend of mine and has been a leader in the sheet metal workers union for a long time. Sheet metal workers with Amtrak were one of the unions that worked with management to find ways to significantly save costs on overhaul work on Acela train sets, which resulted in Amtrak choosing not to farm out this work and instead do a $125 million job to overhaul 20 Acela sets in-house. This is union labor, and this helps support good middle-wage jobs. This helps support good middle-class families and middle-class communities in Delaware and our region. This particular work on this Acela overhaul will last more than 3½ years and sustain dozens of jobs at our Bear facility.

My friend Bill, who is with the IBEW Amtrak union, is another friend who has helped me understand the critical role of the employment Amtrak provides to our whole region—not just to Delaware, not just to the Philadelphia area, but to the whole Northeast corridor.

When we talk about investing in Amtrak, we are not only investing in new options for commuters and businesses, we are talking about investing in our communities and in workers who will build and maintain the next generation of our national passenger rail system. We are talking about the growth of great, high-skilled jobs. By investing in Amtrak's present and giving them a predictable future, we will preserve and continue these important skills and these important workers and their families in our communities.

Amtrak's benefits go beyond just the immediate skilled workers and their families and the communities that benefit from them.

In Delaware, the services Amtrak provides help to keep and draw in new businesses through a ripple effect in our whole economy. Last week there was an announcement of a new company that is spinning off out of Sallie Mae that will be locating its headquarters and 120 jobs in Wilmington. They have chosen a site specifically because it is walking distance from our Amtrak station—from the Joseph R. Biden Amtrak Station in Wilmington, DE.

In Newark, the University of Delaware is building a new campus called the Science, Technology and Advanced Research—STAR—Campus, which will build partnerships between several important entities, such as the Thomas Jefferson University in Philadelphia and the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland. What makes that partnership possible is the backbone of the Northeast corridor. It is the connection between these different cities that has made all of us stronger and better because of passenger rail.

I hope from these few examples it is clear that passenger rail is also a critical component of economic development. Passenger rail tends to link downtown urban areas and tends to be absolutely central to anchoring their revitalization, as the Presiding Officer knows so well.
In Delaware, we have a bottleneck around our most popular station, the Joseph R. Biden Station in Wilmington. The rail lines north and south of that station slim from three lines to two, restricting service and preventing the addition of new rail service. That was part of a Federal high-speed rail grant, construction will soon be underway to add a third track to alleviate this critical chokepoint, the main one just south of the station. Without new investment, that chokepoint will continue north of the station.

And that is not to mention the hundreds of bridges and tunnels and other connection points—including the overhead centenary lines—that require repair and replacement on the Northeast corridor alone. We need to invest in our infrastructure not just in the Northeast corridor but across this whole country. We do spend a lot of time here on this floor, as we should, talking about our Nation’s fiscal deficit and debt, but we should also focus on our physical deficit and debt—the delayed repair of critical pieces of infrastructure that we rely on for our economy and for our communities but that we are not focused on.

If we invest in our infrastructure today, it will employ people in repairing it and lay the groundwork for improvement of our economy over the long term. I recognize the reality that while the budget picture has improved, it is not as good as it should be. We are still facing real fiscal challenges. I ride between Wilmington and Washington nearly every day on Amtrak, and our workers are responsible for repairing and retrofitting a lot of the trains on which I ride. I am impressed with their skill and the caliber of their repair work. As a rider and our State Senator, I see how critical Amtrak is to our economy, our communities, and to our country as a whole. I hope that is clear to the rest of the Members of this Chamber.

I hope that anyone watching who has appreciated the value of Amtrak’s connecting power that links this country together from east to west and north to south will communicate with their Senator and convey the importance of strong and sustained investment in the Northeast corridor, yes, but across the whole reach of our country. Only by strengthening Amtrak and ensuring the viability of the entire Nation’s system of passenger rail can we really ensure that American rail will be there for years and generations to come.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today, as I have repeatedly since the health care law has been passed, with concerns I have and to share some information with the Senate because of my concerns that in order to help some people who did not have insurance, I am afraid we have hurt many people who did have insurance, did have care they liked. The President continued to focus on coverage, and I have more concerns, as a member of the Finance Committee, about how people actually getting care, getting health care, the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs.

So I come to the floor today to talk about a new story out this morning, actually this morning in the Huffington Post, called “How Obamacare Leaves Some Patients Without Doctors.”

I recall how the President had said: If you like your policy, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Yet we are hearing stories from all around the country of people who have found that not to be true.

I have heard the majority leader come to the floor and say in a statement that so many stories are lies, they are made up. But I will tell you today, in this publication, there is a lengthy story of several patients in California who have had problems, medical problems, who are worried about their insurance, signed up for insurance, and, as a result, have found out they have insurance, they have coverage, but they cannot find care.

I would like to share with the Senate today a story, and it has some of the concerns I raised during the debate and the discussion of the health care law. But the Speaker of the House at the time, NANCY PELOSI, from California—the State where this happened—said before you get to pass it before you get to find out what is in it. Well, now people all across the country are finding out what is in it, and they are finding out they are terribly disappointed and they feel they have been sold a bill of goods and they are getting stuck with a bill, and they are finding out it is not very good for them.

The report in this morning’s Huffington Post starts out:

In January, a doctor told [Ms.] Friedlander, who was suffering from excruciating lower back pain, that she needed surgery to remove part of a severely herniated disc.

Well, she had Blue Shield insurance, as they report, through Covered California, under Covered California. She has been insured under the ObamaCare, and she planned to use that coverage to pay for the operation. It makes sense.

This is what happened. It says: But when she started to call surgeons covered by Blue Shield, she ran into a roadblock. Surgeons who were covered by her insurance—

amazingly—operated out of hospitals no longer covered by her insurance. . . .

So if the surgery was covered, the hospital was not or, vice versa, she could find a hospital that would cover her surgery but could not find a surgeon that was covered by her insurance that was on the staff of that hospital.

It says: [Ms.] Friedlander spent days on the phone, hours on hold, making dozens of calls across Southern California, trying to match a surgeon with a hospital that would both be covered. In total, she reached out to 20 [different] surgeons and five [different] hospitals.

“ar what could help me. Some expressed sympathy,” Friedlander, 40, told The Huffington Post in an email. “They told me, I’m so sorry—it’s just all just so new. You’re a victim of the changes. No one knows what they’re doing.”

So what we have here is a victim of the Obama health care legislation because first we had to pass it before we got to find out what was covered by her insurance but who operated in a hospital that was covered.

Because she could not, with her insurance, get both the hospital and the doctor.

She expects her insurance to pay the hospital bill, but she had to pay her surgeon’s bill herself.

All out of her own pocket.

The article goes on to report:

. . . nationwide, about 70 percent of Obamacare plans—

About 70 percent of the plans purchased on the Obama health care law—offer fewer hospitals and doctors than employer-sponsored group plans or pre-ACA individual market plans, according to a study by consulting firm McKinsey & Company released in December. This narrowed number of doctors and hospitals is what [Ms.] Friedlander encountered when trying to match a surgeon and hospital that would both be covered.

What we are hearing today is that about 70 percent of ObamaCare plans offer fewer hospitals, fewer doctors, in spite of the President’s promise to the American people that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; if you like your plan, you can keep your plan.

Now, Covered California says they are aware of the problem. A spokesperson for the group—a senior medical adviser with the ObamaCare plan in California—says:

We understand that some people are having trouble getting access to the doctors and hospitals they need. And we’re working very hard to fix [that] as fast as we can.

Well, perhaps if people had actually read the law, understood what was in it, they would have seen this coming.

The President said your insurance premiums would drop. He said families would have $2,500 a family. But the article says:

To make up for ACA costs and keep premiums low, Blue Shield asked its doctors
and hospitals to accept payments from the insurer at rates [well] reduced—

Reduced from what they normally got—

reduced [by] up to 30 percent.

The article goes on:

Not surprisingly, some doctors and hospitals rejected Blue Shield’s reduced payment rates and decided not to re-sign contracts with the insurer. At least three major Los Angeles hospitals previously covered by Blue Shield—

Angie, Madam President, I will tell you, these are first-class hospitals, these are highly thought-of hospitals, hospitals with incredibly good reputations.

. . . three major Los Angeles hospitals previously covered by Blue Shield—UCLA—

The University of California—Los Angeles—

Cedars Sinai and Good Samaritan—have opted out of the insurer’s new network.

According to [the communications manager from Blue Shield], Blue Shield of California now has about 40 percent fewer physicians and 25 percent fewer hospitals in its network than last year.

You listen to what is happening, and they talk about the significant gaps occurring in California.

These are the concerns I hear about when I go home to Wyoming every weekend. These are the concerns I heard about this past weekend in Casper, in Douglas, in Riverton, in Thermopolis, and in Newcastle traveling around the State. People are not able to keep their insurance. They are not able to keep their doctors. It is happening all across the country, and we see this story out of California today.

The interesting part of the issue with California is that—the article goes on and they talk to an insurance agent in Sacramento who says: “ . . . people who already had insurance”—" . . . people who already had insurance"—"especially healthy, young people may be paying more under Covered California"—"may be paying more"; not what the President promised—"for fewer hospitals and doctors."

That is not what the intent of the health care law was but it is what the health care law has delivered.

This is what is happening to real people, real families, all across the country. The majority leader says: false, made up, whole cloth. But I will tell you, these stories will continue to occur.

It is interesting, in today’s article in the Huffington Post it says:

And when signing up for a plan, it’s difficult to determine which doctors and hospitals are still covered.

They are talking about California now. The article says, quoting an insurance agent in California:

“You can sign up on Covered California and think you’re totally fine, only to find out later that you’re totally hosed.”

This man, David Fear, goes on to say:

Specialist doctors, such as surgeons, ob-gyns and urologists, declined Blue Cross and Blue Shield’s lower payments most frequently. Fear estimates that about two-thirds of Blue Cross and Blue Shield’s specialists have opted out of the networks.

It is not just that one patient whom I talked about. There is, like Ms. Friedlander, Ruth Iorio, a 35-year-old mother from Los Angeles, she is struggling to find the care she needs in Blue Shield’s smaller network.

She signed up for Blue Shield through Covered California in November because the Covered California website listed her hospital—

The Web site, the President’s Web site, the Covered California Web site—listed her hospital, UCLA, as accepting Blue Shield. . . .

Continuing:

However, after Iorio gave birth in December, she was told that her ob-gyn at UCLA was not covered by her insurance. So she paid out of pocket.

Iorio has not been able to find a urologist for her son or an ob-gyn who is both covered by her insurance and practicing in a hospital that is covered.

The President said: You can keep your hospital, you can keep your doctor, you can keep your plan.

She’s called over a dozen doctors who are covered by her insurance, and each has told her that if she or her son needs an operation in the hospitals, the doctor contracts with, it won’t be covered.

So even if they get a doctor who is under their plan, they cannot go to a hospital to get actually a procedure done.

As this lady says:

“My insurance is pretty useless. And I’m not fussy about what doctor I see,” Iorio said.

“I don’t know what to do. I may just drop it for myself and keep my son on it. It’s really depressing.”

It is really depressing what the President and the Democrats have forced down the throat of the American people with this health care law.

The article continues:

Before joining Covered California, Iorio had a plan that was cheaper than what she now pays and that gave her wider access to doctors and hospitals.

Cheaper, wider access. Exactly what the President had promised her is exactly what this woman has lost because of the health care law.

She goes on and says:

“I’m paying $500 a month and every doctor I’m calling is saying, ‘No, I can’t see you,’” she said. “I feel like a second-class citizen.”

Is that what the President’s health care law is all about? Making people feel like second-class citizens, hearing from folks when they call and ask for help that, sorry, you are just a victim of the Obama health care law—a nation of more and more victims? It does seem as a second-class citizens, for those who have been helped, we should not have had to hurt this many people because of a law the American people said “we do not want” and was forced, on single-party lines, down the throats of the American people.

This law is bad for patients. We have seen that today. It continues to be bad for providers—the nurses, the doctors, who take care of those patients—and it is terrible for taxpayers. Tax rates will continue to go up. Taxes are continuing to go up as a result of the health care law and the expenses related to it. It has failed repeatedly in dealing with the needs of the American people who knew better in the first place, which was what they wanted the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower costs. Instead, they got this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THOMASINA JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT

Mr. Kaine, Madam President, I rise today to speak on behalf of S. 1074, the Thomasina Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2013. This is a bill granting Federal recognition to six Indian tribes. The bill has recently been reported out of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and I want to thank Chairman Tester, the former chairwoman, Senator Cantwell, and all members of the Committee for this action.

These six Indian tribes—the Chickahominy, Chickahominy Eastern Division, Upper Mattaponi, Rappahannock, Monacan, and Nansemond—are among the best known tribes in American history, but they have never received Federal recognition. Madam President, 566 tribes have received Federal recognition, the vast majority by congressional action—but these tribes have not been recognized.

The story of these tribes and why they have never been recognized is why I take the floor.

It is an amazing story but it is also a deeply tragic story. But the tragedy can be redeemed if Congress acts to correct a gross historical injustice that has deprived these tribes of their rightful place. This is about a full accounting of the treatment of the Chickahominy, Chickahominy Eastern Division, Upper Mattaponi, Rappahannock, Monacan, and Nansemond who have maintained their own tribal identity, customs, and traditions against unbelievable odds for hundreds of years.

The English settlers who arrived at Jamestown in 1607 established a settlement on an island, on land that was already under the control of the Powhatan Indians. The Powhatan Indians were a confederation of numerous Eastern Algonquian Indian tribes who organized in the Chesapeake region.

The interaction among these Powhatan Indians and these six tribes that were part of this Powhatan Confederacy and the English is known to virtually every American. The original settlement of England in the United States was on the verge of failure numerous times and had to be rescued by a commoner who was part of that group, John Smith.

Only John Smith could keep this little settlement alive. Early after the arrival of the English, John Smith was captured by the Powhatan Indians and was on the verge of being executed by
Chief Powhatan because they were unsure about what they thought of these English settlers. In this wonderful story, as he was about to be executed, Pocahontas, the daughter of Chief Powhatan, saved his life. By saving his life, that was the end for the settlement of this very struggling colony. That colony then grew into English-speaking America, as we know, with the arrival of later groups of English at Plymouth Rock and thereafter.

That act by Chief Powhatan is known virtually all Americans. Over the course of the next few decades, they went back and forth in the relationship between these tribes and the English colonists and then between these tribes and African slaves. The first Africans who came to the new world also came to Jamestown Island in 1619.

But after Pocahontas’ act, it was generally a peaceful relationship. There were some times of hostility, but in treaties in the 1660s and then again in a final treaty in 1677, the Treaty of the Middle Plantation, the Powhatan Confederacy and these six tribes basically said to their English colonist neighbors: We want to live in peace with you.

Pocahontas got married to John Rolfe, an English tobacco planter. That was a seminal event in early Virginia colonial history. So by the 1600s, 75 years after the settlement of Jamestown, the Powhatan Confederation was no more. But these Virginia Indians continued to live and maintain their tribal identity, but they lived in complete peace with the settlers that were their neighbors. The Treaty of Middle Plantation was signed 100 hundred years before the Declaration of Independence. That peace that was made between the Indians and the settlers paved the way for modern Virginians and modern English-speaking America. It has been continuous since 1677, and these tribes have lived in complete peace with the settlers that were their neighbors. The relationship between Virginians and the tribes have been strong. They have endured significant adversity. Their numbers of population have dwindled from 1600 to about 3,000 or 4,000 enrolled tribal members today. They converted to the religion of the English settlers, Christianity. They fought as American patriots in every war this country has been in, from the Revolutionary War to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. That was a very different reality for the vast majority of the tribes that were included in the 566 tribes that have been recognized, only about one-fifth have gone through the administrative process. That process usually requires heavy documentation. That process usually requires heavy documentation. That process usually requires heavy documentation.

A full effort to finally receive Federal recognition began in 1999, sponsored overwhelmingly by all Virginians, including the current entire Virginia congressional delegation, Democratic and Republican, House and Senate, and all 10 living Virginia Governors. Confirmation of the recognition of all of these tribes. The six tribes have all been recognized by the State in the 1980s. All tribes that are part of this bill are now recognized by Virginia. And the recognition of these tribes should be national recognition. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is very well documented—by paper what all historians acknowledge to exist—the continuous history of these tribes.

We started, in Virginia, to correct this in the 1980s. In 1983, Virginia began a process of State recognition of all of these tribes. The six tribes have all been recognized by the State in the 1980s. All tribes that are part of this bill are now recognized by Virginia. And the确认 of these tribes should be national recognition. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is very well documented—by paper what all historians acknowledge to exist—the continuous history of these tribes.

A full effort to finally receive Federal recognition began in 1999, sponsored overwhelmingly by all Virginians, including the current entire Virginia congressional delegation, Democratic and Republican, House and Senate, and all 10 living Virginia Governors. Confirmation of the recognition of all of these tribes. The six tribes have all been recognized by the State in the 1980s. All tribes that are part of this bill are now recognized by Virginia. And the recognition of these tribes should be national recognition. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is very well documented—by paper what all historians acknowledge to exist—the continuous history of these tribes.

We started, in Virginia, to correct this in the 1980s. In 1983, Virginia began a process of State recognition of all of these tribes. The six tribes have all been recognized by the State in the 1980s. All tribes that are part of this bill are now recognized by Virginia. And the recognition of these tribes should be national recognition. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is very well documented—by paper what all historians acknowledge to exist—the continuous history of these tribes.

But the relationship is a peaceful one, and these tribes still exist. Two tribes in Virginia have small reservations, and the other tribes own land in common. They have tribal churches, tribal cemeteries, and community centers where they still gather. There is a wonderful tradition. If you are a child of Virginia, you are a child of Governor Virginia. On the day before Thanksgiving Day every year, the Virginia tribes come to the Governor’s mansion and they present to the Governor deer, turkey, fish, and gifts as a tribute to the peaceful relationship between these tribes and the Commonwealth of Virginia since 1677. It was a beautiful act of my time as Governor. It was something we looked forward to every year of these tribes look forward to it as well. Tribal members who have moved all across the country and all across the world come home for a homecoming, and it begins at the Virginia Governor’s mansion.

Now I get to the injustice. The interactions between these Indians and the first English settlers is known to everybody—that story about Pocahontas and John Smith, and then Pocahontas’ wedding to John Rolfe and her moving to England and dying there. You can go to Pocahontas’ grave at Gravesend, which is where the Thames River dumps into the sea. She died coming back to Virginia. The English tended her with reverence at a small Episcopal church in the seaside community.

This is the most archetypal story of the interaction between European settlers and the Indians who were our native inhabitants. It identifies the importance of this interaction, despite the fact that the tribes have lived and maintained their existence intact since before the settlers arrived here, the tribes have never been recognized along with the 566 tribes that exist today. Why? Why have they never been recognized? Well, unbelievably, the first reason they have not been recognized is: They made peace too soon. They made peace with the English. If they had waited until 1730 and made peace with the Americans, that treaty, a treaty with the Americans, would have been the basis immediately for Federal recognition. But they became peaceful too soon with their European neighbors.

Tribal recognition often begins with a treaty. But the treaties are treaties with the American government. All historians acknowledge that the treaties of 1646 and 1677 happened. There are copies of the treaties. The original are still maintained. All acknowledge that these treaties and the Indians’ decision to live in peace with their neighbors was a precondition for the modern Virginia. If there had not been peace, our history may well have been very different.

I will tell you something else. These treaties are recognized by a government, the English government. When our tribes, which have never been recognized by the United States go to visit England, they are given a royal welcome and treated as the sovereign people they are by the government with which they made a treaty in 1646 and 1677. So that was the first “must take” that was made: These treaties made peace too quickly.

There is a second mistake that is in some ways even more difficult to acknowledge. Many of these tribes live in six counties in Virginia. Five of the county courthouses where all their birth, death, and marriage records were stored were burnt during the Civil War. But there were still some records that existed—some.

But in a bizarre bit of our 20th century history, Virginia passed a law, the Racial Integrity Act, in the 1920s. Under a misguided and bizarre notion of “racial purity,” the eugenics movement, State officials determined that you were either white or you were colored. There was a State policy against an Indian. The leader of the State Bureau of Vital Statistics, a man named Walter Plecker—this is well documented—sadly held the position of head of the Bureau of Vital Statistics from 1924 to 1967, 41 years.

Remaining records such as they were in that 41-year period, he undertook what is known in Virginia as the “paper genocide.” He systematically went into every remaining record he could find and recharacterized anybody who had claimed a descent and a tribal connection as an Indian to “colored.” Records were destroyed or altered in a very significant way.

Both of these reasons have made tribal recognition through the BIA process—the Bureau of Indian Affairs—very difficult. Of the 566 tribes that have been recognized, only about one-fifth have gone through the administrative process. That process usually requires heavy documentation.

But the treaty was with the wrong government, and the birth, death, and marriage records were destroyed because of a racist State policy and the burning of courthouses during the Civil War. These six tribes should be rewarded, not punished, for making peace with their neighbors in the 1640s and 1670s, and they should not be held back because of a horribly misguided State policy that stripped them of the means to demonstrate by paper what all historians acknowledge to exist—the continuous history of these tribes.

We started, in Virginia, to correct this in the 1980s. In 1983, Virginia began a process of State recognition of all of these tribes. The six tribes have all been recognized by the State in the 1980s. All tribes that are part of this bill are now recognized by Virginia.

A full effort to finally receive Federal recognition began in 1999, sponsored overwhelmingly by all Virginians, including the current entire Virginia congressional delegation, Democratic and Republican, House and Senate, and all 10 living Virginia Governors. Recognition bills have passed out of the House twice. In the 112th Congress, a bill passed out of the House and then came to the Senate, and it passed out of the Senate committee, only to die because of inaction on the Senate floor.

It is my deep hope that the 113th Congress will finally see the realization of this long-held dream. We should pass this bill because it is right. These tribes exist. They still live in Virginia...
and uphold their tribal traditions. They deserve to have their existence acknowledged just like the hundreds of other tribes in this country.

But there is a final reason why recognition has a very important importance to these Virginia tribes. If you walked 3 blocks from here down the Mall, you arrive at the National Museum of the American Indian. It is part of the Smithsonian, America’s National Museum. The Smithsonian is every bit as much a part of our American Congress as the Capitol.

It is a marvelous museum. It tells the story of our Indian tribes and their amazing history of adversity and triumph. The Smithsonian curators recognize what Congress has failed to do. Go to the second floor. There is a permanent exhibit on the second floor of the museum. The title of the exhibit is, “Return to a Native Place: Algonquian Peoples of Chesapeake.” That permanent exhibit in the museum, with the plastic glass cases, highlights the Powhatan tribes that are the subject of this bill.

Here is how the museum describes the permanent exhibit dedicated to these tribes:

The tribes that we are talking about today, the bones of whose ancestors are held in a warehouse by the Smithsonian is holding the bones of about 1,400 Virginia Indians that were disturbed and unburied during the course of archaeological expeditions in Virginia. The tribes that we are talking about today, the bones of whose ancestors are held in a warehouse by the Smithsonian. For years, these tribes have gone unrecognized. They have asked them: Please return the bones of our ancestors in the only land they ever knew as home.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

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

RWANDA AND SYRIA

Mr. MCCAIN. Today we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide. This week, again and again, I will rise to remind my colleagues and fellow citizens of the humanity we share and appeal to their conscience about the mass atrocities the Assad regime is perpetrating in Syria.

This past Sunday the world joined Rwanda in marking 20 years since the beginning of the genocide that claimed the lives of more than 800,000 innocent men, women, and children. As we reflect on our failures to stop the genocide there, I can’t help but think of the lessons we learned from Rwanda and those we didn’t.

President Obama stated in his remarks on Sunday that the Rwandan genocide was “an accident or unavoidable. . . . The genocide we remember today—and the world’s failure to respond more quickly—reminds us that we always have a choice. In the face of hatred, we must remember the humanity we share. In the face of cruelty, we must choose compassion.” In the face of intolerance and suffering, we must never be indifferent.” I couldn’t agree more with the President of the United States.

President Trump, along with the international community, failed to take the necessary action to prevent a tragedy in Rwanda. We chose to ignore the death of hundreds of thousands of people, and in so doing we forsake our humanity. And now we are dangerously close to doing the same in Syria.

While I would like to believe that “never again” means something in this context, I look around the world today, and I am haunted by the fact that we simply haven’t learned the fundamental lesson from Rwanda that preventing the slaughter of innocents means taking hard political action.

Nowhere is this truer than in Syria, where President Bashar Assad’s regime continues its brutal assault against the Syrian people with increasing ferocity. The slaughter of innocent men, women, and children is being carried out by Syria’s national army and loyal paramilitaries as a result of state policy, and the terror continues to escalate every day that Assad’s crimes go unpunished.

The regime has accelerated attacks against civilians by indiscriminately dropping barbaric bombs on mosques, schools, and bakeries, systematically detaining, torturing, and killing thousands of people—including hundreds of children—and starving entire neighborhoods to death. It was over 5 months ago that Secretary John Kerry declared that this act was “quickly” to stop a “war of starvation” being waged by Assad’s regime against “huge portions of the population.” Yet the world did nothing, and hundreds have died of starvation—thousands—in the 5 months.

Eventually the international community responded by passing resolution 2139 through the U.N. Security Council, which ordered the regime to promptly allow unhindered humanitarian access and threatened further consequences for noncompliance. This was 2 months ago, and yet again the world did nothing to back the resolution. In fact, the U.N. humanitarian coordinator, Valerie Amos, reports that the war of starvation is worsening. The number of Syrians cut off from aid since January has grown by over 1 million people. The Syrian Government continues to prevent supplies of food from entering opposition-held areas, in direct contravention of the U.N. resolution, and it is using U.S.-provided humanitarian aid as leverage in its war against the people. Meanwhile, Iran sends 30,000 tons of food supplies to Assad’s regime. While children starve throughout Syria, the government is at least well fed.

Although 800,000 people have not been slaughtered in mere months, as was the case in Rwanda, over the course of 3 years of conflict in Syria, we have witnessed 9 million people forced from their homes, with 2 million refugees escaping the violence in neighboring countries, and an estimated 150,000 people dead, with casualties escalating daily.

Regardless of the scale or scope, one fact is clear: The world is watching genocide in slow motion, but it seems that regardless of how many innocent men, women, and children die in Syria,
The world’s conscience will not be tipped.

What is happening in Syria should be an affront to our conscience, and it should be a call to action. Each day the media floods our newspapers and television with some gruesome and horrific evidence of Assad’s war crimes. We cannot claim ignorance as we have in the past. Yet we do nothing. It is as if watching all the suffering and simply feeling bad about it has become an adequate moral response. Conventional wisdom tells us that this is because the American public is war-weary. We are scarred by our experience in Afghanistan and Iraq and thus unwilling to get involved in another conflict in the Middle East.

This sentiment is reinforced by the President, who prides himself on having opposed the war on Iraq and getting America out of the region as quickly as possible regardless of the ramifications. He has emphasized the need to end the conflict in Syria, calling it a “civil war” and negating the dangerous spillover effects we are already witnessing, including the destabilization of all of Syria’s neighbors and the growth of an Al Qaeda safe haven in eastern Syria and western Iraq.

Following the President’s lead, the American public has largely applauded his restraint and opposed greater U.S. involvement in Syria. But in so doing we have again failed the legacy of Rwanda.

Stopping the slaughter in Syria will require difficult political action, but it is not only profoundly in our national interest to act but also our moral obligation to do so. In his remarks on Sunday, President Obama said that we should be reminded of “our obligations to our fellow man.” As President, he is the one who should be showing to the American people why it is so vital to our national interest to carry out our moral obligations to our fellow man.

Our policy should be determined by the realities of the moment, not by today’s isolationism dictated by the past. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have nothing to do with how we carry out our responsibilities today. Let there be no mistake; we have a responsibility to stop genocide when we see it happening, as in Syria. “Never again” should mean something whether or not we are的理由 by war-weary.

Of course we would all like to see the slaughter of Syria’s innocent men, women, and children stopped by diplomacy and through nonviolent means. We all want an end to the violence. We all want to believe that a political solution is possible. But there are only two ways to end the violence.

One is for all parties to put down their weapons—something President Bashar Assad and his Iranian partners are clearly unwilling to do, as there is little they believe is possible. So that leaves us with only one other option: to neutralize the party dedicated to the slaughter of innocents and force them to put down their guns. There are options to achieve this goal that fall far short of putting boots on the ground. We do not need to concede and allow genocide to continue or to go to war to prevent it. There are steps in between that the United States, along with our international partners, must take to stand by our international commitments and guarantees of protection.

President Assad has already shown that U.N. resolutions mean nothing to him and that he has no intention of negotiating his departure through the Geneva process. It is clear that military pressure is the only lever that will convince Assad that a political solution is in his favor. We must be ready to prove to Assad that not achieving a diplomatic solution will cost his regime dearly, and there are meaningful actions we can take to help in Syria that will not require us to rerun the war in Iraq. It is not a question of options or capabilities, it is a question of will.

There is a famous quote that states, “All tyranny needs to gain a foothold is for people of good conscience to remain silent.” As we sit back and place our hopes on negotiations and meaningless guarantees of protection, we watch as hundreds of innocent men, women, and children are brutally slaughtered every day; reinvigorated Al Qaeda affiliates operate with more freedom than ever before; terrorist groups loyal to Iran proliferate and threaten our government; our region descends into chaos and turmoil that will inevitably reverberate in the United States of America. This is the price we will pay for choosing to remain disengaged, and the consequences to U.S. national interests will be felt.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles. One is a Reuters story entitled “Assad says fighting largely over by end of year,” a statement by a former Russian Prime Minister that will not require us to rerun the war in Iraq. It is not a question of options or capabilities, it is a question of will.

The second is “Hezbollah confident in Assad, West resigned to Syria stalemate.” There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSAD’S FIGHTING LARGELY OVER BY END OF YEAR—FORMER RUSSIAN PM
(By Steve Gutterman)

Moscow.—President Bashar al-Assad has forecast that much of the fighting in the Syrian civil war will be over by the end of the year, a former Russian prime minister was quoted on Monday as saying.

“This is what he told me: ‘This year the active phase of military action in Syria will be over. After this, the role we will have to play is to shift to what we have been doing all the time—fighting terrorists.’” Itar-Tass news agency quoted Sergei Stepashin as saying.

Stepashin, Russian President Vladimir Putin and former head of Russia’s FSB security service, portrayed Assad as secure, in control and in “excellent athletic shape” after a meeting in Damascus last week.

I asked Assad if I am not Yanukovich, I’m not going anywhere.” Stepashin quoted Assad as saying during their meeting, state-run news agency RIA reported.

Russia had fled to Russia in February after he was pushed from power by protests that followed his decision to spurn closer ties with the European Union and turn to Moscow. Russian leaders have criticised him for losing control of his country.

Stepashin suggested Assad faced no such threat and was likely to win a presidential election this year.

“There is not a shadow of a doubt that he knows what he’s doing,” RIA quoted Stepashin as saying.

“Assad’s strength now lies in the fact that, unlike Yanukovich, he has practically no internal enemies. He has a consolidated, cleansed team.

“Moreover, his relatives are not bargaining and stealing from the cash register but are fighting,” he said, appearing to draw a contrast with Yanukovich and his family.

“FIGHTING SPIRIT”

Stepashin, who served as prime minister in 1989 under President Boris Yeltsin and now headed a charitable organization the Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society, added that “the fighting spirit of the Syrian army is extremely high”.

Russia has been Assad’s most powerful supporter during the three-year-old conflict that activists say has killed more than 150,000 people in Syria, blocking Western and Arab efforts to drive him from power.

Russia and the United States organised peace talks that began in January between Assad’s government and its opponents but no agreement was reached and a resumption appears unlikely soon, in part because of high tension between Russia and the West over Ukraine.

Russian officials say Moscow is not trying to prop up Assad and but that his exit from power cannot be a precondition for a political solution. Their assessments of his future have varied with the fortunes of his military. Assad has lost control of large swathes of northern and eastern Syria to Islamist rebels and jihadis. But Russia, backed by militant group Hezbollah and other allies, have driven rebels back from around Damascus and secured much of central Syria.

The head of Hezbollah said in an interview published on Monday Assad no longer faced a threat of being overthrown, and would face re-election this year.

Stepashin predicted Assad would win.

“The majority of the Syrian population will vote for him,” Itar-Tass quoted him as saying.

(From Reuters, Apr. 9, 2014)

HEZBOLLAH CONFIDENT IN ASSAD, WEST RESIGNED TO SYRIA STALEMATE
(By Samia Nakhoul and Laila Bassam)

Beirut.—Bashar al-Assad’s Lebanese ally Hezbollah said his Western foes must now accept he will go on ruling Syria after fighting rebels to a standstill—a “reality” to which his foreign enemies seem increasingly resigned.

A following recent bullish talk coming out of Damascus, Sheikh Naim Qassem, deputy leader of the Iranian-backed Shi’ite militia which is supporting Assad in combat, told the press that the preparations for popular support among many of Syria’s diverse religious communities and would shortly be re-elected.

There is a practical Syrian reality that the West should deal with—not with its wishes and dreams, which proved to be false,”
Qassem said during a meeting with Reuters journalists at a Hezbollah office in the group’s southern Beirut stronghold.

He said the United States and its Western allies were unsure and lacked a coherent policy on Syria—reflecting the quandary that Western officials acknowledge they face since the pro-democracy protests they supported have made way for a new Assad ally, Shi’ite Hezbollah and other militants to the rebel cause.

Syria’s fractious opposition—made up of guerrillas inside the country and a largely impotent political coalition in exile—had, he said, proved incapable of providing an alternative to four decades of rule by Assad and his late father before him.

“This is why the option is clear. Either to have an understanding with Assad, to reach a resolution to keep the crisis going with President Assad having the upper hand in running the country,” said the bearded and turbaned cleric.

Qassem’s comments follow an account from another Assad ally, Russian former prime minister Sergei Stepashin, who said after meeting him last week that the Syrian leadership had seen and expected heavy fighting to end this year.

Officials said this week that preparations would be made for the presidential election—a move that seems to reflect a degree of optimism in the capital and which may well end with Assad claiming a popular mandate, the he could use to resist the U.N. backed efforts to negotiate a transition of power.

Hezbollah chief Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah also said this week that Assad is no longer at risk and that military gains mean the danger of Syria fragmenting was also receding.

**WESTERN RESIGNATION**

It is a view of Assad that—quietly—seems to be in Western circles.

Calling it bad news for Syrians, the French foreign ministry said this week: “Maybe he will be the sole survivor of this policy of mass crimes”.

France, which last year was preparing to join U.S. military action that was eventually aborted, now rules out force and called the stalled talks on “transition” the “only plan”—a view U.S. officials say is shared in Washington, notably among military chiefs who see Assad as preferable to sectarian chaos.

While rebels do not admit defeat, leaders like Badr Jamous of the Syrian National Coalition, one of the two main opposition groupings, said this stalemate will go on.” A U.S. official, asked about a deadlock that would leave Assad in control of much of Syria, conceded: “This has become a drawn-out conflict.”

Assad, 48, has weathered an armed insurgency which started with protests in 2011 and descended into a civil war that has sucked in regional powers, including Shi’ite Iran and Hezbollah who back the Alawite president and Sunni states like Saudi Arabia and Qatar who back the rebels.

With Russia blocking a U.N. mandate, and voters showing no appetite for war after losses in Afghanistan and Iraq, Western governments have held back from the kind of military engagement that could have tipped the well-armed Syrian leader.

More than 150,000 people have been killed in three years, as Assad has lost the oil-produc-

Qassem said the United States, which backed away from military action in September after blaming Assad for gassing civilians, was hamstrung by fears over the dominance in rebel ranks of al Qaeda’s Syrian affiliate and the terror group that has the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

“America is in a state of confusion. On the one hand it does not want the regime to stay and on the other it cannot control the opposition which is represented by ISIL and Nusra,” he said.

“This is why the latest American position was to leave the situation in Syria in a state of attrition.”

President Barack Obama said last month that the United States had reached “limits” after the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and questioned whether years of military engagement in Syria would produce a better outcome.

Qassem said: “I expect that the stalemate will continue in the Syrian crisis because of the lack of an international and regional decision to facilitate a political solution.”

U.N.-mediated talks at Geneva failed in February to bridge a gulf between Assad’s government and opponents who insist that if the regime remains in power, Syria would not be a government of national unity.

Western and regional powers who support the Syrian opposition say it would be a “parody of democracy” to hold an election in the midst of a conflict which has displaced more than 9 million people and divided the country across frontlines.

Syria’s electoral law effectively rules out participation by opponents who have fled the country in fear of Assad’s police—candidates must have lived in Syria continuously for 10 years.

“My conviction is that Assad will run and will win because he has popular support in Syria from all the sects—Sunni, Shi’ite and secularists,” Qassem said. “I believe the election will take place on its due date and Assad will run and win decisively.”

Fear of hardline Islamists has undermined support for some rebels even among the 75 percent Sunni majority, and bolstered support for Assad among his fellow Alawites, and Christians.

Qassem said it was too soon to speak of Hezbollah pulling out of Syria, despite an increase in Sunni-Shi’ite tensions within Lebanon which has become a testing ground for a border of a movement that is Lebanon’s most accomplished military force and also holds cabinet seats in the government in Beirut.

“Until now we consider our presence in Syria necessary and fundamental,” Qassem said.

“But when circumstances change, this will be a military and political matter that requires a new assessment.”

“But if the situation stays as is and the circumstances are similar, we will remain where we should be.”

Mr. MCCAIN. I won’t include it in the RECORD, but there is an interesting article that states, “Syria’s Assad secure, will seek re-election: Hezbollah leader.”

“STALEMATE WILL CONTINUE”

Mr. MCCAIN. I think the very incredible naïveté, there is an article in the Washington Post by Secretary Kerry entitled “Kerry: US strike in Syria wouldn’t be devastating.”

The Secretary of State says: “It would not have had a devastating impact by which he had to recalibrate, because it wasn’t going to last that long.” Kerry told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

“After we were going to have one or two days to degrade and send a message. . . . We came up with a better solution.”

We came up with a better solution.

The President of the United States said that Bashar Assad crossed a red line and used chemical weapons, we would act. He announced we would act. All our allies knew we were going to act.

Then he took a walk with his national security adviser and said he was going to go to Congress. Meanwhile, Senator Kerry, in a bizarre, incredible act, issued a statement that any attack on Syria would be “incredibly small.” It is remarkable.

Finally, our conscience should be shot, but it is not. We get kind of immune to day after day after day of these various reports of the slaughter that is going on.

Look at the situation in Syria 3 years ago and look at it today: 150,000 dead, millions displaced; entry of jihadist fighters from all over the world who continue brutal bombing with barrel bombs which will slaughter innocent men, women, and children; and our Secretary of State says: Well, it wouldn’t have been much if we would have struck them anyway.

This is a shameful chapter in American history. I say to my colleagues, Historians in future generations will judge us very harshly, and future generations and younger generations may have to pay the price for our inaction and our neglect of our basic human values.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank my good friend Senator PAT TOOMEY from my state of Pennsylvania. I am from West Virginia—for working with me on this vital issue to make sure our kids remain safe in every single school across this country.

I am a father of three, a grandfather of eight, and there is nothing more important to me than protecting my children and grandchildren. The bill Senator TOOMEY and I are working on is
common sense. Our bill makes sure all employees who work with our students pass a background check to make sure they have no criminal records or an abusive history. That includes everyone from principals, teachers, secretaries, cafeteria workers and janitors. It would not allow anyone to contact them with our schoolkids. This is a real problem that demands our attention and demands it now.

Since January 1, 130 teachers across America have been arrested for sexual misconduct. At this rate that is more than one teacher per day who will sexually assault a student. As a parent, as a grandparent, and as a representative of the great State of West Virginia, inaction is simply unacceptable.

There are more than 4 million teachers and school staff employed by our public school districts throughout the United States, and there are millions of additional workers who have direct access to students, including bus drivers, custodians and janitors. Yet there is no—I repeat, there is no—national background check policy in place for people who work directly with our kids every day. Even worse, not all States require checks of child abuse and neglect registries or sex offender registry checks.

A recent report by the Government Accountability Office found that five States—five States—don’t even require background checks at all for applicants seeking employment in our school systems. In addition, not all States use both Federal and State sources of criminal data, such as a State law enforcement database or the FBI’s interstate identification index.

Our bill would simply require mandatory background checks of a State criminal registry, the State child abuse and neglect registries, an FBI fingerprint check, and a check of the National Sex Offender Registry for existing and prospective employees.

Every child deserves to have at least one place where they feel safe and that harm cannot enter their life. For many of our kids these days that place is at school—not always in the home. This is truly a commonsense bill that aims to help protect our kids from sexual assault, predators, or any individuals who inappropriately behave in our schools.

This is a piece of legislation that is long overdue. It is not an unfunded mandate. I know some people will say that, and the reason I am saying it is not an unfunded mandate is because the people who want the employment have to pay. They have to pay for the background check if they want in the system. I think that is common sense.

I would like for all my colleagues, if they would, to please consider this piece of legislation. Again, I appreciate the hard work of my colleague Senator PAT TOOMEY, and at this time I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I thank my colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN, for his terrific efforts on this legislation. I also want to thank other cosponsors, Senators MCCONNELL and INHOFE, for their support as well.

The tragic story that inspired this bill has a connection to my State of Pennsylvania and Senator MANCHIN’s State of West Virginia, so it made it kind of a natural for us to work together on this. It is a terrible story indeed, and I want to summarize it because it goes to the heart of why I am here today.

The story begins with our school teacher, and he is from Delaware County, PA, where one of the schoolteachers was found to have molested several boys and raped one. Prosecutors decided there was not enough evidence to actually prosecute the school because what had happened. So they dismissed the teacher for this outrageous behavior. But shockingly, and somewhat disturbingly, the school also helped this teacher get a new job so they could pass him along and let him become someone else’s problem. It happened the new job was in West Virginia. The Pennsylvania school even went so far as to send a letter of recommendation for this monster to get that job in West Virginia, which he did get. He became a teacher, then a school principal, and while there he raped and murdered a 12-year-old boy named Jeremy Bell in West Virginia.

Justice finally caught up with that teacher, and he is now in jail, serving a life sentence for that murder. For Jeremy Bell, unfortunately, justice came way too late. But Jeremy Bell’s father decided he would not rest until he had done everything he possibly could to minimize the chance that any other child or parent would ever experience a similar tragedy. Roy Bell is Jeremy’s dad. He worked with Congress to create protections for children to ensure they would not be victimized at school, and the House of Representatives responded.

In October of last year, the House unanimously passed the Protecting Students Against Sexual and Violent Predators Act. Unfortunately, there too, in a way, it was a few days too late. Jeremy Bell’s dad passed away 3 days before the vote. But it passed the House, and it passed, as I said, unanimously in the House. Now we are here in the Senate school district to school district. Every day we delay, we increase the risk a predator is moving on to the next of his 73 victims.

So what can we do? Here is what our bill does. Our bill, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act, is an important first step. It would require mandatory background checks for existing and prospective employees and then require the checks be periodically repeated, the timing of it left to the discretion of the States. There are five States that do not require checks at all.

The bill would also check to make sure all employees or contractors who have unsupervised contact with children would be subject to this background check—not just teachers but coaches, schoolbus drivers, anyone who has unsupervised contact with the kids. There are 12 States that don’t require that now.

Our bill requires a more thorough background check. For instance, in Pennsylvania, there is a background check requirement. But if you have lived in the State for more than 2 years, it does not require a background check on the Federal criminal database and yet we know these people move across State lines.

A fourth and important piece is that our bill forbids what has sadly developed its own name—passing the trash. This idea, this practice, unfortunately, of actually recommending the predator to another job in another school or another State so as to get rid of the problem and let him become someone else’s
is so disturbing it is hard to imagine anyone would do this, but we know it happens. We know it happens. And a given State doesn’t have the power to prevent some school district in another State from doing exactly this, as happened in the case of Jeremy Bell.

There is a list of folks who under our legislation a school would simply not be able to hire: anyone ever convicted of any violent or sexual crime against a child. I think that makes a lot of sense. There are certain felonies that would preclude a person from ever being hired: homicide, child abuse or neglect, rape or sexual assault, and a few others. In addition, a person who was convicted in the last 5 years of a felony physical assault or battery or a felony drug-related offense would create a 5-year prohibition against hiring such a person.

The enforcement mechanism we have is withholding Federal funds, which would be the inducement for the States to adopt the requirements.

Let me stress that this bill has broad support. I mentioned before this passed the House unanimously. There was not a single objection in the House. It has bipartisan support here in the Senate. Various child advocacy groups fully in support: the National Children’s Alliance, the Children’s Defense Fund, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Prosecutors and prosecutor associations—the Association of State Prosecutors and the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association—both fully endorse this legislation. Teachers groups: the American Federation of Teachers and the Pennsylvania School Boards Association.

I forget how many former teachers in the House—I think 19 or so—all voted for this bill. I am willing to venture the overwhelming majority of the American people would support this effort to keep our kids as safe as we can. I would also stress there is nothing radical about these proposals. In the Senate we just passed a very similar background check requirement in the child care development block grant legislation, where we insist on almost identical background checks for employees of daycares. That makes perfect sense to me. It is a good step. It is very likely to help protect children in our daycares. But why in the world would we protect the kids in daycare and not provide comparable protection for kids who have gone on to later grades?

This is a bipartisan commonsense bill that has passed the House unanimously. This is our opportunity to pass it in the Senate and send it to the President for his signature. I believe it is a moral imperative we do this to protect these kids. It didn’t come soon enough for Jeremy Bell. And sadly, every day we learn there are more victims. But now is the time we can act.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1596 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I certainly favor the goals of this legislation. The Senator will remember we passed a childcare bill that included many of the same background check provisions for childcare employees. Those provisions were negotiated between Democrats and Republicans on our committee to address issues that were raised about the implementation of any federally prescribed background checks for childcare settings.

We would like to undertake a similar process in the K–12 context to ensure any concerns raised by either side be addressed. That is what the committee process is for. That is what this legislation is all about. The Senator from Pennsylvania is asking for in this bill will have an impact on nearly every public school in the country and every employee, not just teachers—not just teachers—who might have any unsupervised access to children. So that requires us to do some due diligence.

I don’t want anyone to misunderstand me. I am willing to work with the Senator from Pennsylvania and others on this legislation, but I do believe we need to take a closer look at it, talking with relevant stakeholders—States, school districts, employees—about the bill and some perhaps unintended consequences of it. We were able to do that in the childcare bill, and I believe we can achieve similar success with the legislation of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am ready and willing to engage with the Senator, his staff, and his office in that process. I yield the floor.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I support the Senator from Iowa and his request that this bill go to the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.

In the Republican Conference, we talk a lot about the importance of talking legislation through committee so it can be considered through the regular order. This is certainly important legislation. All of us would agree on that.

The Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia deserve a lot of credit for bringing this terrible story to our attention and proposing we address it. And I think we should. But the appropriate way to do that here, is to take it to the committee of jurisdiction to be considered in a marked-up, marked-down, and see if anyone has a better idea.

My second reason for hoping this bill goes to the HELP committee is that I have my own idea. I think this bill poses an important question to the Senate about whether we want to constitute ourselves as a national school board. That is, in fact, what we would be doing if we passed it into law.

In our country there are 100,000 public elementary and secondary schools. They all have a principal who is in charge of the employees in that school.

This bill is about determining what kind of criminal background check those school employees should have. What is the principal supposed to do? Determine the principal responsibility for this? Can the principal just say that this is the job of the United States Senate, so I don’t have to worry about that?

There are 14,000 local school boards across West Virginia, Tennessee, Iowa, Pennsylvania, and all of our other States. What is the responsibility of these local school boards when it comes to determining the qualifications of their teachers or the health and safety of their students? Do the members of the local school board say: We don’t have to worry about those questions too much because the U.S. Senate will determine for us what the qualifications for teaching will be or how we will keep students healthy and safe in our local public schools?

There are 50 Governors of our states. I used to be one of them, as was the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I got pretty tired of people flying to Washington, D.C. thinking that they were the only ones who had any sense of responsibility for the public school students in Tennessee. In fact, I felt like the more Washington, D.C. intruded into Tennessee by making decisions that we should be making for ourselves, the less responsible we felt for those decisions and the less effective we were at doing our jobs.

I remember in the early 1990s there was a piece of legislation which whizzed through the Senate and the House just like this piece of legislation has been doing. It was called the Gun-Free School Zones Act, and it came after a particularly terrible shooting at a school. We still have those shootings today, and it wrecks our heart every time they happen.

So, after the shooting, the U.S. Congress said: We will fix it. The Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional because it exceeded the authority of Congress under the commerce clause—that in effect it wasn’t Washington’s job; it was the job of the states and local communities to determine the issue of gun possession around schools.

I submit that the safety of our schools is the job of the parents of those schools, of the principal in that school, of the community which supports that school, of the local school board, of the supporting organizations, and the government of the state. If they can pretend they can kick that responsibility up to Washington, I think that is wrong. I do
not think that is within our constitutional framework in the United States. Those responsibilities belong locally.

The Senator from Iowa and I have a terrific relationship and ideological differences on many occasions. I spent the morning debating with him about whether his proposal for early childhood education would in effect create a national school board.

He basically made the same argument that is being made here. He said: If we are going to give states money from Washington for early childhood education, we have a responsibility to define how that money is spent, including the parameters for what the teachers' salaries ought to be.

So if we can define what criminal background checks ought to be for school employees in Maryville, TN, public schools, we can define what the teachers' salaries ought to be in the Maryville, TN, public schools. If we can decide what the safety measures in the school ought to be, we can decide what the maximum size of classes ought to be. We can decide what the length of the school day ought to be and what kind of morning or health screenings are ought to provide. Those decisions are important for children as well. Whether the children are fed properly is important as well. Are we going to kick those decisions upstairs to the U.S. Senate and say: You set the rules for that.

Physical activity programs. The distinguished Senator from Iowa has been a champion for more physical activity his whole career here. He would like to see us take this terrible problem of obesity and put the spotlight on the school and the community around it. If they agree with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania this is not a mandate. We don’t need you to make decisions about academic standards and curriculum? In the State of Tennessee and in many other States there has been a national school board. We don’t need you to make decisions about the safety of the schools in your district. We will do that here. We will do that in our own way.

I think we in Congress should be enablers, not mandators. I think we should take this powerful focus the two Senators have put on criminal background checks for school employees, take it to the HELP committee, and put a spotlight on making it easier and more important for all 100,000 principals, all 14,000 local school boards, all 50 State Governors to do it, help parents to be aroused, and put the spotlight where it needs to be.

If they want a gun-free school zone, put the spotlight on the school and the community around it. If they want a safe school, put the spotlight on the school and the community around it. If they want a background check system to keep predators out of schools, put the spotlight on the principal, the school board, and the community around it. That is the way to effectively do it. That is the way to respect our federalist system of government and our constitutional framework. That is the way to avoid creating a national school board.

So I look forward to working with the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from West Virginia, and the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is an important issue. I would like to see it become law. But I would like for our government in Washington to be more of an enabler of local school boards and school principals than a mandator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, needless to say, I am extremely disappointed that we find ourselves here at this impasse with nothing accomplished, and who knows how long it will take to get something accomplished.

I will point out that the Senate, I think just last week, voted for nearly identical language in the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act. We voted for this. This is the language vetted by this committee.

If it is vital to keep kids safe at a daycare—which I think it is—why isn’t it just as vital to keep kids or their older siblings safe for the rest of the day? I don’t think we need to go through the committee to answer that question. We have waited long enough. The criminal background check bill which has been introduced in the House or the Senate since 2009, and here we have nothing on the Senate floor. The committees had 5 years to act. The committees had 5 months when they could have taken up this bill at any time, marked it up, and moved it through the process, but they didn’t do this.

As far as using the committee process, I am generally a fan of going through the committee. But let’s not pretend that is how we normally operate around here. There are 27 bills so far in this Congress which have received floor consideration without going through a committee at all—7 under the jurisdiction of this committee. Last Congress there were 42 bills which received floor votes without going through committee.

Let’s be candid. In just the last week or so, and looking toward another week or two, we have more legislation under the jurisdiction of this committee. Whether it is paycheck fairness or a minimum wage bill, those are under the jurisdiction of this committee. They are going to be brought to the floor without having gone through the committee.

By the way, those are bills we know are going nowhere. Those are political statement bills. So is it more important to get bills which have political statements to the Senate floor than it is legislation which could actually be signed to protect kids from violent predators? This seems to me to be a very misordering of priorities.

I can say to my colleagues for whom I have a great deal of respect and with whom I generally find myself in agreement, on this issue I happen to disagree with the senior Senator from Tennessee. In my view, this is not a mandate on the States.

If a State chooses not to develop the background checks we have put into this bill, then we would withhold the ESEA funding, which is 3.5 percent of total funding. That is not insignificant. But it leaves it up to the State to decide. We think kids ought to be safe in schools. If they disagree about the background checks, OK, then they don’t have to take this funding. The Supreme Court, by the way, has agreed that this does not represent coercion. It does not amount to coercion when it is on this scale.

The second point I would make in this regard is part of this legislation absolutely requires Federal legislation. As I mentioned briefly in my remarks earlier, this all originated from a case where a school in one State sent a letter of recommendation to a school in another State for one of these monsters to be hired. Frankly, I don’t know how the school in the State where this person ended up could have prevented that from happening. But Federal legislation can prevent that, and I think it should.

So I am deeply disappointed we are not able to move to this today. I hope we will be able to soon.

I think my colleague from West Virginia had a point he wished to make, so I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHEIN. Madam President, I first thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator TOOMEY. I also thank the Senator from Tennessee, for whom I also have the greatest regard for his knowledge and commitment to our children and education, to which he has dedicated his life, and also the Senator from Iowa. This is very serious and very personal to both of us. Our States have been affected. But every State has been affected.

I am not in favor of a national school board in any way, shape or form. I strongly believe in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution and States rights. But I believe that certain standards have to be set, and we have done that before as far as on a national level.

There are five problems we have always talked about, and those five problems apply to every child in America—not just in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee or Iowa but in America.

The first is every child should have a loving, caring adult in their life. Those are not always the biological parents or family members. It could be a neighbor or somebody next door. It could be an extended family member.

Every child should have a safe place in their life. Unfortunately, as has been said, it is not always the home. It might be school.

Every child should have a healthy start. Nutrition—for many children across America, their breakfast, lunch, and nutrition comes from the school.

Every child should be taught to have a livable skill. Again, that is in the school. We depend upon that.

And the fifth thing—which is the hardest to teach—is that every child should grow to be a loving, caring adult, and be able to give back. That is set before, we set the standards for that. A child will emulate what they see. If they love it and respect it, they will do it.

For us to say we don’t believe raising a Federal standard the well-being and safety of every child in a school system—guaranteeing that the person who is going to be teaching them, nurturing them, taking them to school, and feeding them has a clean background check and is not a child molester—we can do that. It is all we are asking for in this bill. I hope that it would get the attention it needs. Again, I am also very disappointed that we cannot move it forward, and I know that precedent has been set and has been articulated by the Senator from Pennsylvania. But I would hope that both the ranking member and the chairman of the HELP Committee would maybe reconsider and take another look at it.

Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am willing to support holding a hearing on the bill, moving it rapidly through the HELP committee, and moving it back to the Senate floor. I will make my argument in committee or on the floor, and I may win or I may lose. But I have thought about the gun-free school zones act for more than 20 years, and I thought about it from the point of view of a parent and of a Governor.

The Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee has conservative Republicans on one side and liberal Democrats on the other. I spend most of my days on the committee trying to argue my Democratic friends out of their good ideas that they want to impose on every local school district in America. There is a moral imperative to have high academic standards for children. There is a moral imperative to have physical education for children. There is a moral imperative to have breakfast for children. There is a moral imperative to help disabled children. There is a moral imperative to do all these things. We all feel that. But just because we in Washington contribute 10 percent of the money spent on elementary and secondary education doesn’t mean we should substitute our judgment for that of the local school board and the principal who is accountable to that community for the safety of each child in their school. We ought to think about that before we start assuming these responsibilities because if we pass this bill into law, leave people to think that we solved the problem, and another problem happens, then who is going to be held accountable? The local principal? The local school board? The Governor? No. Maybe the Senate will be held accountable because we took it upon ourselves to say to the parents: We have kept your child safe.

We should enable parents. We should enable schools and enable local school districts to create safe and effective schools with high standards. We should give parents choices of schools with effective teachers, but we shouldn’t mandate it or define it from Washington. That is my argument, which I would like to be considered when we think about the extent to which we ought to say to a local school board or principal: We are going to define for you what a criminal background check should consist of for the people you hire in your school.

I pledge to work on it as rapidly as Senator HARKIN can move it through the committee. I will make my argument, and we will come to a conclusion.

I appreciate the Senators from Pennsylvania and West Virginia putting a focus on such an important issue, and I look forward to participating in the debate and a passage of an appropriate bill on an important issue. I just hope it enables instead of mandates.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.
Now, with the strength of One Boston still with us, we look ahead to justice that has yet to be served, to healing that remains to be done, to a future of achievements, of celebrations, and of memories.

May God bless those we have lost. May He inspire those who survived to carry forward. May He keep our community united in bravery and strength and love. And may He always watch over the people of Boston, of Massachusetts, and of the United States of America.

Thank you, Madam President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Madam President.

HEALTH CARE

There was a new announcement today from the Secretary of Health and Human Services that 7.5 million people have signed up for private health care through the exchanges by virtue of the Affordable Care Act. The initial estimates from CBO last fall were that in the best case about 6 million people were going to sign up. We have blown through those numbers. More people are signing up than had estimated by the government.

For the first time ever, the Affordable Care Act begins to be rescinded.

The number of uninsured rises from 14.5 percent to a peak of 18 percent. But guess what happens when it hits the peak. The Affordable Care Act goes into operation. The Affordable Care Act begins to be implemented, and in a very short period of time, the number of enrollment until the end of the first period of enrollment being March 31, the number goes from 18 percent uninsured to 15.6 percent uninsured. That is a remarkable decrease over a very short period of time and by the people of the country.

The Affordable Care Act begins to be rescinded. Another 3 million people have access to Medicaid, and another 3 million people on top of that have access to insurance on their plan.

When we look at what has happened to young people over a similar period of time, we can see the same dynamic playing out. This is the rate of uninsured of 18- to 25-year-olds in this country. Here, they are at 28 percent. I mean, how on Earth, in the most affluent, most powerful country in the world, did we ever allow for more than one-quarter of our young people to be uninsured? But we were at 28.4 percent, and the Affordable Care Act was passed and the first provision went into effect, it allowed people who were under 26 to stay on their parents’ plans.

Look. The number starts to move downward. It is a pretty consistent downward slope, moving from 28 to about 24. Then the ACA plans start, and then the number—just as in the uninsured data for the population at large—drops again from 24 down to 21. It was 26 percent at the passage of the law. Now it is under 20 percent.

Other studies show the same. This is survey data from Gallup, which is generally the gold standard on tracking the rate of uninsured in the country. But we also have a RAND study that was done. This is a very well-known consulting study which said that from the period of September of last year until mid-March, 9.3 million people who were uninsured became insured.

So when Republicans say this data doesn’t really tell you the true story because this are all people just shifting from one plan to another, that is not true. The RAND study tells us that 9.3 million people who were uninsured became insured. The RAND study also says that 7.2 million people got access to employer-based insurance who didn’t have it previously. And that data doesn’t even include the surge of enrollment at the end of March. The Affordable Care Act isn’t just shifting people from one insurance plan to another insurance plan; it is actually having a remarkable effect on the number of insured in this country.

I am not suggesting this trend line is going to continue along that axis, but, boy, if the next couple of years looks anything like the first 6 months of Affordable Care Act plans being available to people, we are going to see a revolution in this country in terms of the number of people who can access our health care system. Yet this week was the 52nd, 53rd, 54th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act in the House of Representatives. The Presiding Officer and I sat through probably 40 of those votes, and there is a statistic for a reason.

A budget presented, again, by Representative PAUL RYAN would take away insurance from 7 million people who now have it, take away Medicaid coverage from 3 million more people who now have it, would be a law that has provided $9 billion in savings for seniors when they are in the doughnut hole. And $9 billion is a big number and hard to comprehend. By the way, his bill would return that $9 billion to the drug industry because that is where it came from. It didn’t shift money from one set of taxpayers to another set of taxpayers. The way we closed the doughnut hole was asking the drug industry to fund it out of their money in order to get seniors.

The irony of all ironies is that the Ryan budget—while repealing all of the provisions that have provided insurance to over 10 million people and decreased health care costs for millions more—would keep in place the $716 billion in Medicare savings that Republicans and outside groups have hammered Democrats for supporting over the course of the last 5 years.

Over and over we have been told we are killing Medicare, killing Medicare advantage. By asking Medicare Advantage to run their insurance plans for the same costs that Medicare charges. Yet despite all of the rhetoric, the Republican budget in the House would keep in place all of the Medicare cuts they have been running against outside of this building.

What our constituents know is that despite bumps in the road, the Affordable Care Act works. Anytime you reorder one-sixth of the American economy, you are going to have problems and you are going to have people who are going to be unhappy. The reality is that for decades we had the most expensive health care system in the
world, times two, compared to any other industrialized nation, and we were getting results that didn’t measure up to the amount of money we were spending. We had 30 million people who were uninsured, rates of infant mortality and infections that went way above what we could have predicted half as much as we did. We had to make a change. That there were 54 votes in the House of Representatives to repeal the bill, and not a single effort to replace it, tells you that it has been Democrats who have been willing to stay on the plate and do the tough reform necessary to try to make changes that were 100 years overdue. The numbers don’t lie in the end.

I get it that Republicans think they can win an election by continuing to hammer away at the Affordable Care Act, but there are 7½ million people who now have private health care. There are 3 million people who now have access to Medicaid. There are 3 million adults who can stay on their parents’ plans. RAND and Gallup tell us that the number of people without insurance in this country is absolutely plummeting by the day. All of that is evidence that despite the best intentions from our Republicans to undermine the law the ACA works.

In my view, the failure to act is not defensible. Restoring these benefits is the right thing to do for job seekers and the smart thing to do for our economy. The very modest $300-a-week average benefit, which our bill restores, helps people meet the financial circumstances as they search for a job. That modest benefit gets pumped back into the economy at the local supermarket or gas station. It is just common sense. People will get this—I hope—benefit, and they will go right along and take care of the daily needs of life. They are not in a position to stitch it away—most of them—and they are not in a position to do anything else but to try to stay afloat through very difficult circumstances.

Unemployment remains stubbornly high in my State, and across the United States. The March employment report, while positive, showed we still have much more to do to strengthen our economy, especially for the 10.5 million Americans looking for work, including 3.7 million of the long-term unemployed. Again, this benefit we propose is particularly directed at these long-term unemployed Americans.

That is why this is a critical effort in our attempts to strengthen our economy—restoring these benefits. We have never let these benefits lapse when the long-term unemployment rate is higher than 1.3 percent—and today it is nearly twice that at roughly 2.6 percent. We have acted on a bipartisan basis, on a fiscally responsible basis, on a basis that recognizes not only the needs of families but the need to help further grow our economy. Now it is time for the House to act thoughtfully, fiscally, and responsibly to help our neighbors and our constituents, on a bipartisan basis, to get this bill done quickly and get it to the President.

It is my hope the House of Representatives stops blocking this. This is fully paid for. It is fiscally responsible. It is a bipartisan effort. It is what every one of our constituents says we should be doing more of—responsible, thoughtful, bipartisan legislation. We have done our part in the Senate and now it is up to the House. I hope they move quickly—this week indeed—to get this relief to millions of Americans.

With that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. REED. Madam President, it has been 103 days since emergency unemployment insurance expired and 3 days since the Senate sent a bipartisan agreement to the House which would restore these benefits for up to 2.7 million Americans. These benefits are fully paid for and would lift the entire economy. That is why the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that failing to renew the benefits for a full year would cost the economy 200,000 jobs. We recognize our bill is a partial restoration, not a full year. The restoration we proposed will increase jobs in the economy as attested by the CBO.

Unfortunately, it appears that the House has no intent to take up the Senate-passed agreement to restore these benefits before they leave town for 2 weeks. That is wrong if the House fails to pass what the Senate has passed on a bipartisan vote—and this was a bipartisan, fiscally responsible measure—the Speaker, who says he wants job creation, will be rejecting a portion of those 200,000 new jobs projected by the Congressional Budget Office, which is headed by his own appointee.

Contrary to the criticism that our proposal does not create jobs and doesn’t do anything with jobs, it does. More importantly, it restores benefits to people who are desperately looking for work in a very difficult economy, and who need these benefits to keep searching for work as well as supporting their families.

In my view, the failure to act is not defensible. Restoring these benefits is the right thing to do for job seekers and the smart thing to do for our economy. The very modest $300-a-week average benefit, which our bill restores, helps people meet the financial circumstances as they search for a job. That modest benefit gets pumped back into the economy at the local supermarket or gas station. It is just common sense. People will get this—I hope—benefit, and they will go right along and take care of the daily needs of life. They are not in a position to stitch it away—most of them—and they are not in a position to do anything else but to try to stay afloat through very difficult circumstances.

Unfortunately, it appears that the House failed to act in my view, the failure to act is not defensible. Restoring these benefits is the right thing to do for job seekers and the smart thing to do for our economy. The very modest $300-a-week average benefit, which our bill restores, helps people meet the financial circumstances as they search for a job. That modest benefit gets pumped back into the economy at the local supermarket or gas station. It is just common sense. People will get this—I hope—benefit, and they will go right along and take care of the daily needs of life. They are not in a position to stitch it away—most of them—and they are not in a position to do anything else but to try to stay afloat through very difficult circumstances.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I, rise today to take a look back at the evolution of our Federal budget over the past few years, as we moved from deficits and debt not seen since the years surrounding World War II to the current deficit, which still involves deficits and debt that are far too high.

The Federal deficit in fiscal year 2009 was nearly 10 percent of our economy. This was due partly to efforts to battle the financial crisis and partly to ineffective and reckless spending measures like the so-called stimulus.

Since then, the deficit has fallen. From the rhetoric of the administration and its allies here in Congress, you would think that deficit reduction has been accomplished almost exclusively through spending cuts. Indeed, in an effort to demonstrate his reasonableness in calling for even more tax hikes, President Obama often touts the so-called stimulus that took place under his administration.

Of course, after spending ballooned in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 to almost a quarter of the size of our entire economy, it eventually had to be curtailed. We had a recovering economy, along with tax hikes engineered by the administration and its allies in Congress, deficits have admittedly come down.

Unfortunately, however, as the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office tells us, the deficit reduction will be short lived. The CBO tells us clearly that after 2015, the deficit will rise again and, as a consequence, the Federal debt remains on an unsustainable path.

As the CBO and every credible budget analyst has made clear, our fiscal path is unsustainable because our entitlements are unsustainable—that means Social Security, that means Medicare and Medicaid, and that means the Affordable Care Act.

We know those programs cannot be sustained on their current trajectories. Yet the administration and its allies refuse to do anything about it.

The Senate Democratic budget left entitlements virtually untouched. The President’s budget offers little in the way of structural entitlement reforms necessary to put these programs on sound fiscal footing. In fact, with his latest budget, President Obama has even retreated on reforms that he has offered in the past.

But let’s look back on how our budget has evolved over the last few years. If you listen to my friends on the other side of the aisle and their supporters, the Federal Government has significantly scaled back on spending which, they say, is responsible for almost all the changes in the Federal deficit since the outsized deficits in fiscal years 2009 and 2010.

As we look back from our friends on the other side of the aisle about how they have “slashed” spending. We hear about “austerity,” as though it is something inherently evil.
For example, in June of 2013, the left-wing Center for American Progress said that “we have enacted about $2.5 trillion in deficit reduction with about three-quarters coming from spending cuts.

In March of this year, Vice President Biden’s former aide Jared Bernstein wrote in the New York Times that we have generated $2.5 trillion in deficit savings, with 77 percent coming from spending cuts.

In February of this year, the Senate Budget Committee chairman wrote to her Senate Democratic colleagues that since August 2010, we have had “$3.3 trillion in deficit reduction put in place over the last few years” with 77 percent claimed as coming from spending reductions.

Depending on who you listen to, deficits have been reduced by $2.5 trillion or $3.3 trillion or maybe more. No matter the number, the claimed reduction stemming from spending cuts usually ends up at around 75 percent or more. That would mean that deficit reduction has been accomplished by a 3-to-1 or higher ratio of spending cuts to tax highs. Of course, all of those deficit reduction and spending reduction claims represent promises for the future.

They are measured relative to some artificial so-called budget baseline or yardstick, which can pretty much be anything that you want it to be. Pick one yardstick and you get one result. Pick a different yardstick and you get a different result. But it has been recorded that in fiscal year 2009, the Federal deficit was more than $1.4 trillion or almost 10 percent of GDP at the time.

Also on the books is that in fiscal year 2013, our most recently closed fiscal year, the deficit was around $680 billion or just over 4 percent of GDP at that time. Therefore, deficit reduction we have seen between fiscal years 2009 and 2013, or a 4-year period, has been about $735 billion. That is not $2.5 trillion. That is not $3.3 trillion.

The larger deficit reduction numbers are derived almost entirely from future promises to reduce spending, promises that we are pretty darn sure are never going to be kept, based upon all of the past history of this country and the Democratic Party, by the way.

Once again, in terms of real actual deficit reduction, the number comes in at roughly $735 billion. Keep in mind all the rhetoric about deficit reduction consisting of 3-to-1 spending reductions to tax hikes. Well, if that is what we would have enacted, we would imagine those ratios would have been at least somehow reflected in the deficit reduction realized over the past 4 years or so.

If not, then, let’s be clear that they are only promises to reduce spending, promises that the current and future Congresses can undo with the stroke of a pen. If past experience is the norm, you can count on it. You can count on undoing those promises. I have been in the Senate—this is my 38th year. I have heard countless promises to rein in spending in the future. The fraction of those promises that have ended up being kept is very small.

Promises notwithstanding, let’s go back over the past 4 fiscal years and ask what we did. From fiscal year 2009 to 2013, the deficit has gone down by $735 billion. No one disputes this, certainly not my friends on the other side of the aisle, who have used this number as justification for turning their spending engine back to full throttle.

Given all that they said about spending cuts having been responsible, on a 3-to-1 basis for deficit reduction, the question becomes: Is 75 percent of the deficit reduction we have seen over the last 4 years attributable to spending cuts or austerity? The answer is not even close. The $735 billion of deficit reduction has been accomplished with $970 billion of increased revenues, and only $55 billion of spending reductions, which is around $3.5 trillion of annual spending is a reduction of below 2 percent.

I will say that again. The $735 billion of deficit reduction from fiscal year 2009 to 2013 has been accomplished by a 3-to-1 ratio of increased revenue to future tax cuts. Specifically, more than 91 percent of the deficit reduction has stemmed from higher taxes, and less than 9 percent from reductions in spending.

Less than 9 percent of deficit reduction stems from spending cuts is a far cry from the 75 percent or more that my friends on the other side of the aisle claim. Those claims are based on promises of future spending reductions and budget projections. Yes, those claims are based on carefully crafted budget baselines or yardsticks that my friends creatively construct. All of this is future, which we all know will never come to pass.

But if we had enacted budgetary changes aimed at reducing deficits that involved anything near a 3-to-1 ratio of spending cuts to tax increases, then you would think it would have at least started to slow up over the past 4 fiscal years. As I said, however, it is not even close. Of course, some of the revenue increases have reflected the economy recovering from the recession to its current state, which by the way remains sluggish.

But the 2013 numbers begin to reflect recent tax legislation engineered by my friends on the other side of the aisle. Moving forward, we can expect even more revenue to be extracted from economy from tax hikes, including the higher tax rates that were passed last year in the fiscal cliff deal, along with the myriad of taxes included as part of the Affordable Care Act.

We have already seen in fiscal year 2014 through February Federal tax revenues hitting a record high for the first 5 months of the fiscal year relative to any past fiscal year. Yet, even as the revenue grows in, my friends on the other side of the aisle want to double down with even more tax hikes. Let’s not think for a minute that their demand for higher taxes has anything to do with rein in the deficit or reducing our debts.

Instead, the proposals from Democrats are for even more spending, more redistribution, and bigger government. The President’s recent budget is exhibit No. 1. Of course, you will not hear it being called “inefficient and wasteful government spending.” No, you will hear about investment.

You will not hear about the wonderfully egalitarian goal of fairness, as judged by the norms of Democrats.

You will not hear about big government controlling an outsized and increasing share of economic activity in our country. No, you will hear about how virtually every private sector company in virtually every sector of the economy acts abusively or out of greed, without restraint, in search of tax loopholes to exploit to the detriment of the middle class.

Once again, it is clear from the budget data already in the books over the past fiscal years that major- ity of deficit reduction, more than 91 percent of it, has come from increased revenue extracted from the private sector. Less than 9 percent has come from any kind of spending restraint. Those are facts. Those are the numbers on the books. Those data do not depend on CBO projections. They do not depend on picking a baseline. They do not rely on budget assumptions.

What these numbers tell us is that virtually none of the so-called austerity or slashed spending that my friends on the other side of the aisle have pretended to endure have occurred in the real world.

As we continue to hear from my friends on the other side of the aisle about how our budget challenge has faded away, and about the trillions and trillions of deficit reduction that has been accomplished through spending cuts, let’s keep in mind our recent track record. That record is clear.

I will say it again just to make sure the point is not lost on anyone.

The spending restraint we have seen since the outside spending sprees in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 has been minor. The vast majority of deficit reduction we have seen to date, more than 91 percent of it has resulted from increased revenue. The past 4 fiscal years have shown no evidence of the ongoing promises of 3-to-1 spending cuts to tax hikes.

We do not need to increase taxes yet again. We have already done that. We do not need to declare deficit and debt crisis and turn spending spigots back on to maximum flow. Our fiscal challenge remains where it has been for some time now. We have unsustainable growth in our entitlement spending and we need to discuss and enact structural reforms to our entitlement programs in order to put them and our fiscal position on a more sustainable course.
Democrats, of course, have other ideas. For instance, take a look at page 33 of the President’s budget. The document discusses the future unsustainable deficits and debt and alludes to a large tax increase that is undefined. Here our American people, if you will, the President says, “Even with respect to Medicare and other entitlements and tough choices . . . we will need additional revenue to maintain our commitments to seniors.”

As I said, my friends on the other side never tire of asking for more money from our American people—never tire of it. For example, both the President’s budget and the budget proposed by Senate Democrats last year envisioned revenue increases of over $1 trillion. That apparently is their answer to the entitlement question—not reforms, not structural changes, but “additional revenues.”

If you are going to try to fix our entitlement problems entirely on the revenue side of the ledger, it is going to take more revenue than what my friends on the other side of the aisle have previously proposed. If that is the route they want to go, they should at least be honest with the American people about where the revenue will come from and who will be paying for it. The American people deserve to know. I think it is about time our friends on the other side explained it to them. Do not count on that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

CUBA

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, we heard news a week or so ago that the U.S. Government, through the Agency for International Development, was conducting a program in Cuba titled ZunZuneo. It was an attempt to set up a kind of alternative Twitter account, and the intent was certainly noble—to increase access for Cubans to information that would help and assist them.

I have no issue with programs such as this. I think overall they are good. The more we can have people have Internet access and meaningful content is good, but I and many others do have an issue with the Agency for International Development—USAID—undertaking this program.

USAID’s mission is to help with humanitarian needs and to promote democratic development around the world. It needs not, should not, engage in covert—or in their case they are saying it wasn’t covert, they are calling it discreet. Either way, it casts suspicion on other activities that USAID is undertaking around the world. USAID is in some very tough places around the world—delivering supplies into South Sudan, for example. We work with the peoples in Syria—not to help the government side, but to help the opposition side. We work in many dangerous parts of the world, and the last thing we need is suspicion cast on USAID where people think it is an arm of the CIA. It just shouldn’t be done. I think USAID does great work around the world, and it should not involve itself with work of this type.

With regard to Cuba itself, as I said, I think our goal should be to make sure that Cubans are better informed, that we have increased contact, and that we have more American influence there. That could be most easily forwarded by simply allowing Americans to travel to Cuba. It is the only country in the world where we have a policy that you have to get a specific license—where only certain classes of people are allowed to go there. That simply makes no sense at all.

If our goal is to make sure that Cuban people are aware of what is going on in the world, that they get real information outside of the government sources—the government in Cuba denies Cuban people the ability to get good, meaningful information—we ought to be all about making sure they have access to that, but the best way to do that is simply allowing Americans to travel there. We do that with other repressive regimes around the world.

It has been said—I think Freedom House has Iran as the only government that is more restrictive, more authoritarian, and more repressive than the Cuban regime. Yet we allow Americans to travel to Iran. In Iran, the Iranian Government may restrict who may come in—as will the Cuban Government. I am sure, once we lift our travel ban there. But that ought to be their province. I have often said if someone is going to limit my travel, it should be a Communist government, not my government.

As we review this program and as we talk about it in the coming weeks—we had a hearing this morning with the head of USAID testifying about it—I hope we simply keep in mind the best way to help the Cuban people to have access to information and to have contact with Americans, to be subject to American influence, freedom, and economic opportunity, is to allow Americans to travel freely there. That would do more than any program we could install, any program administered by USAID, the State Department, the CIA, or anybody else—just allow Americans to travel to Cuba.

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

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the Senator. Mr. DURBIN. I will make a statement in the nature of a question since we discussed this this morning. We had a lengthy discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee about this twitter project, whatever it was, and whether it was wise—and I think it was the consensus of our committee—that if it opens up Cuban people to other ideas and more information, it is a positive thing.

You and I discussed afterward the fact that there are other things we can do. I think you just alluded specifically to them on the floor, and I wanted to associate myself with your thinking on this and hope that after some 50-years—some of the folks fresh thinking on our foreign policy in terms of Cuba may lead to what we ultimately want, and that is giving the Cuban people an opportunity to be part of a real democracy and have real freedoms. Isn’t that right?

Mr. FLAKE. It is. I thank the Senator. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

The majority leader.

The Senator from Colorado, Mr. MARKEY, is not present.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the presence of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, are not present.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN, the Senator from Texas, Mr. CRUZ, the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MORAN, the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. HOEVEN, the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURRE, and the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT.

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

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 37, as follows:

[Vote No. 107 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin . . . Heinrich
Begich . . . Heitkamp
Bennet . . . Heller
Biniamenhal . . . Hirono
Booher . . . Johnson (SD)
Brown . . . Kaine
Cantwell . . . King
Cardin . . . Klubnik
Carper . . .Landrieu
Casey . . . Heinrich
Coons . . . Heitkamp
Donnelly . . . Heller
Durbin . . . Hirono
Franken . . . Johnson (SD)
Gillibrand . . . King
Hagan . . . Klukas
Harkin . . . Landrieu
But I guess the American people have people watching this to understand courts. There is no reason to delay this. We have 85 vacancies on the Federal circuit in the entire country. The Senate has been notified of the Senate's action and the intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that if confirmed, the nomination be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. We are here this afternoon because Republicans are holding the confirmation of two important nominations. Earlier today the Senate voted to invoke cloture on Michelle Friedland to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. So the only question is, when will she be made a Federal judge in the Ninth Circuit.

There are some who say that 30 hours should run. They can speak for themselves why they insist on doing so. There is no question it is not to debate the nomination. It is just to do nothing, to stand around here and do nothing.

Few, if any, Senators have come to the floor to express any reason to oppose this good woman. She was nominated 9 months ago by President Obama. So it is time to confirm this well-qualified nominee. Enough stalling has taken place.

She graduated second in her class at Stanford University Law School. She clerked for Sandra Day O'Connor in the Supreme Court. She has been a partner in a prominent law firm. She has been a partner in a prominent law firm.

The Ninth Circuit is the busiest circuit in the entire country. The Senate confirmed 18 of President Bush's circuit court nominees within a week of being reported out of committee. This woman, as I already indicated, was 13 months ago. We have 30 other judicial nominees pending on the calendar. We have 85 vacancies on the Federal courts. There is no reason to delay this nomination.

There is no reason to delay the nomination of David Weil to lead the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. He is a Boston University professor, a Harvard University researcher.

I am sure it is a little difficult for people watching this to understand why Republicans are demanding that we waste time, because that is all it is. But I guess the American people have become accustomed to wasting time. That is what they have tried to do for 5 years. We have wasted time because of issues such as this. The staff has to be here. We have wasted so much time that we could be working on important issues.

The Republicans have come to the floor saying: We want amendments. The reason we don't deal with that kind of stuff is because we spend so much time on this. We have wasted thousands of hours during the 5 years, and that is very unfortunate. The Republicans are stalling so much.

The majority leader knows, we make that clear. And second, the majority leader said maybe the people of Iowa have a right to have an opinion. Let's say to my colleagues in the U.S. Senate, we don't object, and I would offer an alternative from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Reserving the right to object, and I would offer an alternative; but before I do that, I wish to say to my colleagues in the U.S. Senate that, first of all, there is controversy about this nominee. Let's make that clear. And second, the majority leader said maybe the people of this country don't really understand what is going on.

They understand what is going on. We are working under the rules that the majority changed by ignoring the rules of the U.S. Senate in November. So as the majority leader knows, we have not yielded back postcloture time on judicial nominations since the so-called nuclear option was triggered last November.

We have followed the rules of the U.S. Senate for regular order on all judges before the Senate in the last 5 months, just exactly the way the rules were changed in November. So there is 30 hours of postcloture debate on this nomination. Therefore, I would ask the consent request be modified so that the vote on confirmation would occur at 5:30 p.m., Monday, April 28, when we return from the April recess. This would allow the Senate to process the pending cloture nomination on the wage and hour nominee this afternoon and set that confirmation vote also for Monday, when we return on April 28. That is the alternative I offer to the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. REID. I reserve my right to object.

Madam President, obviously this is not a dissertation on logic, because if it were, why in the world would we want to waste 30 hours doing nothing? And that is what we are doing, 30 hours.

I know my friend from Iowa has been on the Judiciary Committee a long time. I appreciate all he has done, but it is apparent the colleague from Iowa expresses delay is for delay itself, no other reason.

Now, I may have missed it. There could have been someone telling me what a bad person she is or why she is not qualified, but I must have missed that. I heard little, if any, opposition. In fact, I have heard none for this nominee. I have heard only obstruction for obstruction's sake, delay for delay's sake.

This has been going on for 5 years. It appears that the Senator wishes his caucus to be the caucus that "just says no," and that is what they did here.

So, Madam President, I object to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Reserving the right to object, and I will object, but to remind everybody, when the majority leader says that nothing is being done on judges, we have confirmed 233 judges and only disapproved the 2; so don't ever try to sell the American people on the idea that the Senate is not doing its work on getting judges approved. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. As I indicated, this is something without logic. We have had a lot of judges approved after wasting hundreds of hours of time doing nothing. We have judges reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously, led by our good friend, the senior Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Committee, who does such an admirable job. They were reported unanimously, and they stall—the Republicans stall, delay, obstruct, and then we have a vote here and it passes very easily. Their only purpose for the delaying is for delay's sake. They are obstructing this as they have obstructed everything over the last 5 years.

I know people complain about the rule change that was made. Where would we be in this country without having changed that rule?

I got a letter today from Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, outlining nine important people in the Department of Defense who need to be confirmed. Most of the positions have been without anybody there for more than a
year. We have numerous ambassadors to important countries around the world, and they are not being confirmed because they are being stalled. Why? Why could we not have these people go do their work? They have been nominated. Countries all over the world are waiting for ambassadors to the United States. Where would we be if we had not changed that rule?

Now we are slogging through these nominations. It is kind of slow because of the inordinate amount of time that we are taking up. But that is not the reason there is that maybe we should have changed the rules more than we did.

So, unless something changes, we will have a vote tomorrow at 5:00 p.m. We will have three votes here tomorrow at 5:00 p.m. on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I think it is important to put all of this in context. My good friend, the majority leader, broke his word last year when he said we had settled the issue of what the rules were going to be for the Senate for this Congress. He then broke the Senate rules in order to change the Senate rules in a very unfortunate precedent, and continues to abuse the Senate rules by using the device called filling the tree to prevent Members of the Senate, from his party and from our party, from even offering alternatives.

Despite this heavy-handed behavior, he expects the minority to simply expedite consideration of, in the case of the matter we are discussing, a life-pedite consideration of, in the case of the party, from even offering alternatives.

Setting a very unfortunate precedent, going to be for the Senate for this Congress, to exercise his word last year when he said we had good friend, the majority leader, broken his word last year when he said we had

We have had a couple of examples of trying to edge back to normal here, as Senator GRASSLEY pointed out, we are simply exercising our rights under the rules of the Senate. I might say many of these nominees would have been confirmed last December had we not experienced this event perpetrated by the majority in a heavy-handed attempt to alter the balance, to change the nature of the Senate with a simple majority. It was an unfortunate decision, but those kinds of decisions have consequences.

And all we have done here is exercise, as Senator GRASSLEY pointed out, the rights that Senators have under the rules of the Senate. If the majority leader doesn’t like the way the Senate is working, I would recommend that he change his behavior.

You see, we don’t have a rules problem. We have a behavior problem.

We have had a couple of examples of trying to edge back to normal here, where we brought up a bill that was actually open for amendments, and amendments were—proposed from Members on both sides. But it seems late we are back to the old Senate. All we are about is scoring partisan points and denying Members the opportunity to offer amendments.

I think most Members on both sides of this aisle can agree here to be Senators, which involves having your committee work taken seriously and having the opportunity to offer amendments taken seriously. This body—when it was at its peak and operating the way it should under Members of majorities of both parties—has been a more civil place in which rights were respected.

The Senator from Iowa—the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee—is probably the best exponent of simply exercising our rights under the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARRREN). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I am a patient man. At least I try to be. For my friend to come here and have the audacity to talk about my breaking my word—the trouble with that statement is that the whole Senate is here to see what happened.

He said something and I said something. What he said was that we are not going to have all of these filibusters on motions to proceed.

For the viewing audience, we wasted so much time to get on a bill. It is not that easy. You have to file something in the Senate, and then you have to wait a day to get on the bill. If they object—and they object hundreds of times—it takes 2 days to get on the bill. Then we vote, wait 90 hours, and then we are only on the bill. To get off the bill, we have to go through that process all over again, and we have done that hundreds of times.

There have been more filibusters on President Obama’s judicial nominations than in the entire history of the country for other Presidents. We have been a country for a long time—roughly 240 years. There have been more filibusters for President Obama in the course of 5 years than for the previous 235 years.

I went to New York and had the good fortune to watch a wonderful play—“All the Way”—about LBJ. That good man—during the time he was majority leader—had 6 years—had to overcome one filibuster.

As the majority leader in the Senate—because of the performance we have had over here—I had to overcome over 500 filibusters. This is for the country. It is not for me. We have been stymied on everything we have tried to do—everything.

We know—it is public record now—that 3 days after Obama was elected the first time, a meeting was held here in the Thursday night meeting for Republicans. More than President Bush had approved at the same time in his Presidency.

Again, I am sorry for the inconvenience to Members, but the Senate knows that for them it is pretty easy. They can just walk out of here. They don’t have to be here, but we do because it is our burden to run the country. They can walk away and take their little trips and go home. We are not going to be able to do that. We have to vote and approve these two people.

We have a very good judge we need to approve. We have somebody for the Wage and Hour Division at the Department of Labor. The job has been vacant for a long, long time.

I have been here a while. I know how people used to work together, but you can’t work together if one side says no to everything. Once in a while we have had the good fortune to be able to piece together some work with the Republicans. It is getting harder and harder to get that many have been able to get it done a few times.

They have wasted the time of the American people. If there is an objection to this woman, then come to the floor and talk about what is wrong with her. She attended one of the finest law schools in America. A battle goes on every year, whether it is Harvard, Yale or Stanford, and they flip back and forth. It doesn’t matter. She is a very fine academic. She clerked for one of the finest Supreme Court justices we have had in the history of the country—by the way, a Republican.

What is wrong with her? What do we gain by holding this up? The country gains nothing. As I have indicated, we have about 140 nominations that are being held up over here. My friend, the Republican leader, said: Hey, listen, we would have approved them all in December anyway. Please. Who in the world thinks that there is a bit of credibility to that?

I say to everybody that I am sorry. In 25 hours, I guess, we can come here to vote on these people. All we need is a majority, and that is the way it is. I am so sorry for the inconvenience to Members, but the Senate knows that for them it is pretty easy. They can just walk out of here. They don’t have to be here, but we do because it is our burden to run the country.

They can walk away and take their little trips and go home. We are not going to be able to do that. We have to vote and approve these two people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have just a couple of brief observations that are relevant to the point.

No. 1, we have approved more judges at the point for Republicans than President Bush had approved at the same time in his Presidency.

No. 2, the majority leader has a curious definition of filibuster. The reason the majority leader has had difficulty getting onto bills is because as soon as we get on bills, there are no amendments allowed. Once you get past the motion to proceed—I would say to the people who may be listening and are not as deeply steeped in Senate rules—there is a 2-step process. You vote to get on the bill, and then you are on the bill.

What happens is that once we get on the bill, the majority leader has made
Mr. CORKY, Madam President, I have heard my friend the Republican leader come to the floor often and say: Why don’t we work on Fridays? Most people work on Fridays. I want to make sure we work on Fridays. I want to make sure: Why don’t we get them the majority in November. I don’t think that is going to work. We are here to do the work of the American people. Is it right that we have more than 100 people who are being held up for no reason other than they want to make sure that if we have somebody who is going to be a circuit court judge, we have to file cloture—that is 2 days—and then we have 30 hours, and then we have—simply moving to a piece of legislation, we waste a week getting to it because of their obstruction and delay. So it is unfortunate.

My friends talk about all the great things they have done. I will tell my colleagues the great things they have done. I can give lots of examples. We tried to do a highway bill—a highway bill—which is important for this country. We have a deficit in infrastructure of $3 trillion. It wasn’t much better a couple of years ago. So we brought that bill to the floor, and we had this great amendment process. They wanted to debate amendments. What did they do? They wanted to stop women from getting contraceptives. That held up things for a month—a month—before they finally got some sense and withdrew that.

The Republicans made a decision a little more than 5 years ago to oppose the majority leader if he is aware— and I believe he is—that the majority leader and other leaders of his party had a press conference last week, I believe it was, announcing their agenda from this point through the election in November, which involved issues such as the vote we had yesterday, the vote on the increase in the minimum wage, the vote on extending long-term unemployment benefits, the vote on preventing sequester— the vote I believe there was a quote in the article—if the Senator will remember like I do—that basically said: We are not interested in legislating. We are just basically interested in posturing and politics to help distract the American people from the unpopularity of this President’s policies and this party’s policies.

Does the Senator remember something to that effect?

Mr. McCONNELL. I do. The Senator from Texas is entirely correct. There was a rather candid admission at a press conference that the whole agenda was basically crafted by the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and that getting an outcome was sort of irrelevant and all about scoring political points for the fall election here on the floor of the Senate.

If that is one of the urgent items the majority leader has in mind that would somehow be prevented if we had a vote on this judgeway after the recess, it is perplexing to reach the conclusion that this is a matter of great urgency for the American people if there is no interest whatsoever in getting an outcome.

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have heard my friend the Republican leader come to the floor often and say: Why don’t we work on Fridays? Most people work on Fridays. I want to make sure I am right, but I have not seen or heard a single Republican come to the floor and say: a single word about the nomination of the one judge, we have to file cloture—that is 2 days—and then we have 30 hours, and then we have—simply moving to a piece of legislation, we waste a week getting to it because of their obstruction and delay. So it is unfortunate.

Mr. McCONNELL. I am happy to yield to a question.

Mr. CORKY. Madam President, the majority leader said that there is urgent work the Senate needs to turn to, which is why we ought to amend the ordinary rules of the Senate which call for a 30-hour postcloture period.

I ask the distinguished Republican leader if he is aware of any urgent work that the majority leader has planned for us to turn to that would be a reason to expedite this particular nomination?

Mr. McCONNELL. I am sure the majority leader will announce at some point what we are going to do next, but I am not quite sure what that is at this particular point.

Mr. CORKY. Madam President, if the Senator would yield for another question, I would like to ask the distinguished Republican leader if he is aware—and I am confident he is—that the majority leader and other leaders of his party had a press conference last week, I believe it was, announcing their agenda from this point through the election in November, which involved issues such as the vote we had yesterday, the vote on the increase in the minimum wage, the vote on extending long-term unemployment benefits, the vote I believe there was a quote in the article—if the Senator will remember like I do—that basically said: We are not interested in legislating. We are just basically interested in posturing and politics to help distract the American people from the unpopularity of this President’s policies and this party’s policies. Does the Senator remember something to that effect?

Mr. McCONNELL. I do. The Senator from Texas is entirely correct. There was a rather candid admission at a press conference that the whole agenda was basically crafted by the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and that getting an outcome was sort of irrelevant and all about scoring political points for the fall election here on the floor of the Senate.

If that is one of the urgent items the majority leader has in mind that would somehow be prevented if we had a vote on this judgeway after the recess, it is perplexing to reach the conclusion that this is a matter of great urgency for the American people if there is no interest whatsoever in getting an outcome.

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have heard my friend the Republican leader come to the floor often and say: Why don’t we work on Fridays? Most people work on Fridays. I want to make sure I am right, but I have not seen or heard a single Republican come to the floor and say: a single word about the nomination of the one judge, we have to file cloture—that is 2 days—and then we have 30 hours, and then we have—simply moving to a piece of legislation, we waste a week getting to it because of their obstruction and delay. So it is unfortunate.

My friends talk about all the great things they have done. I will tell my colleagues the great things they have done. I can give lots of examples. We tried to do a highway bill—a highway bill—which is important for this country. We have a deficit in infrastructure of $3 trillion. It wasn’t much better a couple of years ago. So we brought that bill to the floor, and we had this great amendment process. They wanted to debate amendments. What did they do? They wanted to stop women from getting contraceptives. That held up things for a month—a month—before they finally got some sense and withdrew that.

The Republicans made a decision a little more than 5 years ago to oppose...
everything President Obama wanted or tried to do, and they have stuck with that. It has not been good for the country, and we have situations just like we have here.

(Mr. SCHATZ assumed the Chair.)

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Sure.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the majority leader says there is important work for the Senate to do, and I can think of one urgent thing we could do today if the majority leader would consent.

The House has passed the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act.

To remind colleagues, this is money Congress appropriated to the Department of Justice for grants to local law enforcement agencies and forensic labs to test unprocessed rape kits. This is a national scandal, the number of unprocessed rape kits which have prevented law enforcement from identifying serial perpetrators of sexual assault, many sometimes not just involving adults but also children.

The House has passed the reauthorization of that bill. All it takes is for the majority leader and the Senate to consent that bill today and pass it to get it to the President’s desk.

I think that, perhaps, is the most important and most urgent thing we could be doing right now. So I ask the majority leader if he would consent to taking up that bill and passing it in the Senate right now.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the committee, of which I am almost certain my friend is a member—the Judiciary Committee; is that right?

Mr. CORNYN. I am on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. REID. He is also a former supreme court justice of Texas.

They have reported the bill out of the Judiciary Committee, and my friend was part of that reporting situation. Part of what they reported out has the Debbie Smith language in it, but it has more stuff in it than just that. So I would be happy to take a look at that.

We can talk to the chair of the committee and the ranking member, who is on the floor here today, and if they would be willing to separate this stuff here and have it rather than what was reported out of the committee—they can take a look at this. Senator LEAHY was on the floor. He is not here now, but I would be happy to take a look at that.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I may ask one more question of the majority leader, one final question.

Mr. REID. I am sorry, I didn’t hear that.

Mr. CORNYN. Will the majority leader yield for one last question?

Mr. REID. Yes. But before doing that, I have just been informed that this bill that was reported out of the committee on which the senior Senator from Texas serves—we have cleared it on our side. If they want to clear it today, we will get this out today. All they have to do is clear it on their side. We have cleared it.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I could ask the majority leader through the Chair, there is the Justice for All Act which, as the leader points out, includes the Debbie Smith Act, which has not cleared the Senate, which, if it did clear the Senate, would include the Debbie Smith Act. That would be a positive development.

There is a separate bill—if the Justice for All Act is not cleared, there is a separate bill which would reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act which has passed the House. So we could take up just the Debbie Smith reauthorization that the House has passed and get that done today, which I would urge the majority leader to consider, if we can’t clear the larger bill, the Justice for All Act.

But, frankly, I would be happy with either one. But if we could just do the Debbie Smith Act today, I think we would have a great win for justice and for some of these people who have been waiting too long for the law enforcement community to be able to identify the perpetrators and get these folks off the street.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if the Senate has cleared over here is a bill to protect crime victims’ rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide postconviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes. We will pass that right now. We are happy to do that.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I may respond to the majority leader, the bill he is referring to is the Justice for All Act, which I support. But there has been some reason why that bill has not come to the floor and received floor time. If the majority leader would pass that, we will delay the passage of the Debbie Smith Act, which is a component of that act, which we could take up, having passed the House, and we could take that up today and then deal with the Justice for All Act in due course.

So I ask the majority leader if he would grant unanimous consent to take up and pass the House-passed reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act, and I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, more diversion and delay. The Judiciary Committee took what the House did, reviewed it, and said: We can do better.

It is here on the floor right now. Now they are saying: Even though the Judiciary Committee did it—and we are being told all the time to let the committees do their work—we don’t like what they did. Let them do something else.

The Debbie Smith Act is important, and the Justice for All Act is a lot better than that. Why don’t we approve that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Yes, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the majority leader thinks this is a zero sum game. This could be a win-win. Debbie Smith, whom I have met and I daresay virtually every Member of this body knows, is a passionate advocate for this cause, hence the naming of this statute, this law, on her behalf. She recognized that these unprocessed rape kits are a national scandal and that people like her who had been victims of sexual assault, many sometimes not just involving adults but also children, want to have their day in court.

Mr. REID. This is what we deal with here. We have a number of legislation that has been reported out of the committee. It has been cleared by the Democrats here in the Senate, and the Republicans are now saying: Well, we like that, but we don’t want to do it that way; let’s do it some other way.

The point is the committee met and reviewed the House legislation and decided they wanted to do more than what the House did. I think we should go forward with what the committee says.

I hear my friend the Republican leader and other Republican Senators say: Let’s have the committees do their work.

Congress have done their work. We approved their work. We are ready to pass this right now, which includes the Debbie Smith language but does a lot more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee to remind me what the challenge is with the Justice for All Act. We have a Member on our side who is unfortunately not here today because of medical concerns who has concerns about that bill, so we cannot pass that bill by unanimous consent over that Senator’s objection.

What we can pass is the Debbie Smith Act, which is a piece of this. There is an addition to that, that I know of. Then we could get this rape kit issue addressed today, while we take up the concerns of the absent Senator, who is necessarily not here because of medical issues, when he returns and when the Senate returns.

So I would reiterate my unanimous consent request that the Senate take up and pass by unanimous consent the House-passed Debbie Smith Act.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the right to object, more diversion and delay. The Judiciary Committee took what the House did, reviewed it, and said: We can do better.

The point is the committee met and reviewed what the House did, reviewed it, and said: We can do better.

The Debbie Smith Act is important, but the Justice for All Act is a lot better than that. Why don’t we approve that?
to identify the perpetrators and get them off the street.

So what Debbie Smith has asked me and I daresay the majority leader and all of us do is to take up this piece of the bill. We can do that, and I think we will have a good thing today. If we can’t take up the Justice for All Act because of other concerns people have—this shouldn’t be a zero sum game. We could pass the Debbie Smith Act today, and then we could take up the Justice for All Act when we return following the recess. It doesn’t have to be a zero sum game.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. This has been cleared on this side for more than 2 weeks—more than 2 weeks. This is what is going on in the Senate. The Republicans basically oppose everything. That is what they decided they were going to do, and they do it. And they come back and say: We reported this out of the committee.

I read what is in it. It is a very good piece of legislation. But they said: We don’t like that. Let’s forget about the committee process and do something with what the House did.

We have a committee structure here that I have tried to follow. I admire the work done by Senator LEAHY. He led this piece of legislation out of his committee. I accept it and I approve it, as do all other 54 Democratic Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

DIGITAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2013

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I originally was trying to engage in a colloquy with Senator PORTMAN on a very important piece of legislation that we, Senator COBURN, and Senator CARPER, were working on for 2 years, and he will come back.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 337, S. 994.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 994) to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; the Carper substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered; the Carper amendment at the desk be agreed to; the Carper substitute, as amended, be agreed to; and the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 2970) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to. (The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, April 9, 2014, under “Text of Amendments.”)

The amendment (No. 2971) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To allow the Secretary of Defense to request an extension to report financial and payment information data)

On page 9, strike lines 17 through 21 and insert the following:

(2) AGENCIES—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

(B) NONINTERFERENCE WITH AUDITABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Upon request by the Secretary of Defense, the Director may grant an extension of the deadline under subparagraph (A) to the Department of Defense for a period not to exceed 6 months to report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

(ii) LIMITATION.—The Director may not grant more than 3 extensions to the Secretary of Defense under clause (i).

(iii) NOTIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives of—

(1) each grant of an extension under clause (i); and

(2) the reasons for granting such an extension.

The bill (S. 994), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 994

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014” or the “DATA Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) to the extent practicable to include direct Federal agency expenditures and linking Federal contract, loan, and grant spending information to programs of Federal agencies to enable taxpayers and policy makers to track Federal spending more effectively;

(2) establish Government-wide data standards for financial data and provide consistent, reliable, and searchable Government-wide spending data that is displayed accurately for taxpayers and policy makers on USASpending.gov (or a successor system that displays such data);

(3) simplify reporting for entities receiving Federal funds by streamlining reporting requirements and reducing compliance costs while improving transparency;

(4) improve the quality of data submitted to USASpending.gov by holding Federal agencies accountable for the completeness and accuracy of the data submitted; and

(5) apply approaches developed by the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board to spending across the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006.

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended—

(1) in section 2—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “this section” and inserting “this Act”;

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (4), and (7), respectively;

(iii) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(iv) by inserting after paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

(2) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ‘Federal agency’ has the meaning given the term ‘Executive agency’ under section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(v) by inserting after paragraph (4), as so redesignated, the following:

(5) OBJECT CLASS.—The term ‘object class’ means the category assigned for purposes of the annual budget of the President submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to the type of property or services purchased by the Federal Government;

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

(8) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (4), by striking ‘and’ at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

(6) shall have the ability to aggregate data for the categories described in paragraph (1) through (5) without double-counting data; and

(7) shall ensure that all information published under this section is available—

(A) in machine-readable and open formats;

(B) to be downloaded in bulk; and

(C) to the extent practicable, for automated processing.

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

(E) in subsection (e), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’; and

(F) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

(2) by striking sections 3 and 4 and inserting the following:

SEC. 4. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Defense—

(A) to ensure the implementation of the requirements of this Act for the Department of Defense on or before the date that is—

(i) 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act for the categories described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 3; and

(ii) 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act if the Secretary determines that additional time is necessary.

(B) to request an extension of the deadline under subsection (a) to the Department of Defense for a period not to exceed 6 months to report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

(1) shall ensure the availability of all information published under this section that is in machine-readable and open formats to the public on the Department of Defense’s website;

(2) shall ensure that all information published under this section that is in machine-readable and open formats is available for public download; and

(3) shall ensure that all information published under this section that is in machine-readable and open formats is available in a format that can be aggregated and analyzed.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT.

There is appropriated to the Administrator of the Office of Management and Budget—

(A) for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the requirements of this Act for the categories described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 3; and

(B) for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the requirements of this Act for the categories described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 3.
SEC. 3. FULL DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

(a) In General.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the heads of other Federal agencies, shall establish the Government-wide financial data standards established under subsection (a).

(2) AGENCIES.—

(A) In General.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

(B) NONINTERFERENCE WITH AUDITABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—

(i) In General.—Upon request by the Secretary of Defense, the Director may grant an extension of the deadline under subparagraph (A) for a period of not more than 6 months to report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

(ii) LIMITATION.—The Director may not grant more than 3 extensions to the Secretary of Defense under clause (i).

(C) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Secretary and the Director, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall establish a standard method of converting the financial data prepared by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds into a consistent, computer-readable format.

(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The pilot program shall include—

(A) a description of the data collected under the pilot program, the usefulness of the data provided, and the cost to collect the data from recipients; and

(B) a discussion of any legislative action required and recommendations for—

(i) consolidating aspects of Federal financial reporting to reduce the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

(ii) automating aspects of Federal financial reporting to increase efficiency and reduce the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

(iii) simplifying the reporting requirements for recipients of Federal awards; and

(iv) improving financial transparency.

(4) WEBSITE.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, the Director and the Secretary shall ensure that the data standards established under subsection (a) are applied to the data made available on the website established under section 2.

(d) NOTIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the House of Representatives of—

(1) each grant of an extension under clause (i); and

(2) the reasons for granting such an extension.

(3) WEBSITE.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, the Director and the Secretary shall ensure that the data standards established under subsection (a) are applied to the data made available on the website established under section 2.

(4) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under subsection (a) shall, to the extent reasonable and practicable—

(A) include a combination of Federal concepts, standards body; and

(B) simplify the reporting process, including by reducing duplicative reports.

SEC. 4. DATA STANDARDS.

(a) In General.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall establish Government-wide financial data standards for recipients of Federal funds that are available to or expended by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds.

(2) DATA ELEMENTS.—The financial data standards established under paragraph (1) shall include common data elements for financial and payment information required to be reported by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be consistent with accounting and data standards established by other data standards; and

(B) include widely accepted common data elements, such as those developed and maintained by—

(A) an international voluntary consensus standards body;

(B) Federal agencies with authority over contracting and financial assistance; and

(C) accounting standards organizations;

(2) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, searchable, platform-independent computer-readable format;

(3) include unique identifiers for Federal awards and recipients of Federal funds that can be consistently applied Government-wide;

(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

(5) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary;

(6) produce consistent and comparable data, including across program activities; and

(7) establish a standard method of conveying the reporting period, reporting entity, line of measure, and other associated attributes.

(c) DEADLINES.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, the Director and the Secretary shall issue guidance to Federal agencies on the data standards established under subsection (a).

(2) AGENCIES.—

(A) In General.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

(B) NONINTERFERENCE WITH AUDITABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—

(i) In General.—Upon request by the Secretary of Defense, the Director may grant an extension of the deadline under subparagraph (A) for a period of not more than 6 months to report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

(ii) LIMITATION.—The Director may not grant more than 3 extensions to the Secretary of Defense under clause (i).

(C) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Secretary and the Director, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall establish a standard method of converting the financial data prepared by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds into a consistent, computer-readable format.

(d) NOTIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the House of Representatives of—

(1) each grant of an extension under clause (i); and

(2) the reasons for granting such an extension.

(e) WEBSITE.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, the Director and the Secretary shall ensure that the data standards established under subsection (a) are applied to the data made available on the website established under section 2.

(f) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under subsection (a) shall—

(A) include a combination of Federal concepts, standards body; and

(B) simplify the reporting process, including by reducing duplicative reports.

SEC. 5. SIMPLIFYING FEDERAL AWARD REPORTING.

(a) In General.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, the Director and the Secretary shall ensure that the data standards established under subsection (a) are applied to the data made available on the website established under section 2.

(2) AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, the Director and the Secretary shall—

(i) simplify the financial and payment information data in accordance with the standards established under section (1); and

(ii) consolidate aspects of Federal financial reporting to increase efficiency and reduce the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

(iii) simplify the reporting requirements for recipients of Federal awards; and

(iv) improve financial transparency.

(B) GOVERNMENT-WIDE IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director submits the report under paragraph (5), the Director shall issue guidance to Federal agencies on the data standards established under section (4) to the heads of Federal agencies as to how the Government-wide financial data standards established under section (4) shall be applied to the information required to be reported by entities receiving Federal awards to—

(A) reduce the burden of complying with reporting requirements; and

(B) simplify the reporting process, including by reducing duplicative reports.

SEC. 6. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.

(a) Inspector General Reports.

(1) In General.—In accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of this section, the Inspector General of each Federal agency, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall—

(i) review a statistically valid sampling of the spending data submitted under this Act by the Federal agency; and

(ii) submit to Congress and make publicly available a report assessing the completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data sampled and the implementation and use of data standards by the Federal agency.

(2) DEADLINES.

(A) FIRST REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section (4)(c)(1), the Inspector General of each Federal agency shall submit and make publicly available a report as described in paragraph (1).

(B) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—On the same date as the first report required under paragraph (1), each Federal agency submits the second and fourth reports under sections 3521(f) and 9101(a)(3) of...
title 31, United States Code, that are submitted after the report under subparagraph (A), the Inspector General shall submit and make publically available a report as described in paragraph (1). The report submitted under this subparagraph may be submitted as a part of the report submitted under section 3521(f) or 9105(a)(3) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with paragraph (2) and after a review of the reports submitted under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and make publically available a report describing and evaluating the data completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data submitted under this Act by Federal agencies and the implementation and use of data standards by Federal agencies.

(2) DEADLINES.—Not later than 30 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section 4(c)(1), and every 2 years thereafter until the date that is 4 years after the date on which the first report is submitted under this subsection, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit and make publically available a report as described in paragraph (1).

(c) RECOVERY ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY BOARD DATA ANALYSIS CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a Center or expending the data completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data submitted under this Act by Federal agencies and the implementation and use of data standards by Federal agencies.

(A) the prevention and reduction of improper payments by Federal agencies; and

(B) improving efficiency and transparency in Federal spending.

(2) CONTENT.—The Secretary shall enter into memoranda of understanding with Federal agencies, including Inspector General and Federal law enforcement agencies—

(A) under which the Secretary may provide data from the data analysis center for—

(i) the purposes set forth under paragraph (1);

(ii) the identification, prevention, and reduction of waste, fraud, and abuse relating to Federal spending; and

(iii) the use in the conduct of criminal and other investigations; and

(B) which may require the Federal agency, Inspector General, or Federal law enforcement agency to provide reimbursement to the Secretary for the reasonable cost of carrying out the agreement.

(3) TRANSFER.—Upon the establishment of a data analysis center or the expansion of a service under paragraph (1), and on or before the date on which the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board terminates, and in addition to any other transfer that the Director determines is necessary under section 1531 of title 31, United States Code, there to the Department of the Treasury all assets identified by the Secretary that support the operations and activities of the Recovery Operations Center of the Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board relating to the detection of waste, fraud, and abuse in the use of Federal funds that are in existence on the day before the transfer.

SEC. 7. CLASSIFIED AND PROTECTED INFORMATION.

Nothing in this Act shall require the disclosure to the public of—

(1) information that would be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘‘Freedom of Information Act’’); or

(2) information protected under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘‘Privacy Act of 1974’’), or section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 8. NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to create a private right of enforcement of any provision of this Act.”.

SEC. 4. EXECUTIVE AGENCY ACCOUNTING AND OTHER FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORTS AND PLANS.

Section 3521(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and make available on the website described under section 1122 after ‘appropriate committees of Congress’.”

SEC. 5. DEBT COLLECTION IMPROVEMENT.

Section 3716(c)(5) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) inserting “(A)” before “Any Federal agency’’;

(2) in subparagraph (A), as so designated, by striking “190 days” and inserting “120 days’’; and

(3) by adding at the end following:—

(B) The Secretary of the Treasury shall notify Congress of any instance in which an agency fails to notify the Secretary as required under subparagraph (A)”.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, after the last exchange, I would point out that the Senate now has acted on a very important piece of legislation that has a lot to work with, that actually does reflect the ability for us to come together in a bipartisan consensus. So I rise today to discuss the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act—or DATA Act—an important bill that the taxpayers and policymakers can track every dollar the Federal Government spends. It is pretty unbelievable that in this day and age, we don’t have an easily accessible Web site for tracking every Federal tax dollar. Believe it or not, we do not. Instead, we have an incomplete and thoroughly confusing structure of financial reporting which most people can’t understand.

I have served in business. I have served in the Federal Government. I have served as Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia. So I have done business accounting and State government accounting. There is nothing like Federal Government accounting and the lack of standards and transparency.

Our taxpayers deserve to know where their money goes, and it is our obligation to share that information in a clear and direct way. Today, Senator PORTMAN and I, originally, along with Senator COBURN and Senator CARPER, rise—and now that the Senate has acted, we are actually taking a giant step to correct that problem and to make sure taxpayers actually get the transparency they deserve.

Since the Federal Government spends more than $3.7 trillion each year, with about $1 trillion in awards, accurately tracking these funds in a consistent way can definitely be a big job. But the data collected by the budget shops, the accountants, the procurement officers, the grant makers should be combined and reconciled and then published in a grant-friendly, investor-friendly, and transparent way. The various systems should be able to work together based on consistent financial standards so that policymakers and the public can track the full cycle of Federal spending. In a word, the public should be able to “Wikipedia” where and how the Federal Government spends its money, and quite honestly, that is what the DATA Act does.

The DATA Act will make four important improvements that I want to quickly highlight.

First, it creates transparency for all Federal funds. The DATA Act will expand the current ability of usaspending.gov to include spending data for all Federal funds by appropriation, Federal agency, program, function, as well as maintain the current reporting for Federal awards like contracts, grants, and loans.

Second—and this is a giant step forward; we are not going to get all the way there—we are starting down this path of setting government-wide financial data standards. We closely monitored the efforts to increase transparency for the Recovery Act funds a few years back, and one reason—even for folks who did not like the Recovery Act—that oversight was successful is because they had consistent standards for reporting the data. Our taxpayers would like to see where the funds and projects were located in their communities.

So the DATA Act requires the Department of the Treasury to establish government-wide financial data standards for Federal agencies so that every term reported is consistent across the Federal Government. This should clearly improve the quality of data.

Too often we see an item appear in one area as a grant and in another area as an expenditure. Trying to sort through what’s what is virtually impossible. This part of the DATA Act will help clear that up.

Third, so we do not simply layer on additional reporting requirements without eliminating the greater of our Federal Government. This should clearly improve the quality of data.

Fourth, the DATA Act, the inspectors general at each agency will be required...
to provide a report every 2 years on the quality and accuracy of the financial data provided to usaspending.gov. The GAO will create a government-wide report on data quality and accuracy. Too often the data that is reported at this point does not meet appropriate standards.

We must have a reliable system in place to track Federal funds and compare spending across Federal agencies to get the best value for taxpayers and reduce duplication.

In fact, in the GAO’s annual report on duplication released this week, it highlighted the need for better data and specifically called out the limitations. GAO described a “lack of reliable budget and performance information and a comprehensive list of federal programs” as one of the biggest challenges in addressing duplication.

I know many of the Members, when I started talking about data standards and better accountability, headed for the door. I hope this is a topic that unnecessarily excites folks. But I see my colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, on the floor—a former Governor, as was I. If we are going to get better value for our taxpayers, we have to start with better data, work that good data, work to have to start with a better ability to monitor that data and follow it.

In a world where people can google all kinds of information, we ought to be able to follow the money in terms of where our taxpayer dollars head. We ought to make sure the recipients of those taxpayer grants can report that information in a single, consistent, and clear way. Policymakers and taxpayers should be able to assess the value of the dollars we invest in these programs.

This has been a long and winding path. As a relatively new Member of the Senate—and I hear some of the debates about some of the old days in the Senate. And I am sure I was among the old days. But this is a case where, after a 2-year period, working with Members of the House—Chairman Issa and Ranking Member Cummings in the House—and working in the Senate with Senator Carper and Senator Coburn—Senator Coburn who is out today for health reasons—and my colleague who joined with me in pushing this bill from day one, Senator Portman—who, if time allows, will get back from a speech to add his comments as well—I would like to thank these Members.

I would also like to thank all of the Members for their support of their support of the DATA Act, including members of our Budget Committee, the Government Performance Task Force that I chair.

I would like to thank in particular Senators Coons, Whitehouse, Ayotte, Johnson, and our Budget Committee Chairman Patty Murray, and my staff, Amy Edwards, and all the others who have been relentless in working this through with other committees and the administration to make sure we got this bill done.

So while we may not have resolved all the issues of the day, today the Senate acted in a unanimous, bipartisan way to actually provide better value for taxpayers, more transparency, and less bureaucracy. I would say for a Thursday afternoon—well that is the other discussions done—we.york well done. With that, I yield the floor.

**NOMINATION OF MICHELLE T. FRIENDLAND TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT—Continued**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Carolina and I be allowed to engage in a colloquy for 20 minutes, and following that the Senator from Iowa be recognized.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina and I were both involved in intercollegiate athletics. He was a scholarship athlete at Wake Forest University and I was a football player. But I think I was at Vanderbilt University several years before that.

We are here today to make a few comments on the recent ruling by a regional director of the National Labor Relations Board that university student athletes as employees of the university. It affects only private universities for now—not the University of Tennessee. But it would affect Wake Forest, where the Senator from North Carolina was an outstanding football player, and it would affect Vanderbilt, where I attended.

I guess our message to the NCAA and intercollegiate athletics is: We hope they will understand the opinion of one regional director of the National Labor Relations Board is not the opinion of the entire Federal Government. That is the message I would like to deliver.

I would refer back—and then I will go to the Senator from North Carolina—to 25 years ago, when I was the president of the University of Tennessee, and I was asked to serve on the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. It was headed by the president of North Carolina, Bill Friday, and the head of Notre Dame, Father Hesburgh. It was a bipartisan group with a great deal of knowledge.

The major conclusion they came to was that presidents need to assert more institutional control over athletics. There is no defining that these players from Northwestern—workers who have put up the money so that these players from Northwestern would go to the NLRB and say: We want to unionize at Northwestern University. Well, on the face of it, it creates a great inequity between public and private schools, where we have a governing body that tries to make this process as equitable as it can.

But let me make this point: If you want to drive the rest of the schools out of the major sport—only 10 percent of our Nation’s athletic programs make money. That means 90 percent of them lose in the athletic department. But for the quality of life of
Mr. BURR. Well, let me say to my good friend from Tennessee. I will quote the words of Wake Forest President Nathan Hatch, a former provost at Notre Dame, in an editorial he wrote in the Wall Street Journal just this week.

He says:

To call student-athletes employees is an affront to those players who are taking full advantage of the opportunity to get an education. Do we really want to signal to society and to the many students that making money is the reason to play a sport in college, as opposed to getting an education that will provide a lifetime benefit?

President Patrick Harker, president of the University of Delaware, in the same article said:

Turning student athletes into salaried employees would endanger the existence of varsity sports on many college campuses. Only about 10 percent of Division I college sports programs turn a profit, and most of them, like our $28 million athletic program at the University of Delaware, lose money. Changing the status of student athletes would almost certainly increase the amount schools have to spend on sports, since earnings are taxed and scholarships are not. In order just to maintain the value of a scholarship, the university would have to spend more.

At Wake Forest, let me say, today a scholarship is worth $45,600 in tuition in fees, $15,152 in room and board, $1,100 in books. I will say to my good friend from Tennessee, I am not sure if there is still 15 of laundry money a month that exists under a scholarship. That is what it was when I was there. I daresay I hope it is more than that today because I do not think you can do laundry for $15 a month.

Imagine what it would be like if we allowed the military to collectively bargain. Let me tell you, none of us would feel safe at night because we would know they have all gone through. Today we feel safe because we know they have all gone through the same thing.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I think our time is coming toward a shift with—this is a topic that we have been working on for a long time. We thank him for his courtesy in allowing us to go ahead.

I think our time is coming toward a shift with—this is a topic that we have been working on for a long time. We thank him for his courtesy in allowing us to go ahead.

I guess the message—I particularly enjoyed hearing the Senator from North Carolina. The message today is directed at two groups. One is to the NCAA, which is to say, do not think that the attitude of one Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board reflects the view of the U.S. Government. It does not. The other is to the student athletes. Think about the value of the opportunity you have.

Here are two former student athletes who have been even better just the privilege of participating.
To the NCAA, the members of the NCAA have talked about issues such as should we provide more expense money for athletes. I mentioned earlier that 40 percent of them have Pell grants which can go up to $5,600 a year in addition to their $3,500 to $6,000 of football scholarship. So think about that. That was considered by the NCAA and voted down because the small schools said: It will hurt us. Women’s programs said: We will have to drop women’s programs.

So this is more complicated than it would seem at first. What about health care? Of course, a student athlete can be covered by his parents’ health care insurance. Under the Affordable Care Act, I am sure many on the other side would be quick to say, they would always be able to be insured for any sort of preexisting condition, but these are issues that can be properly looked at by the NCAA.

Unionization, in my opinion, would destroy collegiate athletics as we know it. I think we should look back to the opinion of the Knight Commission, headed by Bill Friday of North Carolina and Ted Hesburgh of Notre Dame, and reaffirm that the student athlete is not a professional, not a hired hand. He or she is a student. One percent of the athletes in this country—there may be problems to solve, but the universities and the NCAA can address those problems. Unionization is not the way to do it.

Mr. BURR. I just wanted to address one last thing; that is, the claim that this case was all about health care. The Senator from Tennessee has pointed out as well the options that we have today. But let me speak from a first-hand experience: a college athlete, four operations—two knees, an elbow, a finger. Probably the only record I hold at Wake Forest is the total number of inches of scars on my body. Because of modern medicine, that record will not be broken because they do not do surgery that way anymore.

But I think it is best summed up by our current Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, when he said this:

When sports are done right, when priorities are in order, there is no better place to teach invaluable life lessons than on a playing field or court. . . . Discipline, selflessness, resilience, passion, courage, those are all on display in the NCAA.

Why would we do anything to risk that? Not only do I believe this is risky, I think just a consideration of it is enough to make us—or should make us reject this quickly, not embrace it. I thank my colleagues from Tennessee. Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank my colleague from North Carolina. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his courtesy in allowing us to go ahead.

Some 50 years ago, I had the opportunity to compete in track and field for Vanderbilt University. Unlike my colleague from North Carolina, who as a fine defensive back at Wake Forest University, there was no athletic scholarship available for me. But I was fortunate enough to be a member of a record setting team.

Twenty-five years ago, while I was president of the University of Tennessee, I was asked to serve on the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. The Knight Commission was created in October 1989 in response to a series of scandals in college sports. After 18 months of careful study, our 22-member commission issued a report called “Keeping the Student-Athlete: A New Model for Intercollegiate Athletics.”

Our central recommendation was that college presidents needed to exercise stronger control of their athletics programs to ensure their academic and financial integrity. And our guiding principle in making that recommendation was that athletes are students first, not professionals. We wrote:

We reject the argument that the only realistic solution to the problem is to drop the student-athlete concept, put athletes on the payroll, and reduce or even eliminate their responsibilities as students. Such a scheme is not having to do with education, the purpose for which colleges and universities exist. Scholarship athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way possible. The essential difference is that the idea of intercollegiate athletics is that the teams represent their institutions as true members of the student body, not as hired hands. Surely American higher education has the ability to devise a better solution to the problems of intercollegiate athletics than making professionals out of the players, which is no solution at all but rather an unacceptable surrender to despair.

The Knight Commission’s perspective on student athletes could not be more different to the perspective in the recent decision, issued by a regional director of the National Labor Relations Board in Chicago, to treat athletes as employees and permit them to form a union.

Student athletes are found throughout our colleges and universities. There are both private schools—small through large, but those that receive athletic scholarships are only at division I and II schools. Division III schools are not allowed to award athletic scholarships.

For the purposes of the NLRB decision, we are talking about an even smaller subset of athletes—scholarship athletes at private institutions like Notre Dame, Vanderbilt, and Stanford. For example, as a non-scholarship athlete, I would not have been able to unionize. Senator BURR, on the other hand was given a scholarship to play defensive back at Wake Forest. He would be allowed to unionize.

In 2011, there were roughly 25 million undergraduate students; 9 million Pell recipients, which is approximately 36 percent of undergraduate students. In addition, there were 177,000 scholarship athletes enrolled in bachelor programs at public and private institutions. This is approximately 1.7 percent of all students in bachelor’s programs. Of those, 71,000 received Pell Grants, approximately 40 percent of scholarship athletes. The number of scholarship athletes at private institutions enrolled in a bachelor’s program was 104,000, approximately 4.2 percent of private students in bachelor’s programs. Of those, 43,700 received Pell Grants, approximately 42 percent of private scholarship athletes.

The total number of division I and II schools is 662 of which 283 are private institutions. In division I the total is 350 with 119 of them being private, while the division II total is 312 with 161 private.

Athletic scholarships are limited to only tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books. At Vanderbilt the total scholarship could be as much as $59,240 which is a combination of $42,768 for tuition, $14,362 for room and board, and $1,370 for books. At Stanford the total scholarship could be as much as $59,240 which is a combination of $44,184 for tuition, $13,631 for room and board, and $1,425 for books.

Contrast that with the University of Tennessee where the scholarship total could be up to $21,900 consisting of $11,194 for in-state tuition, $9,170 for room and board, and $1,536 for books.

Athletic scholarships are awarded in most cases by the athletic department which encourages an athlete to complete the federal application. If an athlete is determined to have a need, then the financial aid office awards the necessary aid, Federal and/or both. A student athlete is restricted to the institutional cost of attendance when combining other aid with their scholarship, unless they are using their Pell Grant or a veterans benefit. Thus a student athlete with need could receive a full scholarship covering all costs and receive additional funds.

Only 1 percent of student athletes will ever play professional sports. For the remainder, their college degree is in many cases being paid for by college sports. According to the College Board, the value of a college degree is $1 million over an individual’s lifetime. As a former student athlete, who wasn’t on scholarship, I can speak from experience that the value of collegiate athletics goes beyond the money. It can enrich every aspect of our education, teaching lessons and developing habits that will pay dividends no matter what a student pursues in life.

Unfortunately, the problems with the Northwestern football players are concerned with are not unique to Northwestern and they are not new. These problems include: the NCAA does not
currently allow a full-ride athletic scholarship to cover the actual full cost of attendance; Other expenses include: transportation costs; health fees; student activity and recreation fees and personal expenses allowable under Federal financial aid rules.

For example, a full-ride scholarship at Vanderbilt University is worth $58,520 but the full cost of attendance is calculated by the school to be $62,320. The difference must be made up by the student.

For some student athletes, the lingering effects and potential disabilities will be felt for many years after their playing days are over. Some students are asking for long term medical coverage to help them cover costs of treating these injuries. Schools could provide for some form of additional medical coverage.

While playing sports has certain inherent risks, we do know more now than ever before about how injuries can be avoided, protections from injury—football concerns with concussions. Schools can take, and some are taking, steps to improve the safety of their student athletes.

Some students are asking for help to finish their education even when athletic eligibility has run out.

There is money available to address these concerns and take care of our student athletes without unions.

The NCAA and the member universities do need to reform their rules and guidelines, and they will.

Earlier this week we spoke to David Williams, Vanderbilt University’s athletic director, who had this to say:

The NCAA and its member universities have the authority and the responsibility to correct the flaws that exist in the system today, many of which are mentioned by the student athletes at Northwestern University.

The question is do we have the will to do so. I believe we do. I believe we will.

Mark Emmert the President of the NCAA, quoted in a recent Meet the Press interview said:

We have twice now had the board of the N.C.A.A. pass an allowance to allow schools to provide athletes up to a thousand dollars in what we call “miscellaneous expense” allowances... The board’s in favor of it. The membership, the more than a thousand colleges and universities that are out there, the 350 of them that are in division one had voted that down. We’re in the middle right now of reconsidering all that. I have every reason to believe that to be in place sometime this coming year.

What would actually happen if collegiate sports teams were unionized? Well, David Williams, Vanderbilt’s athletic director, said:

The decision by the NRLB regional board has the power to change the structure, dynamics and maybe the effectiveness of college athletics. It may ultimately end college athletics as we know it today.

I agree with this statement. And think those who support turning college athletes into employees and unionize them should consider the potential consequences. One potential consequence relates to taxes. This recent decision, in essence, may require the entire scholarship to be treated as compensation thus making the whole amount taxable.

Another consequence of potential collegiate unionization relates to labor. There are a few essential thought of traits when a union represents a workforce is the right to strike. Section 13 of the National Labor Relations Act, NLRA, expressly provides the right of employees to strike, with some exceptions. If a unionized college baseball team doesn’t like the coaches’ decision to switch practice times, they could decide to walk off the field right before the first pitch is thrown, and call a strike.

The NLRA requires the union and employer to bargain over wages, hours, and other conditions of employment. If a football team joins a union, will the union negotiate different compensation amounts depending on the player’s position or contribution to the team? For example, a five-star quarterback in high school could decide to attend Notre Dame, because the players’ union promises to negotiate a larger scholarship package for him, but the one star, offensive lineman may only get the bare minimum. This could lead to a team and its union making value judgments based on the on-field contributions of a player.

What about when a coach decides to change the offensive scheme from a pro-style offense to the wish-bone? A union wide receiver might have a grievance because this could effect the “condition of employment,” in that his role on the team could be diminished. Under the NLRA, a decision like that would have to be bargained for. A coach could not unilaterally change the playbook without approval of the union.

But let’s say that a wide receiver decides to go directly to the coach to discuss his concern with an offensive scheme. Under the act, that conversation will not be a one-on-one between the coach and the player. Instead, a union representative has the right to be present at that meeting. And instead of resolving the issue internally, the Federal government through the NLRB, or possibly the Federal courts could have the final say.

The current NRLB has struck down several employee conduct policies and grievance procedures that violate an employee’s section 7 right to “concerted activity” under the NLRA. Will the NRLB now turn its attention to and interfere with the player conduct policies that schools require of their players?

The NFLB issued a 2011 decision in Specialty Healthcare, that permitted unions to organize, multiple, small groups of employees within a single workplace, known as “micro-unions.” It is conceivable that every different position on the football team could decide to have their own bargaining unit. The quarterbacks in one unit, the line-backers in another, etc. The university would then have to separately bargain with multiple different unions, all with different demands.

Universities require its athletes to maintain a 2.0 grade point average, or risk losing their scholarship and position on the team. Would the NLRA consider a minimum grade point average as a condition of employment under the law that must be bargained for? Schools and players’ unions could bargain a lower GPA.

Would that be enough? I don’t know why you’d want them to be students. If they’re employees and they’re playing basketball for you, don’t let calculus get in the way.

Yesterday, the Senate voted against cloture on the Paycheck Fairness Act. This is a bill that would amend the Equal Pay Act to make it easier to sue for pay discrimination based on gender by limiting an important employer defense.

Under the bill, the employer would have to prove any difference in pay was based on job-relevant factors consistent with a business necessity: If these student athletes are now considered “employees” under the eyes of a regional director in Chicago, they would theoretically be entitled to protection under statutes like the Equal Pay Act; And if the Paycheck Fairness Act were to become law, it is conceivable universities could be liable for any differences in compensation that they provide the football team, versus the women’s soccer team.

Then there is the effect on smaller schools. Big schools with big budgets may have the ability to negotiate with a union for better benefits for their student athletes. If a football union at Notre Dame negociates for higher compensation that may set a standard the school must match for other athletes as well. I imagine that there is enough money coming into the Notre Dame or Stanford athletic departments to allow them to adjust to the realities of unionized college athletics.

But what about smaller schools? They will have to make cuts somewhere. If they preserve their football
program, it will likely be at the cost of other sports.

Another consideration that must be taken into account are public universities versus private universities. Because the NLRB regional director’s decision only applies to private universities, it is not in conflict of rules for private universities than for public universities.

The private schools with athlete unions may ultimately be forced to negotiate salaries or other benefits that violate NCAA rules; to continue competing, they would have to set up their own conference or association. The departure of schools from the NCAA to this new, union friendly association, would fracture the foundations of collegiate sports.

And what about possible title IX implications? As title IX was enforced related to college athletics, institutions made difficult choices to eliminate many athletic programs. Title IX is focused on equal access to education. If athletes are employees, then it is unclear how the requirements and protections of title IX will apply to them.

Due to the current limited nature of the federal law, if football players’ compensation are considered salaries and not scholarships, then would one of the possible effects be a reduction in the number of women’s scholarships that title IX requires the university to offer? If so, title IX requirements on any benefits not received by a football team under their collective bargaining be shared equitably with the women’s sports at the university?

With limited resources and title IX requiring both proportional opportunities for athletes and pay, the recent decision may result in further reductions of athletic programs and opportunities on college campuses.

The Knight Commission’s executive director, Amy Privette Perko, recently wrote in the New York Times that:

The commission supports many of the benefits being sought for college athletes by groups like the College Athletes Players Association, but unions are not needed to guarantee those benefits. Colleges can enact proposals long recommended by the commission to restore the educational role of athletics and improve athletes’ experiences.

I continue to believe that athletes are students first, not professionals. Some of the concerns raised by these college athletes are legitimate but unions are not the solution. They can and should be addressed by the schools and the NCAA.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 25 years ago today the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 was signed into law. To mark that anniversary, I come to this floor today to discuss some of the history that led to that legislation, the lessons learned over the past 25 years, and the work that still needs to be done to protect whistleblowers.

I emphasize that last part because there still needs to be a lot of work done to protect whistleblowers. The Whistleblower Protection Act was the result of years of effort to protect Federal employees from retaliation. Eleven years before it became law in 1989, Congress enacted whistleblower protection as part of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978.

I was then in the House of Representatives. There I met a man named Ernie Fitzgerald, who had blown the whistle on a Lockheed C–5 aircraft defense program going $2.3 billion over budget. Ernie was fired by the Air Force for doing that, and as he used to say: He was fired for the act of “committing truth.”

When the Nixon tapes became public after Watergate, they revealed President Nixon personally telling his Chief of Staff to get rid of that SOB. That is how a famous whistleblower who pointed out the waste of $2.3 billion was treated.

The Civil Service Commission did not reinstate Ernie until 12 years later. In the meantime, he was instrumental in helping get the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 passed. Yet it soon became clear that the law did not do enough to protect whistleblowers. In the early 1980s, the percentage of employees who did not report government wrongdoing due to fear of retaliation nearly doubled.

Some whistleblowers still had the courage to come forward. In the spring of 1983, I became aware of a document in the Defense Department known as the Spinney report. The report exposed the unrealistic assumptions being used by the Pentagon in its defense budgeting. Those unrealistic assumptions were the basis for add-ons later on so defense contractors could bid up the cost. It was written by Chuck Spinney, a civilian analyst in the Defense Department’s Program Evaluation Office.

I asked to meet with Chuck Spinney but was stonewalled by the Pentagon. When I threatened a subpoena, we finally got them to agree to a Friday afternoon hearing in March 1983. The Pentagon hoped the hearing would get buried in the end-of-the-week news cycle. Instead, on Monday morning the newstand featured a painting of Chuck Spinney on the front cover of Time magazine.

It labeled him as “a Pentagon Maverick.” I called him what he ought to be called, the “conscience of the Pentagon.” The country owes a debt of gratitude to people such as Ernie Fitzgerald and Chuck Spinney. It takes real guts to put your career on the line, to expose waste and fraud, and to put the taxpayers ahead of Washington bureaucrats.

In the mid-1980s, we dusted off an old Civil War-era measure known as the False Claims Act, as a way to encourage whistleblowers to come forward and report fraud. We amended that Civil War law in 1986 to create the modern False Claims Act, which has resulted in over $40 billion in taxpayers’ money being recovered for the Federal Treasury. We made sure when we passed it that it contained very strong whistleblower protections. Those provisions helped to build up support for whistleblowing.

People such as Chuck Spinney and Ernie Fitzgerald helped capture the public imagination and showed what whistleblowers could accomplish.

However, that didn’t mean the executive branch stopped trying to silence whistleblowers. For example, in the spring of 1987 the Department of Defense asked Ernie to sign a nondisclosure form. It would have prohibited him from giving out classifiable—as opposed to classified—classifiable information without prior written authorization. That, of course, would have prevented those of us in Congress from getting that information so we couldn’t do our oversight work.

Further, the term “classifiable” didn’t only cover officially classified information, it also covered any information that could later be classified.

The governmentwide nondisclosure form arguably violated the Lloyd-Lafollette Act of 1912. That law states that “the right of employees to furnish information to . . . Congress . . . may not be interfered with or denied.”

Just to make sure, I added the so-called anti-gag appropriations rider to the Defense Appropriations Act of 1987. That rider, the anti-gag rider, said that no money could be used to enforce any nondisclosure agreements that interfere with the right of individuals to provide information to Congress. It remained in every appropriations bill until 2013. I then worked to get that language into statute in 2012 through the passage of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act.

By the time of the first anti-gag rider in 1987, there was widespread recognition that all Federal employees ought to be protected if they disclosed waste and fraud to the Congress or for a lot of other reasons as well.

Meanwhile, I had also worked with Senator LEVIN of Michigan to coauthor what we called the Whistleblower Protection Act. It was introduced in February 1987. There were hearings on our bill in the summer of 1987 and the spring of 1988. It proceeded to pass the Senate by voice vote in August. Then there was unanimous consent that in October. After reconciling the differences, we sent the bill to the White House. However, President Reagan failed to sign it. That meant we had to start all over again in the next Congress.

We didn’t let President Bush’s inaction—because that was a pocket veto—stand in the way. Senator LEVIN and I moved forward again. When we reintroduced the bill in January 1989, I came to the floor to make the following statement:

“We’re back with this legislation in the 101st Congress, and this time, we’re going to make it stick.
It does still have some gray areas, I am sorry to say. It leaves some of the policy and procedure development to the discretion of the executive branch, and that is a mistake we know exists because we had a similar thing happen with the FBI because in 1989 the protection Act didn’t apply to the FBI. That turned out to be a big mistake.

Yet that law did require the Attorney General to implement regulations for FBI whistleblowers consistent with those in the Whistleblower Protection Act. However, it soon became clear that was a little like putting the fox in charge of the henhouse. The Justice Department and the FBI simply ignored that part of the law for nearly 10 years. Not until 1997 did the Attorney General finally implement regulations for whistleblowers at the FBI.

The Justice Department was pushed into action by the Whistleblower Protection Act by an FBI employee by the name of Dr. Fred Whitehurst. Dr. Whitehurst was considered by the FBI to be its leading forensic explosive expert in the 1990s.

What I am about to show you is that by being a good, patriotic American and blowing the whistle when something is wrong, you can ruin yourself professionally.

Shortly after the Whistleblower Protection Act was passed in 1989, Dr. Whitehurst disclosed major problems with the FBI crime lab. From 1990 to 1995 he wrote close to 250 letters to the Justice Department inspector general about these problems. In other words, he tried to do his job. He was in and working within that agency to expose wrongdoing but didn’t get very far.

In January 1996 he formally requested that the President implement Whistleblower Protection Act. Only after Fred was suspended in 1997 did the White House finally issue such a memo to the Attorney General. It instructed the Attorney General to create a process for FBI whistleblowers consistent with the Whistleblower Protection Act. Fred Whitehurst’s case dragged on for another year until the FBI finally agreed to create their procedures, giving them 6 months. However, remember that is exactly the same amount of time President Obama gave Attorney General Holder to come up with regulations, and it still hasn’t happened 18 months later. Congress needs to be vigilant about getting both the intelligence community and the Attorney General to act.

In the meantime, the FBI fiercely resists any efforts at congressional oversight, especially on whistleblower matters. For example, 4 months ago I sent a letter to the FBI requesting its training materials on the insider threat program. When we just want copies of training materials, would that be difficult for a bureaucracy to present to a Member of Congress?

That program happened to be announced by the Obama administration in October of 2011. It was intended to train federal employees on how to deal with insider threats among their colleagues. Public news reports indicated that this program might not do enough to distinguish between true insider threats and legitimate whistleblowers. I relayed these concerns in my letter. I also asked for copies of the training materials. I said I wanted to examine whether they adequately distinguished between insider threats and whistleblowers so it didn’t become a damper on whistleblowing.

In response, an FBI legislative affairs official told my staff that a briefing might be the best way to answer my questions. It was scheduled for last
week. Staff of both Chairman LEAHY and myself attended. The FBI brought the head of their insider threat program. Yet the FBI didn’t bring the insider threat training materials as we had requested. However, the head of the insider threat program told the staff of both Senator LEAHY and myself there was no need to worry about whistleblower communications.

They are telling me that at a time when we have decades of history of whistleblowers being treated like skunks at a picnic? They gentleman said whistleblowers had to register in order to be protected and the insider threat program would know to avoid these people.

I have never heard of whistleblowers ever being required to “register” in order to be protected. The idea of such a requirement should be pretty alarming to all Americans. We are talking about patriotic Americans wanting to make sure the government does what the law says it should do and spend monies that are intended to be spent. They have to register to be protected just because they are a patriotic American? The reason they can’t do that is because sometimes confidentiality is the best protection a whistleblower has.

Unfortunately, neither my staff nor Chairman LEAHY’s staff was able to learn more because after only 10 minutes—only 10 minutes—in the office and into the briefing, the FBI got up and abruptly walked out.

It might be one thing to walk out on Republican staff, but they walked out on the staff of a Democratic chairman of one of the most powerful committees in the U.S. Senate as well—Chairman LEAHY’s staff.

FBI officials simply refused to discuss any whistleblower implications in its insider threat program and left the room. These are clearly not the actions of an agency that is genuinely open to whistleblowers or whistleblower protection.

Like the FBI, the intelligence community has to confront the same issue of distinguishing a true insider threat from legitimate whistleblowers. This issue will be impacted by title V of the current Intelligence authorization bill, which includes language about continuous monitoring of security clearance holders.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper seems to have talked about such procedures when he appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 11 of this year. In his testimony he said this:

We are going to proliferate deployment of auditing and monitoring capabilities to enhance and rapidly detect insider threat detection. We’re going to need to change our security clearance process to a system of continuous evaluation. . . . What we need is . . . a system of continuous evaluation, where we have a way of doing.

Now, get this.

—monitoring their behavior, both their electronic behaviors on the job as well as off the job, to see if there is a potential clearance issue.

Director Clapper’s testimony gives me major pause, as I hope it does my colleagues. It sounds as though this type of monitoring would likely capture communications between whistleblowers communicating with Congress.

To be clear, I believe the Federal Government is within its right in monitoring employee activity on worker computers. Yet this is more in the intelligence community. However, as I testified before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee recently, there are areas where the executive branch should be very cautious.

The House oversight committee held a hearing on electronic monitoring that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration had done of certain whistleblower in that agency. This monitoring captured personal email accounts at work. As a result, the FDA’s whistleblower monitoring captured personal email account passwords, and attorney-client communications and confidential communications to Congress and the Office of Special Counsel.

Some of these communications are legally protected. For example, whistleblower communications are protected disclosures. The Food and Drug Administration allows its employees to check personal email accounts at work. As a result, the FDA’s whistleblower monitoring captured personal email account passwords, and attorney-client communications and confidential communications to Congress and the Office of Special Counsel.

It wouldn’t surprise me, considering the culture of some of these agencies, that is exactly what they want to do, because there is a great deal of peer pressure to go along to get along within these agencies. Whistleblowers, as I said, are kind of like a skunk at a picnic.

There could be safeguards, however. For example, whistleblower communications could be segregated from other communications. Access could be limited to only certain personnel rather than all of the upper management. In any case, whistleblower disclosures to Congress or the special counsel can’t just be routed back to the official accused of wrongdoing.

As the 1980 Executive order made clear, who is a Federal employee’s duty. It should be considered part of their official responsibilities and something they can do on work time. However, that doesn’t mean they aren’t allowed to make their protected disclosures anonymously to protect against the usual retaliation. A Federal employee has every right to make protected disclosures anonymously, whether at work or off the job.

Every Member of this body should realize that without some safeguards there is a chance their communications with whistleblowers may be viewed by the executive branch.

These same considerations apply to the intelligence community. The potential problems are heightened if electronic monitoring extends off the job, such as Director Clapper mentioned in the quote I gave. We have to balance insider threats with letting whistleblowers know that their legitimate whistleblower communications are protected.

With continuous monitoring in place, any whistleblower would understand their communications with the inspector general or Congress would likely be seen by their agency and punishment could follow. They might perhaps even be seen by those they believe are responsible for waste, fraud, or abuse, and punishment to follow. That leaves the whistleblower open to retaliation.

Even with the protections of this bill, we should all understand it is difficult to prevent retaliation because it is so indigenous in the culture of most government agencies. It requires a lengthy process for an individual to try to prove the retaliation and get any remedy. It is far better, where possible, to take precautions that prevent the likelihood of retaliation even occurring; otherwise, it will make it virtually impossible for there to be such a thing as an intelligence community whistleblower. Fraud and waste would then go unreported. No one would dare take the risk.

To return to the theme I started with—whistleblowers need protection from retaliation today just as much as they did 25 years ago when the Whistleblower Protection Act was passed on April 10 of that year. I have always said whistleblowers are too often treated like a skunk at a picnic. You have now heard it for the third time. You can’t say it too many times. I have seen too many of them retaliated against.

However, 25 years after the Whistleblower Protection Act is on whistleblowing is in, and the debate on whether to protect whistleblowers is over. There is widespread public recognition that whistleblowers perform a very valuable public service.

Earlier this year PricewaterhouseCoopers found that 31 percent of serious fraud globally was detected by whistleblowing systems or other tipsoffs. According to a 2012 report from another organization, that number is even higher when looking just in the United States, with 31 percent of the fraud tips coming from a company’s own employees.

In 2013, of U.S. workers who had observed misconduct and blown the whistle, 40 percent said the existence of whistleblower protection had made them more likely to report misconduct.

Whistleblowers are particularly vital in government, where bureaucrats only seem to work overtime when it comes to avoiding transparency and accountability.

A year and a half after the Whistleblower Protection Act, President Bush
issued Executive Order 1990 that said all Federal employees “shall disclose waste, fraud, abuse and corruption to appropriate authorities.” That should have changed the entire culture of these agencies that are antithetical to whistle-blowing but it hasn’t. But that is what the directive says.

Federal employees are still under obligations this very day. They are fulfilling a civic duty when they blow the whistle.

I encouraged President Reagan and every President after him that we should have a Rose Garden ceremony honoring whistleblowers. If you do that, it sends a signal from the highest level of the U.S. Government to the lowest level of the U.S. Government that whistleblowing is patriotic. Unfortunately, there isn’t a single President who has taken me up on my suggestion.

Further, while the Obama administration promised to be the most transparent it has, instead, cracked down on whistleblowers as never before.

Last week, the Supreme Court denied a petition to hear an appeal from a case named Kaplan v. Conyers. The Obama administration opposed that case, if allowed to stand, means untold numbers of Federal employees may lose some of the very same appeal rights we tried to strengthen in the Whistleblower Protection Act. There could be half or more of the Federal employees impacted. Such a situation would undo 130 years of protection for civil servants dating back to the Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act of 1883.

We all remember that President Obama promised to ensure that whistleblowers have full access to the courts and due process. However, his administration has pursued the exact opposite goal here. That ought to be unacceptable to all of us.

I think it is important to send a loud and clear signal that waste, fraud, and abuse won’t be tolerated in government, and that is why I am pleased to announce I will officially be forming a whistleblower protection caucus at the beginning of the 114th Congress. Until then, I will be talking to my colleagues and encouraging them to join me as we start putting together an agenda for that caucus in a new Congress.

As we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Whistleblower Protection Act, we should all recognize whistleblowers for the sacrifices they make. Those who fight waste, fraud, and abuse in the government should be lauded for patriotism. Whistleblower protections are only worth anything if they are enforced.

Just because we have passed good laws does not mean we can stop paying attention to the issue. There must be vigilance and oversight by the Congress.

The best protection for a whistleblower is a culture of understanding and respecting the right to blow the whistle. I hope this whistleblower caucus will send the message that Congress expects that kind of culture.

I call on my colleagues to help me make sure whistleblowers continue to receive the kind of protection they need and deserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STOP IDENTITY THEFT ACT OF 2013

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass the Stopping Tax Offenders and Prosecuting Identity Theft Act of 2013.

With tax day coming upon us on Tuesday, the time is now to pass this bipartisan legislation.

I worked on the STOP Identity Theft Act to address the growing problems of tax identity theft and to protect taxpayers against fraud. From the beginning this bill has been bipartisan. Senator Grassley introduced the Republican version of this bill, and in fact recently this bill passed the Senate Judiciary Committee on a vote of 18-0. Given the number of members on the committee with very different views on issues, what that is asking for shows what a pressing problem this is.

I think people will be pretty shocked, as you will be, Mr. President, when you hear these numbers. Criminals are increasingly filing false tax returns using stolen identity information in order to claim victims’ refunds. You might think that would be a rare incident, but as a former law enforcement person, as the attorney general for the State of New Mexico, I think you know that this is happening all the time and shows what a pressing problem this is.

I think people will be pretty shocked, as you will be, Mr. President, when you hear these numbers. Criminals are increasingly filing false tax returns using stolen identity information in order to claim victims’ refunds. You might think that would be a rare incident, but as a former law enforcement person, as the attorney general for the State of New Mexico, I think you know that this is happening all the time and shows what a pressing problem this is.

I think people will be pretty shocked, as you will be, Mr. President, when you hear these numbers. Criminals are increasingly filing false tax returns using stolen identity information in order to claim victims’ refunds. You might think that would be a rare incident, but as a former law enforcement person, as the attorney general for the State of New Mexico, I think you know that this is happening all the time and shows what a pressing problem this is.

I think people will be pretty shocked, as you will be, Mr. President, when you hear these numbers. Criminals are increasingly filing false tax returns using stolen identity information in order to claim victims’ refunds. You might think that would be a rare incident, but as a former law enforcement person, as the attorney general for the State of New Mexico, I think you know that this is happening all the time and shows what a pressing problem this is.

I think people will be pretty shocked, as you will be, Mr. President, when you hear these numbers. Criminals are increasingly filing false tax returns using stolen identity information in order to claim victims’ refunds. You might think that would be a rare incident, but as a former law enforcement person, as the attorney general for the State of New Mexico, I think you know that this is happening all the time and shows what a pressing problem this is.

I think people will be pretty shocked, as you will be, Mr. President, when you hear these numbers. Criminals are increasingly filing false tax returns using stolen identity information in order to claim victims’ refunds. You might think that would be a rare incident, but as a former law enforcement person, as the attorney general for the State of New Mexico, I think you know that this is happening all the time and shows what a pressing problem this is.

In 2012 alone, identity thieves filed 1.6 million fraudulent tax returns, almost double the number confirmed in 2011. The numbers and the documents in these cases may be forged, but the dollars behind them are real, because in 2012 there was another 1.1 million fraudulent tax returns that slipped through the cracks, and our U.S. Treasury lost more than $3.6 billion in fraudulent refunds—$3.6 billion. That is the number coming from the IRS. That is your taxpayer dollars going down the drain to people who are actually stealing taxpayers’ identities, putting them on returns, filing returns, and getting back the money bilion in fraudulent tax refunds. This included the arrest of a middle service worker who sold the identities of more than 400 students, if you can believe it. Those victims are just kids, and criminals are stealing their identities to file fake returns.

Are you ready for this one? Attorney General Eric Holder recently revealed that he was a victim of tax return identity theft. This came out this week. Two young adults used his name, his date of birth, and Social Security number to file a fraudulent return. They got caught. They were prosecuted. But if you can imagine that this can happen to the Attorney General of the United States—at least we got action there—think about some guy in Circle Pines, MN, who has it happen. As I said, it is happening over a million times every year, from a retired man in Minnesota to middle school students in Florida, to the Attorney General of the United States. It is clear that identity theft can happen to anyone.

We also know this crime can victimize our most vulnerable citizens, victims such as seniors living on fixed incomes or people with disabilities who depend on tax returns to make ends meet and cannot financially manage having their tax returns stolen. There is a lot at stake here and action is needed. That is why I put forward the bipartisan legislation a few years back with Republican Senator JEFF Sessions of Alabama, to take on this problem and crack down on the criminals committing this crime. There was also significant bipartisan work in the Senate last year. A very similar bill was passed in the House that did the same thing, passed bipartisan bills in the House of Representatives. It happened. And the Senate now, as we know, passed it 18-0 out of the Judiciary Committee.

This critical legislation will take important steps to streamline law enforcement resources and strengthen
penalties for tax identity theft. The STOP Identity Theft Act will direct the Justice Department to dedicate additional resources to address tax identity theft. It also directs the Department to focus on parts of the country with especially high rates of tax return identity theft to boost its efforts for vulnerable populations such as seniors, minors, and veterans.

We also urge the Justice Department to cooperate fully and coordinate investigations with State and local law enforcement organizations.

Identity thieves have become more creative and have expanded from stealing identities of individuals to stealing that of businesses and organizations. My bill recognizes this change and broadens the definitions of tax identity theft to include businesses, nonprofits, and other similar organizations. This is important because once a company or an organization's tax information is stolen, it can be used to create fraudulent tax returns and claim false refunds.

Finally, we need to crack down on the criminals committing this crime. This bill would strengthen tax identity theft penalties by raising the maximum sentence from 15 to 20 years. I believe this bill goes a long way in helping law enforcement use their resources more efficiently and effectively and it is time to bring it to the floor.

In recent weeks we have made significant progress, as I said, by passing the bill out of the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously on an 18–0 vote. It doesn’t happen often. I thank all of my colleagues on the committee and all of my friends across the aisle for joining with us to vote for this bill. After a long discussion we had amendments. We got this bill. Every single member of the Judiciary Committee voted for this bill, including Senator Cruz, Senator Schumer, Senator Feinstein, and Senator Hatch. It was a unanimous 18–0 vote.

Now I want to bring this bill to the full Senate. I would love to get this done before tax day. I know there is a holdup on the other side of the aisle, and it is time for people to understand that this is a bill that passed the House of Representatives, it passed on an 18–0 vote out of Judiciary, and we simply need to get this done.

When the Attorney General of the United States of America is having his identity stolen and his identity is used to file fake tax returns, we have a problem. We have a problem that involves a lot of money. We have a problem that involves 1.8 million fraudulent tax returns in 2012 alone, double the number in 2011. We have a problem that also involves a lot of money. We have a problem that involves $3.6 billion in 1 year alone in 2012, paid out by the U.S. Government. What do you think taxpayers think of that? That $3.6 billion went to thieves and we have a bill that passed out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously—18–0? I would want someone explaining why they are holding up this bill.

It is time to get this bill done. I would love to see it happen before we go back to our home State so I can explain it to my constituents, and I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will work with Ben. Because with tax season upon us, it is time to pass this bipartisan legislation, to crack down on identity thieves and protect the hard-earned tax dollars of innocent Americans. The time to do it is now.

I again urge the Senate Majority Leader, Senator SCHUMER, for being the Republican on this bill, and I thank all my colleagues for passing it through the committee. I thank the House for getting it done over there. It is now the time to pass it in the Senate.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. I would ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. I wish to speak as if in morning business.

The DATA ACT

Mr. President, I was not able to be here earlier on the Senate floor when my colleague, Senator WARNER, got unanimous consent to pass the DATA Act. This is the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act, something we have been working on over the last couple of years.

It is a good bill, and it is about good government and I am glad we were able to pass it this afternoon in the Senate. I now hope it will go to the House for passage and get to the President’s desk, because it will help to give all the taxpayers a better view into our government.

Specifically, it improves Federal financial transparency and data quality, both of which are going to help identify and illuminate the ways we spend—certainly something we should be focused on with the huge deficits and all the pressure we are facing.

It will also ease the compliance burden with the people working in the Federal Government and recipients of Federal resources. At the same time it improves the data that they send to the Federal Government. It is a win/win for the taxpayer, for the government, at getting at the issue of waste, fraud, and abuse.

It is an issue that transcends party lines. I want to thank my friend Senator COBURN because he has been a leader in the Governmental Affairs Committee and also the chairman of the committee, Senator TOM CARPER. Without their help, Senator WARNER and I would not have been able to get this bill to the floor today. We also have a number of other cosponsors on a bipartisan basis.

We all know that the Federal Government spends a lot of money—over $3 trillion a year. The goal is to know more about how that money is spent so we can ensure it is being spent on the right things. This legislation, the DATA Act, picks up on lessons we learned about how the American people want more accountable and more transparent so taxpayers have a better understanding of how the money is being used. This has to do with grants and contracts. I think it is something that is going to give us more assurance that we are spending the money right but also eliminating fraud and abuse that we otherwise would not find.

I first got involved in this issue when I was at the Office of Management and Budget. I supported it and then was tasked with implementing a 2006 bill that was introduced by Senator COBURN and Senator Obama at the time. It was called the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act, FFATA—an unfortunate acronym in my view.

FFATA worked in the sense that it led to something which is called usaspending.gov. Back then a lot of Federal agencies thought this could not be done; that we would not be able to improve our transparency up to the standards that were established in FFATA, and we proved them wrong, thanks to a lot of hard work by a lot of folks in the agencies and at the Office of Management and Budget where I served as Director. It ended up with the ability of taxpayers to get a wealth of information online, again, about Federal grants and Federal contracts so they could better understand how their tax dollars were spent.

It was a good start. It also helped us learn some lessons about how to improve fiscal data quality and transparency even more. We learned that the usaspending.gov can be more comprehensive, more accurate, more reliable, and more timely.

By the way, if you have not gone on this Web site, usaspending.gov, I recommend it. If we pass this legislation, you will like it even more because the data you will be seeing will be more understandable, will be more uniform across the agencies, and will enable us all, as taxpayers, to get a better view into the government.

What does it do? First, it makes it easier to compare spending across the Federal agencies by requiring establishment of these governmentwide standards, such as financial data standards, which is very difficult to do, as I learned when I was at the Office of Management and Budget. It sounds easy, but it is hard and it pays off. It promotes consistency and reliability in data. Second, it strengthens the Federal financial transparency by reforming and significantly improving the Web site itself. It requires more frequent and more frequent and more frequent updates of spending by each Federal agency on their programs and at the object class-level basis. It is basically more
TRIBUTE TO PETER MUNK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the more than 30 years of hard work and leadership Mr. Peter Munk has demonstrated as the founder and chairman of the board of Barrick Gold Corporation.

Since Barrick Gold was established in 1983, Mr. Munk has worked to make Barrick one of the world’s largest gold mining companies, with projects reaching four continents. In 1986, Mr. Munk bet on Nevada, bringing Barrick to the Silver State and giving the state of the goldstrike mine located on the Carlin Trend in Eureka County. Nevada has since become the largest source of gold in the United States, producing more than 75 percent of the gold mined throughout the country. Even today, the Goldstrike mine is one of Barrick’s most productive properties. Two of Barrick’s 5 core gold mines are located in Nevada, and the company continues to operate 7 mines throughout the state, employing more than 4,200 people.

Mr. Munk has shared his many successes and accomplishments with the communities in which he works and lives, and through his philanthropy, he has demonstrated a dedication to education and health. He created the Peter Munk Charitable Foundation in 1992 and has made significant donations to his alma mater, the University of Toronto, which is home to the Munk School of Global Affairs. Additionally, the premier Peter Munk Cardiac Centre was constructed at the University Health Network in Toronto as a product of his generous contributions.

Under Mr. Munk’s strong leadership, Barrick Gold has given back to the many communities surrounding Barrick mining operations, and the company has helped provide added support for local economic, health, and social development. In Nevada, much needed scholarships, and large community projects have been funded with the support of Barrick Gold. The company has also implemented strict controls to help reduce the impacts of mining on the environment and contributed to wildlife restoration and improvement projects to enhance Nevada’s native plants and species habitats. For instance, in 2012, Barrick partnered with Federal and State land managers to restore vital greater sage-grouse habitat that had been scarred and damaged by a devastating wildfire.

Mr. Munk has made a significant impact on the State of Nevada and has established a lasting legacy on the international mining industry. His influence has been recognized by the Canadian Business Hall of Fame and the Canadian Mining Hall of Fame, and he was honored with one of Canada’s highest honors for a private citizen when he was made a Companion of the Order of Canada. Mr. Munk was the first Canadian to be awarded the Woodrow Wilson Award for Corporate Citizenship in 2002 and received the Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Medal in 2012.

As Mr. Munk steps down from his role as chairman of the board of Barrick Gold Corporation, I congratulate him on his many years of success and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

JUSTICE FOR ALL ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this week marks the 30th annual National Crime Victims’ Rights Week. It is a time to recognize victims of crime and their families and to acknowledge the efforts to help them recover and rebuild their lives in the wake of tragedy. It is also a time to ask what more we can do to help serve victims of crime and improve our criminal justice system. We have an opportunity this week to pass a bill that will not just pay lip service to crime victims but actually impact and improve their lives.

The Justice for All Act is a bipartisan bill that Senator CORNYN and I introduced nearly 1 year ago to improve the quality of justice in this country. It was approved by the Judiciary Committee in October by a unanimous voice vote, and it cleared the Democratic side of the hotline on March 27. However, it still has not passed the Senate because Senate Republicans object. For reasons that have not been explained, Republicans have failed to consent to passing this commonsense bill. This is no way to treat victims of crime, especially during a week when we seek to honor them.

The Justice for All Act authorizes the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Reduction Act, which has provided significant funding to reduce the backlog of untested rape kits so that victims need not live in fear while kits languish in storage. That program is named after Debbie Smith, who awaited years for her rape kit to be tested. Although delayed for years, that rape kit test ultimately enabled the perpetrator to be caught. She and her husband Rob have worked tirelessly to ensure that others will not have the same experience. I thank Debbie and Rob for their continuing help on this extremely important cause.

The Justice for All Act reauthorization establishes safeguards to prevent wrongful convictions and enhances protections and legal rights for crime victims. It is supported by experts in the field and law enforcement, including the National Center for Victims of Crime, the National Center of Police Organizations, and the National District Attorney Association. Yet, even during Crime Victims’ Week, which coincides with Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, Senate Republicans have not yet shown a willingness to clear the important reauthorization. Senator CORNYN was on the floor just last week and earlier today expressing his commitment to getting this passed and signed into law. I urge him to lead...
his caucus to get it through the Senate. He and I both know that a unanimous voice vote in the Judiciary Committee is uncommon and happens on only the most uncontroversial and uniformly applauded bills. This is one of those bills, and we need to pass this today.

Senator McConnell is also a cosponsor of this bill. This effort has been bipartisan from the beginning, and I am proud that we have the minority leader and the minority whip helping to lead this. This has proved helpful. The Senate Republican leadership, the bill nonetheless remains stalled. Perhaps it is because the House Republican leadership would rather pass a much narrower bill. I trust that the Senate will stand up for all victims who deserve justice, just as we did when the Senate passed an inclusive Violence Against Women Act reauthorization last year.

Our bipartisan Senate legislation strengthens the Kirk Bloodsworth Post-conviction DNA Testing Grant Program, one of the key programs created in the Innocence Protection Act. Kirk Bloodsworth was a young man just out of the Marines when he was sentenced to death for a heinous crime that he did not commit. He was the first death row inmate in the United States to be exonerated through the use of DNA evidence.

Since the Justice for All Act was first enacted in 2004, we continue to see cases where people are found to be innocent after spending years in jail.

Thomas Haynesworth was exonerated in 2011 after spending 27 years in prison for crimes he did not commit, thanks to a grant provided by the Justice for All Act. He was accused of rape in 1984 and wrongfully convicted, and the real perpetrator in this case went on to rape more than a dozen women.

It is an outrage when an innocent person is punished, and this injustice is compounded by the true perpetrator remains on the streets, able to commit more crimes. We are all less safe when the system gets it wrong.

This bill also provides funding for the Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program, which assists laboratories in performing the many forensic tests that are essential to solving crimes and prosecuting offenders.

I cannot imagine why there is an objection to supporting scientific testing and improving the reliability of criminal convictions. Every American, including crime victims, is better served when our justice system has the resources it needs to operate effectively.

If there is a person in the Senate who objects, I ask them to come forward and explain that to me and to the American people. I would welcome that debate.

The hotline on this bipartisan Justice for All Act reauthorization has been running on the Republican side since March 31, and I have not heard one substantive argument against the merits of this bill. Police officers, prosecutors, and crime victims agree on the necessity of this bill. Why can’t we?

The Justice for All Act takes important steps to ensure that all criminal defendants, including those who cannot afford a lawyer, receive effective representation. Setting aside the system, including successful prosecution, depends upon effective representation on both sides.

This is not a time for delay. This is a time for leadership. The stakes are too high and crime victims are depending on us to do the right thing. I urge all Senators, and particularly those in the Republican caucus, to clear this bill today.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. Warren. Mr. President, on April 4, 2014, I was unavoidably absent from the following vote as a result of memorial events related to the tragic deaths of Lieutenant Eddie Walsh and Firefighter Mike Kennedy in Boston on March 26, 2014—rollcall votes No. 97 and 98. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on the motion to table Reid Amendment No. 2878 to H.R. 3979; and “yea” on vote No. 98, on the motion on table the appeal of the ruling of the chair that a third degree amendment was not in order.

WAR CRIMES IN SYRIA

Mr. Cardin. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the ongoing crisis in Syria. Last month marked the 3-year anniversary since the brutal conflict began. According to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2139, which was unanimously accepted in February of this year, the conflict resulted in the death of over 100,000 people in Syria, including at least 10,000 children. UNICEF reports that Syria is among the most dangerous places on Earth to be a child, pointing to high child mortality and a growing risk of traumatic violence, deteriorating access to education, and health concerns. The number of children suffering in Syria more than doubled in the third year of the conflict.

The crisis is only getting worse. Hundreds of thousands of Syrian civilians are under fire by government and opposition forces in violation of internationally accepted laws of Armed Conflict. These war crimes are truly devastating, and the escape of violence, millions of refugees have flooded into neighboring Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan, while thousands more remain internally displaced inside Syria. Last year I visited the Kilis refugee camp in Turkey which is currently sheltering more than 14,000 Syrian refugees. I witnessed first-hand the remarkable bravery of the Syrian refugee population. Many of these families relocated several times within Syria and ultimately made the heart-wrenching decision to leave their country in order to seek food, medical attention, and safety outside of Syria.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has registered more than 2.6 million Syrian refugees with women and children making up more than 80 percent of the refugee population. By the end of this year, the United Nations estimates that the number of refugees could increase to 4 million.

That is why I am a cosponsor of the Syria Humanitarian Resolution of 2014, which urges all parties in Syria to allow for and facilitate immediate, unfettered access to aid throughout the Syrian Arab Republic. This legislation calls for the safety, security, independence, and impartiality of humanitarian workers and demands freedom of movement to deliver aid.

I remain deeply concerned by the instability of the entire region, as violence spills over into neighboring countries such as Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon, and Israel.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper has testified that, “In Syria, the ongoing civil war will probably heighten regional and sectarian tensions.” The influx of Syrian refugees to Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey and Iraq is putting a strain on those countries’ resources.

The United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic reports that pro-government forces have murdered, tortured, assaulted, and raped civilians in Syria. Anti-government groups have also engaged in murder, execution without due process, torture, hostage-taking, and shelling of civilian neighborhoods.

But nowhere is the brutality of this war more evident than in the events of August 21, 2013, when the Syrian Army, under the direction of President Assad, launched a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs. This attack left over 1,400 innocent Syrian civilians dead—many of whom were children.

Assad’s criminal use of chemical weapons against his own people is morally reprehensible and violates internationally accepted rules of war. The international community cannot stand by and allow the murder of innocent men, women, and children to go unchallenged. We must bring Assad and all other perpetrators of gross human rights violations in the Syrian conflict to justice.

It is clear that we must take action. Last week I introduced, the Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act of 2014, S. 2209 along with Senators Rubio and Kaine.

My bill strongly condemns the ongoing violence, the use of chemical weapons, the targeting of civilian populations, and the systematic gross human rights violations carried out by both the Syrian government and opposition forces.

My legislation requires the Secretary of State to provide Congress with a description of violations of internationally recognized human rights abuses
and crimes against humanity committed during the conflict in Syria. Finally, the bill requires the Secretary to report to Congress on efforts by the Department of State and USAID to ensure accountability for these violations and provide a review of the facts concerning any prosecution in the case of Syrian crimes that could be defined under universal jurisdiction.

This Monday marked the 20th anniversary of the genocide in Rwanda. Unfortunately, we have not learned the lesson of the past. We must do better to not only see that sort of atrocities never again occur under our watch, but to ensure that the perpetrators of such heinous crimes are held accountable for their actions.

Ignoring the crisis in Syria is both morally wrong and counterproductive to our National security and that of our allies. War tactics employed in Syria by government and some opposition forces fly in the face of the rules of war. Threats to our National security interests and regional stability, we cannot turn a blind eye to these heinous acts.

I strongly believe that there are times when the international community must stand together to end atrocities, protect innocent lives from crimes against humanity and hold accountable the groups that perpetrate them.

The Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act of 2013 sends the strong message to the international community that the United States is firmly committed to bringing all perpetrators of international crimes in Syria to justice. I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

NATIONAL CONGENITAL DIAPHRAGMATIC HERNIA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss S. Res. 414. I am pleased the Senate has unanimously declared April as National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month for the second consecutive year. I thank my friend and able colleague, Senator BEN Cardin of Maryland, for joining me in this legislation. This resolution is very important to me and my family, as my grandson, Jim Beau, is a CDH survivor. CDH is a defect that occurs when the fetal diaphragm fails to fully develop. The lungs develop at the same time as the diaphragm and the digestive system. When a diaphragmatic hernia occurs, the abdominal organs move into and develop in the chest instead of remaining in the abdomen. With the heart, lungs, and abdominal organs all taking up space in the chest, the lungs do not have space to develop properly. This may cause the lungs to be small and underdeveloped.

A diaphragmatic hernia is a life-threatening condition. When the lungs do not develop properly during pregnancy, it can be difficult for the baby to breathe after birth or the baby is unable to take in enough oxygen to stay healthy.

CDH will normally be diagnosed by a prenatal ultrasound, as early as the 16th week of pregnancy. If undiagnosed before birth, babies born in a facility that is not equipped to treat its compromised system because many CDH babies will need to be placed on a heart-lung bypass machine, which is not available in many hospitals. All babies born with CDH will need to be cared for in a neonatal intensive care unit, NICU, and most will need extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, ECMO.

Babies born with CDH will have difficulty breathing as their lungs are often too small, biochemically and structurally immature. As a result, the babies are intubated as soon as they are born, and parents are often unable to hold their babies for weeks or even months at a time.

Most diaphragmatic hernias are repaired with surgery 1 to 5 days after birth, usually with a Gore-Tex patch. The abdominal organs that have migrated into the chest are put back where they are supposed to be and the hole in the diaphragm is closed, hopefully allowing the affected lungs to expand. Hospitalization often ranges from 3 weeks to 10 weeks following the procedure, depending on the severity of the condition.

Survivors often have difficulty feeding, some require a second surgery to control reflux, others require a feeding tube, and a few will reherniate and require additional repair.

Awareness, good prenatal care, early diagnosis, and skilled treatment are the keys to a greater survival rate in these babies. That is why this resolution is so important.

Within the last year, researchers identified a specific gene that may contribute to CDH. Researchers then use the genetic information and biological samples obtained from patients and their families by working with the Massachusetts General Hospital and the Chil-diagnosed with CDH during my daughter Mary Abigail’s 34th week of pregnancy. At that time, no one in my family had heard of CDH before. Fortunately, she was referred to Dr. David Kays at Shands Children’s Hospital in Gainesville, FL, who is a premier surgeon and expert on CDH.

Jim Beau was born on November 30, 2009. My daughter and her husband Paul heard their son cry out twice after he was born, right before they intubated him, but they were not allowed to hold him.

The doctors let his little lungs get strong before they did the surgery to the development of a diaphragmatic hernia. Up to 20 percent of cases of CDH have a genetic cause due to a chromosome defect or genetic syndrome. According to the CDC, babies born with CDH experience a high mortality rate ranging from 20 percent to 60 percent depending on the severity of the defect and the treatments available at delivery. The mortality rate has remained stable since 1989.

Approximately 40 percent of babies born with CDH will have other birth defects in addition to CDH. The most common is a congenital heart defect.

Babies born with CDH today have a better chance of survival due to early detection and research on treatment options. Researchers are making great progress to determine the cause of this birth defect and to identify optimal treatment methods for babies born with CDH.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities, NCBDDD, and the National Birth Defects Prevention Network, NBDPN, collaborate to identify risk factors for birth defects and to assess the effect of these birth defects on children, families, and the healthcare system.

NBDPN investigators are currently working to examine risk factors for CDH and predictors of long-term survival for infants born with CDH, with analysis planned in 2014 and publication anticipated by 2015.

In addition, investigators at the National Birth Defects Prevention Study, NBDPS, have proposed conducting specific research to better understand risk factors for CDH, as well as factors that predict improved survival rates for infants born with CDH.

In fiscal year 2013, NIH funded approximately $2.560 million in CDH research.

The Developmental Biology and Structural Variations Branch, DBSVB, at the NIH is currently supporting a collaboration between scientists who study CDH and clinicians who work with CDH patients and their families by working with the Massachusetts General Hospital and the Children’s Hospital of Boston. The researchers then use the genetic information and biological samples obtained from patients and their families to identify specific genes that could be involved in the defect.

In 2009, my grandson Jim Beau was diagnosed with CDH during my daughter Mary Abigail’s 34th week of pregnancy. At that time, no one in my family had heard of CDH before. Fortunately, she was referred to Dr. David Kays at Shands Children’s Hospital in Gainesville, FL, who is a premier surgeon and expert on CDH.

Jim Beau was born on November 30, 2009. My daughter and her husband Paul heard their son cry out twice after he was born, right before they intubated him, but they were not allowed to hold him.

The doctors let his little lungs get strong before they did the surgery to
correct the hernia when he was 4 days old.

It turned out that the hole in the hernia was large. His intestines, spleen and one kidney were up in his chest. The skilled surgeon was able to close the hole and properly rearrange the organs. Thankfully, Jim Beau did not have to go on a heart/lung bypass machine, but he was on a ventilator for 12 days and on oxygen for 36 days. In total, he was in the NICU for 43 days before he was able to go home. He is now a healthy, high-spirited 4-year-old and a delight to be around.

Fortunately for my family and thousands of similar families across the United States, a number of physicians are doing incredible work to combat CDH. The CDH survival rate at Shands Children’s Hospital in Gainesville, FL, where my grandson was treated, is one of those fine centers. The survival rate of CDH babies born at Shands is between 80 percent and 90 percent.

Dr. Kays is the head physician and who performed my grandson’s surgeries, uses gentle ventilation therapy as opposed to hyperventilation. Gentle ventilation therapy is less aggressive and therefore protects the underdeveloped lungs.

Dr. Kays published a paper in the Annals of Surgery in October 2013 regarding his work with CDH babies. He and his colleagues reviewed 208 CDH patients to analyze the impact of the timing of the hernia repair on babies born with CDH. This study found that those with more severe CDH may benefit from repair before ECMO, while those with a less severe hernia have higher survival rates and reduced need of ECMO if the repair surgery is delayed at least 48 hours after birth, as was the case with Jim Beau. This conclusion is a vital step in the development of a risk-specific treatment strategy for management of CDH. The final line of Dr. Kays’ paper should be noted: "[T]his study is a unique and inclusive series of patients with CDH should be reassuring to physicians and parents faced with a new prenatals diagnosis of CDH.

My family was very lucky that Jim Beau’s defect was caught before he was born, and that he was in the right place to receive excellent care for his CDH.

The resolution Senator Cardin and I introduced is important because it will bring awareness to this birth defect, and this awareness will save lives. Although hundreds of thousands of babies have been diagnosed with this defect, the causes are still unknown and more research is needed. Every year more is learned and there are more successes. We are making good progress and we must continue our efforts.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation to bring awareness to CDH.

TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT 35TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish to celebrate the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, TRA, which has served as a tangible symbol of the unbreakable friendship between the United States and Taiwan. Today, the partnership between our two countries is stronger than ever before.

The 1979 Taiwan Relations Act provides the framework for our official engagements with Taiwan, which marked the end of our official diplomatic ties. For 35 years the TRA has facilitated a partnership committed to facilitating trade, investment, cooperation, and promoting regional security.

The bilateral achievements made through the TRA have allowed our citizens to create innovative and lasting advancements to the world economy. Today, Taiwan stands as our 12th largest trading partner, and in 2013, the United States and Taiwan traded over $63 billion in goods and services. This bilateral relationship has supported thousands of jobs in both countries, and we must remain committed to the mutual gains this collaboration can provide.

I applaud our West Virginia businesses that have recognized the potential of the Taiwanese economy and export-oriented commodities, high-tech goods, and services to Taiwan last year. We must build on this strong foundation while helping Taiwan meet its needs for foreign sources of energy. I will continue to seek opportunities for further trade integration with Taiwan and shared economic prosperity.

I look forward to working hand-in-hand with our friends in Taiwan to ensure the next generation of American leaders can stand where I stand today, 35 years from now, and celebrate several more decades of peaceful and vibrant collaboration.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the Armenian genocide is sometimes called the “forgotten genocide.” But every April, we come together to remember and commemorate the Armenian genocide and to declare that we will never forget.

In order to prevent future genocides, we must clearly acknowledge and remember those of the past. For many years, the Armenian genocide had been a resolution which clearly affirms the factual reality that the Armenian genocide did occur. I was a strong and vocal supporter of the genocide resolution for my entire tenure in the House, and I am proud to have joined Senator Menedez and Senator Krik in introducing the Armenian genocide resolution in the Senate.

This is the 99th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, yet the suffering will continue for Armenians and non-Armenians the world over. Today, allows denial to exist and prevail. It is long overdue for the United States to join the many other nations that have formally recognized the Armenian genocide.

That is why today’s passage by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the genocide resolution in advance of the 99th anniversary is so historic. I was proud to vote for this important resolution today in committee and I will keep fighting to ensure its passage by the full Senate. I will continue to work with the Armenian-American community to build a prosperous and bright future for the Armenian people.

We must continue to stand up for our ally, economically, morally, politically, and militarily. Armenia is an ally of ours that can stand with us in the world and is an ally of ours that can stand up for our other allies when we are all threatened. Armenia has a long and painful history that includes suffering and pain. Armenia is a country that has proven to be a strong ally of ours, and we must continue to build a strong partnership and a strong friendship.

The Armenian people are true survivors. Despite repeated invasions, loss of land, and the loss of between one-half and three-quarters of their population in the genocide, the people of Armenia have prevailed.

We have a shared responsibility to ensure that the Armenian people are able to build their own independent and prosperous future. Together we can continue to build an Armenia that is respected and honored by its allies and neighbors. But for this to happen, there needs to be universal acknowledgement of the horror that was the Armenian genocide.

TRIBUTE TO MARION LOOMIS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, after 38 years with the Wyoming Mining Association, Marion Loomis is retiring.

Marion started his career in the early 1970s with the State of Wyoming’s Department of Economic Planning and Development as an economic development geologist. In one of his first jobs, he ran the fuel allocation office during the Arab oil embargo in 1973. In 1976, he joined the Wyoming Mining Association and was made executive director in 1991. His vast knowledge and experience are tremendous assets to the State and its people, and we are grateful for his service.

In Wyoming, we have adopted the Code of the West as our official State code of ethics. Marion Loomis personifies the code. This list of ten ideals everyone must embrace is written by perfectly describes Marion’s personal and professional—demeanor. Marion Loomis takes quiet pride in his work. With his advocacy, Wyoming has seen exponential growth in the coal industry. When he began, Wyoming produced 8. We must continue to stand up for our ally, economically, morally, politically, and militarily. Armenia is an ally of ours that can stand with us in the world and is an ally of ours that can stand up for our other allies when we are all threatened. Armenia has a long and painful history that includes suffering and pain. Armenia is a country that has proven to be a strong ally of ours, and we must continue to build a strong partnership and a strong friendship.

The Armenian people are true survivors. Despite repeated invasions, loss of land, and the loss of between one-half and three-quarters of their population in the genocide, the people of Armenia have prevailed.

We have a shared responsibility to ensure that the Armenian people are able to build their own independent and prosperous future. Together we can continue to build an Armenia that is respected and honored by its allies and neighbors. But for this to happen, there needs to be universal acknowledgement of the horror that was the Armenian genocide.
Marion has never been one to boast or brag. Instead, he lets his accomplishments speak for themselves. In the past 40 years, Wyoming’s production of trona has grown from 1 mine that produced 300,000 tons per year to 4 mines which produce over 10 million tons annually. Wyoming has an entire town and an entire airport named after Marion. They know that his opinions reflect a lifetime of study and are tough, balanced, and fair.

Throughout his career, Marion Loomis has been a champion for Wyoming’s energy industry. He was a steadfast leader for the Wyoming Mining Association during several boom and bust cycles in energy development. The State’s uranium production is a prime example. He witnessed a booming industry stagnate in the 1990s. Today, it has emerged again as a valuable resource. Marion has always promoted Wyoming as a key player in our Nation’s quest for energy independence. He truly does ride for the brand, and his leadership is inspiring.

Marion retired from the Wyoming Mining Association earlier this month. He will be missed, but he has left both the association and the industry stronger, thanks to his dedication and hard work. In the days ahead, Marion plans to fish the streams of Wyoming’s Bighorn Mountains, where he and his wife have a cabin. I cannot think of a more fitting reward for a job—and a career—well done.

NATIONAL HEALTHCARE DECISIONS DAY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to recognize National Healthcare Decisions Day, which is next Wednesday, April 16, a day to educate the public about advance care planning and encourage them to have conversations with loved ones to plan for end-of-life decisions. I am pleased that over 50 organizations representing health providers, communities of faith, the legal community, and the public sector—in Florida are participating in the day’s events.

This issue has been important to me throughout my career, and as the chairman of the Senate’s Special Committee on Aging, I had the opportunity to chair a hearing on end-of-life care last June. We found that polls show most Americans would like to talk about their advanced care needs, but they do not know how or with whom to have these conversations. In fact, only about 20 percent of Americans have executed an advanced directive, in part due to a lack of knowledge about planning.

Our hearing also touched on some commonsense solutions that individuals have used to broach this topic with their loved ones. For example, Aging with Dignity, an organization based in my home State of Florida, has created a simple resource called Five Wishes that is focused on things that are meaningful for patients and families, rather than a system of advance care planning dictated exclusively by the terms of doctors and lawyers. Five Wishes takes into account personal, emotional, and spiritual needs as well as medical wishes. With a straightforward, easy-to-complete questionnaire, Five Wishes takes end-of-life decisions out of the emergency room and into the living room.

There are also areas where the Federal Government could help alleviate some of the barriers individuals face in trying to complete an advance directive. For example, one individual could use the assistance of a trusted health care provider in completing an advance directive. In 2010, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—CMS—included advance care planning as a reimbursable item as part of the annual wellness visit for Medicare beneficiaries under the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately, just a short time later, CMS reversed itself and removed this service as reimbursable. I hope this decision is revisited.

At the same time, there are efforts at the State level. For example, in Florida, a consortium of health care providers, faith-based groups, and the legal profession are collaborating to establish Lifeline: Physician Orders for Sustaining Treatment program to ensure that advance directives are honored.

It is my hope Congress will support the goals of National Healthcare Decisions Day. Advance care planning is a desired health service and should be a normal part of health care. Advance care planning can empower individuals and allow adults to voice their medical treatment preferences. Together, we can ensure Americans’ wishes for medical care at the end of their lives are respected and achieved.

MEDICARE PHYSICIAN PAYMENT SYSTEM

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, recently the Senate failed to permanently repeal the current system of automatic payment cuts for physicians who treat Medicare patients and to replace it with a more sensible system for reimbursing physicians. Instead, the Senate voted—yet again—to pass a short-term patch to this broken system, which postponed these payment cuts for one more year.

After speaking with Medicare providers in my State, I decided to oppose this legislation since it provides only a bandoal for a wholly broken system. I believe that an enduring solution is possible and absolutely necessary, and I will continue to fight for a more sustainable replacement that rewards physicians for the high-quality care they deliver.

Minnesota is No. 1 in the Nation when it comes to the quality of the health care that we provide. If our system were sustainable, it could reward providers for their efficiency and quality—rather than the quantity of the services they administer—we could improve the value of the care that our seniors receive while rewarding providers who keep patients healthy. We can do that by overhauling the Medicare physician payment formula and implementing a system that rewards health care value over volume, and that does not force physicians to work harder to do that than now. Over the past 10 years, Congress has spent $150 billion on short-term fixes; the Congressional Budget Office estimated earlier this year that the cost of permanently repealing the formula and replacing it with a more sustainable program now would be even lower than that total so far. For the first time since the passage of our current formula, there was bipartisan, bicameral legislation to fully repeal the Medicare physician payment formula and replace it with a payment system that would better reward physicians for providing high-value care.

We have a unique opportunity to permanently solve this problem. Temporary patches—like the one just passed—only perpetuate the instability created by the annual threat of payment reductions. This instability is bad for patients and bad for providers. Take, for example, the young physician who recently called my office to discuss how proposed payment cuts would affect his practice and his future. As a father and a new surgeon, this doctor described the challenges of paying off high levels of debt and starting a new practice in a time of fiscal uncertainty. These uncertain fixes will not help this young doctor to establish a practice and provide the best possible care to his patients. Stopgap measures fail to address the underlying problem with the way Medicare pays for physician services, and I am tired of postponing good policies that help support high-quality providers in Minnesota.

It is clear that now is time to permanently repeal and replace the Medicare physician payment formula that is why I did not support the legislation to temporarily patch our provider payment system and why I am committed to working towards a permanent solution that would put in place a payment system to reward high-value care.

My goal is to make sure that Medicare beneficiaries, now and in the future, have access to high-quality, affordable health care services. To achieve this, Medicare must be on sound financial footing and be prepared to meet the needs of an aging baby boomer generation.

Replacing Medicare’s broken system of provider payments with a system to promote high-value care is a critical step in this direction. I remain committed to helping to take this step.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an invaluable member of my staff on the Select Committee on Intelligence. Andrew Kerr, a former Marine, has not only worked for me face around the committee for the last 7 years, but he will leave us shortly to return to the State Department. I am
honored to have the opportunity to thank Andrew for his service on the committee, and I want to publicly note my appreciation for his outstanding work.

Since becoming the vice chairman of the committee in 2011, I have often looked to Andrew for guidance and counsel on intelligence and counterterrorism matters. Despite the successes or shortcomings of the intelligence community, Andrew has always provided grounded and dependable advice. He has also done extensive oversight work designed to reduce excessive spending and encourage efficiency in the intelligence community.

Andrew is a dedicated public servant and I am sure the State Department is happy to have him return. His presence will be missed on the committee and in the Senate, but I want to wish him well as he returns to the Executive branch.

Thanks Andrew, for a job well done.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SOUTH ANCHORAGE HIGH SCHOOL
• Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to South Anchorage High School as they celebrate their 10th anniversary.

Since opening 10 years ago, the South Anchorage High School has excelled both academically and interscholastically by preparing students for higher education and job training. In addition to a full complement of advanced placement classes for students, the Wolverines also annually achieve one of the highest graduation rates in the state at 88 percent. These academic achievements are a testament to the knowledgeable teachers, hard-working students, and supportive parents that call the south Anchorage area home.

Along with their academic achievements, South Anchorage has also been very successful in interscholastic athletic events. With over eight State championships in various sports over the past few years, South High School's students have shown they can excel in the classroom and on the field.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing South Anchorage High School on their 10th anniversary and wish them continued growth and success.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN T. WATTS
• Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I wish to honor John T. Watts. Tommy, as he is known to his friends and colleagues, is a friend of mine. I know he is so proud of his three children, six grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. It is notable that his daughter Kimberly is married to former U.S. Congressman Zach Wamp.

A native of Old Hickory, TN, Tommy moved to my hometown of Chattanooga, TN, at the age of 10. After graduating from Red Bank High School, he attended Tennessee Tech University. He returned to Chattanooga and began working for Southern Champion Tray in 1976.

During his 38 years of service to Southern Champion Tray, Tommy served in a variety of capacities, including as a plant supervisor and most recently, as structural design manager. Winning numerous design awards in the paper and box industry, his designs can be found in places such as Chattanooga Bakery and Top Flight.

He distinguished himself within the company by being the only employee to work in all three company locations—two in Chattanooga and one in Mansfield, TX. I wish him and his family all the best as he finishes his impressive career at the end of this month.

REMEMBERING VAL OGDEN
• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a strong community leader, dedicated public servant, and advocate from the State of Washington, Val Ogden.

Val was a longtime friend and I would not be where I am today without her support. She was a community advocate, in the truest and strongest sense of the word, and was a champion for women and children.

She was a member of the Washington State House of Representatives, serving as speaker pro tempore. Val was a leader for her community, securing funding for Washington State University Vancouver. She was a strong Democrat and very active in the Clark County Democratic Party. Val served as the executive director of the Clark County TWCA.

But you can’t talk about Val without talking about her husband of 67 years, Dan. They were a team and were always working together to make their community a better place to live.

Val was an outstanding mother and grandmother. Along with Dan, she is survived by three children: Dan, Janeth and Patti, six grandchildren, and six great-grandchildren.

She will be missed by many but her legacy and leadership lives on.

Mr. President, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in paying homage to Val Ogden. She lived a full life and our thoughts are with her loved ones at this time of great loss.

BUTTERNUT MOUNTAIN FARM
• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to bring to your attention to a remarkable Vermont family.

The Marvin family has an incredible family tie to Vermont and to one of the State’s best known products—maple syrup. David Marvin founded Butternut Mountain Farm in 1972 on land his father purchased in Johnson, VT. In the 1960s, David Marvin has a strong and enduring commitment to an iconic Vermont industry. Through careful stewardship, and with the help of his wife Lucy, he has built a company renowned for quality maple products.

The family produced maple syrup, grew Christmas trees and consulted on mountain farms. Today, David’s children, Ira and Emma, are integral to the operation, which includes more than 80 employees, maple syrup from 300 Vermont farms, and a 75,000 square-foot facility in Morrisville, VT. Butter nut Mountain Farm is more than just a producer of maple syrup; it has also become an effective marketer of a treasured product of Vermont.

The family and the company have been recognized for their success. Just a decade after the company’s founding, for example, Butternut Mountain Farm was named Vermont State Tree Farm of the Year and National Tree Farm of the Year by the American Forest Institute.

The Marwins are encouraging a culture of conservation. Their Morrisville operation is increasingly relying on renewable energies and energy efficiency. The family has also developed a pay structure that seeks to reward employees with flexible hours, to help reduce commuting costs, and a fair wage.

It is also worth noting that the Marvin family’s business plays a crucial role in supporting the jobs of countless Vermonters throughout the state who produce maple syrup which is bottled by Butternut Mountain Farm.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2195. An act to deny admission to the United Nations who has been found to have engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.
The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 10, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2186. An act to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorrist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5296. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Watermelon Research and Promotion Plan; Importer Membership Requirements” (Docket No. AMS–FV–11–0031) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5294. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Special Leadership and Low Intensity Conflict), Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), Defense of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the training of the U.S. Special Operations Forces with friendly foreign forces during fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5295. A communication from the Associate Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Syrian Sanctions Regulations” (31 CFR Part 542) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.


EC–5297. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Generator Verification Reliability Standards” (Docket No. RM13–16–000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5298. A communication from the Director, Equal Opportunities Equal Diversity Programs, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration’s fiscal year 2014 annual report relative to the Notice and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5299. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notice and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No PEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5300. A communication from the Associate Commissioner, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notice and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No PEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5301. A communication from the Director of the National Park Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency’s fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notice and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No PEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.


EC–5305. A joint communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Rollovers to Qualified Plans” (Rev. Rul. 2014–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5306. A communication from the Director of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Health Insurance Providers Fee: Procedural and Administrative Guidance” (Notice 2014–24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5307. A communication from the Assistant Secretary (Special Leadership and Low Intensity Conflict), Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), Defense of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Enhanced Prudential Standards for Bank Holding Companies and their Nonbank Affiliates” (RIN7100–AD86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5308. A communication from the Chair of the Broadband Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of the Commission’s Rules regarding Beneficial Ownership Registrants in the 1655–1710 MHz, 1755–1780 MHz, and 2155–2180 MHz Bands” ((GN Docket No. 13–185) (FCC 14–31)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5309. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Related to Reorganization Commission on Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking” (MB Docket No. 10–71, FCC 14–29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5310. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulatory Guide for Response Strategies for Aircraft Threats” (Regulatory Guide 1.214, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5311. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulatory Guide for Response Strategies for Aircraft Threats” (Regulatory Guide 1.214, Revision 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5312. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Rollovers to Qualified Plans” (Rev. Rul. 2014–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5313. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Health Insurance Providers Fee: Procedural and Administrative Guidance” (Notice 2014–24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5314. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the United States People’s Republic of China Science and Technology Agreement of 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5315. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration’s fiscal year 2013 report relative to the Notice and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No PEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5316. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacuous Ciss in the Office of Management and Budget, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 10, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5317. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Department of Transportation fiscal year 2014 annual report relative to the Notice and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No PEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.
PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS
The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-233. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, proposing to pass H.R. 2510—Helping Veterans exposed to Toxic Chemicals Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:
H.R. 567. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land holdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-148).
H.R. 862. A bill to authorize the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960 (Rept. No. 113-149).
H.R. 876. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-150).
H.R. 1138. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area (Rept. No. 113-151).

By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:
S. 1728. A bill to amend the Uniformed Services Voting Act of 2002 to require States to develop contingency plans to address unexpected emergencies or natural disasters that may threaten to disrupt the administration of an election for Federal office, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SCHUMER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:
S. 1837. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to develop contingency plans to address unexpected emergencies or natural disasters that may threaten to disrupt the administration of an election for Federal office, and for other purposes.
S. 2197. A bill to repeal certain requirements related to identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.
S. 1937. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.
S. 2236. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance efforts to address antimicrobial resistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
S. 2238. A bill to ensure that the United States Government in no way recognizes annexation claims; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
S. 2240. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage Medicare beneficiaries to voluntarily adopt advance directives guiding the medical care they receive; to the Committee on Finance.
S. 2239. A bill to enhance the safety of drug-free playgrounds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
S. 2234. A bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive family care for caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for the uniforms services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.
S. 2263. A bill to establish the prudential regulator of community and independent depository institutions as the conduit and arbiter of all Federal financial oversight, examination, and reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE
The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nominations lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Julie Anne Koenen and ending with Brian Keith Woody, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Aaron Schubert)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Raymond F. Arnold and ending with Frenio F. Zora, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Christopher David Frederick and ending with Julio Maldonado, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Serjan Torbjorn and ending with Geoffrey W. Wiggins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Roberta Mahoney and ending with Ann Marie Vassilevich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014. (minus 3 nominees: Susan K. Brems; Sharon Lee Croner; Biele)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kathleen M. Adams and ending with William Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kate E. Addison and ending with William F. Zeman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Gerald Michael Feierstein and ending with David Michael Satterfield, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014. (minus 3 nominees: Douglas A. Koneff; Leslie Meredith Tsou; Lon C. Fairchild)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Matthew D. Lowe and ending with William G. Zehr, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kevin Timothy Covert and ending with Paul Wulfsohn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Beata Angelica and ending with Benjamin Beardsley Dille, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 30, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Daniel Menco Hirsch)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Mark L. Driver and ending with Karl William Wurster, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Scott S. Simdelar and ending with Christine M. Sloop, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2014. (Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)
S. 2250. A bill to extend the Travel Promotion Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2251. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to develop and test an expanded and advanced role for direct care workers who provide long-term services and supports to older individuals in efforts to coordinate care and improve the efficiency of service delivery; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2252. A bill to reaffirm the importance of community banking and community banking reform on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, to ensure that the Federal Reserve Board of Governors has a member who has previous experience in community banking or community banking supervision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2253. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide a temporary shift in the scheduled collection of the transitional reinsurance program payments; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKKAY, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2254. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE HEAT grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2255. A bill to remove the Kurdish Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan from the list of terrorist organizations and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. Res. 420. A resolution designating the week of October 6 through October 12, 2014, as “Naturopathic Medicine Week” to recognize the value of naturopathic medicine in providing safe and affordable health care; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. Res. 421. A resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and military achievement by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending them for leadership and valor in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 422. A resolution to authorize written testimony, document production, and representation in Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Foundation, Inc. v. United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 162
At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 162, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004.

S. 367
At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy cap.

S. 489
At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 576
At the request of Mr. Pnyor, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRIYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to reform laws relating to small public housing agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 734
At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans’ dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 1163
At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1163, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation.

S. 1174
At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1189
At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1189, a bill to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, and for other purposes.

S. 1339
At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1331, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 1459
At the request of Mr. Udall of New Mexico, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1468, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Network for Manufacturing Innovation and for other purposes.

S. 1500
At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to declare the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, a terrorist attack, and to ensure that the victims of the attack and their families receive the same honors and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families.
At the request of Mr. Moran, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Enzi) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of general welfare benefits provided by Indian tribes.

S. 1507

At the request of Ms. Landrieu, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. King) were added as cosponsors of S. 1530, a bill to realign structures and allocate resources in the Federal Government, in keeping with the core American belief that families are the best protection for children and the bedrock of any society, to bolster United States diplomacy and assistance targeted at ensuring that every child can grow up in a permanent, safe, nurturing, and loving family, and to strengthen intercountry adoption to the United States and around the world and ensure that it becomes a viable and fully developed option for children in need, and for other purposes.

S. 1530

At the request of Ms. Heitkamp, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Heinrich) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1622, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboloff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 1622

At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1645, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 1645

At the request of Mr. Cornyn, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Pryor) were added as cosponsors of S. 1728, a bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve ballot accessibility to uniformed services voters and overseas voters, and for other purposes.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. Donnelly, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1802, a bill to provide equal treatment for utility special entities using utility operations-related swaps, and for other purposes.

S. 1802

At the request of Mr. Begich, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. Shaheen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1839, a bill to make certain luggage and travel articles eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

S. 1839

At the request of Mr. Blunt, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Brown), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Toomey) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow) were added as cosponsors of S. 1862, a bill to grant the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Monuments Men, in recognition of their heroic role in the protection, and restoration, of monuments, works of art, and artifacts of cultural importance during and following World War II.

S. 1862

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Paul) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. Mikulski) were added as cosponsors of S. 1975, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an above-the-line deduction for child care expenses, and for other purposes.

S. 1975

At the request of Mrs. Hagan, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCaskill), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Ayotte), the Senator from Montana (Mr. Walsh) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Burr) were added as cosponsors of S. 1996, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 1996

At the request of Mr. Roberts, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Thune) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Wicker) were added as cosponsors of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 2037

At the request of Mrs. Shaheen, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2078, a bill to prohibit Federal funding for motorcycle checkpoints, and for other purposes.

S. 2078

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Kirk) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2082, a bill to provide for the development of criteria under the Medicare program for medically necessary short inpatient hospital stays, and for other purposes.

S. 2082

At the request of Mr. Heller, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Toomey) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Thune) were added as cosponsors of S. 2091, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing by the Department of Veterans Affairs of claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2091

At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Murphy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2100, a bill to promote the use of clean cookstoves and fuels to save lives, improve livelihoods, empower women, and protect the environment by creating a thriving global market for clean and efficient household cooking solutions.

S. 2100

At the request of Mr. Boozman, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Enzi) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations with respect to the medical certification of certain aircraft pilots, and for other purposes.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. Heinrich, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2140, a bill to improve the transition between experimental permits and commercial licenses for commercial reusable launch vehicles.

S. 2140

At the request of Mr. Udall of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2163, a bill to establish an emergency watershed protection disaster assistance fund to be available to the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance for any natural disaster.

S. 2163

At the request of Mr. Alexander, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2178, 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, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 2178

At the request of Mr. Walsh, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. Harkin, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCaskill), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Brown), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Reed), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. Mikulski), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren), the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Cardin), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Franken), the
At the request of Mr. Rubbo, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. Hatch) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 34, a concurrent resolution expressing the interest of Congress that the President should hold the Russian Federation accountable for being in material breach of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions
By Mr. Cardin (for himself, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Booker, Mr. Harkin, Mr. Sanders, and Mrs. Gillibrand):

S. 2235. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Cardin. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Democracy Restoration Act, known as the DRA. I want to thank Judiciary Committee Chairman Leahy and Senators Durbin, Whitehouse, Booker, Harkin, and Sanders as original cosponsors of this legislation.

As the late Senator Kennedy often said, civil rights is the "unfinished business" of America. The Democracy Restoration Act would restore voting rights in Federal elections to approximately 5.8 million citizens who have been released from prison and are back living in their communities.

After the Civil War, Congress enacted the 15th Amendment, which provides that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Unfortunately, many States passed laws to nationalize the Jim Crow period after the Civil War to make it more difficult for newly-freed slaves to vote in elections. Such laws included poll taxes, literacy tests, and disenfranchisement measures. Some disenfranchisement measures applied to misdemeanor convictions and in practice could result in lifetime disenfranchisement, even for individuals that successfully reintegrated into their communities as law-abiding citizens.

It took Congress and the States nearly another century to eliminate the poll tax, upon the ratification of the Twenty-Fourth Amendment in 1964. However, the Amendment provides that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax."

Shortly thereafter Congress enacted the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which swept away numerous State laws and procedures that had denied African-Americans the right to vote in the decades since the Civil War. The act outlawed the use of literacy or history tests that voters had to pass before registering to vote or casting their ballot. The act also prohibits States from imposing any "voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure . . . to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote in any State election on account of race or color." Congress overwhelmingly reauthorized the Act in 2006, which was signed into law by President George W. Bush. Congress is now working on legislation to revitalize the VRA after recent Supreme Court decisions curtailed its reach.

In 2014, I am concerned that there are still several areas where the legacy of Jim Crow laws and State disenfranchisement statutes lead to unfairness in Federal elections. First, State laws of sovereign jurisdiction provide that voting rights vary widely throughout the country, such that persons in some States can easily regain their voting rights, while in other States persons effectively lose their right to vote permanently. Second, these State disenfranchisement laws have a disproportionate impact on racial and ethnic minorities. Third, this patchwork of State laws results in the lack of a uniform standard for eligibility to vote in Federal elections, an unfair disparity and unequal participation in Federal elections based solely on where an individual lives. Finally, studies indicate that former prisoners who have voting rights restored are less likely to reoffend, and disenfranchisement hinders their rehabilitation and reintegration into their community.

In 35 States, convicted individuals may not vote while they are on parole. In 11 States, a conviction can result in lifetime disenfranchisement. Several States require prisoners to seek discretionary pardons from Governors, or action by the parole or pardon board, in order to regain their right to vote. Several States deny the right to vote to individuals convicted of certain misdemeanors. States are slowly moving or repeal or loosen many of these barriers to voting for ex-prisoners.

Studies estimate 5,850,000 citizens of the United States, about 1 in 40 adults in the United States, currently cannot vote as a result of a felony conviction. Of the 5,850,000 citizens barred from voting, only 25 percent are in prison. Nearly 75 percent of the disenfranchised reside in their communities while on probation or parole after having completed their sentences. Approximately 2,600,000 citizens who have completed their sentences remain disenfranchised due to restrictive State laws. In six States: Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia—more than 7 percent of the total population is disenfranchised.

Studies show that a growing number of African-American men, for example, are act specifically disenfranchised. Given current rates of incarceration, approximately 1 in 3 of the next generation of African-American men will be disenfranchised at some point during their lifetime. Currently, 1 of every 13 African-American men will be disenfranchised because of felony disenfranchisement, which is a rate 4 times greater than non-African-Americans. Nearly 8 percent of African-Americans are disenfranchised, compared to less than 2 percent of non-African-Americans. In 3 states more than 1 in 5 African-Americans are unable to vote because of prior convictions; the rates are Florida at 23 percent, Kentucky at 22 percent, and Virginia at 20 percent.

Latino citizens are disproportionately disenfranchised based on their disproportionate representation in the criminal justice system. If current incarceration trends hold, 17 percent of Latino men will be incarcerated during their lifetime, in contrast to less than 6 percent of non-Latino white men. When analyzing the data across 10 States, Latinos generally have disproportionately higher rates of disenfranchisement compared to their percentage of the voting age population. In 6 out of 10 States studied in 2003, Latinos constitute more than 10 percent of the total number of persons disenfranchised by State felony laws. In 4 States, California, 37 percent; New York, 94 percent; Texas, 30 percent; and Arizona, 27 percent, Latinos were disenfranchised by a rate of more than 25 percent. Native Americans are also disproportionately disenfranchised.

Congress has addressed part of this problem by enacting the Fair Sentencing Act to partially reduce the sentencing disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine convictions. Congress is now considering legislation
that would more broadly revise mandatory sentencing procedures and create a fairer system of sentencing. While I welcome these steps, I believe that Congress should take stronger action now to remedy this particular problem. The legislation would restore rights to prisoners after their release from incarceration. It requires that prisoners receiving Federal funds notify people about their right to vote in Federal elections when they are leaving prison, including probation, or convicted of a misdemeanor. The bill authorizes the Department of Justice and individuals harmed by violation of this act to sue to enforce its provisions. The bill generally provides State election officials with a reasonable period to resolve voter eligibility complaints without a lawsuit before an election.

The legislation is narrowly crafted to apply to Federal elections, and retains the State's ability to re-establish voting qualifications. This legislation is therefore consistent with Congressional authority under the Constitution and voting rights statutes, as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court.

I applaud this legislation that has been endorsed by a large coalition of public interest organizations, including: civil rights and reform organizations; religious and faith-based organizations; and law enforcement and criminal justice organizations. In particular I want to thank the Brennan Center for Justice, the ACLU, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the NAACP for their work on this legislation.

This legislation is ultimately designed to reduce recidivism rates and help reintegrate ex-prisoners back into society. When prisoners are released, they are expected to obey the law, get a job, and pay taxes as they are re-established and reintegrated into their community. With these responsibilities and obligations of citizenship should also come the rights of citizenship, including the right to vote.

In 2008, President George W. Bush signed the Second Chance Act into law, after overwhelming approval and strong bipartisan support in Congress. The legislation expanded the Prison Re-Entry Initiative, by providing job training, placement services, transitional housing, drug treatment, medical care, and faith-based mentoring. At the signing ceremony, President Bush said: "We believe that even those who have struggled with a dark past can find brighter days ahead. One way we act on that belief is by helping former prisoners who have paid for their crimes. We help them build new lives as productive members of our society."

The Democracy Restoration Act is fully consistent with the goals of the Second Chance Act, as Congress and the States seek to reduce recidivism rates, strengthen the quality of life in our communities and make them safer, and reduce the burden on taxpayers.

More recently, in a February 2014 speech, Attorney General Eric Holder called on elected officials to reexamine disenfranchisement statutes and enact reforms to restore voting rights.

I therefore urge Congress to address the issue of disenfranchisement and support this legislation.

By Mrs. MURRAY:
S. 2243. A bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to extend benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. President, I come to the floor today to introduce the Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act. This is a bill that will make critical improvements to how we support our ill and injured veterans and their caregivers.

I am especially pleased to be joined this morning by our former colleague Senator Elizabeth Dole, who has come to the floor today and who has been such a tremendous advocate for a woman in working to bring these caregiver issues to national attention. I really appreciate her being here and being such a champion on this, and a leader.

She has brought people from all over the country together to make a difference for our caregivers and for our veterans.

We also have many of the very caregivers this bill is designed to help—representing, by the way, almost every State—in the gallery today to see this legislation introduced. I am very proud they are here. It is incredibly important that they are here today and on Capitol Hill because, as the Presiding Officer knows, our caregivers work extremely hard without any recognition, and they are doing it for themselves. In fact, most of the caregivers I have met sound much like the veterans and servicemembers they care for when they say: Oh, this isn’t about me; I am just doing my part. So last week, when RAND released their comprehensive, groundbreaking study on military caregivers, they chose a very appropriate title: “Hidden Heroes.” That is why it is so important to have all of those caregivers here today and weekly to make sure we all understand what they do.

I am very proud to be introducing this bill not only as a Senator and a senior member of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee and someone who has fought so hard for the implementation of the VA caregivers program, but, as many of my colleagues know, for me, this is really a deeply personal issue.

Growing up, I saw firsthand the many ways military service can affect both veterans and their families. My father served in World War II. He was among the first soldiers to land in Okinawa. He came home as a disabled veteran and was awarded the Purple Heart.

Later in life he was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis. Eventually he became too sick to work at the little five-and-dime store he managed, and my mom became his caregiver. This was no small burden for my mom, who had raised seven children, care for my dad, and was now the primary source of income for our family.

Today, after more than a decade of two wars, men and women in uniform, as did my father, have done everything that has been asked of them and so much more. But now in this conflict winds down, the support we provide cannot end when the war no longer leads the nightly news broadcasts and disappears from the front pages of our newspapers. It is an enduring commitment for those who will first need help now or those who will need help later in their lives. It is a lifetime of care for so many.

In so many cases, the responsibility for providing that care often falls on the loved ones of severely injured veterans, who have their courage and their devotion in taking on these responsibilities is inspiring for all of us. They are the reason we created the VA caregivers program, which now provides these family members with health care and counseling and training and respite and a living stipend.

I was proud to lead congressional efforts to push the VA to stop delaying the implementation of the caregivers program and restore the eligibility criteria to the intent of the law. Thankfully, as we know, in the end the White House and the VA announced they would allow more caregivers of more veterans to be eligible for benefits and finally got the program implemented. But there is a lot more we can do because, as the RAND study clearly shows us, caregivers are still struggling. Military caregivers have significantly worse health than noncaregivers, and they are at higher risk for depression. The stress they live under jeopardizes their relationships and puts them at greater risk of divorce, and they have trouble with employment and keeping health insurance. There is no way we will sit by and let caregivers and veterans face this on their own—not when we can make it a little bit easier.

The bill we are introducing this morning, the Military and Veterans Caregivers and Services Improvement Act, makes some broad changes to help give caregivers and veterans the tools they need to help tackle what they face. I wish to take a moment on the floor today to highlight just a few of the important provisions contained in this bill.

First and foremost, this bill will make veterans of all eras eligible for the full range of caregiver support programs. This is the first step in creating the post-9/11 veterans caregivers program. Now that the VA has had some time to get this program
and their median weekly earnings were third lower than the national average—

Under the bill, caregiver services will also be expanded to include childcare, financial advice, and legal counseling. Those are some of the top and currently unmet needs of family caregivers.

The bill will also require the Federal Government to meet the unique needs of employees who are caregivers with flexible work arrangements so they can stay employed while caring for their veteran. I, of course, want to see all employers make these kinds of accommodations for caregivers, but I want the Federal Government to lead by example.

When it comes to the Department of Defense, the bill makes several improvements to the special compensation for assistance with activities of daily living—first, by making those benefits permanent, and second, eligibility for special compensation would also be set at a more appropriate level of disability and would be more inclusive of mental health injuries and TBI.

The Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act addresses a key theme identified by RAND. There are many services inside the government and outside to assist caregivers, but these programs are not coordinated. Eligibility criteria are different for each one of them, and there is not enough oversight to ensure the quality of those services. So what our bill does is create a national interagency working group on caregiver services. It will coordinate caregiver policy among all the different departments and create standards of care and oversight tools to make sure our veterans and their caregivers receive high-quality services.

The last provision I wish to highlight is intended to help a military spouse who may be required to become the primary source of income for the family after the service member has been injured, just as my mom was. In order to help that spouse get the job they need to support their family, this bill will allow the injured service member or veteran to transfer their post-9/11 GI bill benefits to their dependents by exempting them from the length of service requirement that would currently prevent them from transferring those benefits. Injured veterans should not be penalized because their injury occurred early in their service.

This provision is extremely important because for 2013 the unemployment rate for people with bachelor’s degrees was only 1 percent—about one-third lower than the national average—and their median weekly earnings were 34 percent higher than the national average. Meanwhile, the RAND study found that 62 percent of post-9/11 caregivers reported financial strain because of their caregiving.

I know this is important because I saw it in my family. For my family, the additional education my mom obtained so she could support her family while she was caring for my dad. It is what made the difference.

I want to again thank some key people who have been true leaders to get this to this point.

I again want to thank Senator Dole and her great staff at the Elizabeth Dole Foundation for keeping our country focused on the needs of our military and veteran caregivers and for bringing such national momentum to make the changes we need.

I also want to thank the Wounded Warrior Project, which was a driving force in creating the very first VA caregivers program. They have provided invaluable advice in developing the bill I am introducing today.

Finally, I really want to thank the outstanding folks at the RAND Corporation. They have put together a truly groundbreaking study that takes stock of where care and benefits have fallen short, where new needs are emerging, and how we can make it easier for veterans to get the care and benefits they deserve.

There are many ways for the whole country—government, nonprofits, businesses, community leaders, faith leaders—to do more to help. For all of us in Congress, that starts with passing this legislation to help our hidden heroes—our military and veteran caregivers.

I again want to thank all of our tremendous caregivers in this country for their service, for not asking for help, as they should. We are the ones who need to ask for help for them and to be there to provide it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act of 2014.”

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION IN AND SERVICES PROVIDED UNDER FAMIL Y CAREGIVER PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.
(a) FAMILY CAREGIVER PROGRAM.—
(1) EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (a)(2)(B) of section 1720G of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “or” and inserting “or” and inserting a semicolon;
(2) CLARIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR ILLNESS.—Such subsection is further amended by inserting “or illness” after “serious injury”;
(3) EXPANSION OF NEEDED SERVICES IN ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—Subsection (a)(2)(C) of such section is amended—
(A) in clause (1), by striking “or” and inserting a semicolon;
(B) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iv); and
(C) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause (iii):
“(iii) a need for regular or extensive instruction or supervision in completing two or more instrumental activities of daily living; or”.

(4) EXPANSION OF SERVICES PROVIDED.—Subsection (a)(3)(A)(ii) of such section is amended—
(A) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” and inserting a semicolon;
(B) in subclause (V), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and
(C) by adding at the end the following new subclause:
“(VI) child care services or a monthly stipend for such services if such services are not readily available from the Department;
“(VII) financial planning services relating to the needs of injured and ill veterans and their caregivers; and
“(VIII) legal services, including legal advice and consultation, relating to the needs of injured and ill veterans and their caregivers.”

(5) EXPANSION OF RESPITE CARE PROVIDED.—Subsection (a)(3)(B) of such section is amended by striking “shall” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “shall—
“(i) be medically and age-appropriate;
“(ii) include in-home care; and
“(iii) include peer-oriented group activities.”

(6) MODIFICATION OF STIPEND CALCULATION.—Subsection (a)(3)(C) of such section is amended—
(A) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iv); and
(B) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause (iii):
“(iii) In determining the amount and degree of personal services provided under clause (1) with respect to an eligible veteran whose need for personal care services is based in whole or in part on a need for supervision protection under paragraph (2)(C)(i) or regular instruction or supervision in completing tasks under paragraph (2)(C)(iii), the Secretary shall take into account the following:
“(I) The assessment by the family caregiver of the needs and limitations of the veteran;
“(II) The extent to which the veteran can function safely and independently in the absence of such supervision, protection, or instruction.
“(III) The amount of time required for the family caregiver to provide such supervision, protection, or instruction to the veteran.”

(7) PERIODIC EVALUATION OF NEED FOR CERTAIN SERVICES.—Subsection (a)(3)(D) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:
“(D) In providing instruction, preparation, and technical support under subparagraph (A)(i)(II) to each family caregiver who is approved as a provider of personal care services for an eligible veteran under paragraph (6), the Secretary shall periodically evaluate the needs of the eligible veteran and the skills of the family caregiver of such veteran to determine if additional supervision, training, or technical support under those subparagraphs is necessary.”

(b) REFIRAL OF GENERAL CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.—Such section is amended by striking subsection (b).
(c) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO CAREGIVERS OF CERTAIN VETERANS.—Such section is further amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):
"(b) Provision of Assistance to Caregivers of Certain Veterans.—(1) In providing assistance under subsection (a) to family caregivers of eligible veterans who were previously injured in the Armed Forces before September 11, 2001, the Secretary may enter into memorandum of understanding with agencies, States, or other entities to provide such assistance to such veterans.

(2) The Secretary may provide assistance under this subsection only if such assistance is reasonably accessible to the veteran and is substantially equivalent or better in quality to similar services provided by the Department.

(3) The Secretary may provide fair compensation to entities that provide assistance under this subsection pursuant to memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1).

(4) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall work with the interagency working group on policies relating to caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces established under section 7 of the Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act of 2014.

(d) Modification of Definition of Family Member.—Subparagraph (B) of subsection (d)(4) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(B) is not a member of the family of the veteran or does not provide care to the veteran on a professional basis."

(e) Modification of Definition of Personal Care Services.—Subsection (d)(d)(4) of such section is amended by striking "in paragraph (3)" and inserting the following:

"in paragraphs (3) and (4)".

(f) Annual Evaluation Report.—(1) In General.—Paragraph (2) of section 101(c)(3) of title 10; 38 U.S.C. 1720G note) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) is described in paragraph (1) of section 1720G(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:"

"S 3319A. Authority to transfer unused education benefits to family members by seriously injured veterans"

(a)(1) In General.—Subject to the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary may permit an individual described in subsection (b) who is entitled to educational assistance under this chapter to elect to transfer to one or more of the dependents specified in subsection (c) of such individual's entitlement to such assistance, subject to the limitation under subsection (d).

(b)(1)(A) An individual transferring entitlement is not a member of the family of the veteran described in subsection (a) of such individual's entitlement to such assistance, and (B) in paragraph (2), by striking "under subsection (a)(2) or a covered veteran under subsection (b)";

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking "under subsection (a)(2) or a covered veteran under subsection (b)"; and

(c)(1) Designate the number of months of entitlement transferred under this subsection without regard to the 15-year delimiting date specified in section 3231 of this title, but not as referred to in subsection (a)(1) of section 1720G of this title may not exceed 36 months.

(2) The Secretary may prescribe regulations that would limit the months of entitlement that may be transferred under this section to less than 18 months.

(e)(1) The Secretary must prescribe regulations that would limit the months of entitlement that may be transferred under this section to less than 18 months.

(ii) Designation of Transferee.—An individual transferring entitlement under this section may designate the dependent or dependents to whom such entitlement shall be transferred.

(1) Designate the dependent or dependents to whom such entitlement shall be transferred.

(2) The Secretary may prescribe regulations that would limit the months of entitlement that may be transferred under this section to less than 18 months.

(f) Time for Transfer; Revocation and Modification.—(1) Transfer of entitlement to educational assistance under this section shall be subject to the time limitation for transfer of entitlement under section 3231 of this title.

(2)(A) An individual transferring entitlement under this section may modify or revoke the use of the transferred portion of the entitlement so transferred.

(3) The Secretary may modify or revoke the transfer of entitlement under this subsection only if such modification or revocation is made by the submittal of written notice of the action to the Secretary.

(g) Commencement of Use.—A dependent child to whom entitlement to educational assistance is transferred under this section may not commence the use of the transferred entitlement until—

(1) the completion by the child of the requirements of a secondary school diploma (or equivalency certificate); or

(2) the attainment by the child of 18 years of age.

(h) Additional Administrative Matters.—(1) The use of any entitlement to educational assistance transferred under this section shall be subject to the use of the entitlement by the individual making the transfer at the rate of one month for each month of transferred entitlement that is used.

(2) Except as provided under subsection (e)(2) and subject to paragraphs (5) and (6), a dependent to whom entitlement is transferred under this section is entitled to educational assistance in the same manner as the individual from whom the entitlement was transferred.

(3) The monthly rate of educational assistance payable to the dependent to whom entitlement referred to in paragraph (2) is transferred under this section shall be payable at the same rate as such entitlement would otherwise be payable under this chapter to the individual making the transfer.

(4) The death of an individual transferring an entitlement under this section shall not affect the use of the entitlement by the dependent to whom the entitlement is transferred.

(5) (A) A child to whom entitlement is transferred under this section may transfer the benefits transferred without regard to the 15-year delimiting date specified in section 3231 of this title, but may not, except as provided in subsection (b), subdivide or transfer such benefits so transferred after attaining the age of 26 years.

(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), in the case of a child who, before attaining the age of 26 years, is prevented from pursuing a chosen program of education by reason of acting as the primary provider of personal care services for a veteran or member of the Armed Forces under section 1720G(a) of this title, the child may use the benefits beginning on the date specified in clause (iii) for a period whose length is specified in clause (iv).

(ii) Clause (i) shall not apply with respect to the period of an individual as a primary provider of personal care services if the period concludes with the revocation of the individual’s designation as such a primary provider under section 1720G(a)(7)(D) of this title.

(iii) The date specified in this clause for the beginning of the use of benefits by a child under clause (i) is the later of—

(1) the date on which the child ceases acting as the primary provider of personal care services for the veteran or member concerned as described in clause (i);
“(II) the date on which it is reasonably feasible, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, for the child to initiate or resume the use of benefits; or
“(III) the date on which the child attains the age of 26 years.”

“(Iv) the length of the period specified in this clause for the use of benefits by a child under clause (ii) is determined in accordance with the length of the period that—
“(I) begins on the date on which the child begins acting as the primary provider of personal care services for the veteran or member concerned as described in clause (i); and
“(II) ends on the later of—
“(aa) the date on which the child ceases acting as the primary provider of personal care services for the veteran or member as described in clause (i); or
“(bb) the date on which it is reasonably feasible, as so determined, for the child to initiate or resume the use of benefits.

“(VI) The purposes for which a dependent to whom entitlement is transferred under this section may use such entitlement shall include the pursuit and completion of the requirements of a secondary school diploma (or equivalency certificate).

“(vii) The administrative provisions of this chapter shall apply to the use of entitlement transferred under this section, except that the dependent to whom the entitlement is transferred shall be treated as the individual for purposes of such provisions.

“(1) OVERPAYMENT.—(I) In the event of an overpayment of educational assistance with respect to a dependent to whom entitlement is transferred under this section, the dependent and the individual making the transfer shall be jointly and severally liable to the United States for the amount of any overpayment of educational assistance under paragraph (1).

“(II) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply in the case of a dependent who fails to complete the service agreed to by the individual under subsection (b)(1) in accordance with the terms of the agreement of the individual under that subsection, the amount of any transferred entitlement under this section that is used by a dependent of the individual as of the date of such transfer shall be treated as an overpayment of educational assistance under paragraph (1).

“(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply in the case of a dependent who fails to complete service agreed to by the individual—
“(i) by reason of the death of the individual; or
“(ii) for a reason referred to in section 3311(c)(4) of this title.

“(2) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

“(2) Such regulations shall specify—
“(A) the manner of authorizing the transfer of entitlements under this section;
“(B) the criteria in accordance with subsection (b); and
“(C) the manner and effect of an election to modify or revoke a transfer of entitlement under subsection (f)(2).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TRANSFERS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES.—The heading of section 3319 of such title is amended by inserting “members of the Armed Forces” after “family members”.

(2) BAR TO DUPLICATION OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS.—Section 3322(e) of such title is amended by inserting “or 3319A” after “3319A”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 33 of such title is amended by inserting the following new items:

“331A. Authority to transfer unused educational benefits to family members by members of the Armed Forces.”

“3319A. Authority to transfer unused educational benefits to family members by seriously injured veterans.”

SECTION 4. ENHANCEMENT OF SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES WITH INJURIES OR ILLNESSES REQUIRING ASSISTANCE IN EVERYDAY LIVING.

(a) EXPANSION OF COVERED MEMBERS.—Subsection (b) of section 3319 of United States Code, is amended—

“(1) by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(1) has a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated in the line of duty;”;

“(2) is in need of personal care services (including supervision or protection or regular instruction or supervision) as a result of such injury or illness; and;”;

“(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(b) VARIOUS PROVISIONS OF SPECIAL COMPENSATION.—Such section is further amended—

“(1) by redesigning subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively;

“(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

“(e) SPECIAL COMPENSATION.—Monthly special compensation paid under subsection (a) shall not be included in income for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO FAMILY CAREGIVERS.—Such section is further amended by inserting after subsection (e)(1), as amended by subsection (b) of this section, the following new subsection (f):

“(f) ASSISTANCE FOR FAMILY CAREGIVERS.—(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide family caregivers of a member in receipt of monthly special compensation under subsection (a) the assistance required to be provided to family caregivers of eligible veterans under section 1720G(a3)(A) of title 38 (other than the monthly personal caregiver stipend provided for in clause (ii)(V) of such section). For purposes of the provision of such assistance under this subsection, the definitions in section 1720G(d) of title 38 shall apply, except that any reference in such definitions to an eligible veteran shall be deemed to be a reference to the member concerned.

“(2) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide assistance under this subsection—

“(A) in accordance with a memorandum of understanding entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense; and

“(B) in accordance with a memorandum of understanding entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to members of the Coast Guard).”

(2) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (2).

(3) SERIOUS INJURY OR ILLNESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘serious injury or illness’ means an injury, disorder, or illness (including a mental disorder) that—

“(I) renders the afflicted person unable to carry out one or more activities of daily living;”;

“(II) renders the afflicted person in need of supervision or protection due to the manifestation or residual effects of neurological or other impairment or injury;”.

SECTION 5. FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term “covered employee” means an employee under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code who—

“(1) is a caregiver, as defined in section 1720G of title 38, United States Code; or

“(2) renders the afflicted person in need of supervision or protection due to the manifestation or residual effects of neurological or other impairment or injury.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ALLOW FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may promulgate regulations under which a covered employee may—

“(1) use a flexible schedule or compressed schedule in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 61 of title 5, United States Code; or

“(2) telework in accordance with chapter 65 of title 5, United States Code.

SECTION 6. LIFESPAN RESpite CARE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2901 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300i-1) is amended—

“(1) in paragraph (1)—

“(A) by redesigning subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and realigning the margins accordingly; and

“(B) by striking ‘who requires care or supervision to—’ and inserting ‘who’;

“(C) by striking the period and inserting ‘;’;

“(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) a veteran participating in the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers under section 1720G of title 38, United States Code; and

“(3) a member of the Armed Forces by seriously injured veterans established under section 7 of the Veterans Health Care Improvement Group Act of 2014 after ‘Human Services’.

(b) GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 2902(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300i-1(c)) is amended by inserting ‘and the interagency working group on policies relating to caregivers of veterans established under section 7 of the Military and Veteran Caregiver Services Improvement Act of 2014’ after ‘Human Services’.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2905 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300i-4) is amended—

“(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ‘and’ at the end and inserting ‘; and’; and

“(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting ‘;’;”.

SEC. 5. FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(1) EXPANSION OF COVERED EMPLOYEES.—In this section, the term “covered employee” means an employee under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code who—

“(1) is a caregiver, as defined in section 1720G of title 38, United States Code; or

“(2) renders the afflicted person in need of supervision or protection due to the manifestation or residual effects of neurological or other impairment or injury.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ALLOW FLEXIBLE WORK ARRANGEMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may promulgate regulations under which a covered employee may—

“(1) use a flexible schedule or compressed schedule in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 61 of title 5, United States Code; or

“(2) telework in accordance with chapter 65 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) CEREMONIAL AMENDMENT.—Section 5127(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking in section 5127(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ‘and’ in the place specified by this section.
(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) $15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''.

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP ON CAREGIVER POLICY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be established in the executive branch an interagency working group on policies relating to caregivers and members of the Armed Forces (in this section referred to as the ‘‘working group’’).

(b) MEMBERS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—The working group shall be composed of the following:

(A) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(B) The Secretary of Defense.

(C) The Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(D) The Administrator of Medicare.

(E) The Administrator of Medicaid.

(F) A representative of the Armed Forces.

(G) A representative of the Armed Services.

(H) A representative of the Department of Labor.

(I) A representative of the Department of Education.

(J) A representative of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

(K) The Chair of the Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

(L) The Chair of the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted to Congress by the working group shall include the following:

(A) A description of any steps taken by the working group to improve the coordination of services for caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces among the entities specified in subsection (b)(1)(B) and eliminate barriers to effective use of such services, including aligning eligibility criteria.

(B) An evaluation of the performance of the entities specified in subsection (b)(1)(B) in providing services for caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces.

(C) An evaluation of the quality and sufficiency of services for caregivers of veterans and members of the Armed Forces available from non-governmental organizations.

(D) A description of care or services provided by caregivers to veterans or members of the Armed Forces identified by the working group, and steps taken by the entities specified in subsection (b)(1)(B) to eliminate such gaps or recommendations for legislative or administrative action to address such gaps.

(E) Other matters or recommendations as the chair considers appropriate.

SEC. 8. STUDIES ON POST-SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, VETERANS AND SERIOUSLY INJURED VETERANS.

(a) LONGITUDINAL STUDY ON POST-9/11 VETERANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a longitudinal study on members of the Armed Forces who commenced service in the Armed Forces after September 11, 2001.

(2) GRANT OR CONTRACT.—The Secretary shall award a grant to, or enter into a contract with, an appropriate entity unaffiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct the study.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE STUDY ON SERIOUSLY INJURED VETERANS AND THEIR CAREGIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a comprehensive study of seriously injured veterans and their caregivers.

(A) VETERANS.—The Secretary shall conduct the study required by paragraph (1) to include the following:

(i) The financial status and needs of the veteran.

(ii) The benefits available to the veteran.

(iii) The health status of the veteran.

(iv) The treatment of the veteran.

(B) CAREGIVERS.—The Secretary shall conduct the study required by paragraph (1) to include the following:

(i) The health status of the caregiver.

(ii) The treatment of the caregiver.

(C) REPORTS.—Not later than October 1, 2019, and every four years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report on the implementation of such standards to:

(i) The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(ii) The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(iii) The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(ii) The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(iii) The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study required by paragraph (1).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 420—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 6 THROUGH OCTOBER 12, 2014, AS ‘‘NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE WEEK’’ TO RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF NATUROPATHIC MEDICINE IN PROVIDING SAFE, EFFECTIVE, AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 420

Whereas, in the United States, more than 75 percent of health care costs are due to preventable chronic illnesses, including high blood pressure, which affects 88,000,000 people in the United States, and diabetes, which affects 25,000,000 people in the United States;

Whereas nearly 5% of adults in the United States are overweight or obese and, consequently, at risk for serious health conditions, such as high blood pressure, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, arthritis, and depression;

Whereas 70 percent of people in the United States experience physical or nonphysical symptoms of stress, and stress can contribute to the development of major illnesses, such as cardiovascular disease, depression, and diabetes;

Whereas the aforementioned chronic health conditions are among the most common, costly, and preventable health conditions;

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides noninvasive, holistic treatments that support the inherent self-healing capacity of the human body and encourage self-responsibility in health care;

Whereas naturopathic medicine focuses on patient-centered care, the prevention of chronic illnesses, and early intervention in the treatment of chronic illnesses;

Whereas naturopathic physicians attend 4-year, graduate level programs that are accredited by agencies approved by the Department of Education;

Whereas aspects of naturopathic medicine have been shown to lower the risk of major illnesses such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes;

Whereas naturopathic physicians can help address the shortage of primary care providers in the United States;

Whereas naturopathic physicians are licensed in 29 States and territories;

Whereas naturopathic physicians are trained to refer patients to conventional physicians and specialists when necessary;

Whereas the profession of naturopathic medicine is dedicated to providing health care to underserved populations; and

Whereas naturopathic medicine provides consumers in the United States with more choice in health care, in line with the increasing use of a variety of integrative medical treatments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
SENATE RESOLUTION 421—EXPRESSING THE GRATITUDE AND APPRECIATION OF THE SENATE FOR THE ACTS OF HEROISM AND MILITARY ACHIEVEMENT BY THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE JUNE 6, 1944, AMPHIBIOUS LANDING AT NORMANDY, FRANCE, AND COMMENDING THEM FOR LEADERSHIP AND VALOR IN AN OPERATION THAT HELPED BRING AN END TO WORLD WAR II

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 421

Whereas June 6, 2014, marks the 70th anniversary of the Allied amphibious landing on D-Day, June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France, during World War II;

Whereas soldiers of 6 divisions (3 American, 2 British, and 1 Canadian) stormed ashore in 5 main landing areas on beaches in Normandy, where they faced code-named “Utah,” “Omahe,” “Gold,” “Juno,” and “Sword”;

Whereas of the approximately 10,000 Allied casualties incurred on the first day of the landing, more than 6,000 casualties were members of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas the age of the remaining World War II veterans and the gradual disappearance of those remaining memory of World War II and the Normandy landings make it necessary to increase activities intended to pass on the history of these events, particularly to younger generations;

Whereas the young people of Normandy and the United States have displayed unprecedented commitment to and involvement in celebrating the victory of the Normandy landings and the freedom that they brought with them in 1944;

Whereas the significant material remains of these Normandy battles, such as shipwrecks and various items of military equipment found both on the Normandy beaches and at the bottom of the sea in French territorial waters, bear witness to the remarkable human and material resources used by the Allied Armed Forces to execute the Normandy landings;

Whereas 5 Normandy beaches and a number of sites on the Normandy coast, including Pointe du Hoc, were the scene of the Normandy landings, and constitute both now and for all time a unique piece of common world heritage, and a symbol of peace and freedom, whose unspoilt nature, integrity, and authenticity must be protected at all costs; and

Whereas the world owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the “greatest generation” who assumed the task of freeing the world from Nazi and Fascist regimes and restoring liberty to Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 70th anniversary of the Allied amphibious landing on D-Day, June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France, during World War II;

(2) expresses gratitude and appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the D-Day operations;

(3) thanks the young people of Normandy and the United States for their involvement in recognizing and celebrating the 70th Anniversary of the Normandy landings with the aim of making future generations aware of the acts of heroism and sacrifice performed by the Allied forces;

(4) recognizes the efforts of the Government of France and the people of Normandy to preserve, for future generations, the unique witnesses of the Normandy beaches and the sunken material remains of the Normandy landing, by inscribing them on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage List; and

(5) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to celebrate with appropriate ceremonies and programs to honor the sacrifices of their fellow countrymen to liberate Europe.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, on June 6th, 1944, the brave men and women of the Allied Forces began the opening phase of Operation Overlord in an effort to break the Nazi stranglehold on Western Europe. On that early morning, 31,000 members of the United States Armed Forces, and 153,000 of their counterparts in the Allied Expeditionary Force, stormed ashore five landing areas on the beaches of Normandy, France, in what is known as D-Day. In that first day alone, approximately 10,000 allied soldiers were wounded or killed, including 6,000 Americans. Now, 70 years later, it remains our duty to remember the sacrifices made by the members of the “greatest generation” who answered the call of those being oppressed by the Nazi and Fascist regimes. In recognition of the incredible feats achieved by our veterans, the Parliament of the French Republic has asked to join us in the passage of an identical resolution in both bodies, honoring these sacrifices made in the name of liberty. As co-chairs of the Senate French Caucus, I have joined with Senator LANDRIEU to introduce this resolution to recognize the upcoming 70th Anniversary of the D-Day Landings and to express our gratitude and appreciation to the members of the U.S. Armed Forces who participated in these operations.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2970. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. PORTMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes.

SA 2971. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2970 proposed by Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PORTMAN) to the bill S. 994, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2970. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PORTMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:
SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014” or the “DATA Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) by disclosing direct Federal agency, component, and recipient of Federal contracts, loan, and grant spending information to programs of Federal agencies to enable taxpayers and policy makers to track Federal spending effectively;

(2) establish Government-wide data standards for financial data and provide consistent, reliable, and searchable Government-wide data that is displayed accurately for taxpayers and policy makers on USASpending.gov (or a successor system that displays the data);

(3) simplify reporting for entities receiving Federal funds by streamlining reporting requirements and reducing compliance costs while improving transparency;

(4) improve the quality of data submitted to USASpending.gov by holding Federal agencies accountable for the completeness and accuracy of the data submitted; and

(5) to achieve the purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (4) without increasing the burden on Federal agencies.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL FUNDING ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006.

The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended—

(1) in section 2—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “this section” and inserting “this Act’; and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (2), (4), and (7), respectively;

(iii) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.”;

(iv) Higher spacing after paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(3) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ‘Federal agency’ has the meaning given the term ‘Executive agency’ under section 105 of title 5, United States Code.”;

(v) by inserting after paragraph (4), as so redesignated, the following:

“(5) OBJECT CLASS.—The term ‘object class’ means the category assigned for purposes of the annual budget of the President submitted under section 1106(a) of title 31, United States Code, to the type of property or services purchased by the Federal Government.”;

(2) PROGRAM ACTIVITY.—The term ‘program activity’ means the meaning given that term under section 1115(b) of title 31, United States Code; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) Supplementary financial data.—The term ‘Supplementary financial data’ means the meaning given that term under section 1115(h) of title 31, United States Code.”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “of the Office of Management and Budget’; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by striking “of the Office of Management and Budget’;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” and inserting “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” and inserting “and” at the end;

“(6) shall have the ability to aggregate data for the categories described in paragraphs (1) through (5) without double-counting data; and

“(7) shall ensure that all information published under this section is available—

“(A) in machine-readable and open formats;

“(B) to be downloaded in bulk; and

“(C) to the extent practicable, for automated processing.

“(D) in subsection (d)—

“(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

“(ii) in paragraph (2)(A) and (B), by striking ‘you shall obtain’;

“(i) in paragraph (A), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’; and

“(ii) in paragraph (B), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

“(E) in subsection (e), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

“(F) in subsection (g)—

“(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’;

“(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ‘of the Office of Management and Budget’; and

“(3) by striking sections 3 and 4 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 3. FULL DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, by disclosing data to the Data Act Reporting Portal, the Federal Government shall ensure that the data in subsection (a) are applied to the data made available on the website established under subsection (a).

“(b) INFORMATION TO BE POSTED.—For any funds made available to or expended by a Federal agency or component of a Federal agency, the information to be posted shall include—

“(1) for each appropriations account, including an expired or unexpired appropriation account, the amount—

“(A) of budget authority appropriated;

“(B) that is obligated;

“(C) of unobligated balances; and

“(D) of any other budgetary resources;

“(2) from which accounts and in what amount—

“(A) appropriations are obligated for each program activity; and

“(B) outlays are made for each program activity;

“(3) from which accounts and in what amount—

“(A) appropriations are obligated for each object class; and

“(B) outlays are made for each object class;

“(4) for each program activity, the amount—

“(A) obligated for each object class; and

“(B) outlays made for each object class.

“SEC. 4. DATA STANDARDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—The Secretary and the Director, in consultation with the Heads of Federal agencies, shall establish Government-wide data standards for any Federal funds made available to or expended by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds.

“(2) DATA ELEMENTS.—The financial data standards established under paragraph (1) shall include common data elements for financial and payment information required to be reported by Federal agencies and entities receiving Federal funds.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under paragraph (1) shall, to the extent reasonable and practicable—

“(1) incorporate widely accepted common data elements, such as those developed and maintained by private stakeholders in establishing data standards;

“(A) an international voluntary consensus standards body;

“(B) Federal agencies with authority over contracting and financial assistance; and

“(C) accounting standards organizations;

“(2) incorporate a widely accepted, non-proprietary, searchable, platform-independent computer-readable format;

“(3) include unique identifiers for Federal awards and entities receiving Federal awards that can be consistently applied Government-wide;

“(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

“(5) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary;

“(6) produce consistent and comparable data, including across program activities; and

“(7) establish a standard method of conveying the reporting period, reporting entity, unit of measure, and other associated attributes.

“(c) DEADLINES.—

“(1) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, the Director and the Secretary shall issue guidance to Federal agencies on the data standards established under subsection (a).

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information required under the data standards established under subsection (a).

“(3) WEBSITE.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, the Director and the Secretary shall ensure that the data standards established under subsection (a) are applied to the data made available on the website established under section 2.

“(d) CONSULTATION.—The Director and the Secretary shall consult with public and private stakeholders in establishing data standards under this section.

“SEC. 5. SIMPLIFYING FEDERAL AWARD REPORTING.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with relevant Federal agencies, recipients of Federal awards, including State and local governments, and institutions of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)), shall review the information required to be reported by recipients of Federal awards to identify—

“(1) common reporting elements across the Federal Government;

“(2) unnecessary duplication in financial reporting; and

“(3) unnecessarily burdensome reporting requirements for recipients of Federal awards.

“(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014, the Director, or a Federal agency designated by the Director, shall establish a pilot program (in this section referred to as the ‘pilot program’) with the participation of appropriate Federal agencies to facilitate the development of recommendations for—

“(A) standardized reporting elements across the Federal Government;

“(B) the elimination of unnecessary duplication in financial reporting; and

“(C) the reduction of compliance costs for recipients of Federal awards.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The pilot program shall—

“(A) include a combination of Federal contracts, grants, and subawards, the aggregate value of which is not less than $1,000,000,000 and not more than $2,000,000,000; and

“(B) include a diverse group of recipients of Federal awards; and

“(C) in implementing the pilot program, use the best practices for Federal award reporting to develop changing and dynamic reporting requirements.
"(C) to the extent practicable, include recipients who receive Federal awards from multiple programs across multiple agencies.

"(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The pilot program shall include data collected during a 12-month reporting cycle.

"(4) REPORTING AND EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each recipient of a Federal award participating in the pilot program shall submit to the Office of Management and Budget or the Federal agency designated under paragraph (1), as appropriate, any requested reports under Federal awards.

"(5) TERMINATION.—The pilot program shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the pilot program is established.

"(6) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the pilot program is established under paragraph (5), the Director shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program, which shall include—

"(A) a description of the data collected under the pilot program, the usefulness of the data provided, and the cost to collect the data for Federal agencies;

"(B) a discussion of any legislative action required and recommendations for—

(i) consolidating aspects of Federal financial reporting to reconcile the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

(ii) automating aspects of Federal financial reporting to increase efficiency and reduce the costs to recipients of Federal awards;

(iii) simplifying the reporting requirements of Federal awards; and

(iv) improving financial transparency.

"(7) GOVERNMENT-WIDE IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director submits the report under paragraph (6), the Director shall issue guidance to the heads of Federal agencies as to how the Government-wide financial data standards established under section 4(a) shall be applied to the information required to be reported by entities receiving Federal awards to—

"(A) reduce the burden of complying with reporting requirements;

"(B) simplify the reporting process, including by reducing the scope of the reports.

"SEC. 4. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDING.

"(a) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS.—In accordance with paragraph (2), the Inspector General of each Federal agency, in consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, shall—

"(1) review a statistically valid sample of the spending data submitted under this Act by the Federal agency; and

"(2) submit to Congress and make publically available a report assessing and comparing the data completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data sampled and the implementation and use of data standards by Federal agencies.

"(b) DEADLINES.—Not later than 30 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section 4(c)(1), and every 2 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit and make publically available a report assessing and comparing the data completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data submitted under this Act by Federal agencies and including implications and use of data standards by Federal agencies.

"SEC. 5. ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY BOARD DATA ANALYSIS CENTER.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a data analysis center or the expansion of a data analysis center under section 3521(f) or 9105(a)(3) of title 31, United States Code.

"(2) DEADLINES.—Not later than 30 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section 4(c)(1), and every 2 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit and make publically available a report assessing and comparing the data completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data submitted under this Act by Federal agencies and including implications and use of data standards by Federal agencies.

"SEC. 6. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a data analysis center or the expansion of a data analysis center under section 3521(f) or 9105(a)(3) of title 31, United States Code.

"(2) DEADLINES.—Not later than 30 months after the date on which the Director and the Secretary issue guidance to Federal agencies under section 4(c)(1), and every 2 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit and make publically available a report assessing and comparing the data completeness, timeliness, quality, and accuracy of the data submitted under this Act by Federal agencies and including implications and use of data standards by Federal agencies.

"SEC. 7. CLASSED AND PROTECTED INFORMATION.

"Nothing in this Act shall require the disclosure to the public of—

"(1) information that would be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’); or

"(2) information protected under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Privacy Act of 1974’), or section 6163 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"SEC. 8. NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to create a private right of action for enforcement of any provision of this Act.

"SEC. 4. EXECUTIVE AGENCY ACCOUNTING AND OTHER FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.

"Section 3521(a)(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ‘and make available on the website described under section 1122 after “appropriate committees of Congress”.

"SEC. 5. DEBT COLLECTION IMPROVEMENT.

"Section 3718(c)(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by inserting ‘(A)’ before ‘Any Federal agency’;

"(2) in subparagraph (A), as so designated, by striking ‘180 days’ and inserting ‘120 days’; and

"(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) The Secretary of the Treasury shall notify Congress of any instance in which an agency fails to notify the Secretary as required under subparagraph (A)."

"SA 2971. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2972 [Mr. PORTMAN] to the bill S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 9, strike lines 17 through 21 and insert the following:

"(2) AGENCIES.

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not later than 2 years after the date on which the guidance under paragraph (1) is issued, each Federal agency shall report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

"(B) NONINTERFERENCE WITH AUDITABILITY OF REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon request by the Secretary of Defense, the Director may grant an extension of the deadline under paragraph (A) to the Department of Defense for a period of not more than 6 months to report financial and payment information data in accordance with the data standards established under subsection (a).

"(2) LIMITATION.—The Director may not grant more than 3 extensions to the Secretary of Defense under clause (1).

"(3) NOTIFICATION.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives of—

"(I) each grant of an extension under clause (1); and

"(II) the reasons for granting such an extension.

"NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, April 30, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at
2:30 p.m., to conduct a legislative hearing to receive testimony on the following bill: S. 2312, a bill to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes. Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at (202) 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Keeping the Lights On—Are We Doing Enough to Ensure the Reliability and Security of the U.S. Electric Grid?”

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, on April 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Expanding Access to Quality Early Learning: the Strong Start for America’s Children Act”.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The President’s Budget for Fiscal Year 2015.”

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 2 p.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on European Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 3:00 p.m., to hold an European Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, “Transatlantic Security Challenges: Central and Eastern Europe.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL AND CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Oversight of Small Agencies.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPower

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Brian Winseeck, a detaillee assigned to the Budget Committee from Senator Warner’s office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today’s session.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. tomorrow, all post cloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 574; further, that following disposition of that nomination, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on Executive Calendar No. 613, and that if cloture is invoked, all post cloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar Nos. 760, 761, 762, 763, and 764, and all nominations placed on the calendar by the Secretary of the Senate; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard under title 14, U.S.C., section 271(d):

Linda L. Fagan
Thomas W. Jones
Steven D. Poulin
James E. Rendon

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 30:

Rear Adm. William D. Lee

Rear Adm. Charles W. Ray

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 30:

Rear Adm. Charles D. Michel

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 47:
To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Peter V. Neffenger

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY’S DESK IN THE COAST GUARD

PN1357 COAST GUARD nominations (2) beginning M. CHARLIE W. WAMPLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 16, 2014.

PN1358 COAST GUARD nominations (2) beginning William C. Adams, and ending Adam K. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 16, 2014.

PN1402 COAST GUARD nominations (6) beginning KEVIN J. LOPES, and ending MARTIN D. COLBY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2014.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

LEGAL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 422.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 422) to authorize written testimony, document production, and in-camera representation in Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Foundation, Inc. v. United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a subpoena to a Senate employee in a civil action pending in the Court of Federal Claims. The plaintiff in this case is an organization serving as trustee for a trust set up by Senator Max Baucus, to promote conservation and recreational use of land in Montana. The suit arises out of a dispute between the plaintiff and the Department of the Interior over the Department’s amendment of the trust agreement with plaintiff. As part of discovery in the case, plaintiff has issued a subpoena to Holly Luck, a former employee of then-Senator Baucus, seeking information and documents involving this matter.

This resolution would authorize Ms. Luck to provide written testimony and to produce documents from Senator Baucus’s office, except where a privilege should be asserted, with representation by the Senate Legal Counsel. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening motion thereon.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 422) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s Record under “Submitted Resolutions.”
The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 8081:

BRIG. GEN. W. B. BERRY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

BRIG. GEN. J. A. NORMAN

To be major general

COL. A. R. M. RYBERG

To be brigadier general

LTC. COL. R. N. L. KEMP

To be rear admiral (lower half)
THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624 TO BE MAJOR
The following named officers for appointment in the Marine Corps:

[Names of officers listed as in the image]
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

To be captain

WILLIAM A. GARBEN

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be commander

LEANDER J. SACKEY

The following named officer for appointment in the grade indicated in the Regular Navy under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER M. DAVIS

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 10, 2014:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Navy under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 424:

To be vice admiral

RRAD. WILLIAM D. LEE

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under Title 14, U.S.C., Section 56:

To be vice admiral

RRAD. CHARLES W. RAY

The following named officer for appointment as vice commandant of the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under Title 14, U.S.C., Section 56:

To be vice admiral

RRAD. CHARLES D. MICHEL

The following named officer for appointment as vice commandant of the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under Title 14, U.S.C., Section 56:

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUBY L. COLLINS AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL W. WAMPLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 16, 2014.


COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN J. LOPES AND ENDING WITH MARIETTE C. OGG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2014.
EXTENDING CONGRATULATIONS TO PATTI ALDERSON

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Patti Alderson, who is being honored on April 11, 2014, by the Boy Scouts of America Fort Hamilton District for her service to her community at the “Do A Good Turn Daily” event.

This recognition is awarded annually to an individual in the Butler County, Ohio, community who has demonstrated outstanding character and commitment to others. As a mother, caregiver, volunteer, and fundraiser, Patti has dedicated her life to the service of her family, friends, community members, and those in need.

In 1999, Patti led a group of women to establish The Community Foundation of West Chester/Liberty. At its founding, and in the fifteen intervening years, the Community Foundation has sought to respond to the needs of the community and provide a vehicle for volunteerism and philanthropy. Among its many initiatives, the Community Foundation has sent children to camp, established a high school-aged student philanthropy group, raised money for the local food pantry, and provided dental screenings to elementary-aged students in need.

In 2010, seeking to help the local youth, Patti stepped in and led the initiative to establish a Boys and Girls Club of America in the townships of West Chester and Liberty, Ohio. With hard work and persistence, the Boys and Girls Club of West Chester/Liberty in 2013 became the grateful recipient of a $750,000 grant, allowing the center to become a reality. The Boys and Girls Club of West Chester/Liberty opened in March of this year and will initially serve approximately 400 students.

I am very proud to call Patti Alderson my good friend, and I extend my most sincere congratulations to her. Her drive is unparalleled; her devotion to serving others is both unwavering and inspiring. Each day, many lives are touched by the initiatives that are the outgrowth of Patti’s efforts. Thank you, Patti, for your passion and longstanding commitment to our community.

TRIBUTE TO JAY REAVIS

HON. TOM LATHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Jay Reavis of Innovative Captive Strategies in West Des Moines, Iowa, for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Jay in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Reavis for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Jay on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

CONGRATULATING MRS. LEONA DAYTON ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Leona Eunice Dayton on her 100th birthday. It is an honor to have the opportunity to recognize the life of such a distinguished citizen.

Mrs. Dayton, known to her family and friends as Bobby, was born on this day in 1914 to Amos and Leila Brewer in the small town of Erma, Texas. As a member of the “Greatest Generation” she witnessed many historic events during the 20th century and played a part in making this nation great. Bobby married her high school sweetheart, Jack Cooper Dayton, and together they embodied the entrepreneurial spirit that has defined this country and its people since its inception. With a little bit of love and a lot of hard work, they began several small businesses, including the Dayton Oil Company, which they owned for over 30 years.

Throughout her life, Bobby established herself as a pillar of the community in London, Texas where she devoted herself to the service of others through Eastern Star and as Postmaster of the London Post Office. She could also often be seen at the London Methodist Church teaching Sunday School or playing piano for early morning services.

Today, she continues her commitment to others by spending her days traveling, gardening, and filling her house with love, laughter, and great food. The fruits of her life-long endeavors can be seen by the smiles on the faces of her children, five grandchildren, ten great grandchildren and four great-great grandchildren as they gather to celebrate this momentous occasion.

We all, including my colleagues in the House, could learn a bit from Mrs. Dayton’s commitment to family, friends, and community. I am honored to have the opportunity to help celebrate this special day. Her accomplishments throughout her life represent an important part of the American story. Again, congratulations to Leona Eunice Dayton and Happy 100th Birthday.

CONGRATULATING PAUL MONROE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my congratulations to Paul Monroe who, after 43 years of dedicated service, will be retiring from Fireman’s Fund Insurance Company on Friday, April 11.

Paul began his career at the Fireman’s Fund Houston office in 1971 as a loss control trainee, following his graduation with a degree in Aerospace Engineering from the University of Texas in Arlington. He subsequently became the head of the Loss Control Department in Houston before becoming trained in property casualty insurance sales and underwriting. Over the years, he made a series of transitions and promotions within Fireman’s Fund, which included moves to San Antonio, Texas; Greensboro, North Carolina; and New York City. In 2002 he came to the Fireman’s Fund headquarters in Novato, California and in his latest job served as Assistant Vice President for Underwriting Quality. In this capacity, he and his team were instrumental in creating a number of systems designed to enhance and provide better consistency in the underwriting process.

Successful people are typically characterized by their discipline and their desire to constantly improve and Paul exemplifies these virtues. He received his Masters in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Houston in 1976 and while living in Greensboro, he obtained his MBA. He has participated in several industry groups and has served as a Board Member of the Pennsylvania Joint Underwriting Association since 2002. His hobbies include golf and running, and he has run seven Marathons, including five in New York City. He has been happily married to his wife Druella (Dru) for 42 years and they have two grown children, Jay and Molly.

43 years is a long time and the world has changed significantly from when Paul first started. Paul Monroe’s career has spanned a remarkable period of time, and his dedication to Fireman’s Fund and his adherence to the finest virtues of solid character, integrity, mentorship and personal kindness is truly inspiring.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in offering my praise and congratulation to Paul Monroe, and extend our best wishes for a happy retirement to Paul and Dru as they
prepare for the next chapter of their life together.

**IN SUPPORT OF THE UKRAINE, AZERBAIJAN, AND GEORGIA**

**HON. FILEMON VELA**  
**OF TEXAS**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, April 10, 2014**

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the actions of Russia in the Crimean Peninsula.

Now is the time for the United States to show our solidarity with former Soviet states such as Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Georgia, while encouraging these nations to continue to institute democratic reforms and modernize their economies.

Countries in the Caucus region such as Azerbaijan and Georgia are located at the crossroads of Western Asia and Eastern Europe—a strategic location for U.S. foreign policy objectives given that Russia is to the north and Iran is to the south.

With the volatility and strategic importance of this region, the U.S. must continue to work with its allies such as Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Georgia to ensure their sovereignty is protected, especially in light of Russia’s actions in the Crimean Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to recognize the importance of our country’s relationship with Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Georgia.

**RECOGNIZING THE WEEK OF THE YOUNG CHILD**

**HON. KATHERINE M. CLARK**  
**OF MASSACHUSETTS**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, April 10, 2014**

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the Week of the Young Child, which is celebrated this year from April 6 to April 12. I also rise to recognize the tireless work of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, which was instrumental in launching this week in 1971, and which works every day to create a brighter future for our nation’s youngest learners.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is clear: strong investments in early education are vital to America’s future. Young children experience astonishing brain growth, forming more neural pathways from birth to age five than at any other point in their lives. Investment in this phase of life pays serious dividends—not just other points in their lives. Investment in this phase of life pays serious dividends—not just for the individual and the family, but for communities and economies throughout the world.

Too often, American parents are forced to choose between the workforce and ensuring the healthy development of their child. The Child Care Development Block Grant reduces this gap by providing a modest subsidy to eligible working parents, allowing them to purchase quality child care for their children, join the workforce, and contribute to our nation’s economic prosperity. Last month, I was proud to lead 111 of my House colleagues in a letter to House Appropriators supporting this critical program.

In today’s day in age, Mr. Speaker, I find it unacceptable that any child’s zip code would determine whether they, or their parents, have a fair chance to reach for the American Dream. I look forward to the day when true equality of access to early education is finally achieved, and I’m proud to stand with the National Association for the Education of Young Children, as well as the Massachusetts Association for the Education of Young Children, in working to make this future a reality.

**HAPPY BIRTHDAY MRS. MARGARITA MUÑOZ**

**HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ**  
**OF CALIFORNIA**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, April 10, 2014**

Ms. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a lifelong resident of my district on her upcoming centennial birthday. On April 11, 2014, Mrs. Margarita Muñoz will celebrate 100 years of life.

Born in 1914, Margarita is the middle sibling to two older brothers and two younger sisters. When she was a young girl, Margarita’s family moved from Arizona to California in search of a better life and settled in downtown East Los Angeles. Margarita attended local elementary and middle school with her brothers and sisters. She graduated from Lincoln High School in 1932 where she met her sweetheart, Augustine Muñoz.

Margarita and Augustine married in 1935 and gave birth to their first son, Charles, in 1936. The young family was blessed with the birth of their second son, Robert, in 1937, daughter Dorothy in 1943, William and John in 1944 and 1950, and daughter Carol in 1955. In 1955, Margarita and Augustine moved their growing family from East Los Angeles to the city of Montebello. The children attended Eastmont Elementary and Montebello Junior High and Montebello High School. For Margarita and Augustine Muñoz, Montebello proved an ideal place to raise a family.

In 1964, Margarita’s husband passed away from a sudden heart attack and was left to raise their children on her own. During this difficult time, Margarita demonstrated tremendous work ethic and resiliency; despite tremendous adversity, she succeeded in providing for her children and giving them a home in which to flourish.

Margarita’s life revolved around her children. She dedicated herself to giving them the best upbringing possible and made sure to instill in them strong values. With her support and guidance, all of Margarita’s children went on to be successful members of their community; among many impressive achievements, two of her children earned their masters degrees.

Today, Margarita still lives in the same Montebello home where she and her family settled in 1955. She enjoys knitting, crocheting, gardening, and of course seeing her family, which has grown quite a bit since 1935. At family celebrations and holidays she has the joy of spending time with her 18 grandchildren, numerous great grandchildren and great, great grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Margarita Muñoz represents the best in our community. Margarita exemplifies the true meaning of family, and her community is grateful to have such a role model of commitment and dedication. I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in wishing Margarita a very happy 100th birthday.

**TRIBUTE TO JC RISEWICK**

**HON. TOM LATHAM**  
**OF IOWA**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, April 10, 2014**

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize JC Risewick of Seneca Companies in Des Moines, Iowa, for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like JC in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Risewick for utilizing his talents to better his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating JC on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

**HONORING THE CAREER AND SERVICE OF DR. KULWANT S. BHANGOO**

**HON. BRIAN HIGGINS**  
**OF NEW YORK**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Thursday, April 10, 2014**

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a respected member of my Western New York community, Dr. Kulwant S. Bhangoo.
Dr. Bhangoo is a specialist in plastic and reconstructive surgery and has a practice in Buffalo, New York. He has earned an undergraduate degree from the University of Cambridge and his medical degree from the University of East Africa, where he won the Muligha-Loosen award, recognition which is awarded to the best student of the year. He completed his surgical training in England before coming to the Mercy Hospital of Buffalo to complete his residency in plastic surgery.

He has continued his distinguished academic record in Buffalo, where he has been published on subjects including wound healing and scar tissue and is a Clinical Assistant Professor of Plastic Surgery at the University at Buffalo School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences.

The history of Western New York is the story of immigrants who have brought their experience, training and drive to enrich our community, and Dr. Bhangoo's story is no different. Yet he has remained engaged with his native India. He travels often to conduct workshops and training for surgeons in India and has been recognized for his good work with the Lifetime Achievement Award by the Association of Aesthetic Surgeons of India.

Through his hard work and generous spirit Dr. Bhangoo has changed the lives of patients and enriched the careers of surgeons on four continents. We are proud to have him in our community and look forward to many years of his continued service in Western New York.

RECOGNIZING THE 99TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE
HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 99th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, also known as the Meds Yeghern or "Great Crime," to those of Armenian descent, but our fellow citizens of Armenian descent, but the truth is necessary, not just out of respect for the government’s failure to communicate effectively.

While serving as a government employee, Dr. Cheek was the chair of PLAIN, a federal interagency plain language advocacy group. In her role as chair, Annette administered the group’s website, and taught courses on plain language to government agencies.

In 2003, Annette founded the Center for Plain Language, a non-profit organization dedicated to plain language advocacy. Annette has served as Chair of the organization since 2003. In her role as Chair, Dr. Cheek has urged both the Federal Government and the private sector to communicate in a clear and understandable way.

Dr. Cheek’s biggest success was her work to pass the Plain Writing Act into law. I was honored to work with Annette in writing this important legislation which requires government agencies to communicate in plain language. Annette has served as Chair of the organization since 2003. In her role as Chair, Dr. Cheek has urged both the Federal Government and the private sector to communicate in a clear and understandable way.

Dr. Cheek also spent four years as the chief plain language expert on Vice President Gore’s National Partnership for Reinventing Government.

In 2003, Annette founded the Center for Plain Language, a non-profit organization dedicated to plain language advocacy. Annette has served as chair of the organization since 2003. In her role as Chair, Dr. Cheek has urged both the Federal Government and the private sector to communicate in a clear and understandable way.

I’m very proud of Annette, and honored to call her a friend. I congratulate her on retirement, and wish her and Charles all the best in their future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO GAIL MAYFIELD HAMM
HON. JANICE HAHN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Gail Mayfield Hamm.

Despite being so active in her neighborhood though, she cherished her time with her own family comprising of three surviving children, nine grandchildren, and six great grandchildren. I had the honor of working with Gail while on the Los Angeles City Council. I found her dedication and good nature to be inspiring.

Mr. Speaker, ask that all the members of the House join me in a moment of silence to commemorate the life of Gail Mayfield Hamm.

HON. ADAM SMITH
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Seattle Seahawks on being named the Washingtonians of the Year by the Association of Washington Generals. Given each year to those who have demonstrated leadership, selflessness, generosity, and compassion in their service to others, this award is a well-deserved recognition of all that the Seattle Seahawks have contributed to our community.

Through their work off the field may be less visible than their stellar on-field performances, it is no doubt equally as valuable. From individual visits by players and coaches to area hospitals, to the innovative work of the Seattle Seahawks Charitable Foundation, the team has contributed to the well-being of our community at all levels of the organization.

A shining example of this is the work of the Seattle Seahawks’ “A Better Seattle” program. This program, in partnership with the YMCA and the City of Seattle, has invested in the future of our youth in powerful ways. Through their support of the YMCA’s “Alive & Free” street outreach program, the Seattle Seahawks have helped to transform the lives of hundreds of youth in our area by ensuring a safer and more peaceful future. Combined with the many other youth and child focused efforts of the Seattle Seahawks, the Seahawks organization has solidified itself as one of the greatest advocates for the welfare of young people in our region.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Seattle Seahawks on their recognition as Washingtonians of the Year. They are richly deserving of this award, and I look forward to their continued excellence on and off the field.

TRIBUTE TO ERIN ROLLENHAGEN
HON. TOM LATHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Erin Rollenhagen of Entrepreneurial Technologies in Urbandale, Iowa, for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record. Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an
INTRODUCTION OF THE HOUSING FINANCIAL LITERACY ACT OF 2014

HON. JOYCE BEATTY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, owning a home is the cornerstone of achieving the American Dream for many Americans. Homeownership is a source of pride and develops robust and stable communities. However, for many prospective first-time homeowners, the process of purchasing real estate may be confusing and daunting and may leave uninformed buyers victims of unaffordable or predatory loans.

I believe that we must support access to homeownership and the financial literacy necessary to become a successful first-time homeowner. That is why today I am introducing the Housing Financial Literacy Act of 2014 which would provide a discount on Federal Housing Administration, or FHA, upfront mortgage insurance premiums of 25 basis points to first-time homebuyers who complete a housing counseling program certified by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or HUD. This bill would encourage first time homebuyers to take advantage of these critical counseling resources that can increase their financial literacy skills and capabilities.

Currently, HUD's Housing Counseling Assistance Program provides counseling to consumers on the entire spectrum of housing counseling needs: from finding and financing, to maintaining and owning a home. Studies have shown that homebuyers who receive pre-purchase housing counseling courses are nearly one-third less likely to fall behind on their mortgage, and that housing counseling can improve prospective borrowers’ access to affordable, prudent mortgage loans. Consequently, an additional anticipated benefit is a reduction in delinquencies and defaults by better-informed first-time homebuyers that housing counseling can improve prospective borrowers’ access to affordable, prudent mortgage loans. Consequently, an additional anticipated benefit is a reduction in delinquencies and defaults by better-informed first-time homebuyers that are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career fields. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Erin in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Rollenhagen for utilizing her talent and career with both her company and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Erin on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

HONORING SGT. FELIX CONDE-FALCON

HON. JOHN R. CARTER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American hero.

A native son of Puerto Rico, Sgt. Felix Conde-Falcon volunteered to join the Army in 1963 and was soon stationed in Texas at both Fort Bliss and Fort Hood. He settled in the Lone Star State with his wife and young family before answering the call to fight for freedom in Vietnam.

On April 4, 1969, while serving as platoon leader in the vicinity of Ap Tan Hoa, Vietnam, Sgt. Conde-Falcon showed extraordinary leadership under heavy fire as he took out multiple enemy positions. While in enemy positions, he and his heroic actions saved the soldiers serving with him, he was shot and killed just as he eliminated the final bunker. He was laid to rest in Rogers, TX.

Nearly a half century later, Sgt. Conde-Falcon was awarded the Medal of Honor. Recognized for his service, he is also the thirtieth recipient to receive the Medal of Honor.

Were Sgt. Conde-Falcon still with us, he would know how grateful his nation is for his service, his heroism, and his commitment to duty. He'd know how admired he is by his fellow soldiers. Because of his valor, many of his platoon brothers were able to return home. Some would honor promises made in the jungles of Vietnam and spend decades tracking down Sgt. Conde-Falcon’s family to let them know of his bravery, leadership, and the impact he had.

Were Sgt. Conde-Falcon still with us, he would have seen his family grow and prosper. His children carried on the tradition of service in the military. His son Richard would receive the Medal of Honor on his behalf.

Are you a better person today than you were yesterday? Were Sgt. Conde-Falcon alive, like those of over 58,000, is enshrined forever in black stone at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Those extraordinary men and women, from a multitude of races, faiths, and backgrounds, fought for a country brave enough to confront its past injustices and hopeful enough to embrace a better tomorrow. His story, like all of theirs, was one of sacrifice and devotion to freedom.

There is no more deserving recipient of the Medal of Honor than Sgt. Felix Conde-Falcon. Despite a life cut short, this brave warrior’s patriotism, service, and noble sacrifice serve for personal acts of valor above and beyond the call of duty, it is our nation’s highest military tribute.

Linemen are often the first responders during a storm or other catastrophic event, which means these brave men and women are often required to make the scene safe for other public safety heroes. Linemen work with thousands of volts of electricity high atop power lines every day of the year in order to protect the nation from dangerous electrical currents.

The profession of Lineman is steeped in tradition and family, both professionally and personally. Generations ago, Linemen climbed poles using hooks and blocks, but as technology has grown through the years, inventive Linemen have pioneered advancements with innovative materials, altering the direction of line work for the future.

I urge my colleagues to join me today in honoring the extraordinary commitment and courage demonstrated every day by the nation’s Linemen.

CELEBRATING AMERICA’S 143RD ARBOR DAY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honoring the extraordinary commitment and courage demonstrated every day by the nation’s Linemen.
If our nation is to continue being the greatest nation on earth, it is important that we continue to safeguard what makes us great, our people and our resources. I urge each and every citizen to help make our communities greener, cleaner, and more pleasant places to live by joining with me and taking the time to plant a tree. It is with great gratitude and pride that I rise to honor and celebrate Arbor Day and all that it stands for.

HONORING IOWA MIDDLE LEVEL PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR GARY HATFIELD

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gary Hatfield on being selected as the Iowa Middle Level Principal of the Year. Gary serves as the principal at Talie Middle School in Cedar Rapids which is in my district. Gary was selected because of his leadership in implementing a system of learning supports for students and teachers.

Mr. Hatfield began his career as a math teacher at Wilson Middle School. In 2008, he came to Talie Middle School to serve as the principal. He received his bachelor’s degree in math from Iowa State University, and master’s degrees in middle school math education and educational administration from the University of Northern Iowa.

Mr. Hatfield was selected for this award by a committee of Iowa middle level principals, and he is now a candidate for National Middle School Principal of the Year. Gary has proven that he is a leader at his school and throughout the Cedar Rapids community. I’m proud to call him a constituent, and congratulate him on all of his success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STRENGTHENING HEALTHCARE OPTIONS FOR VULNERABLE POPULATIONS ACT

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the bipartisan Strengthening Healthcare Options for Vulnerable Populations Act.

This legislation, which I will introduce today, extends the authorization of Medicare Advantage Dual Special Needs Plans, or D–SNPs, and makes necessary improvements to this valuable program for vulnerable seniors.

Special Needs Plans, or SNPs, are a type of Medicare Advantage Plan with membership limited to a specific population with specific diseases or characteristics, and tailored benefits, provider choices, and drug formularies developed to best meet the needs of the group they serve.

Dual Special Needs Plans, or D–SNPs, are plans developed for individuals who are both Medicare and Medicaid eligible. The Medicare dual eligible population is low-income and more likely to have complex and costly healthcare needs. Nationally, it costs $300 billion to care for this population. D–SNPs are driving improved care outcomes and greater efficiency eliminating redundancies between the two programs.

There are 125,000 dual eligible individuals in Arizona and nine million nationally. More than half of the dual eligibles in my state are enrolled in a D–SNP. D–SNPs in Arizona are well-run and have demonstrated success: 31 percent lower rate of hospitalization; 43 percent lower rate of emergency room visits; 21 percent lower readmission rate; 3 percent higher preventive care services.

But D–SNPs are not just about controlling cost and improving healthcare delivery for a vulnerable population. D–SNPs, because of their innovative and targeted services, are a valuable option for seniors trying to live with dignity or people with disabilities trying to live fuller lives.

Bonnie Grant is in her 60s and lives in south Phoenix. Through her D–SNP, she has access to a transportation called Van Go. Bonnie uses the service to go shopping and other places “instead of being stuck at home.” She said that it helps because “instead of being holed up in your home,” she can be engaged in the community and enjoy her life.

The Van Go benefit is the type of creative service offered by D–SNPs that improve the wellbeing of enrollees.

Joseph Ford lives in suburban Phoenix. He was disabled in a car accident. The hands-on managed care he receives through his D–SNP, including in-home visits, allows Mr. Ford to stay in his home and live a fuller life. Keeping individuals like Mr. Ford in their homes instead of institutional care facilities is better for the beneficiary and a significant cost savings to the Medicaid and Medicare programs.

We need creative and commonsense solutions to control the cost and improve the quality of services provided to this vulnerable population, which includes seniors and single working mothers. That is what D–SNPs are doing and that is why we introduce this bill today.

The Strengthening Healthcare Options for Vulnerable Populations Act will allow seniors to have greater choice, help drive down cost and improve outcomes.

First, this bill extends authorization for D–SNPs and requires that plans fully integrate Medicare and Medicaid services, while providing states with flexibility to make the plans work for their citizens. This long term authorization will create stability in the SNP program, thereby allowing states, the federal government and the private sector to begin to develop consistent strategies for addressing care for dual eligibles. Beneficiaries will also know that the plan they have chosen will not be taken away.

Second, the bill directs CMS in coordination with State Medicaid Directors to develop a clearly defined role for state Medicaid agencies in contracting and oversight of integrated D–SNPs.

Third, the legislation follows the recommendation of National Association of Medicaid Directors (NAMD) to designate the Medicare/Medicaid Coordinating Officer within CMS as the dedicated point of contact to assist states with ongoing D–SNP administration issues, including eliminating redundancies and improving coordination of Medicare and Medicaid services and streamlining the flow of information to beneficiaries. The bill would also allow HHS to adjust Medicare’s processes, timelines and requirements to improve the seamless delivery of patient-centered services across the care continuum.

Fourth, the bill provides additional protections to beneficiaries by requiring CMS, in coordination with states, to establish a streamlined dispute resolution process and by requiring Medicare to continue to provide coverage during the dispute process.

Lastly, our legislation improves the Medicare Advantage star ratings program to better evaluate and incentivize D–SNP performance. The bill directs CMS to take the necessary steps to recognize and incentivize performance by plans who serve more difficult or complex populations like the dual population. Ensuring that vulnerable seniors continue to have access to these valuable plans is an important part of ensuring that they can live out their golden years with dignity.

The Strengthening Healthcare Options for Vulnerable Populations Act extends an important program for one of Arizona’s most vulnerable populations. This bill ensures that seniors and others in these plans will be able to keep the managed care services they have selected. This bill provides seniors greater flexibility to control cost and provide improved services. Finally, this bill can help control cost for a very expensive population nationally while at the same time improving healthcare outcomes.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREA STACKHOUSE

HON. TOM LATHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Andrea Stockhouse of Neumann Monson Architects in Des Moines, Iowa, for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to recognize Andrea Stockhouse of Neumann Monson Architects in Des Moines, Iowa, for her great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.
HONORING GARIFUNA-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH
HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to recognize the 217th anniversary of the forcible transfer of the Garifuna people from St. Vincent to Central America, which is to be observed on April 12, 2014. Each year this day serves as an important reminder of the rich history and heritage that is an intrinsic part of this community, and of the history of the United States. This commemoration is the culmination of Garifuna-American Heritage Month, which celebrates the important and unique contributions of the Garifuna community to my home borough of the Bronx, to New York City, and to our nation as a whole.

The Garifuna community has a unique heritage, language, and culture. As descendents of West African slaves, Venezuelan Caribs and Arawaks, Garifuna communities have long been an important part of several nations, including Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Nicaragua. The Garifuna people first arrived in New York City in the 1930s as part of the merchant marines, and their numbers quickly grew in several neighborhoods. The Garifuna people are now a long established part of the fabric of New York City, and of my district in the Bronx. Today, I am proud to be able to pay tribute to their history and their future.

Mr. Speaker, Garifuna-American Heritage Month celebrates the unique cultural contributions and ethnic pride this community has provided to the melting pot that is New York City. I am confident that this month will continue to exist as an important cultural landmark celebration for many years to come. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the significance of April 12th in the history of the Garifuna people, and in recognizing their contributions to New York City and to our nation.

HONORING MAINE’S PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS
HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Maine’s Public Safety Dispatchers for their essential service to our communities in times of emergency. Maine’s public safety telecommunicators are committed to putting the safety and interests of the community before themselves, and I would like to commend them for their invaluable hard work and commitment to ensuring public safety.

These unsung heroes are our country’s “unseen first responders.” They are the men and women who answer the calls of those citizens asking for help with a promise that help is, in fact, on its way. We place our trust in these individuals every day of the year and rely on their bravery and professionalism as they make critical decisions, obtain information, and quickly dispatch needed aid. Regardless of the call, they always answer with compassion, persistence, and patience. As a result, their work is imperative to our country’s citizens, police, fire and emergency medical assistance personnel.

They remain calm in times of crisis and helpful in times of hurting. Their voices guide a young mother through infant CPR, talk an accident victim out of going into shock, and provide comfort to those who have been harmed or injured as they wait for emergency personnel to arrive. Yet, they seldom witness the product of their good work because they do not see the young mother’s face when her infant takes its first breath, or the accident victim’s face as first responders come into sight. It is for these reasons that they deserve our special appreciation and recognition.

In addition to the services they directly provide to the general public, they also handle governmental communications related to forestry, conservation, highway safety, and natural disasters. This means that while most individuals seek shelter during a flood or blizzard, the public safety telecommunicators are at their posts ensuring that everyone in their communities, including the police officers and firefighters, return home safely.

These telecommunicators are selfless, skilled, and often overlooked. Their daily service to the public goes without due recognition by the many beneficiaries of their services. Today, I would like to take a moment and extend my deepest gratitude on behalf of the state of Maine and applaud them for their honorable service.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognition and appreciation of the many public safety telecommunicators of Maine.

HONORING THE EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT’S 80TH BIRTHDAY
HON. JERRY McNERNEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the East Bay Regional Park District (the District) for 80 years of creating beautiful parkland and open spaces in both Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. The District has over 114,000 acres, 65 parks and 1,200 miles of trails, which allow people to enjoy nature, outdoor recreation, and environmental education experiences.

Through its Healthy Parks, Healthy People Campaign, the District has worked to promote awareness of the parks, trails and events they offer to both counties. The District has always been forward thinking in planning how to manage and conserve our nation’s resources while also providing the public with a variety of recreational activities.

East Bay Regional Parks has been a key participant in conservation for eighty years. The Park District has been created a master plan for the East Bay to preserve our resources through good management while also providing the public with a variety of recreation and outdoor activities.

I ask my colleagues to congratulate the East Bay Regional Parks on its 80th birthday and to recognize its invaluable contributions to our natural resources and our communities.

HONORING IOWA ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR RYAN DAVIS
HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ryan Davis on his selection as the Iowa Assistant Principal of the Year. Ryan serves as the assistant principal at Vinton-Shellsburg High School in my district. Ryan was selected because of his commitment to student success, his vision of student learning and his work with parents and the community.

Mr. Davis began his career as a science teacher in Minnesota. In 2008, he came to Vinton as the assistant principal and at-risk student coordinator. He received his bachelor’s degree from the University of Northern Iowa, his master’s degree in educational leadership from Saint Mary’s University, and his certificate in education administration from Saint Mary’s University.

Mr. Davis was selected for this award by a committee of Iowa assistant principals, and he is now a candidate for National Assistant Principal of the Year. Ryan has proven that he is a leader at his school and throughout the Vinton-Shellsburg community. I’m proud to call him a constituent, and congratulate him on all of his success.

TRIBUTE TO SHANE STARK
HON. TOM LATHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Shane Stark of
Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Shane Goodspeed of the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize the 100th birthday of Mr. Clarence Rostad of Big Timber, Montana. Clarence Rostad was born on April 28th, 1914, in Big Timber, Montana, to George and Susanna Rostad. Clarence and his ten siblings grew up on the East Fork of the lower Sweet Grass Creek and on the family’s ranch on the Boulder River near McLeod. It was here that his love for ranching and farming truly developed.

Clarence attended school at Big Timber Grade School. After a few years of working on the ranch, he attended college classes at Montana State College. He also served his country in the United States Army. In 1946 he married his beloved wife Ruth, whom he shared 57 years on their ranch on the Boulder River. The two raised six children and regularly hosted their 14 grandchildren and 19 great-grandchildren.

Clarence loves his ranch on the river—but even more, he loves welcoming others to enjoy the beauty of the mountains and the blue-ribbon river surrounding his ranch. Clarence’s desire to welcome strangers to the ranch resulted in having friends of multiple generations in the same family—all of whom have enjoyed the ranch and the company of Clarence’s hospitality, as well as him surrendering them with his harmonica.

One of Clarence’s great loves in life, in addition to his family and ranching, is his love for God. As evidenced in his patience and love for his family and ranching, Clarence is a strong man of faith in his Lord Jesus Christ. As described by his family, his love of raising sheep and cattle has truly blessed him with the heart of the Good Shepherd. Today, one of Clarence's greatest desires is to honor God through playing sacred music on his harmonica. Having learned to play his harmonica in the solitude of the foothills and mountains in the Boulder River valley, Clarence has the great ability to play complex tunes despite not having any formal music education. Clarence keeps his mind refreshed and his heart renewed by playing music of faith that expresses his love for God.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 100th birthday of Clarence, who has led an outstanding life dedicated to loving God, his family, and loving his neighbor as himself. I wish him many more joyful years of health and happiness.
CELEBRATING THE LAUNCH OF FRESH NEW START

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I had the privilege of employing a brilliant and dedicated young staffer named Francis B. Gibbs. Francis was one of my first campaign staffers and I was privileged for him to come with me to Washington as I began my congressional career in 2001. He was a trusted aide and a true friend who always gave me the straight answer. He left my office to become Legislative Director, then Chief of Staff for U.S. Representative Connie Mack and later served as Chief of Staff for the Florida Department of Transportation. Rooted in principle, Francis was an honest, committed public servant, friend to many, and devoted husband to LeAnne and father to children Couper and Riley. He faced a world of possibility and wasn’t afraid to tackle challenges head on.

So it was devastating when he received a cancer diagnosis that turned his world—and that of his family—upside down. It was a challenge that, despite every effort, he ultimately was unable to overcome. Francis passed away on May 17, 2013, at the age of 40, leaving behind grieving family and friends who could only ask themselves the age-old question: “Why?”

Struggling with the “why” and feeling overcome by the pain that comes with losing someone you love so much can be debilitating. Our human nature tells us to withdraw from the world, to isolate and self-protect. And as hard as it is to pick ourselves up and carry on, it is the only way that beauty can be born from ashes.

LeAnne Holdman Gibbs did just that. In the midst of her own pain, this extraordinary young widow and mother of two young children decided that she needed to honor Francis’ wish for her and reconnect with the world after a year of cancer-caregiving. So she took a group of girlfriends on a trip to Florence, Italy, using the trip to renew and refresh, to rediscover passions, and to dream about her future.

But it didn’t end there. Before his death, Francis and LeAnne talked about how she might use her own experience to inspire other young women who were in a similar situation. As she began her own widowhood journey, she was surprised and frustrated to find that there were so few resources dedicated to serving young cancer widows who had been their spouses’ primary caregivers. She was determined to do something about that, and has since dedicated herself to supporting such women.

The concept for a not-for-profit corporation was born. With tremendous courage, hard work, and help from a core group of friends, LeAnne founded Fresh New Start, an organization “that seeks to refresh and renew the young woman who has lost her husband to cancer and to offer encouragement and support as she begins and endures her journey through widowhood.” Fresh New Start will sponsor trips/retreats for selected candidates and up to three adult friends to give other young cancer widows the opportunity to “renew, refresh, and restart.” The corporation will also serve these women by providing connections to other young cancer widows and additional resources for them and their caregivers.

Fresh New Start officially launched on the first day of spring on April 20, 2014. I am proud of LeAnne for honoring Francis’ memory by launching Fresh New Start and offer my congratulations on the creation of an organization that will benefit many young widows for years to come and honor the legacy of a friend I miss dearly, Francis B. Gibbs.

IN HONOR OF GEORGE W. KOCH

HON. SAM FARR
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend George W. Koch who passed away on January 26, at the age of 87.

George William Koch was born on April 8, 1926, in Cincinnati. After serving in the Navy during World War II, he received a bachelor’s degree in business in 1948, a bachelor of laws degree in 1950 and a juris doctor degree in 1950, all from the University of Cincinnati.

After working as an assistant city attorney in Cincinnati, George became director of the Ohio Council of Retail Merchants before joining Sears and then the Grocery Manufacturers of America. George led the Grocery Manufacturers of America, GMA, trade association from 1966 to 1990. He was an inspiring leader who led the GMA to become one of the most influential and effective trade associations in America. Last year, George W. Koch received the first-ever Grocery Manufacturers Association’s Leadership in Public Policy and will name the award in his honor going forward.

As consumers, we all benefit from George’s leadership in promoting good practices at stores and grocery chains across America.

Among his countless achievements, George is responsible for leading the initiative at GMA to introduce the Universal Product Code in 1974, and the development of tamper-resistant packaging in the wake of the Tylenol poisonings of 1982.

He is survived by his wife of 63 years, Helen Lawton Koch; his six children, Jonie Koch Kenny, Daniel, Patrick, Robert, Monte, and Lucy Lawton Koch; and 14 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend George W. Koch and to wish his family peace and solace during this difficult time.

TRIBUTE TO KRISTAL TAMILLO

HON. TOM LATHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Chrystal Tamillo of Flemings Steakhouse in West Des Moines, Iowa, for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Chrystal in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Ms. Tamillo for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Chrystal on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN R. CARTER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes earlier this week in order to attend the memorial services held for the victims of the tragic shooting at Fort Hood, TX, last week. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

April 7, 2014: Rollcall No. 165, Motion to Recommit H.R. 1872—“nay.”
Rollcall No. 166, Passage of H.R. 1872—“yea.”

April 8, 2014: Rollcall No. 167, Motion to Recommit H.R. 1871—“nay.”
Rollcall No. 168, Passage of H.R. 1871—“yea.”
Rollcall No. 169, Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 544—“yea.”
Rollcall No. 170, Adoption of H. Res. 544—“yea.”

April 9, 2014: Rollcall No. 171, Substitute Amendment No. 1—“nay.”
Rollcall No. 172, Substitute Amendment No. 2—“nay.”
Rollcall No. 173, Substitute Amendment No. 3—“yea.”
Rollcall No. 174, Passage of H.R. 4414—“yea.”

HONORING DR. ROBERT EDWARD PAINE, JR.

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks in honor of Dr. Robert Edward Paine, Jr.—also known as Dr. Bob or Grandoc—of Salem, Virginia, who “completed
Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Chair, I will vote for the bipartisan Ryan Murray budget agreement; for efforts to simplify our nation’s tax code to make it simpler and fairer for all involved; for repeal of the president’s misguided and unworkable health care law; for efforts to address the president’s wasteful spending proposals and burdensome regulations, which are preventing our economy from reaching its full potential; for efforts to ensure that our men and women in uniform have the support they need; and for efforts to balance our nation’s budget—the President’s budget proposal never achieves balance.

Mr. Chair, I will vote for efforts to reform our entitlement programs to ensure that they are preserved and protected for future generations. This budget proposal is a thoughtful document that forces the Congress to face reality—these programs, which are on autopilot, are simply unsustainable in their current form. And we must reform these programs because they consume roughly two-thirds of our nation’s spending. We must preserve our ability to quickly respond to any crisis, foreign or domestic, while still ensuring we have the ability to make the needed investments that will spur economic private industry growth and innovation.

Just like the bipartisan Ryan Murray budget agreement, I do not agree with every line in this budget framework, and I will work to improve any future legislation that may be considered as a result of its adoption. But I do agree that we have a duty to offer ideas in the public sphere. I will vote yes because our fiscal challenges are real, and they must be addressed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

SPEECH OF
HON. FRANK R. WOLF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 8, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I will vote for H. Con. Res. 96 because I continue to believe the Congress has a responsibility to produce a budget each year. As a longstanding member of the House Appropriations Committee, I feel it is important that Congress have an open and honest debate about the fiscal challenges our country faces, especially our out-of-control entitlement spending that continues to deplete the federal coffers of resources to invest in defense, infrastructure, education, science and technology, and our nation’s health care. These investments are what America great in the 20th century, and are on track to be completely overtaken within a decade due to unchecked entitlement spending growth.

When I came to the floor to vote for last year’s budget, we were $16.7 trillion in debt. Today, we are over $17.5 trillion in debt. That’s a nearly trillion dollar increase in one year. We are projected to grow to $27 trillion in 10 years, another $10 trillion increase. Our unfunded obligations and liabilities are now projected to be well of $70 trillion, and CBO’s February 2014 budget outlook projected this year’s deficit to be about $514 billion. These numbers get worse with each passing year.

Equally troubling, this mounting debt is increasingly held by foreign countries. In 1970, 6 percent of debt held by the public was in foreign hands. In 1990, it was 19 percent. Today, nearly 50 percent of our publically held debt is in foreign hands—and it is held by countries like China and Saudi Arabia which certainly do not share our interests or values.

My vote today reflects my desire to advance the congressional budget process to confront our nation’s challenges. While there are many good things in this budget, my vote should not be interpreted as a reflection of my satisfaction with the legislation itself. Simply put, I believe this is a flawed proposal that stands no chance of being adopted by both chambers of Congress. It is sure to fail because it has serious concerns with several of the provisions, and if I believe fails short of being a plan that can garner the bipartisan support necessary to put our nation on a path towards fiscal responsibility.

Most notably, this budget once again falls short in its failure to incorporate most of the recommendations of the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Commission. Regrettably, another year has gone by where the president and both parties of the Republican and the Democratic Party have failed to advance the only bipartisan fiscal reforms that would address our debt and deficit in a manner that could result in real progress.

As I have repeatedly said, I would much prefer to vote for a bipartisan budget modeled off the Simpson-Bowles plan. It could be improved by incorporating changes in existing law and other proposals, such as those produced by the discussions between the president and Speaker BOEHNER, and plans offered by House Republicans and Senate Republicans. But only a budget based on this model can put our nation on a sustainable, long-term path to replace sequestration and reform our nation’s entitlement programs so they will exist for future generations.

As much as both sides might prefer that their party control both chambers of Congress and the White House, this simply is not the case. And it’s unlikely to change until 2016 at the earliest. Either the Congress can get serious about adopting budget reforms that have bipartisan consensus and could be signed into law, or we can continue having these same quixotic debates, while our debt and deficit grow unabated. The debt and deficit numbers continue to get worse, and none of the actions taken by the Congress—including sequestration—have made a meaningful impact on our fiscal situation.

For the last eight years I have been working toward finding consensus on bipartisan budget reforms based on the premise that all Americans, not just one group or another, will have
to give something towards reducing our debt and deficits. Starting in 2006, during the Bush Administration, I began advocating for a bipartisan commission—the Securing America’s Future Economy (SAFE) Commission—to identify budget reforms that could win the support of both Republicans and Democrats. The Simpson-Bowles Commission, appointed in 2010, was formed largely in response to efforts in the House and Senate to advance the SAFE Commission. The commission’s co-chairs, former Senator Alan Simpson and Erskine Bowles, ultimately produced a package of bipartisan reforms that was serious and effective.

Unfortunately, President Obama and congressional leadership have spent the last three years running away from the Simpson-Bowles recommendations. When my colleagues and I have brought legislation to the floor of the House based on these recommendations, the efforts have fallen short due to a lack of support from both Republican and Democrat leadership. I believe their misguided opposition represents a failure of leadership that they will come to regret in the years ahead, as our budget challenges grow more dire.

To date, we have instead been presented with tepid proposals that fail to meaningfully impact our debt, or proposals, like this budget, that embrace a vision for budget reform that stands little chance of passing and becoming law.

This year, President Obama has retreated from even modest budget reforms that he has proposed in the past, such as chained CPI. I believe history will not look kindly on his failure to lead efforts to bring both parties together around meaningful reforms to address this existential national threat. His failure to lead over the last five years is directly reflected in the budget that the House has passed today, which reflects a conservative blueprint for budget reform rather than reforms based on bipartisan consensus.

There’s a certain irony that the budget approved today is drawn from only one section of the Simpson-Bowles framework: making our federal workforce contribute more towards its retirement and taking steps towards ending the defined benefit retirement plan. Yet again, the Congress is targeting just one group of Americans for additional sacrifice—just as has been done for offsets in past budget agreements. This flies in the face of the Simpson-Bowles vision of shared sacrifice among all Americans in fixing our debt and deficit and, as I have said many times, is just wrong. To cite the Simpson-Bowles recommendations as an excuse to single out additional cuts to federal employees is disingenuous and inappropriate.

My colleagues often forget that while there are many federal employees in the capital region, it is worth noting that more than 85 percent of the workforce is outside of Washington. They also may not realize that more than 65 percent of all federal employees work in agencies that support our national defense capabilities as we continue to fight the War on Terror.

The first American killed in Afghanistan, Mike Spann, was a CIA agent and a constituent from my congressional district. CIA, FBI, DEA agents, and State Department employees are serving side-by-side with our military in the fight against the Taliban.

Federal employees include the Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents who are working to stop the flow of illegal immigrants and drugs across our borders. They are the medical researchers at NIH working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer’s and autism. They are the VA doctors and nurses treating veterans from World War II to the present day. They are the NASA astronauts and engineers working to support the International Space Station and build our nation’s exploration program. These are just a few examples of the hardworking people that serve our country each day that this budget unfairly targets.

I am also concerned with a provision in the budget that would only replace one federal employee for every three vacancies. Do we really want to cut the number of FBI and Border Patrol agents and VA doctors by two-thirds? This proposal amounts to an indiscriminate sequestration of the federal workforce. While there may be some agencies where reductions are necessary, I do not support this indiscriminate approach of doing so. Taken together, these proposals on federal employees may very well undermine the federal workforce.

It is often said that budgets are about choices, and I fear that yet another year will go by where we fail to make the tough choices—yet tough choices that members from both parties can support—to make real progress in confronting our debt and deficit. Until the president and congressional leadership start to incorporate the Simpson-Bowles recommendations, or a bold plan like this that gets control of the debt and deficit, into their budgets, we will likely never address the structural reforms that must be made to responsibly get our nation’s fiscal house in order. This should be done in a manner that involves shared sacrifice from all Americans, not just certain groups of Americans.

I am proud to have served on the House Appropriations Committee for most of my tenure in the Congress, where each year we produce appropriations bills that make tough choices, yet the bills often pass with bipartisan support. Over the last several years, the full Appropriations Committee has made more than $100 billion in cuts to discretionary spending. The Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations subcommittee, which I chair, has contributed more than $12 billion towards those cuts. But we approached these cuts in a responsible manner and I am proud that we have often had bipartisan support for the bills we produce. It can be done, but it requires leadership.

Mr. Chair, this budget is constructive for advancing the debate about our nation’s fiscal challenges, and my vote today reflects my support for the process. But until this Congress passes a budget based on the bipartisan reforms recommended by the Simpson-Bowles recommendations, it is unlikely we will ever make real progress towards reducing our debt and deficit in a substantial way. It’s time for leadership—from the president and both Republicans and Democrats in Congress—to deal with this issue.
TRIBUTE TO TIMOTHY WHIPPLE

HON. TOM LATHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Timothy Whipple of Iowa Economic Development Authority in Des Moines, Iowa, for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Timothy in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. Whipple for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Timothy on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

COLUMBIA REGIONAL CENTER OF INNOVATION

HON. GREG WALDEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable economic partnership under way in the Pacific Northwest, where the Columbia River Gorge joins the states of Oregon and Washington. This initiative, the Columbia Gorge Regional Center of Innovation, is aimed at streamlining the region’s education to prepare its students for the modern workforce, in turn, bringing economic growth and development to the region.

With economies originally based firmly in agriculture and natural resources, communities within the Columbia Gorge have become a center for a burgeoning technology sector, anchored by a Google data center in The Dalles, Oregon, and a Boeing subsidiary, Insitu, in Bingen, Washington. Quality of life, outdoor recreation, and natural beauty helped attract those employers.

While regional prosperity beckons, challenges remain. The cost of housing in the area makes it difficult for persons on low to moderate incomes to live where they work. There are significant infrastructure concerns, most notably two interstate bridges serving the central Columbia Gorge. And most importantly, the continued growth of the region’s technology sector requires a skilled workforce. This is a special challenge in a region where 80,000 people are dispersed over a rural area roughly the size of Massachusetts. Innovation, creativity and collaboration are essential to address these common challenges.

The Columbia Gorge Regional Center of Innovation is a cross-sector partnership that brings together private industry, economic development regions, local colleges and universities, the K-12 school districts, early childhood education, community colleges, the land-grant universities of Oregon and Washington, and other regional public and private universities to find solutions to these challenges. The result of this partnership is improved cooperation across the state line; innovative strategies to construct “attainable housing” for the region’s workforce and tackle infrastructure concerns; and promoting job creation through improved access to industry-specific skills.

This dialogue will continue on Friday, April 18, when the first-ever Columbia Gorge Education and Industry Summit takes place on The Dalles Campus of Columbia Gorge Community College, and on May 16, 2014, when the first-ever Columbia Gorge Bi-State Legislative Summit will bring together state lawmakers from Salem and Olympia. The goal is to recognize the Columbia Gorge as a bi-state region with common concerns, which can best be resolved through improved cooperation across the state line with the federal government, Mid-Columbia Economic Development District, and the Columbia River Gorge Commission.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending local leaders of the bi-state Columbia Gorge for their innovation and courage in addressing the economic challenges that still confront their region. Their hard work deserves our recognition.

WORKER'S MEMORIAL DAY RESOLUTION

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, millions of workers worldwide come together to recognize Worker’s Memorial Day. Worker’s Memorial Day commemorates those who have been injured or killed on the job. My own family experienced tough times when my Dad was permanently injured in a workplace fall when I was very young. Over the past several decades in the United States we have made great progress in preventing injuries and deaths at the workplace. However, there is still work to be done as much as 5,000 Americans are killed due to workplace related injuries, and millions more experience occupational injuries and illnesses. Work related accidents are still too common in the United States. An average 16 Americans are killed each day due to workplace injuries. It is clear we must continue work towards ensuring that every workplace is a safe one.

While in the United States we have improved workplace safety in recent decades, the numbers across the globe are overwhelming. It is estimated that nearly 2 million workers die each year due to work related accidents or diseases worldwide. More people are killed due to workplace injury or disease than are killed in war.

As a member of Congress, I will continue to fight for workplace safety. I’m also committed to recognizing Worker’s Memorial Day and the millions of workers across the world who have given their lives while on the job. That is why I’m proud to have co-introduced a resolution honoring Worker’s Memorial Day with Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. We must continue to honor the millions of men and women who have given their lives for the continued progress of humankind. As long as I’m in office, I will continue to work towards strengthening the middle class and advocating for workplace safety.

RECOGNIZING THE ALARMING MORTALITY RATE OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN BREAST CANCER PATIENTS RESOLUTION

HON. JANICE HAHN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, April has been designated Minority Health Awareness Month, and I want to shine a spotlight on a crucial minority women’s healthcare issue—the alarming mortality rate of African-American women from breast cancer. In the last few months, both the New York Times and Los Angeles Times featured articles about the disparity in mortality rates between African-American and white women with breast cancer.

The New York Times wrote “After her doctor told her two months ago that she had breast cancer, Debrah Reid, a 58-year-old dance teacher, drove straight to a funeral home. She began planning a burial with the funeral director and his wife, even requesting a pink coffin... ‘I was just going to sit down and die...’ That is heartbreaking.”

Much progress has been made over the last two decades to increase awareness, screening, and treatment of breast cancer, but unfortunately this progress has not been made for all women. In the 1980s, the mortality rate for African-American and white women were nearly identical. Today, shockingly, African-American women are 40 percent more likely to die from breast cancer than white women. Much of this difference results from a lack of screening, access to life-saving treatments, and quality of treatment.

Additionally, the higher difference in the death rate from breast cancer varies by region. In my city of Los Angeles, sadly, an African-American woman with breast cancer is 70 percent more likely to die compared to a white woman. This is not true in other cities, such as New York, where the disparity is nominal. Clearly, this demonstrates that public health improvements can be made to improve the survival rates for African-American women.

Therefore, I am introducing a resolution to highlight the high mortality rate for African-American women confronting breast cancer. My hope is that this resolution will bring awareness to this injustice to ensure that quality screening and treatment is available for all women, regardless of race. This is an issue of life and death and we must take every action available to ensure that every woman has access to the resources and treatment she needs to survive.
Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly great American on the occasion of his retirement from the United States Army. On April 16, 2014, Colonel Daniel D. Pick will relinquish his command of Commandant of the Defense Language Institute for the Presidio of Monterey and retire from the Army after 29 years of exemplary service. It is my great pleasure to have had the opportunity to get to know this soldier scholar. He truly represents for me the highest qualities of military leadership: courage, vision, integrity, and keen understanding of the broader world that we live in. Peace is best served when we can bridge cultures. In light of his commitment to military language capacity, his own language and cultural use, and his Institute as a diplomat and soldier overseas, Colonel Pick, is the personification of this truth.

In 1987, Colonel Pick graduated from the University of Washington and began his Army career as an active duty military intelligence officer. His early career took him many places, including scout platoon leader and battalion S2 in 3rd Battalion, 66th Armor Regiment in Garlstedt, Germany. In addition, he had a deployment to Operations Desert Shield/Storm in January 1991 as S2 3/66 Armor Battalion. Following his graduation from the Army Intelligence Officer Advanced Course, Colonel Pick served with 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne) as Commander, Military Intelligence Detachment and Group S2.

Colonel Pick became a Middle East Foreign Area Officer (FAO) in 1996. His FAO assignments include: Kuwait Land Forces Advisor, OMC–Kuwait; FAO Assignment Officer, Army Human Resources Command, WAD.C.; Executive Officer, Human Intelligence Team, 2nd Battalion, 10th Special Forces Group (Airborne); Northern Iraq; Army attaché, U.S. Embassy, Amman, Jordan; Policy Officer, Office of the Secretary of Defense; and FAO Program Director, Defense Language Institute.

Colonel Pick holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Near Eastern Languages and Civilization from the University of Washington, a Master of Military Studies from Marine Corps University, Quantico, and a Master of Arts degree in Near Eastern Studies from Princeton University. He speaks Arabic, Persian-Farsi, Persian-Dari, and Assyrian. He is a graduate of Marine Corps Command and Staff College, Defense Language Institute Basic Arabic Course, Jumpmaster Course, Military Intelligence Officer Basic and Advance Courses, Ranger School and Airborne School. In addition, his decorations include the Combat Action Badge, Bronze Star Medal with an oak leaf cluster, and Iraq Campaign Medal with arrowhead device.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in extending our most sincere gratitude and appreciation to Colonel Pick’s service to our Nation. The United States is a more secure and fruitful place as a consequence of his efforts. I want to wish Colonel Pick, his wife Karen, and children Dalton and Lauren, all the best as they transition from active duty to what will surely be an active and fruitful second career of continued public service. And while the Army is losing one of its most capable officers, the Monterey Bay region is retaining one of its most capable citizens.

Mr. McCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of a man who has dedicated much of his life to the educational system in Kern County.

Superintendent Don Carter recently announced his retirement after 38 years of service, serving as Kern High School District Superintendent over the past 10 years. A graduate of West High School, Don went on to earn his bachelor’s from California State University, Bakersfield and an Ed.D from the University of La Verne. In 1976, Don joined the teaching staff at Bakersfield High School as a math and science teacher before eventually becoming the school’s assistant principal and principal. After serving as the district associate superintendent for instruction, he was promoted to Superintendent in 2004.

Though his tenure at Kern High School District is coming to an end, his impact will be long-lasting. Serving California’s largest high school district, Don was responsible for the oversight of 18 high schools and over 3,700 employees. A strong advocate of academic achievement, Kern High School District’s performance index improved every year under Don’s tenure, including the significant improvement in the number of graduates that met entrance requirements for the University of California and California State University systems. As a proud former student of Superintendent Carter, I know personally of his dedication and steadfast commitment to ensure that every student he taught, and every student within our high school district, had the opportunity to achieve academic success. On behalf of a grateful community, I am honored to thank Don Carter for his dedication to our youth and I wish him a well-deserved retirement.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Marjorie Bertha Keck, who passed away on April 6, 2014, at the age of 93. She was a beloved wife and mother to four children who was known in recent years for saying, “Growing old isn’t for wimps!” She was all about family. Whether it was hosting boat rides on the bay or a day at the ballpark with the Oakland A’s, Marjorie would always find a way for family and friends to relax together amongst their busy lives.

As a devout follower of the Lord, her family and friends rejoice that she is reunited with her beloved husband Lee, and is in the arms of her Savior. She will be missed by all, but her spirit and love will always be with us.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Jason White of Warren County Economic Development in Indianapolis, Indiana, for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Indiana publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to represent leaders like Jason in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. White for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Jason on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 99th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of nearly 600 business leaders and growing. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to represent leaders like Jason in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mr. White for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Jason on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

This time every year, we pause in solemn remembrance and honor the victims who perished on Remembrance Day is to remember, it also serves another important purpose. Indeed, the act of remembering, the commitment to never forget, sends a clear message to the world that we cannot abide a culture of impunity. That we will not gloss over historical atrocities.
That we must not fail to hold to account those responsible for gross human rights violations. If we fail to remember horrific acts like the Armenian Genocide, we doom ourselves to repeat the most tragic chapters of history.

Accordingly, during my time in Congress, I have cosponsored House resolutions that have clearly stated the U.S. record regarding the true nature of the Armenian Genocide—an officially orchestrated ethnic genocide of innocent men, women and children.

In closing, I respectfully request that all my colleagues join me today in honoring the victims and survivors of the Armenian Genocide.

HONORING APRIL GREEN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my constituent, April Green.

Born April Smith, Ms. Green was born in Clarksburg, West Virginia to Janet Smith and Thomas on April 12, 1969. Raised by Janet and Daniel Thomas in Jacksonville, Florida, she was educated in the public school system, graduating from Sandlewood High School in 1987. Upon completion of high school she attended Georgia Southern University in Statesboro, Georgia where she majored in biology and played on the basketball team. April then enlisted in the Air Force Reserve, and shortly after enlisting was deployed to the Middle East in support of Operation Desert Storm, where she served in the Medivac Unit as a medical assistant.

After serving her country and completing college at Georgia Southern she returned to Jacksonville, Florida and began a career in banking. After many years at Barnett Bank of Florida, reaching the position of Vice President of Loans, April was called upon to serve in a different capacity. In 2003 she was contacted by her pastor, Bishop Rudolph McKissick, Sr. to provide leadership in the role as the church administrator and chief financial officer. At Bethel Baptist Institutional Church, April oversees the day to day operation of the church staff, finances and development. Bethel is the oldest African American Church in the State of Florida with a membership of approximately 11,000.

Always wanting to give back to the community and having a passion to assist kids with their quest to attend college and further their education, April started the Jacksonville Pistons, a non-profit organization that would accomplish that goal. She created a traveling basketball organization for boys and girls between the ages of 8–17 with an emphasis on academic achievement and personal growth. To date she has mentored over 200 kids whom attended college.

As she celebrates her 45th birthday, I speak for the entire Fifth District in thanking April Green for all her hard work serving the Jacksonville Community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, yesterday, I missed the House’s vote on Mr. MULVANEY’s Substitute Amendment to H. Con. Res. 96. The Substitute Amendment that Mr. MULVANEY called for was the President’s Budget for Fiscal Years 2015 through 2024. I was unfortunately not present while the voting occurred. However, I would like the RECORD to reflect that it was my intention to vote “no” on the President’s Budget.

NATIONAL FAIR HOUSING ALLIANCE COMPLAINT AGAINST SAFEGUARD PROPERTIES

HON. M ARCY KAP TUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. KAP TUR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the National Fair Housing Alliance and the Toledo Fair Housing Center filed a Federal housing discrimination complaint with the Department of Housing and Urban Development against Safeguard Properties headquartered in Ohio. Safeguard is the Nation’s largest privately held mortgage field services property preservation company. Their business model involves maintaining and marketing bank owned, foreclosed homes (REO properties). The National Fair Housing Alliance and its member organizations have recently gathered evidence that shows that companies like Safeguard are neglecting and failing to maintain foreclosed homes in minority and low income neighborhoods.

In Toledo, Dayton, Baton Rouge, New Orleans and Memphis, Safeguard has failed to prevent blight from entering into the neighborhoods that are most venerable in our country. In an Office of the Inspector General report they were named as one of the preservation companies that would provide inaccurate information and would manipulate photos of foreclosed properties that it managed in their reports to Fannie Mae. We cannot allow these big corporations to continue taking advantage of the American people. I would encourage more States and representatives to investigate situations like this and send a message to these companies that we will not sit back and allow them to profit off of the suffering of the American people any more.

HONORING IOWA SECONDARY PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR AIDDY PHOMVISAY

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Aiddy Phomvisay on being selected as the Iowa Secondary Principal of the year. Aiddy serves as the principal at Marshalltown High School which is in my district. Aiddy was selected because of his work in creating a culture of high expectations for all learners.

Mr. Phomvisay began his career as a ninth and tenth-grade teacher for the Ames Community School District. In 2008 he came to Marshalltown to serve as the principal. He received his bachelor’s degree, master’s degrees in curriculum and instruction and educational leadership, and his superintendent certification from Iowa State University.

Mr. Phomvisay was selected for this award by a committee of Iowa secondary principals, and he is now a candidate for National High School Principal of the Year. Aiddy has proven that he is a leader at his school and throughout the Marshalltown community. I’m proud to call him a constituent, and congratulate him on all of his success.

TRIBUTE TO JULIE V ANDE HOEF

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Julie Vande Hoef of Clive, Iowa, for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 600 business leaders and growing.

Julie Vande Hoef currently serves as Policy Advisor to Iowa Governor Terry Branstad and Lieutenant Governor Kim Reynolds. She maintains a wide breadth of expertise on several policy issues including agricultural natural resources, financial services, insurance, cultural affairs, and trade. Growing up on a family farm in Jackson County, Julie’s family endured and survived the 1980s farm crisis. Since then, Mrs. Vande Hoef has immersed herself in government service to promote policies that benefit the people of Iowa. Before working for the Office of the Governor, Julie served Iowa Congressman Jim Leach as a Legislative Assistant, directed government affairs for Policy Works, and was a member of the Greater Des Moines Partnership’s government affairs committee. Mrs. Vande Hoef has also donned a bulletproof vest in Iraq as she represented the United States and instructed women and minorities on the merits of democracy. Amidst all her impressive accomplishments and continued service to our state, Julie’s top priority remains being the best wife and mother she can be to her husband Dustin and their son Tyson. In all aspects of her life, Mrs. Vande Hoef is an example of service, hard work, and Iowa values that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to recognize Mrs. Vande Hoef and all our Forty Under 40 honorees for their commitment to Iowa’s future.
and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Julie on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.

HONORING REV. DR. ALBERT LOUIS PATTERSON, JR., OF HOUSTON, TEXAS, SENIOR PASTOR, OF MOUNT CORINTH MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH, COMMUNITY LEADER, AND GODFATHER OF EXPOSITORY PREACHING

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Rev. Dr. Albert Louis Patterson, Jr., an amazing leader who touched and changed the lives of thousands for the better through his pastorate of the Mount Corinth Missionary Baptist Church in Houston, which he led for 36 years. This beloved man of God, was requested to join our Lord on Wednesday, April 9, 2014.

The Rev. Dr. Albert Louis Patterson, Jr., or “Dr. Pat” as he affectionately known by many, trained and mentored hundreds of preachers of the gospel. Among his peers, he was regarded as the acknowledged master and “Godfather of Expository Preaching.” One of his proteges, the Rev. Robert Earl Houston, put it best:

He wasn't just an expository preacher. He was a preaching lyricist of the highest order. To hear Dr. Patterson was to hear gymbalistic preaching—he hit you with the text, oratory, poetry, interrogative statements, engagement, tenacity for the truths of the text, humor and truth. You would leave a preaching moment with Dr. Patterson in awe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share just a few of the highlights of the remarkable career of this extraordinary preacher, pastor, theologian, husband and a father of three children.

His traveling companion was his beloved wife, Melba and he had three children—Anthony, Albert III, Alan, and Alette.

Rev. Patterson was recognized three times by his peers as a “Living Legend.” He taught and preached at the National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc. and lectured for the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, for the Promise Keepers, and the Preachers Division, National Baptist Congress.

Rev. Patterson was named by Ebony Magazine as one of America’s greatest black preachers and was inducted into the Morehouse College Hall of Preachers. Rev. Patterson pastored congregations in California and Texas and was the author of three books: “Joy For the Journey”; “Wisdom in Strange Places”; and “Prerequisites for a Good Journey.”

Mr. Speaker, the Rev. Dr. Albert Louis Patterson lectured at the Morehouse College of Religion, the American Baptist College in Nashvile, Tennessee and the Mid-American Theological Seminary. He conducted revivals in more than 25 cities and preached more than 100 sermons and lectures in the National Baptist Convention.

The Rev. Dr. Albert Louis Patterson lived a consequential life in the service of his community, his family, and our country. He has gone on to receive his great reward, a place in the Lord’s loving arms.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family and loved ones.

I ask that a moment of silence be observed in memory of the Rev. Dr. Albert Louis Patterson, Jr., of Houston, Texas.

THE WORLD WAR II MERCHANT MARINER SERVICE ACT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of this Congress matter of utmost importance—the World War II Merchant Mariner Service Act, which was included in the omnibus veteran’s bill, FIR 2189. The bill passed the House on October 28th, 2013.

The World War II Merchant Mariner Service Act directed the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for Veterans status of an individual engaged in service in the Merchant Mariners during World War II.

The Merchant Marine is a civilian auxiliary of the U.S. Navy, but not a uniformed service, except in times of war when, in accordance with the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Mariners are considered military personnel. In an effort to support the American war effort during World War II, they became an auxiliary to the United States Navy. Their mission was to transport bulk war materials including food, clothing, and weapons, as well as troops to all areas of conflict as well as domestic coastal installations.

During their missions in open waters, Merchant Marines often encountered the enemy and took hostile fire. Almost 250,000 Merchant Marines served during World War II and approximately 10,000 were killed while serving and protecting the United States.

In 1977 President Jimmy Carter signed into law the GI Bill Improvement Act of 1977. This bill granted authorization to the Secretary of Defense to determine the service performed by an “organized group of citizens” to be considered “active service” for purposes of Veterans benefits and established the Department of Defense Civilian/Military Service Review Board and Advisory panel. In 1988, President Reagan signed a bill into law granting veteran status to merchant mariners who served in war. Moreover, the GI Bill Enhancement Act of 1998 expanded Merchant Marine Veteran benefits to include burial in a National Cemetery.

I am proud that the Borough of Manhattan College is working on a documentary titled “The Sea of My Brother.” My constituent, Gabriel Frank, an 85-year-old veteran of the World War II and Korea, who served in the merchant marine for 23 years, and whom I had the honor and privilege to meet.

The film follows the fight of Gabriel and others for the passage of a bill in Congress, H.R. 1941—1946. From rallying his fellow veterans to meeting with politicians, Gabriel and his comrades passionately fight to win this dignity for their community.

Today, elderly veterans continue their fight for this recognition. Their strong, positive and fighting spirit will not let them give up as they choose to advocate for their fellow veterans, leaving a legacy of inspiration for all.

I am urging the Senate to act on their Omnibus Bill so this important legislation can be acted into law.

HONORING NEW MEXICO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 32 high school students from Highland High School and Moriarty High School that will represent New Mexico this month in the We The People National Finals, a three-day academic national civics competition on the U.S. Constitution. During the competition these exceptional students will have the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of constitutional principles in simulated congressional hearings before panels of judges.

The We The People program of constitutional study was initiated in 1987 and since its inception more than the 30 million students have benefited from the program. The program divides students into teams where they are able to learn together and challenge each other. Surveys have shown that these students are more civic minded, politically active and have a better understanding of how the government functions.

Highland High School was the winner of the New Mexico We The People state competition and Moriarty High School is a wild card entry. I commend these students and their dedicated teachers and coaches for participating in this instructional program that fosters attitudes that students need in order to participate as effective, responsible citizens.

School: Highland High School; Teacher: Bob M. Coffey; Students: Ethan Alley; Ezra Geilin Baldwin; Dakson Byle; Kathryn Cook; Giuseppe DeLeers-Certo; Diana Garcia; Hannah Glasgow; Brendan Heath; Rachel Lentz; Angela Malagodi; Pilar Martinez; Gabriel Pereira De Medeiros; Morgan Roberts; Alexandra Shomaker; Sahleah Tubbeh; Francisco Viramontes; Rosemary White.

School: Moriarty High School; Teacher: Amy Page; Students: Arianna Abrams; Peter BrownShelbee Geyer; Mason Howells; Tyler Cruz House; Brian Landes; Emily Montano; Alexander Neverdousky; Allison New; Alicia Page; Rachel Pozzi; Jenna Purpura; Tony Ramirez; James Saunders; Cassandra Scott; Griffin Woolery; Donzlynn Worthington.

I congratulate these outstanding students and thank them for their contributions to New Mexico.
TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ZEV YAROSLAVSKY

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to my trusted, long-time friend, Los Angeles County Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky. Zev is retiring at the end of this year after forty years of exceptional public service.

I first met Zev more than four decades ago when he headed California Students for Soviet Jews at the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA). It was clear at that time that Zev was driven by idealism, an inherent sense of fairness, and a commitment to public service. And, it was clear that he was a pragmatic problem solver and knew how to get things done.

Zev started his career in elected office in 1975 at the age of twenty-six after winning a hard fought grassroots campaign for a seat on the Los Angeles City Council against a much more experienced candidate who had the strong support of the Democratic political establishment.

Zev helped the Los Angeles City Council’s Finance Committee and worked very hard and very creatively to find solutions to difficult budgetary problems. As chair of the Police, Fire, and Public Safety Committee, he fought against the Los Angeles Police Department’s use of choke holds and against the department’s intelligence activities, which included spying on critics of the department and individuals who held liberal political beliefs.

Two of the most intractable problems Zev tackled on the City Council were unrestrained commercial development and traffic congestion. He co-authored Proposition U, which proposed to halve the size of new buildings allowed on most of the city’s commercial and industrial property. The initiative passed by a wide margin in 1986. He then worked for Proposition O, which passed in 1998 and blocked Occidental Petroleum Corp.’s long battle to drill for oil along the Los Angeles coastline.

Zev served on the Los Angeles City Council until 1994 when he won a seat on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. A strong environmentalist, Zev made major significant progress in protecting precious county land. He sponsored the 1996 Proposition A park bond to protect open space and develop urban parks and inner-city recreation programs countywide. He led the effort to acquire more than 7,000 acres of county parkland and worked hard on the purchase of the 588-acre King Gillette Ranch in the Santa Monica Mountains from Soka University.

As the largest, most populous county in the United States, Los Angeles County has complex transportation needs. Zev championed a diversity of transit alternatives to most efficiently and cost-effectively meet the needs of the different communities and geographic make-up of the County. He has worked to bring to densely populated areas subway access and to less densely populated areas light rail and bus rapid transit service. He advanced the Orange Line busway in the San Fernando Valley, which has been tremendously popular. He has fought for the new light rail Expo Line, which, upon completion, will travel from downtown Los Angeles to Santa Monica. And, he has been a driving force to extend the subway to the Westside of Los Angeles.

Zev also led the effort to rebuild and modernize the world famous Hollywood Bowl amphitheater which was destroyed by fire, and he was instrumental in the development of Walt Disney Concert Hall, the home of the L.A. Philharmonic Orchestra. He has also helped fund major investments in the L.A. County Museum of Art and the County’s Museum of Natural History.

On health care, Zev has worked to secure the viability of our nation’s second largest public health system and pushed for reforms that have brought access to care for millions of vulnerable individuals. He led the push for more primary care and strong partnerships that endure today between LA County’s public system and primary care clinics throughout the County. He has been a tireless advocate for implementation of the Affordable Care Act and its expansion of Medicaid. Medicaid expansion alone has brought health coverage to more than 300,000 uninsured individuals in LA County.

One of Zev’s most passionate goals has been the end of homelessness in LA County. In 2007, he initiated Project 50, a pilot project using a “housing first” approach for the most chronically homeless individuals on Skid Row. Project 50 was so successful that the VA created Project 60 in Los Angeles and uses the “housing first” model to work with veterans who are chronically homeless veterans. Zev showed that it is not only possible to help the dispossessed regain their dignity and their lives, but that it can be done while saving taxpayer dollars.

Zev’s extensive accomplishments as County Supervisor have touched every part of LA County and improved the lives of every County resident. LA County, the State of California, and our nation owe Zev a debt for his tireless work. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in thanking Zev for his exceptional service and extending to him, his wonderful wife Barbara, and their two children, Mina and David, our very best wishes for the future.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LEO ALEXANDER VOSKAN

HON. JOHN L. MICA
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy and service of Leo Alexander Voskan.

From the day he was born in New York in 1915, Leo had a keen thirst for adventure. The son of Armenian immigrants who came to the United States in search of a better life for their family, Leo spent his childhood on the waterfront in Brooklyn.

By the time Leo reached High School, he had developed into quite the athlete and was the quarterback for his high school’s football team and was also a member of the school’s track team. His physical talents extended beyond the athletic field and onto the stage. As a member of the University of New York’s Arthur Murray Studio and was also a competitive dancer at the famous Rainbow Room in New York’s Rockefeller Center.

While attending New York City College following High School, Leo was forced to leave school and assume the responsibilities of the family’s manufacturing business due to his father’s failing health.

With World War II looming on the horizon, Leo voluntarily enlisted in the U.S. Army for both patriotic and family reasons. Leo’s goal was to keep his younger brother George out of the military as long as he possibly could so that he could maintain the family business while Leo went overseas to fight.

While serving as a member of the U.S. Army’s Signal Corps, his superiors recognized his leadership potential and sent him to Officer’s Candidate School where upon his commission he earned the rank of 2nd Lieutenant. Leo was in command of a Combat Engineering Platoon that participated in the Normandy invasion, where despite his leadership; many of his men were lost including his Company Commander. Leo was given a battlefield promotion and assumed Command of the entire Company.

In Normandy, Leo’s Company fell under the command of General George Patton and went on to liberate France and eventually fought in the Battle of the Bulge. Leo was also involved in the liberation of several concentration camps across Nazi Germany.

Upon returning home Leo and his brother George resumed their roles in the family’s manufacturing business. During this period, Leo also met the love of his life, Joan. Leo and Joan soon married, moved to the New Jersey suburbs and began their family. Leo was a loving father to four children, Craig, Gail, Lynn and Diane who tragically died of pneumonia at the age of three.

In 1952, Leo moved his family to Longwood, Florida to start an orange grove business which was devastated in the freeze of 1958. Always the determined entrepreneur, Leo continued his professional life by starting several businesses including, a night crawler supply company and a pallet manufacturing company which helped sustain his family. Leo was also passionate about politics and teaching others about business including real estate licensing. Leo’s zest for life will always be treasured by those who knew him and his service to our nation will never be forgotten. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives join me in recognizing the distinguished life and service of Leo Alexander Voskan.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

SPEECH OF
HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican Budget for fiscal year 2015. We have two choices in front of us...
today. Two choices on the programs and investments we must fund and prioritize to balance deficit reduction with economic growth.

The prosperity of our Nation is dependent on a strong middle class. Regrettably, the Republican budget would increase taxes on middle class families, provide huge tax breaks for the wealthy and place the burden of paying for those tax breaks on working Americans, and their children.

We have seen this budget before—a couple of times, in fact. It’s the same budget Chairman Ryan brought us in 2013, and in 2012. It is a budget that works for the one percent at the expense of the other 99 percent. It shifts future costs to seniors by ending the Medicare guarantee and raising prescription drug costs. It cuts investment in our Nation’s infrastructure, slashes funding for programs, that keep children from going hungry, and guts education through cuts to Pell grants and K–12 education. Republicans have proposed a budget that attacks the very foundation of the middle class. It is a path that will lead to economic uncertainty for millions of Americans, and it is not a budget I can support in good conscience.

Democrats have offered a fair and balanced alternative budget that preserves our social safety net, keeps the promises made to our seniors, and asks all Americans to pay their fair share in reducing the deficit. Rhode Islanders understand more than most the toll unemployment can take on families and our communities. The Democratic alternative extends emergency unemployment insurance so those who are still struggling to find work can keep paying their bills. It provides $76 billion for early childhood education and ensures college affordability by lowering student loan debt and including new repayment options. It provides funding for public transit, our highways, and supports critical investments in research and development, clean energy, manufacturing, and programs that make our industries competitive globally.

I have a responsibility to my constituents, and to every American, to make sure that policies we enact in Congress provide for the long term health and prosperity of our Nation, which include getting people back to work, giving our businesses the support they need to grow, and building a skilled workforce to meet the demands of a 21st Century economy. The Republican budget takes us in the wrong direction. I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican Budget and support the Democratic alternative that keeps our promises to our seniors, preserves our social safety net, and balances deficit reduction with job growth and economic recovery.

HONORING SADIE AND DOUG HODO

HON. BILL FLORES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Doug and Sadie Hodo of Texas. In light of their commitment to Christian higher education in Texas, Houston Baptist University is dedicating the Sadie and Doug Hodo Residence College on their campus. Dr. Doug Hodo served as the second President of Houston Baptist University from 1987 to 2006. During that time, Dr. Hodo’s wife, Sadie served as First Lady of Houston Baptist University.

It is a true honor to acknowledge Doug and Sadie Hodo’s service and dedication to Houston Baptist University as well as their commitment to Christian higher education.

Under the leadership of Dr. Hodo, Houston Baptist University developed new academic programs and expanded its campus facilities. During his service as president, he created an integrated leadership team that resulted in informed decision making and effective internal communication processes for the University. As First Lady of Houston Baptist University, Sadie Hodo served the university with grace and distinction.

On February 18, 2014, the Houston Baptist University Board of Trustees unanimously approved the dedication of the residence college to Doug and Sadie Hodo. The dedication will take place on April 28, 2015.

Sadie and Doug Hodo’s visionary leadership and extraordinary love for students built Houston Baptist University to be the great University that it is today—and they kept Christ at the center of both the University and their own lives while doing so.

God bless Sadie and Doug Hodo and God Bless the United States of America.

UCONN BASKETBALL WINS

HON. ROSA L. DELAUNO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. DELAUNO. Mr. Speaker, I rise with enormous pride to congratulate the University of Connecticut men’s and women’s basketball teams on a season of unprecedented athletic achievement.

Under coaches Kevin Ollie and Geno Auriemma, the Huskies won both national championships, making UConn the only school to complete this feat twice. This double victory takes more than talent to accomplish. It takes perseverance, sacrifice, and a commitment to the team ideal, and the men and women of UConn have shown each in surpassing measure.

They have shown that, through hard work and dedication to a common goal, anything is possible. I congratulate both teams on two amazing victories, and I look forward to seeing them in action again next season.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on April 9 and 10, 2014, I was unavoidably detained attending to representational activities in my congressional district, including attendance at the memorial services for the victims of the tragic shooting at Fort Hood and thus unable to return in time for rollcall votes 171 through 177. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

1. On rollcall No. 171 I would have voted "no" (April 9)—(H. Con. Res. 96, Rep. Mulvany of South Carolina Substitute Amendment No. 1).
2. On rollcall No. 172 I would have voted "yes" (April 9)—(H. Con. Res. 96, Congressional Black Caucus Budget, Rep. Moore of Wisconsin Substitute Amendment No. 2).
3. On rollcall No. 173 I would have voted "yes" (April 9)—(H. Con. Res. 96, Progressive Caucus Budget, Grijalva of Arizona Substitute Amendment No. 3).
4. On rollcall No. 174 I would have voted "no" (April 9)—(H.R. 4414, Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014).
5. On rollcall No. 175 I would have voted "no" (April 9)—(H. Con. Res. 96, Rep. Woodall of Georgia Substitute Amendment No. 4).
6. On rollcall No. 176 I would have voted "yes" (April 9)—(H.-Con. Res. 96, Democratic Alternative Budget (Rep. VAHLEN—Budge)).
7. On rollcall No. 177 I would have voted "no" (April 9)—(H. Con. Res. 96, Republican Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Resolution (Rep. RYAN—Budget)).

TRIBUTE TO FRANKIE POWELL NEAL

HON. JANICE HAHN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of Frankie Powell Neal. Frankie was a loving woman and a devout Christian. She was dedicated to serving others in all aspects of her life. For over 30 years, she cared for our veterans as a nurse at the Long Beach Veterans Hospital and Harbor UCLA Medical Center. Frankie was also the matriarch of a great family that includes three children, eight grandchildren, and ten great grandchildren.

I have the distinguished honor of having a strong relationship with her son, Long Beach City Councilman Steve Neal. I know that she would be proud of his achievements and service to the great residents of the community in which he serves. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all members of the House join me in a moment of silence to commemorate the life of Frankie Powell Neal.

HONORING IOWA ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR KIM TIERNY

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kim Tierney on being
selected as the Iowa Elementary Principal of the year. Kim serves as the principal at Denver Elementary School which is in my district. Kim was selected because of her leadership in implementing professional learning communities.

Mrs. Tierney began her career as a teacher in the Waukee Community School District. She has been the Principal at Denver Elementary for six years. She received her bachelor’s degree in elementary and middle school education from the University of Northern Iowa, and her master’s degree in educational leadership from Iowa State University.

Mrs. Tierney was selected for this award by a committee of Iowa elementary school principals. The National Association of Elementary School Principals will also honor her as a National Distinguished Principal this fall in Washington, D.C. Kim has proven that she is a leader at her school and throughout the Denver community. I’m proud to call her a constituent, and congratulate her on all of her success.

TRIBUTE TO TYLER DE HAAN

HON. TOM LATHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 10, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Tyler De Haan of Principal Financial Group in Des Moines, Iowa for being named a 2014 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines area who are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious distinction, which is based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2014 class of Forty Under 40 honorees join an impressive roster of 600 business leaders and growing.

Originally from Storm Lake, Tyler obtained his bachelor’s degree in Political Science from Northwestern University in Orange City and his master’s degree in Public Administration from Drake University. As Principal Financial Group’s Internal Wholesaler, Tyler has excelled at his role by implementing a new customer relationship management system while increasing the efficiency of his sales territory and sales totals as a whole.

Outside of work, Mr. De Haan is an active leader in the Iowa Republican Party serving in leadership roles with the Dallas County Republicans and the 3rd Congressional District Executive Committee. He has also been extensively involved in countless candidates’ races as well as organizing the nationally influential Iowa Caucuses. As a member of the Waukee United Methodist Church, Tyler serves on the Finance Committee and as worship leader. Mr. De Haan has also volunteered his time to assist with several fundraising events for the Leukemia Lymphoma Society. Tyler resides in Urbandale with his wife Stacie and their daughter Isabelle. In all aspects of his life, Mr. De Haan is an example of service, hard work, and Iowa values that our state can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent leaders like Tyler in the U.S. Congress and it is with great pride I applaud Mr. De Haan for utilizing his talents to better both his community and our great state. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Tyler on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2014 Forty Under 40 class continued success.
Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS
House agreed to S. Con. Res. 35, Adjournment Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action
Routine Proceedings, pages S2333–S2399
Measures Introduced: Twenty-one bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2235–2255, and S. Res. 420–422. Pages S2378–79
Measures Reported:
H.R. 507, to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona. (S. Rept. No. 113–148)
H.R. 862, to authorize the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960. (S. Rept. No. 113–149)
H.R. 876, to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho. (S. Rept. No. 113–150)
H.R. 1158, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area. (S. Rept. No. 113–151)
S. 1728, to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to improve ballot accessibility to uniformed services voters and overseas voters, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
S. 1937, to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to develop contingency plans to address unexpected emergencies or natural disasters that may threaten to disrupt the administration of an election for Federal office.
S. 2197, to repeal certain requirements regarding newspaper advertising of Senate stationery contracts.
Measures Passed:
DATA Act: Senate passed S. 994, to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto:
Warner (for Carper) Amendment No. 2971 (to the language proposed by Amendment No. 2970), to allow the Secretary of Defense to request an extension to report financial and payment information data.

Authorizing Testimony, Document Production, and Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 422, to authorize written testimony, document production, and representation in Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Foundation, Inc. v. United States.
Measures Considered:
Federal Minimum Wage: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2223, to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.
Appointments:
National Commission on Hunger: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Republican Leader, pursuant to Public Law 113–76, the appointment of the following individuals to be members of the National Commission on Hunger:
Spencer A. Coates of Kentucky, and J. Russell Sykes of New York.

Friedland Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:
By 56 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 106), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.
By 55 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. 107), Senate agreed to the motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 4 p.m., on Friday, April 11, 2014, with the time until 5 p.m., equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees.

Friedland and Weil Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 5 p.m., on Friday, April 11, 2014, all post-cloture time be yielded back, and Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, and that following disposition of the nomination, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, and that if cloture is invoked, all post-cloture time be yielded back, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination of David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor; that no further motions be in order to the nominations.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:
8 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.
Routine lists in the Coast Guard.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:
Robert M. Speer, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.
Ramin Toloui, of Iowa, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.
Jonathan Nicholas Stivers, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Alice G. Wells, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.
William D. Adams, of Maine, to be Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities for a term of four years.
Nancy B. Firestone, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.
Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.
Thomas L. Halkowski, of Pennsylvania, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.
12 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
1 Army nomination in the rank of general.
29 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Messages from the House:
Enrolled Bills Presented:
Executive Communications:
Petitions and Memorials:
Executive Reports of Committees:
Additional Cosponsors:
Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:
Amendments Submitted:
Notices of Hearings/Meetings:
Authorities for Committees to Meet:
Privileges of the Floor:
Quorum Calls: One quorum call was taken today. (Total—1)
Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—107)
Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:05 p.m., until 4 p.m. on Friday, April 11, 2014. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2391.)
Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Commerce, after receiving testimony from Penny Pritzker, Secretary of Commerce.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the posture of the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Deborah Lee James, Secretary, and General Mark A. Welsh III, Chief of Staff, both of the Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine strategic forces programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Office of Environmental Management of the Department of Energy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Bruce Held, Acting Administrator, Donald L. Cook, Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, and Admiral John M. Richard-son, Deputy Administrator, Office of Naval Reactors, all of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and James Owendoff, Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, all of the Department of Energy.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower concluded a hearing to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2015 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, Vice Admiral Joseph P. Mulloy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Integration of Capabilities and Resources, and Vice Admiral William H. Hilarides, Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command, all of the Department of Defense.

ELECTRIC GRID RELIABILITY AND SECURITY

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine how to increase the reliability and security of the nation’s electric grid from cyber and physical attacks, after receiving testimony from Cheryl A. LaFleur, Acting Chairman, and Philip D. Moeller, Commissioner, both of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy; Gerry Cauley, North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Sue Kelly, American Public Power Association, Colette D. Honorable, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Michael J. Kormos, PJM Inter-
connection L.L.C., Nicholas K. Akins, American Electric Power, Thad Hill, Calpine Corporation, and James L. Hunter, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, all of Washington, DC; and Cheryl L. Roberto, Environmental Defense Fund, Columbus, Ohio.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES BUDGET

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2015, after receiving testimony from Kathleen G. Sebelius, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2015 for international development priorities, after receiving testimony from Rajiv Shah, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. Res. 410, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, with amendments;

S. Res. 413, recognizing 20 years since the genocide in Rwanda, and affirming it is in the national interest of the United States to work in close coordination with international partners to help prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and mass atrocities; and

Lists in the Foreign Service.

TRANSATLANTIC SECURITY CHALLENGES

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on European Affairs concluded a hearing to examine trans-
atlantic security challenges, focusing on Central and
Eastern Europe, after receiving testimony from Victoria Nuland, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs; Derek Chollet, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs; and Julianne Smith, Center for a New American Security, Ian J. Brzezinski, Atlantic Council Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security, and Edward C. Chow, Center for Strategic and International Studies Energy and National Security Program, all of Washington, DC.

OVERSIGHT OF SMALL AGENCIES
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight concluded an oversight hearing to examine small agencies, including an original bill entitled “Small Agency Inspector General Act”, after receiving testimony from Peggy E. Gustafson, Inspector General, Small Business Administration, on behalf of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency; Osvaldo Luis Gratacos, Inspector General, Export-Import Bank of the United States; Hubert Sparks, Inspector General, Appalachian Regional Commission; Michael Carroll, Acting Inspector General, United States Agency for International Development; and Beryl H. Davis, Director, Financial Management and Assurance, Government Accountability Office.

STRONG START FOR AMERICA’S CHILDREN ACT
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine expanding access to quality early learning, focusing on the “Strong Start for America’s Children Act”, after receiving testimony from Mayor Angel Taveras, Providence, Rhode Island; John E. Pepper, Jr., Proctor and Gamble Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, on behalf of ReadyNation/America’s Edge; Steven Barnett, Rutgers University National Institute for Early Education Research, New Brunswick, New Jersey; and Grover J. Whitehurst, Brookings Institution Brown Center on Education Policy, Washington, DC.

INTELLIGENCE
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community. Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 41 public bills, H.R. 4445–4485; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 114; H. Con. Res. 97; and H. Res. 550–554 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 863, to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women’s History Museum, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–411, Pt. 1);

H.R. 2657, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal lands in Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, previously identified as suitable for disposal, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–411–98); and

H.R. 4032, to exempt from Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 certain water transfers by the North Texas Municipal Water District and the Greater Texoma Utility Authority, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–413, Pt. 1).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Foxx to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal by voice vote.

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 96, to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and to set forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 205 nays, Roll No. 177. Consideration of the measure began on Tuesday, April 8th.

Rejected:

Woodall amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 113–405) that sought to balance the budget in four years and cut discretionary spending to FY2008 levels (by a recorded vote of 135 ayes to 291 noes, Roll No. 175) and

Van Hollen amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 113–405) that
sought to pursue investments in job creation and education, tax reform that promotes the growth of American businesses and tax fairness, and policies that support access to health care, retirement security, and a safe and secure nation (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 261 noes, Roll No. 176).

H. Res. 544, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution, was agreed to on Tuesday, April 8th.

Denying admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass S. 2195, to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests.

Adjournment Resolution: The House agreed to S. Con. Res. 35, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

National Commission on Hunger—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Commission on Hunger: Mr. Jeremy Everett of Waco, Texas; Dr. Susan Finn of Columbus, Ohio; and Mr. Robert Doar of Brooklyn, New York.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H3164.

Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 33 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3165–66, H3180–81, and H3183–84. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and at 1:45 p.m., pursuant to S. Con. Res. 35, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 28, 2014.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC AND OUTSIDE WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing for public and outside witnesses. Testimony was heard from public and outside witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—BUREAU OF PRISONS FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled Bureau of Prisons FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Charles E. Samuels, Jr., Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

APPROPRIATIONS—INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY OVERVIEW

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Intelligence Community Overview. This was a closed hearing.

APPROPRIATIONS—HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FY 2015 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, HUD, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Department of Housing and Urban Development FY 2015 Budget. Testimony was heard from Shaun Donovan, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

READINESS POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Readiness Posture”. Testimony was heard from General John F. Campbell, USA, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army; Admiral Mark Ferguson, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy; General John M. Paxton Jr., USMC, Assistant Commandant, United States Marine Corps; and General Larry O. Spencer, USAF, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology concluded a markup on H.R. 4342, the “Domain Openness Through Continued Oversight Matters (DOTCOM) Act of 2014”. The bill was forwarded, without amendment, to the Full Committee.

ICANN

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing entitled “Should the Department of Commerce Relinquish Direct Oversight Over ICANN?”. Testimony was heard from Lawrence E. Strickling, Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.
TRIBAL FOREST MANAGEMENT: A MODEL FOR PROMOTING HEALTHY FORESTS AND RURAL JOBS

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Tribal Forest Management: A Model for Promoting Healthy Forests and Rural Jobs”. Testimony was heard from Michael Black, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a business meeting on the resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives find Lois G. Lerner, Former Director, Exempt Organizations, Internal Revenue Service, in contempt of Congress for refusal to comply with a subpoena duly issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The Committee agreed on the motion to report.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PRIORITIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing on Department of Energy Science and Technology Priorities. Testimony was heard from Ernest Moniz, Secretary, Department of Energy.

BUSINESS MEETING; AND ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting on member access requests; and hearing entitled “Ongoing Intelligence Activities”. The Committee agreed to two motions to grant access requests. The hearing entitled “Ongoing Intelligence Activities” was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE

4 p.m., Friday, April 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, post-cloture.

At 5 p.m., there will be up to three rollcall votes on confirmation of the nomination of Michelle T. Friedland, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, and on confirmation of the nomination of David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, April 28

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.
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