United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2014 No. 99

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 24, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GLENN THOMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LIEUTENANT DARRYN ANDREWS: AMERICAN WARRIOR AND TEXAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, growing up, Darryn Andrews was known as one of the most selfless and patriotic kids in the neighborhood. Not surprisingly, he joined the United States Army to serve America. 2nd Lieutenant Darryn Andrews was the platoon leader for the 3rd Blackfoot Company, 1st Battalion, 501st infantry (Airborne) in Afghanistan.

On September 4, 2009, 2nd Lieutenant Andrews' platoon was on a mission and was traveling along a walled road in Afghanistan when an IED exploded and disabled the lead vehicle in the convoy. Lieutenant Andrews quickly jumped out of his vehicle and was assessing the damage of the vehicle that had hit the IED, and he saw through the glint in his eye an RPG coming straight for him and his fellow troops. So, in an instant, he jumped on top of his fellow soldiers and took the brunt of the RPG. He sacrificed himself so that his buddies would live. Recently, it was learned that Lieutenant Andrews and his patrol were searching for a missing soldier by the name of Bowe Bergdahl.

Second Lieutenant Andrews was awarded the Silver Star in honor of his service and the sacrifice he made for his fellow soldiers.

At his death, Darryn left behind his 2-year-old son, his pregnant wife, his twin brother, and both of his parents, Andy and Sondra. Both of his parents, Andy and Sondra, were here last week and testified before my Terrorism Subcommittee. Sondra still wears Darryn's dog tags. The family lives in Cameron, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, General George Patton said it best about warriors such as Lieutenant Darryn Andrews who die in battle. He said:

> While we continue to mourn the loss of such soldiers, we should thank God that such men ever lived.

And that's just the way it is.

FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, ending hunger shouldn't be controversial. It shouldn't be something that we ignore but, rather, a goal that we embrace. Ending hunger is an achievable goal; it is something that we can do if we muster the political will to do so.

Government—Federal, State, and local—will play a large role in ending hunger. The problem is too big and too much a part of our basic values for government institutions not to get involved.

We already created the programs that will help us end hunger: SNAP, WIC, and school meals, just to name a few. Many of these programs are underfunded and need to be responsibly updated for the 21st century. The truth is that these programs do real good in our cities, towns, and communities, and they are working effectively and efficiently.

But government can't do it alone, and that is why I am proud to stand with my friends in the antihunger community in support of their many efforts to end hunger. One such group doing fantastic work to end hunger now is the Food Research and Action Center, known as FRAC.

FRAC is a tremendous organization, but it is not the typical group that first comes to mind when people think about antihunger organizations. FRAC is not a food bank or a food pantry. Run by my good friend Jim Weill, FRAC works with hundreds of national, State, and local nonprofit organizations, public agencies, corporations, and labor organizations to address hunger, food insecurity, and their root cause—poverty.

FRAC conducts research to document the extent of hunger in America, its impact, and effective solutions. It seeks improved Federal, State, and local public policies that will reduce hunger and undernutrition, monitors the implementation of laws, and serves as a watchdog of programs.

FRAC provides coordination, training, technical assistance, and support on nutrition and antipoverty issues to a nationwide network of advocates, service providers, food banks, program administrators and participants, and policymakers. Lastly, FRAC conducts

Printed on recycled paper.

public information campaigns to help promote changes in attitudes and policies.

FRAC helps frame the debate in Congress and State legislatures, educating elected officials and their staff, and they help implement antihunger programs at the local levels. FRAC does everything but literally hand food to hungry Americans. The work they do has resulted in stronger programs and more eligible people receiving food assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal antihunger safety net is excellent, but it is not perfect. It is vast, but it is not comprehensive. FRAC works with policymakers and government officials to make these programs better, to ensure that no hungry person is left without food.

FRAC was a leader in our fight to save the Heat and Eat program in the recently enacted farm bill. It has stood strong in the fight to ensure that everyone gets breakfast at school and food during the summer, and FRAC has also fought back on antinutrition riders that House Republicans have attached to the Agriculture Appropriations bill.

FRAC has stood with me from day one of my End Hunger Now campaign. Like me, they believe that hunger is a political condition, that it is solvable. FRAC has been invaluable in this fight. They have organized countless numbers of food stamp challenges, including the two food stamp challenges that I participated in; and they work with important local antihunger groups like Project Bread and the Massachusetts Law Reform Institute, along with the Northeast Regional Anti-Hunger Network.

FRAC is one of the leaders in the fight to end hunger now. Every single person who works at FRAC is committed to a shared vision of a hunger-free America. Whether it is working to expand the number of kids getting food during the summer or fighting against cuts to SNAP, the people who work for FRAC are doing everything they can to end hunger.

I want to commend Jim Weill and his team at FRAC for everything they do. Not only are they true professionals, they care about their work. I want to thank everyone at FRAC for fighting to end hunger now.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, as they continue their important work, we in Congress will be inspired to do more. It is shameful that this Congress has been so clueless when it comes it ending hunger. We and the White House need to develop a comprehensive plan with benchmarks and timetables to end hunger now and then enact it. Indifference and making believe that the problem will go away on its own is not a policy; it is an excuse to do nothing. Let's instead follow the example of FRAC and End Hunger Now.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH USA GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a follower of Jesus and a lifelong member of the Presbyterian Church USA who is deeply grieved by what transpired at last week's gathering of PCUSA's General Assembly. I feel increasingly alienated from this rich faith tradition, which includes John Witherspoon, the only active clergyman to sign the Declaration of Independence, and submit for the RECORD a statement of protest by the Presbyterian Lay Committee Board of Directors, which expresses a similar sentiment.

[June 19, 2014]

PRESBYTERIAN LAY COMMITTEE BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPUDIATES ACTION OF PCUSA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(By Carmen Fowler LaBerge)

DETROIT, MI.—A statement of protest by the Presbyterian Lay Committee repudiating the action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church USA to redefine marriage. The 221st General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (USA) has approved both an Authoritative Interpretation of the Constitution and an amendment to redefine marriage. In the name of 1.8 million Presbyterians nationwide, the General Assembly has committed an express repudiation of the Bible, the mutually agreed upon Confessions of the PCUSA, thousands of years of faithfulness to God's clear commands and the denominational ordination vows of each concurring commissioner. This is an abomination. The Presbyterian Lay Committee mourns these actions and calls on all Presbyterians to resist and protest them. You should tell your pastor and the members of your session that you disapprove of these actions. You should refuse to fund the General Assembly, your synod, your presbytery and even your local church if those bodies have not explicitly and publicly repudiated these unbiblical actions. God will not be mocked and those who substitute their own felt desires for God's unchangeable Truth will not be found guiltless before a holy God. The Presbyterian Lay Committee will continue to call for repentance and reform: repentance of those who have clearly erred at this General Assembly and reform of the PCUSA according to the Word of God. Presbyterian Lay Committee Board of Directors, June 19, 2014.

Mr. WOLF. I will begin with marriage. After several years of internal discussion and debate, the assembly voted overwhelmingly to take a position which runs counter to the counsel of Scripture, which defines marriage as the divinely inspired joining of one man and one woman.

It has long been clear that our culture is in the throes of a seismic shift on this issue. While the current marriage debate is centered around the notion of same-sex unions, in reality there has been a decades-long assault on marriage, such that what was once almost universally recognized as a God-ordained and created institution, the fundamental building block of any society and the nexus of procreation and childrearing, has now been called into question both in the larger culture and increasingly in the legal framework which governs this land. But perhaps the most striking and troubling is that increasingly this is happening within the church itself, which has historically served as a bulwark against the cultural whims of the day.

In the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus says:

> Haven't you read . . . that at the beginning the Creator ''made them male and female,'' and said, ''For this reason, a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and two will become one flesh''? So they are no longer but two, but one. Therefore, what God has joined together let man not separate.''

This passage and others like it remind me of Reverend Billy Graham's comments and the lead-up to the 2012 North Carolina ballot initiative regarding marriage, when he remarked:

> The Bible is clear—God's definition of marriage is between a man and a woman.

In addition to marriage, I was also troubled by the PCUSA's action on Israel. I submit for the RECORD a Wall Street Journal piece which ran yesterday regarding the vote to divest the denomination stock from three American companies that do business with Israel in the West Bank citing their ''involvement in the occupation and the violation of human rights in the region.''

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 22, 2014]

PRESBYTERIANS JOIN THE ANTI-ISRAEL CHOIR

DIVESTING FROM COMPANIES LIKE MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS TO SHOW SOLIDARITY WITH THE PALESTINIANS

(By Jonathan Marks)

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is bleeding members. Between 2000 and 2013, almost 765,000 members left the organization, a loss of nearly 30%. Last week the church's leadership met in Detroit for crisis talks.

No, not about the emptying-pews crisis. The Israel-Palestinian crisis.

On Friday, in a close vote (310–303), the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)—the largest of several Presbyterian denominations in America—resolved to divest the organization's stock in Caterpillar, Hewlett-Packard and Motorola Solutions. The church's Committee on Mission Responsibility Through Investment said the companies have continued to ''profit from their involvement in the occupation and the violation of human rights in the region,'' and have even ''deepened their involvement in roadblocks to a just peace.'' Israel's counterterrorism and defense measures have included razing Palestinian houses (with Caterpillar equipment), operating Gaza and West Bank checkpoints (with Hewlett-Packard technology), and utilizing military communications and surveillance (with Motorola Solutions technology).

The church signaled its antipathy for Israel earlier this year by hawking a study guide called ''Zionism Unsettled'' in its online church store. In the 76-page pamphlet, Zionism—the movement to establish a Jewish homeland and nation-state in the historic land of Israel—is characterized as a ''a struggle for colonial and racist supremacist privilege.''

In a postscript to ''Zionism Unsettled,'' Naim Ateek, a Palestinian priest and member of the Anglican Church, explains the meaning of the charges in the pamphlet. ''It is the equivalent of declaring Zionism heretical, a doctrine that fosters both political

and theological injustice. This is the strongest condemnation that a Christian confession can make against any doctrine that promotes death rather than life.''

In one response, Katharine Henderson, president of New York's Auburn Theological Seminary, said in February that the ''premise of the document appears to be that Zionism is the cause of the entire conflict in the Middle East,'' in essence ''the original sin, from which flows all the suffering of the Palestinian people.'' And amid intense criticism of the study guide from the Anti-Defamation League and other groups, the church's General Assembly declared on Wednesday that '''Zionism Unsettled' does not represent the views of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).'' But the assembly didn't bar the church from continuing to distribute and sell it.

The divestment resolution that ultimately passed included language affirming Israel's right to exist and denying that divesting from the three companies is tantamount to alignment with the broader Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement against Israel. Still, the vote is a victory for anti-Israel forces within the church. And the divestment vote hardly means that the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) is ready to shift its focus: The organization's Middle East Issues Committee sees only one Middle East issue. All 14 of the matters before it this year concerned Israel and Palestine. No Syria. No Iraq.

Another vote regarding Palestinian-Israeli matters by the church's General Assembly, seemingly more innocuous, is actually more disturbing. The vote instructed the church's Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy to prepare a report to help the General Assembly reconsider its commitment to a two-state solution and to create a study guide ''that will help inform the whole church of the situation on the ground in Palestine.''

In its ''advice and counsel'' on an anti-divestment proposal, the committee voiced its support for the boycott-Israel movement, compared Israel with apartheid-era South Africa and declared Israel responsible for its own ''de-legitimation.'' It complained that the anti-divestment proposal ''prioritize[d] Israel's security and underline[d] the flaws of Hamas and other 'hostile' neighbors without noting the constant violence of the occupation.'' Even with respect to Hamas, whose charter commits it to the destruction of Israel, the committee felt compelled to put ''hostile'' in scare quotes. The committee has some history on this score: In 2004, it drew widespread condemnation for meeting with leaders of the terrorist organization Hezbollah.

The General Assembly instructed the advisory committee that the new study guide should ''honestly point out'' that ''simple financial investment in a completely occupied land where the occupiers are relentless and unwavering regarding their occupation is not enough to dismantle the matrix of that occupation or dramatically change the vast majority of communities or individual lives that are bowed and broken by systematic and intentional injustice.'' The vote to commission the guide was 482–88.

With a dwindling membership, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) clearly needs new friends, but the church does itself no favors by courting Israel's enemies.

Mr. WOLF. The PCUSA's deeply misguided decision comes against a backdrop of rising anti-Semitism in Europe and even here in the United States.

I submit for the RECORD a June 20 Washington Post piece highlighting the problem, which noted that ''Jewish leaders here are now warning of a recent and fundamental shift tied to a spurt of homegrown anti-Semitism.''

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 2014]

A ''NEW ANTI-SEMITISM'' RISING IN FRANCE

(By Anthony Faiola)

PARIS—''I am not an anti-Semite,'' French comedian Dieudonné M'bala M'bala says with a devilish grin near the start of his hit show at this city's Théâtre de la Main d'Or.

Then come the Jew jokes.

In front of a packed house, he apes Alain Jakubowicz, a French Jewish leader who calls the humor of Dieudonné tantamount to hate speech. While the comedian skewers Jakubowicz, Stars of David glow on screen and, as the audience guffaws, a soundtrack plays evoking the trains to Nazi death camps. In various other skits, he belittles the Holocaust, then mocks it as a gross exaggeration.

In a country where Jewish leaders are decrying the worst climate of anti-Semitism in decades, Dieudonné, a longtime comedian and erstwhile politician whose attacks on Jews have grown progressively worse, is a sign of the times. French authorities issued an effective ban on his latest show in January for inciting hate. So he reworked the material to get back on stage—cutting, for instance, one joke lamenting the lack of modern-day gas chambers.

But the Afro-French comedian, whose stage name is simply Dieudonné, managed to salvage other bits, including his signature ''quenelle'' salute. Across Europe, the downward-pointing arm gesture that looks like an inverted Nazi salute has now gone so viral that it has popped up on army bases, in parliaments, at weddings and at professional soccer matches. Neo-Nazis have used it in front of synagogues and Holocaust memorials. Earlier this year, bands of Dieudonné supporters flashed it during a street protest in Paris while shouting, ''Jews, out of France!''

''Dieudonné is getting millions of views on his videos on the Internet and is spreading his quenelle,'' said Roger Cukierman, president of the Council for Jewish Institutions in France. ''Something very worrying is happening in France. This is not a good time for Jews.''

Dieudonné was unavailable for comment, but his attorney, Sanjay Mirabeau, said the comedian was simply speaking truth to power.

''If the Portuguese were protected in France and had big influence, then he would protest the Portuguese,'' Mirabeau said. ''But as it is, there are others'' who fit that description.

Jewish leaders say Dieudonné is a symptom of a larger problem. Here and across the region, they are talking of the rise of a ''new anti-Semitism'' based on the convergence of four main factors. They cite classic scapegoating amid hard economic times, the growing strength of far-right nationalists, a deteriorating relationship between black Europeans and Jews, and, importantly, increasing tensions with Europe's surging Muslim population.

In Western Europe, no nation has seen the climate for Jews deteriorate more than France.

Anti-Semitism has ebbed and flowed here and throughout the region since the end of World War II, with outbreaks of violence and international terrorism—particularly in the 1980s and early 2000s—often linked to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. But Jewish leaders here are now warning of a recent and fundamental shift tied to a spurt of homegrown anti-Semitism.

This month, authorities arrested Mehdi Nemmouche, a 29-year-old French national, and charged him with the May killings of four people inside a Jewish museum in Brussels. The attack was the deadliest act of anti-Semitism in Western Europe since a gunman killed seven people, including three children at a Jewish day school, in Toulouse in 2012. Nemmouche allegedly launched his attack after a tour of duty with rebels in Syria, prompting fears of additional violence to come as more of the hundreds of French nationals fighting there make their way home.

In a country that is home to the largest Jewish community in Europe, the first three months of the year saw reported acts of anti-Semitic violence in France skyrocket to 140 incidents, a 40 percent increase from the same period last year. This month, two young Jewish men were severely beaten on their way to synagogue in an eastern suburb of Paris.

Near the city's Montmartre district, home to the Moulin Rouge and the Sacré-Coeur basilica, a woman verbally accosted a Jewish mother before rattling the carriage of her 6-month-old child and shouting, ''dirty Jewess . . . you Jews have too many children,'' according to a report filed by France's National Bureau for Vigilance Against Anti-Semitism. Meanwhile, not far from the rolling vineyards of Bordeaux, stars of David were recently spray-painted on the homes of Jews.

A recent global survey by the New York-based Anti-Defamation League suggested that France now has the highest percentage in Western Europe—37 percent—of people openly harboring anti-Semitic views. That compares with 8 percent in Britain, 20 percent in Italy and 27 percent in Germany. Jewish leaders chalk that up in part to growing radicalization of youths in France's Muslim population—the largest in Europe—as well as outrage in the general public and French media over Israeli policy toward the Palestinians.

But it is also far more complex.

Anti-Semitism, Jewish activists fear, is becoming more socially acceptable. In May, for instance, the far-right National Front—a party long rooted in anti-Semitism but which sought to portray itself as reformed—came in first in elections here for the European Parliament, winning a whopping 25 percent of the national vote. Yet last week, its patriarch, Jean-Marie Le Pen, suggested just how unreformed a segment of the party remains. In a video posted on the party's Web site, he suggested that a Jewish folk singer should be thrown into an oven.

Le Pen's daughter and current party leader, Marine Le Pen, offered a rare rebuke of her father's words and ordered footage of the comments removed from the party's Web site. The elder Le Pen's musings were nevertheless seen as unsurprising within a party whose older members have long harkened back to the days of Vichy France, the Nazi collaborators who allowed tens of thousands of French Jews to go to their deaths.

''I walked into my kosher sandwich shop the other day and the owner asked me, 'Is it time to leave? Are we Nazi Germany yet?' '' said Shimon Samuels, the Paris-based international director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center. ''We've got the National Front in first place. We've got Dieudonné, spreading his hate. So I told him, 'Well, do you really want to be the last to go?' ''

Indeed, French migration to Israel in 2013 jumped to 3,200 people, up 64 percent from 2012. A huge uptick in departures this year has Jewish leaders here predicting that at least 5,000 French Jews will leave in 2014.

''We've been thinking about moving for a long time, but the climate was not as dangerous as it is now,'' said Alain, 30, a medical equipment specialist who is moving to Israel

in July with his wife and three children. He declined to give his last name out of fear for his family's security.

Sitting at his modest dining-room table in eastern Paris, a set of moving boxes in the next room, he added: ''It bothers me because this is not normal; this is not how I remember France when I was growing up.''

Two weeks ago, Alain said, he woke up to find his 13-year-old daughter, Michele, crying. After a recent attack on two Jewish boys not far from her school, she said she was too afraid to join her regular car pool. Instead, she demanded that he take her to school and pick her up, standing guard as she entered and exited each day. He has moved his work schedule around to accommodate her request.

Asked what she was scared of, Michele, an elegant French teenager in a fashionable black skirt and white T-shirt, looked down and said: ''I'm afraid that what happened in Toulouse will happen at my school, too. . . . I hear what people say about Jews. And I am scared.''

Enter Dieudonné.

Born to a father from Cameroon and a white French mother, Dieudonné, ironically, rose to stardom in the 1990s as part of a duo act with Élie Semoun, a Jewish comedian. But the two grew estranged as Dieudonné's humor became indistinguishable from anti-Semitic diatribe.

In the 2000s, he wooed the far right and the far left as his campaign against Zionism made him an unlikely symbol for both. Throughout the 2000s, he was repeatedly fined for making a variety of anti-Semitic statements, including his description of Holocaust commemorations as ''memorial porn.''

Blacklisted from mainstream TV shows and radio, he nevertheless thrives, with a cultlike following on stage and via the Internet, where his satirical videos stand out among a rash of new anti-Semitic Web sites in France. As he has become less mainstream, he has traded larger venues for relatively smaller theater spaces where he is filling seats with fans across racial, political and socioeconomic spectrums.

Dieudonné is an equal-opportunity offender. His act is a study in provocation, targeting not only Jews but also gays and mainstream politicians. Yet—as evidenced by the T-shirts bearing the quenelle salute on sale at his shows—he tends to reserve his toughest punch lines for Jews.

Over the past year, observers say, his depictions have sharply worsened. His act became so offensive that the French government in January took the rare step of encouraging local jurisdictions to bar his performances. The move forced him to tone down his material, largely by deploying inference and shorthand to get his point across.

Mr. WOLF. The denomination's action on Israel stands in stark contrast to its inaction on the persecuted church in the region. The PCUSA expressly declined to sign a recently issued Pledge of Solidarity and Call to Action, which more than 200 religious leaders from across the country signed on to.

Representatives of the American church came together across ecumenical lines to pledge to do more to help beleaguered minority faith communities, foremost among them, the ancient Christian communities in Egypt, Iraq, and Syria. The PCUSA privately expressed concern that this action would be perceived as an ''anti-Muslim'' statement.

The pledge itself was carefully crafted with input from faith leaders here in the United States and throughout the region and conveyed that the time has come for the church in the West to ''pray and speak with greater urgency about this human rights crisis.'' With the PCUSA's decision not to associate itself with the urgent call to action, I find myself once again out of step with my denomination in profound ways.

I believe many of the giants of this tradition, among them: Reverend Peter Marshall of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, where President Lincoln worshipped, and a former Senate Chaplain; Reverend Dick Halverson, senior pastor of Fourth Presbyterian Church and also a Senate Chaplain; Reverend Louis Evans, pastor for 18 years of National Presbyterian Church; and Reverend James Boice, pastor of Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia would find it difficult to recognize the PCUSA church today.

INCREASING SEA LEVELS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today many Members of Congress awoke listening to NPR for yet another story about Norfolk, Virginia, the area of the United States on the eastern seaboard where we have seen the most rapid increase in the sea level. This matters, being home to the largest naval base in the world, placing in question its long-term survivability.

A story in The Washington Post several weeks ago talked about the impact that this is having on the waterfront, including one church that is being forced to relocate. I love the pastor's comment that his parishioners should not have to consult a tide table to determine whether or not they can go to church.

The morning news also included the Supreme Court's third affirmation of the power of the EPA to regulate greenhouse gases, setting hopefully at rest the long-term battle over whether or not we can deal with this critical area of carbon pollution.

We also have seen a media blitz from a coalition of respected senior officials—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents stretching back to the Nixon administration—talking about the impact of climate change, particularly as it deals with business. We have had a report from four Republican EPA administrators talking about the need to support the EPA's effort with the new rule for carbon emissions.

Today, on the steps of Capitol Hill as I passed, there were representatives from the Citizens Climate Lobby from all over the country who are fanning out across the Capitol making their case.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, the science is, in fact, clear. We have very severe problems associated with carbon pollution and the impacts that humans have had on climate. We are looking at reports that ought to sober everybody around here, tripling the number of days of 95 degree-plus weather, thinking about the impacts that rising sea level is going to have on coastal States.

Louisiana, for example, is looking at up to 5 percent of their insurable land being underwater by midcentury, perhaps 20 percent by the turn of the century. There is $1.5 trillion of insurable properties that is likely to be underwater.

It is time for us to stop debating the science. The science is, in fact, clear. It is time for us to look at opportunities. The EPA rule is going to go into effect. We all ought to be engaged with taking advantage of the flexibility that has been proposed by the administration to fine-tune it to the needs and opportunities in our State.

It is important that we start work on the implementation of a revenue-neutral carbon tax. Virtually every expert—conservative, liberal, economists, even many business leaders—agrees that having a revenue-neutral carbon tax to change the habits of American business and households, using the revenues to reduce the impact on lower-income citizens and on small business, is the quickest, fastest way to be able to make progress on climate protection.

We can, in fact, slow the impact, and we can prepare for what we cannot avoid.

Experts in climate science, joined by hardheaded business people and citizen activists, all agree that it is time for Congress to get engaged, for Congress to stop this active denial, and come together on simple commonsense steps that we can make to strengthen our communities to slow the increase of climate change and be able to prepare for stronger opportunities in our local economies as we move to take advantage of this.

Everybody should take action, so that all our families can be safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

ENERGY

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, energy is vital to every aspect of American life. Working families, retirees, and businesses—large and small—are all depending upon reliable and affordable energy. An unwelcome increase in the electric bill leaves many families no other option but to cut elsewhere.

For businesses, higher energy costs mean less money to invest in jobs or expansion. As business costs increase, so does the price of goods down the line, triggering a chain reaction felt throughout the economy.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration's policies are contributing to

the rise in energy costs with policies that discourage exploration of domestic resources and attempt to bypass Congress to implement cap-and-trade. A major way to improve reliability and affordability is to produce more energy here at home.

I am pleased to join my colleagues as we debate energy solutions and advance an all-of-the-above energy policy to power economic growth and job creation.

CELEBRATING IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this month, as we celebrate Immigrant Heritage Month, we reflect upon unique backgrounds and honor our collective history, but the reality is that our current immigration system is badly broken.

Immigration reform is not only the right thing to do morally, it is the right thing to do for our economy. Businesses in Connecticut and across the Nation are demanding that we have immigration reform, so that they can hire employees and expand their businesses.

I have heard from manufacturers and from biotech companies in my own district who are eager to hire new engineers and Ph.D.'s, but our current system forces most of the best and brightest who come from around the world, who train at our research institutions here in the United States, trained at taxpayer expense, we force them to leave this country, taking their talents with them.

I have met with dairy farmers in Connecticut who cannot find enough laborers to work on their farms. Farmers are demanding that Congress reform our immigration system to provide a reliable and stable workforce, so that they can continue to provide local food, milk, and cheese for our families.

There are 11 million immigrants who are ready to emerge from the shadows, ready to join the workforce, and to grow our economy: people like Maria, a mother of three from Meriden, who brought her family here to build a better life; people like Camila and Carolina—twin sisters, honor students—from Danbury, who cofounded Connecticut Students for a DREAM, to help DREAMers navigate the immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to act. Let's honor our Nation of immigrants by passing comprehensive immigration reform that secures our borders, keeps our families together, and creates an earned path to citizenship.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, I voted against the Defense Appropriations bill because of $79.4 billion included it included in OCO funding.

During the amendment process, I joined many of my colleagues in both parties in voting to stop funding the war in Afghanistan after 2014.

Unfortunately, we were unsuccessful in this effort, and I am on the floor of the House today because the American people are frustrated with the administration and with Congress for continuing to spend taxpayer money overseas in unnecessary military interventions. I share this frustration with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House an article in the Daily Journal Online titled ''No End for Afghanistan's War on the United States Taxpayer''—''No End for Afghanistan's War on the United States Taxpayer,'' which states:

> John F. Sopko, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, known as SIGAR, may have taken Uncle Sam and shaken him by the lapels last month, but the media missed it. Americans, however, need to hear how Sopko, in an address at the Middle East Institute in Washington, D.C., laid out why Afghanistan remains ''relevant''—and a cause for outrage—for every U.S. taxpayer and policymaker. In short, Afghanistan is on life support, and Joe Citizen is its permanent IV.

These are the words of John Sopko. This article goes on to say:

> SIGAR, on the job since 2008, has produced 118 audits and inspection reports and made 23 quarterly reports to Congress. Nothing seems to penetrate the Capitol dome, however.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to a quote by Pat Buchanan, with whom I agree strongly on foreign policy issues:

> Is it not a symptom of senility to be borrowing from the world, so we can defend the world?

How appropriate a statement is that? We are a debtor nation that has to borrow money every year to pay the debts of our own Nation, and we borrow money to spend overseas in foreign areas. It makes no sense.

That is why I am so disappointed that, last week, we were unable to put a stop on the waste, fraud, and abuse of the American taxpayer money in Afghanistan.

Now, when we also must consider the collapse of Iraq, I am reminded of a quote from our country's first President, in a letter from George Washington to James Monroe, and I quote Washington:

> I have always given it as my decided opinion that no nation has a right to intermeddle in the concerns of another, that everybody has a right to form and adopt whatever government they liked best to live under themselves.

Mr. Speaker, beside me is a poster of military carrying the casket of an American soldier killed in either Iraq or Afghanistan. I bring this to the floor because, this past weekend, we had three marines from Camp Lejeune—which is in the district I represent, the Third District of North Carolina—three marines in the engineering battalion in Afghanistan helping to build roads in Afghanistan. The three were shot and killed.

That is why I continue to join my colleagues, and both parties come to this floor and to say to the Congress: you are not listening to the American people, the American people are sick and tired of their sons and daughters dying in foreign lands, borrowing money from the Chinese to pay for that development in those foreign lands, and we continue to have more and more losing their life and their limbs.

It is time for the Congress to listen to the American people. They are the ones that elect us to come here to represent their views and their interests, and we are not listening to them as it relates to Afghanistan.

I pray for our men and women in uniform, their families, and pray for the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 150th anniversary of the Yosemite Grant Act that was signed into law in 1864 by then-President Abraham Lincoln and the creation of Yosemite National Park, one of our Nation's greatest treasures.

Yosemite receives over 4 million visitors annually, all who come to experience our breathtaking scenery and wonderment that the park provides for all Americans.

As a Californian and a longtime park supporter since my early childhood, I understand the importance of safeguarding our precious national resources.

Yosemite is an integral part of our communities and our country, and it is also a great source of pride for all Californians. Therefore, we must work together, despite the challenges that we face, to not only preserve Yosemite National Park for future generations to come, but for all of America's great natural resources.

Yosemite is just one of many of the crown jewels of America's national park system. Its beautiful and majestic park is, obviously, something to behold and where visitors come every year from not only across America, but from throughout the world.

For all Americans, we must remember that Yosemite National Park represents among the best of America. As it has been said before: America's national parks, perhaps America's best idea.

Therefore, it is my honor to celebrate the 150th anniversary of Yosemite National Park, the first park designated in our country.

23 IN 1—DEL RIO, TEXAS

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to continue our journey throughout the vast 23rd District of Texas and talk about San Felipe Del Rio, known today as Del Rio, Texas.

San Felipe Del Rio was founded by the Spaniards in the 1600s. In fact, local lore talks about the Spaniards offering a mass there on St. Philip's Day in 1635, hence the name San Felipe.

When the local post office was established in 1883, the name was condensed simply to Del Rio, in order to avoid confusion with San Felipe de Austin.

Del Rio, from the onset, has been carried forward by those with innovation and entrepreneurship in their blood, from the San Felipe Agricultural, Irrigation, and Manufacturing Company, which first harnessed the clear waters of the San Felipe Creek to satisfy the thirst of crops and a growing population, to Julio's Corn Chips, which went from a smalltown favorite now being mailed to Texans abroad who want a little taste of home.

From the skies over war-torn Europe to protecting our border, Del Rio has a long history of military accomplishment and continues to contribute to the safety and security of our Nation.

□ 1030

In 1942, during World War II, the War Department opened Laughlin Field as a training base to prepare pilots for high-risk missions over European skies.

In 1962, U–2 high-altitude spy planes that played a critical role in the discovery of Russian missiles hidden in Cuba were stationed at Laughlin Air Force Base in Del Rio. This action would eventually lead our Nation to having the resolve to win the Cold War.

Through Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio continues its military tradition by training the greatest pilots in the world and serving as a base to those who guard our borders.

Being a mix of Spanish and Mexican tradition, Del Rio is a cultural hub and an example of how in America many cultures can blend together to form something wonderful and exciting.

In Del Rio, you can fill a day visiting a winery run by the Qualia family, which is the oldest winery in Texas; learn about regional history and see Judge Roy Bean's grave at the Whitehead Memorial Museum; or, you can catch an evening show by the Upstagers, Del Rio's award-winning live theater group.

In fact, if you like the outdoors, visit Seminole Canyon, not far from Del Rio, which has one of the largest collections of Indian pictographs found anywhere in the world. You can also visit Devils River, which is the last river in Texas still in its natural state.

If you are a sports fan, there are plenty of sporting events to catch, such as Del Rio's Mighty Ram football team, or the annual fishing tournament held on Lake Amistad, which is an absolutely phenomenal lake and a national recreational area run by the National Park Service.

So if you find yourself near Del Rio, I invite you to experience the culture, take a dip in the clear waters of the San Felipe Creek, or catch a theater show. And bring back a bag of Julio's Corn Chips, which you are sure to enjoy.

BOKO HARAM

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a congressional delegation trip to Nigeria, which was both eye-opening and moving.

Nigeria is a country of huge possibilities. It is an oil rich nation, the largest in Africa, with a population that will surpass the United States by 2050. It is mired with corrupt political leaders and a weakened police and military, leading to a dire political climate of joblessness in the northeast and giving rise to a terrorist organization of mostly young men called Boko Haram. They burn schools, churches, mosques, and police stations. They rob, steal, kidnap, and murder innocent victims in their path. Their violence has resulted in the deaths of thousands in the last decade.

Boko Haram's most notorious activity, which was the focus of our trip, was the recent kidnapping of 270 innocent girls attending school. These girls remain hidden—most likely scattered—and subjected to unimaginable crimes. This kidnapping received international attention for a short time, and then, like the girls, disappeared.

While in Nigeria, we met with victims of Boko Haram, as well as political, military, and civic leaders. We learned of the horrific suffering at the hands of Boko Haram and the inability of the corrupt Nigerian government, which is involved in a competitive upcoming election, to stop this violence.

Embedded in my mind are the young teen girls who told us harrowing stories of how they escaped Boko Haram terrorists while their friends, tragically, remained behind. We met with a weeping father of one such girl.

I will never forget the story of a young mother who witnessed Boko Haram decapitate her husband's head and left her dying in the street with her throat slit. She survived physically, but has been left broken financially and, of course, psychologically.

We spent time with a fusion team of Nigerian, U.S., British, and French military law enforcement put together to strategize the return of these girls.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some quick observations of mine to a very complicated situation.

As I have said before, some crimes against humanity are of the nature that knows no borders and require a response no matter where you live in the world. The kidnapping of 270 girls is such a crime. It cannot be treated just as a flavor of the week that is soon forgotten.

That is why the United States and the international community must continue to apply pressure to the Nigerian government to do all it can to negotiate the safe return of these young girls to their families.

For those citizens who want to join this fight, I join my colleague FREDERICA WILSON in asking people in this country and all over the world to tweet using #bringbackourgirls every day at 9 a.m.

During our trip, Mr. Speaker, we called upon—and we should continue to call upon—the Nigerian government to set up a relief fund for the victims and the families of Boko Haram for the financial and medical care that they so need.

The United States should continue our efforts with the fusion team and quickly respond to the team's request for approval of a strategic plan.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we must continue to advise Nigerian authorities on the need for transparency and honesty and the need to deal with the economic plight of their people and urge a free and fair upcoming election.

As I said from the start, Mr. Speaker, Nigeria is a nation of great possibilities. It can one day be a giant economic partner for the United States and her allies, or it can become a safe haven for terrorists. We can keep it on the right path by bringing those girls home.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pause in Your presence and ask guidance for the men and women of the people's House.

On a day when voters in many States participate in congressional primaries, may Your spirit of wisdom be manifest among those who exercise their rights, rights for which so many struggled 50 years ago to secure for all American citizens.

Here in Washington, may all Members realize that Your congregation is wider and broader than ever we could measure or determine. Help them, and help us, O Lord, to put away any judgments that belong to You and do what we can to live together in peace.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

PRESIDENT OBAMA MUST BRING OUR MARINE HOME

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Andrew Tahmooressi is a 25-year-old United States marine from south Florida who served our country bravely and honorably during two combat tours in Afghanistan. Andrew was meritoriously promoted on the battlefield to sergeant during his last tour, which shows the true character of this young man who once told his mom that he was ''nudged by God'' to join the military.

Andrew suffers from posttraumatic stress disorder and was invited by a fellow marine to seek treatment in San Diego. He accidently ended up at the Mexican border, where he was arrested by Mexican authorities for possessing firearms.

Andrew's mistake was taking a wrong turn. The administration's mistake is to let him languish in Mexican prisons where he faced threats and abuses. President Obama and Vice President BIDEN both had opportunities to demand his release, but they shirked their responsibilities and their obligations to this young man and his family.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring our marine home now.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of June as Immigrant Heritage Month. This month I join my colleague, Representative SÁNCHEZ, as an original cosponsor recognizing the month of June as Immigrant Heritage Month in honor of the role immigrants play in shaping the history and culture of the United States.

No country has been more invigorated by immigrant culture, more rewarded by immigrant labor and immigrant ideas than our country, America. I believe the only true way to honor the immigrants that built the foundation of this great Nation is by fixing our broken immigration system, but House Republicans have refused to pass an immigration reform bill.

To mark Immigration Heritage Month, we must create a message of unity and remember that this country was also built by the dreams and hard work of people who came from someplace else. Perhaps then we can change the dialogue around immigration by placing attention on the country's diverse immigrant heritage and the need to bring immigration reform to the floor for a vote.

WRONG SIGNAL ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Post and Courier of Charleston, South Carolina, presented an editorial last Tuesday correctly revealing the wrong signal on immigration. The opinion states:

> Central American children have entered the United States in large numbers in recent weeks. Their mass entry has also produced another political obstacle to passing comprehensive immigration reform legislation. Opponents of the initiative reasonably point out that this is the latest border problem as additional evidence of the Obama administration's lack of credibility on the issue. Numerous Republican lawmakers have cited, as a motivating factor of this incoming tide of humanity, President Barack Obama's executive edict deferring deportations. And their continuing migration into our country strengthens the assumption that the President has no intention of fulfilling its pledge to bolster border security. Clearly, if the President and other advocates of sweeping immigration reform are serious about moving one through Congress, Federal border enforcement must be intensified.

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

JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize June as Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

Worldwide, at least 44 million people are living with Alzheimer's disease. The number is expected to rise to 76 million by 2030. In the United States, 5 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's.

Those who are affected by this disease know that the costs are high. The disease affects or hits both the afflicted and those who love the afflicted. It is a disease whose origins are unknown but whose end is absolutely certain. It is a disease that takes your mind, your dignity, and eventually your life. Alzheimer's is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States and is the most expensive disease, costing our Nation $214 billion in 2014 alone.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to take action on finding a cure for this fatal disease by supporting the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act to improve diagnosis and treatment of Alzheimer's and to commit to making a strong investment in funding research to find a cure.

KOREAN WAR VETERANS LUNCH

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, I had the chance to join with the Consul General Dong-man Han in presenting the memorial wreath at the 25th annual Korean war veterans lunch held at the VFW hall in Anderson, California. It was an honor to be in the company with such a courageous group of men who fought hard for the freedoms that the people of South Korea enjoy today.

The luncheon also served as a solemn reminder of the sacrifices that have been made on our behalf and the commitment we have to our veterans. That commitment wouldn't be embodied any better than by my friend Kim Chamberlain, who is a Korean immigrant.

As I assured the many veterans in the audience on Saturday, from the first time a constituent alerted me about issues he had faced with the VA until today, the vigilance of my office, myself, and many of my colleagues in this House, that commitment will remain to get to the bottom, to get solutions for the VA and the problems the veterans face on the backlog of not only their health issues but, as well, the backlog of even having their cases heard and the benefits.

So, many questions still remain. I look forward to meeting with the new director of the Oakland regional office there pretty soon and getting to the bottom and getting real solutions for veterans. Our commitment remains on them.

1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM BY THE SENATE

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 1 year since two-thirds of the Senate—Democrats and Republicans—voted for comprehensive immigration reform. So House Republicans have had 1 year to address the 4.3 million families languishing in the immigration backlogs separated from their loved ones for decades, 1 year to bring the 11 million undocumented immigrants who are already in the fabric of our society out of the shadows so they can earn their place in society, and 1 year to allow the brightest minds in the world to graduate from our schools and contribute to the economy. They have had 1 year to reduce the deficit by nearly $1 trillion, as this bill will do.

They promised the American people reform; all we have heard are excuses for the delays. That is why I helped to introduce H.R. 15, a bipartisan immigration bill. This bill has the votes to pass today.

I urge Republican leadership to put politics aside and bring this bill to the floor. It is time to fix our broken immigration system once and for all.

BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you know, the surge of illegal immigration on the southern border of Texas is one of the largest security and social issues facing our Nation today. Thousands of illegals crossing into the United States directly impact our schools, our hospitals, government budgets, employment, crime, and all parts of American life.

Sadly, this surge is no coincidence; instead, it is a direct response to President Obama's failed policies.

News reports stated:

> White House officials acknowledged some of the thousands of children seeking refuge are coming, in part, because they think they will be allowed to stay in the United States because of President Obama's policies.

This is totally unacceptable. We are a Nation of laws. The President has a duty to fully enforce our laws and protect our borders.

Texans and all Americans want, need, and deserve a secure border, period.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT DICK SHIGEMI HAMADA

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Staff Sergeant Dick Shigemi Hamada, a Japanese American World War II veteran born in Hawaii who served under the Office of Strategic Services, a precursor to the CIA.

He volunteered for the renowned 442nd Regimental Combat Team in 1943, shipped off to the fearsome battlefields of the Burma-India-China theater, and later parachuted into what is now Beijing in order to rescue more than 600 prisoners of war.

Throughout his military career, Staff Sergeant Hamada stayed true to the aloha spirit. His love of our country and determination to do whatever it took to accomplish the mission are an inspiration to all who have raised their hands to wear the uniform and serve.

Staff Sergeant Hamada passed away on May 27 at the age of 92, leaving behind a legacy of courage and servant leadership. He will be interred later today at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific at Punchbowl, and we send to him our deepest gratitude and say ''aloha'' to this Hawaii hero.

WE NEED TO SECURE OUR BORDER

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in May of 2011, President Obama gave a speech in El Paso, Texas, where he effectively said: Mission accomplished—our border is secure. In fact, he mocked those of us who disagreed with him, suggesting that we wouldn't be happy until there was a moat guarding our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, as we witness tens of thousands of children crossing our border today, I hope the President remembers his speech in El Paso and owns up to his administration's failure in enforcing our immigration policy.

We need a secure border before we can address any kind of immigration reform, which is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 2220, the SMART Border Act—tough, smart legislation to finally get operational control over our Nation's borders.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE WORKERS OF WARREN MILL

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, last December, in Stafford Springs, Connecticut, Warren mill, a textile mill that had been in operation for 161 years, sadly closed its doors and laid off its workers.

It was a day where many were sort of writing obituaries for the textile industry in New England, but for many, the memory and the reputation of the high quality of that factory lived on.

Fast forward to this past Wednesday, a new owner, American Woolen, closed on a deal to reopen the plant, which the looms will be humming by the end of this month, hiring back the workers whose quality workmanship, again, resurrected this industry for New England.

It was because of the combined effort of my office, which worked with the parties, to bring them together, and Governor Dan Malloy, who provided some low-interest financing, to help the transaction move forward. It all came together, so that by the end of June, 80 workers are going to be back at the looms producing wool and delivering it with a ''Made in America'' stamp, which is not just a dream, it is a reality. It is good business practice for people to invest in America's workers.

Congratulations to the workers of Warren mill in Stafford Springs, Connecticut, for setting an example of how we, as a Nation, can lead again in manufacturing.

GI BILL ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the original GI Bill, also known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. This legislation has had an enormous impact on the lives of millions of veterans, creating access to low-cost home loans and educational and vocational training.

Signed into law on June 22, 1944, the GI Bill came into being during the height of World War II, when America was mobilized into war around the globe. These veterans returned from war, utilized access to education and training, and began building an America that would lead the world economically and militarily for generations to come.

Since then, veterans from other conflicts, including Korea, Vietnam, and others, have used the GI Bill. Recently, it was amended to allow a new generation of veterans to gain access to a variety of benefits to transition to civilian life. The post-9/11 GI Bill builds upon the success of a bill signed into law 70 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans have paid a high price to earn these benefits, and they deserve as much.

HONORING MABON ''TEENIE'' HODGES

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of an outstanding guitarist, songwriter, singer, and legendary Memphis musician, Mabon Hodges, better known as ''Teenie'' Hodges, who passed away in Dallas just yesterday.

Teenie started playing the guitar at age 12, and he and his brothers were part of the Hi Rhythm Section, which was part of Royal Studios and Hi Records music that produced Al Green and Otis Clay and others, a great part of the Memphis sound in the seventies under Willie Mitchell, a great producer and great musician himself.

Willie Mitchell kind of adopted Teenie and taught him something about playing guitar and helped him in his career. Willie's grandson, Boo Mitchell, now runs that studio.

Teenie has been a part of it in the heart of the Hi Rhythm Section, which is well known throughout the world. He cowrote, with Al Green, ''Love and Happiness'' and ''Take Me to the River'' and other great tunes.

He continued playing through the spring. He fell ill with emphysema, which he had for years, but the emphysema got so strong that he had to be taken to the hospital in Dallas this spring, and then he passed away from emphysema. Services will be held in Memphis next week.

I was a friend of Teenie's. He was a great Memphian, a wonderful spirit, and a great talent. All of Memphis will miss him, and all of us in the country appreciate his great music and contribution to our culture.

RECOGNIZING JUDGE JOHN WILSON OF TENNESSEE'S FIRST DISTRICT

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my remarks with my friend, Mr. COHEN, from Memphis.

Today, I rise and recognize Judge John Wilson of Tennessee's First District for his commitment to serving the Third Judicial District of Tennessee and our Nation. His dedication to freedom, liberty, justice, and many other principles that make our country great is both a testament to his character and an achievement to be proud of.

Judge Wilson was born and raised in east Tennessee. He graduated from East Tennessee State University, located in my hometown of Johnson City, Tennessee, with his undergraduate degree, and graduated law school at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville.

Since his graduation from law school, Judge Wilson has served in the United States Air Force as an assistant district attorney and, most recently, as a circuit court judge for the Third Judicial District of Tennessee for 35 years, representing Greene, Hamblen, Hancock, and Hawkins Counties.

Judge Wilson would be the first to say that he could not have done it without his lovely wife, Nancy, who has been by his side for 48 years. I am proud to call both of them my friends.

I thank Judge Wilson for his service to our community, our State, and our Nation and wish him all the best in his well-deserved retirement.

OUTSTANDING ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding environmental research being conducted at the University of California, Merced.

In the midst of California's worst drought on record, scientists at UC Merced are studying the effects drought, fire, and global warming are having on soil and water resources.

One such researcher, Dr. Berhe, along with her students and collaborators, supported by the National Science Foundation, are investigating the impacts of fire, erosion, and climate change on soil processes.

Extreme drought and other catastrophic events can alter the carbon storage potential of the soil, its water-holding capacity, and lead to high rates of surface runoff.

Research such as Dr. Berhe's is critical for addressing challenges to the soil's ability to sequester atmospheric carbon, water security, and the health of the ecosystem.

Continued Federal support of science and research is needed to provide better information for formulating solutions to the challenges in the world around us.

TEXAS IMMIGRATION CRISIS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing an unprecedented crisis on the Texas border, but this is not the result of a natural disaster. This is an entirely manmade crisis caused by the executive branch.

The number of young undocumented immigrants has nearly tripled over the last 2 years. This is not a coincidence. Two years ago, the President essentially rewrote the Nation's immigration policies and promised amnesty to children of a certain age.

Central Americans heard this message loud and clear and have sent their children to the United States in droves, oftentimes under the care of paid-off drug lords who are abusive and dangerous.

I visited the holding facility at Lackland Air Force Base yesterday and heard the stories firsthand of the difficulties these children experience during their trip to the United States.

The Obama administration has said it is committed to ending human trafficking; but, Mr. Speaker, when you are complicit in this degree of human trafficking, I would call you an enabler.

I urge the President to reverse his course for the sake of these innocent children, for the sake of our hard-working border agents, and on behalf of the taxpayers.

HONORING THE USS PENNSYLVANIA FOR COMPLETING THE NATION'S LONGEST STRATEGIC PATROL

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor the sailors of the USS Pennsylvania's gold crew for completing a 140-day patrol.

This is the longest strategic deterrence patrol ever in an Ohio class submarine and the longest of any kind since the 1970s.

The servicemembers of the Pennsylvania ought to be proud of their accomplishments. They have done an extraordinary job of demonstrating the resilience of our sailors and the capability of our platforms.

We must also thank and pay tribute to the families of those servicemembers who went without their loved ones for more than one-third of a year.

President Kennedy once said:

> Control of the seas means security, control of the seas means peace, and control of the seas means victory.

The Pacific Northwest is proud—this country is proud—of the accomplishments and sacrifices of our sailors and their families. We are thankful for what you do for our Nation.

TRIBUTE TO OUR MILITARY AND VETERANS AT CORNERSTONE CHURCH IN SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, I had the opportunity to speak at Cornerstone Church in Salisbury, North Carolina. The service was a tribute to America, our military, and our veterans, and it was an uplifting experience.

Cornerstone was founded over 20 years ago. The first service had 12 attendees, five of whom were related to the founding pastor, Bill Godair. Pastor Godair continues as lead pastor and seeks to use the ministry to attack racism and poverty. The church is growing and serves the people of Salisbury without regard to age, race, or political affiliation.

Mr. Speaker, it was refreshing to join the congregation at Cornerstone and pay tribute to our men and women who serve or have served in our Armed Forces.

As the scriptures tell us in John 15:13:

> Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends.

CHILDREN AT AMERICA'S BORDER

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as the founder and cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I rise to talk

about children, the children in America who need more Head Start seats or the children in northern Nigeria who are being attacked and stolen away by Boko Haram who stole some 30 or 40 girls and some 31 boys.

I rise to talk about the children who are at America's border—through no fault of their own and through no fault of this administration—a baby or children laying on the floor with a blanket. Some have taken to the political grandstanding of blaming the President and the President's administration.

The United Nations has indicated that this is a proportion of international humanitarian crisis. Fifty-eight percent of the children that were questioned were not here for immigration issues; they are displaced internationally—they were forcibly displaced.

It is our job to address this question. We should address this question with humanitarian response, with more processing centers. We should have more detention centers that are there for families and children, so they can be processed appropriately; more immigration judges; we must deal with more children's organizations like the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, First Focus, Children's Legal Defense Fund.

Let us not grandstand on these babies. They are here because they have been forced to leave a devastating condition in their country. Attacking the administration is wrong.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is, once again, poised to act on an important issue facing our country.

Today, Senator DEAN HELLER, from my home State of Nevada, and Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island announced that they will be working to pass another extension of unemployment insurance for those who need a financial lifeline and have lost their jobs at no fault of their own.

The last time the Senate sent a bill to the House to help struggling Americans with unemployment insurance, Speaker BOEHNER and the Party of No let the bill expire.

By the end of this month, there will be 33,800 Nevadans cut off from unemployment insurance and another 3.1 million Americans asking why Congress has turned its back on them.

Is it any wonder that Congress is held in such low regard by the hardworking American people? The Speaker's answer to millions of Americans asking for help is deafening silence, with no plan to do anything.

I did not come to Congress to sit and wait for one person, the Speaker, to decide whether or not this body could act.

I urge the Speaker to bring up the Senate-passed unemployment insurance extension to help 3.1 million Americans who need a lifeline.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, DOMESTIC PROSPERITY AND GLOBAL FREEDOM ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3301, NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 636 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 636

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-48. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-49. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

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

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 636 provides for consideration of two energy bills designed to

provide certainty for those American businesses that have been given excuse after excuse as to why their permit applications have been delayed by the President, the Department of Energy, and other Federal agencies.

The President and his administration have used every delaying tactic they can think of to put off approval of job-creating projects in the natural gas and oil sectors. Quite frankly, the American people are fed up with it. Republicans are here today to stand up for citizens, unions, and businesses that have stood up and called for a more expeditious process that removes politics from the permitting decision-making.

The rule before us today provides for consideration of two bills, H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act. Both bills receive a standard structured rule under this rule.

For H.R. 6, the Rules Committee makes in order four amendments—two from Democratic sponsors and two bipartisan amendments. For H.R. 3301, the rule makes in order three amendments, all sponsored by Democrats.

This is a straightforward and fair rule that will allow the House to fully debate the issues of liquefied natural gas exports and cross-border pipeline and transmission line projects.

House Republicans have been focused on this country's energy independence for years. The Energy and Commerce Committee has been out in front of this effort, holding hearings on the Obama administration's harmful policies, holding hearings on the job-killing regulations and those that place restrictions on development on public lands and thereby increase the cost of producing electricity and fuel.

Although President Obama is quick to take credit for an increase in natural gas and oil production in this country over the last few years, any honest observer knows that any increase in production has come as a result of efforts on private, not public land, and certainly not lands controlled by the Federal Government.

In continuing the Republican majority's focus on domestic production issues, utilizing the resources that we have here in North America, Representative CORY GARDNER introduced H.R. 6, the bipartisan Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, to provide for the expedited approval of exploration of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries. I am an original cosponsor of the legislation.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we have had hearings about the gridlock which has held up dozens of applications from domestic production companies looking to export liquefied natural gas. Since the first non-free trade agreement application was submitted to the Department of Energy nearly 4 years ago, seven have been approved. Twenty-four are awaiting action.

Interestingly enough, to counter what the Department of Energy knew would be the inevitable bipartisan criticism of its delays at the last hearing we held on this topic, the Department of Energy announced just days before the hearing the approval of another LNG export application.

For anyone who thinks that this activity in the House is futile, given HARRY REID's intransigence in taking up any legislation that comes to the Senate from the House, this action by the Department of Energy highlights that efforts taken in this body—the House—can have meaningful impacts beyond simply having legislation signed into law.

Sending a clear signal to the Obama administration that the people's House is fed up with its delaying tactics and refusal to move forward with the approval of legitimate permit applications is key to making progress toward a more robust domestic energy sector.

The delays which President Obama's administration has imposed on these applications make it more and more difficult. As applications sit collecting dust for these companies trying to secure financing and countries looking to do business with American suppliers, they will soon lose patience and look elsewhere for their needs. The window for these opportunities is closing, and it is the President's hand that is pushing it down.

Mr. GARDNER's legislation is straightforward. Indeed, it is a two-page bill with a clear purpose and intent. The legislation expedites the decisionmaking process for authorization to export natural gas by requiring the Department of Energy to issue a decision within a finite number of days.

This legislation does not force the Department of Energy to make a decision or to make a decision a certain way. It simply says: make a decision.

Moreover, an increase in liquefied natural gas exports in the United States can have major positive ramifications on international relations.

I recently traveled to the Ukraine for their elections. I saw firsthand how Russia's cruel restrictions on natural gas are affecting the region's social and political atmosphere. Officials from the Ukraine and other Eastern European countries have told members of the Energy and Commerce Committee that the mere mention that the United States is increasing its LNG exports can have dramatic impacts on Russia's influence over the region. Mr. GARDNER's bill achieves that goal.

The passage of this bill will move the United States yet another step closer to both assisting our allies abroad as well as creating a more robust domestic industry at home.

The second bill included in today's rule, H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, authored by Chairman UPTON of the Energy and Commerce Committee, further improves the laws governing the permitting of oil and gas pipelines which cross the United States border between either Mexico or Canada.

As the country has witnessed over the past few years, despite overwhelming support from the American people for the project, President Obama and his Secretary of State—first Hillary Clinton and now John Kerry—have refused to approve the Keystone pipeline to bring oil from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico.

Those of us who have followed the process over the many years that this administration has had the Keystone application under its review know that the delays which the President has imposed on this approval process have been done purely for political considerations and, in the process, have harmed the country's relationship with one of our closest allies, our neighbor to the north.

If the goal of the President's delays—which he is clearly doing for his friends in the environmental lobby and certainly not for the many unions who have loudly called for the project's approval—was to stop development of the oil sands in Canada, the President again has failed.

Canada recently approved the exploration of a new pipeline to its western coast, where oil would be transported and exported to Asia. Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee have been highlighting this possibility for years. Apparently, our predictions are about to come true.

H.R. 3301 is about more than simply the Keystone pipeline. This legislation is about preventing the President—and future Presidents, regardless of their party—from playing politics with decisions that should be made on the merits of the project.

This President has repeatedly ignored the State Department's comprehensive environmental review of the application, which found that minimal adverse impacts would occur from the building and operation of a cross-country pipeline, and has instead decided to base the decision purely on those special interests.

This is not how major national projects should be evaluated in this country, and Chairman UPTON's legislation ensures that future decisions will be done without the shadow of politics looming over them.

However, although the legislation removes the politics out of such decision-making, it still ensures that other key safeguards in the approval process remain in place. Cross-border pipelines would still have to meet the Natural Gas Act's requirements, and they would still comply with all relevant Federal, State, and local siting and environmental law.

The Department of Commerce and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission both will play roles in this process, as well as the Department of Energy. Decisions must be made within a 120-day timeframe to prevent the types of delaying tactics that we have seen from the administration with regard to energy projects.

To be clear, this legislation applies only to projects which cross national borders and does not make changes to the application process for interstate and intrastate energy projects.

Mr. Speaker, both bills before us today are commonsense responses to the problems we have experienced when the President decides to play politics with the Nation's domestic energy industry.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying bills. First of all, this rule is not open, and it denies some important and germane amendments. This is consistent with the increasingly closed mindset of this Republican leadership.

I want to remind my colleagues that this is now the most closed Congress in history. There have been 62 closed rules in this Congress alone. That is a title I don't think either party would enjoy having, but this is the most closed Congress in history. Speaker BOEHNER, in his opening speech, said that openness would be the new standard. I guess he misspoke because that is not what is happening on these bills, and it hasn't been happening on most other important pieces of legislation. The approval rating of Congress from a poll, I think, Gallup did last week is at 7 percent. My friends can't blame that on President Obama, and they can't blame that on someone else. They are running the show here in the House. This is a reflection on the work or on the lack of work that is being done here.

I think the American people want a full and open debate on important issues. I think the American people want us to focus on things that will actually make their lives better and that have a chance of actually becoming law. We have millions of our fellow citizens who are unemployed, and we can't even get the Republican leadership to bring an extension of unemployment insurance to the House floor for a vote. We can't even get it on the floor for a vote.

We are trying to raise the minimum wage so that we are not subsidizing McDonald's or Wendy's, which pay their workers minimum wage. We are trying to give people a raise so that work actually pays in this country. We can't even get a minimum wage bill to this House floor for a vote. We can't even debate it, and we can't have a vote on it. They are blocking it.

We need to fix our immigration system. It is broken. An immigration reform bill passed in the United States Senate in a bipartisan way, and it solves many of the problems that some of my friends on the other side are complaining about, but the leadership of this House won't even let us bring a bipartisan immigration reform bill to the House floor so that we can vote on it.

It is no wonder why, under this Republican leadership, the approval rating of this body is 7 percent. I think that is history in and of itself. I don't know whether there was ever a Congress in the history of this country that had such a low rating.

Now here we are with this legislation, H.R. 6, the amazingly named Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, which would improve neither our domestic prosperity nor global freedom. Instead, it would undermine the Department of Energy's approval process for the export of liquefied natural gas. The current process allows the DOE to evaluate the impacts of LNG exports on domestic natural gas prices for consumers and manufacturers as well as environmental impacts.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Energy is already aggressively approving LNG exports. The amounts already approved for exports would transform the United States into the world's second largest exporter of LNG. Further, under the bill, LNG would not be exported any faster. I urge my colleagues not to be fooled by the rhetoric that you may hear on the floor today. Passing this bill will not magically solve the natural gas problem in Ukraine or in other parts of the world.

The other bill, H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, would dramatically weaken the environmental review process for transborder pipeline and electrical transmission line projects. This bill, which is a blatantly transparent effort to ''rig the game'' in favor of the Keystone pipeline project, would preclude the Federal Government from reviewing a project's full impacts, including oil spills and the consequences for landowners, public safety, drinking water, wildlife, and, yes, Mr. Speaker, climate change. Let me say those two words again because I know that many of our Republican colleagues tend to stick their heads in the sand when they hear them—climate change.

I think it is important to say a few things. Here is what we know. We know that burning fossil fuels releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. We know that carbon dioxide traps heat. We know that the levels of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere are higher than they have been in 800,000 years. We know that 9 of the 10 warmest years since 1880 have been in the last decade. We know that last month was the warmest month of May ever recorded.

Yet, to hear some of my Republican friends, we should just move along—nothing to see here, nothing to worry about. There is no need to worry that the Arctic ice sheets are melting, leading to rapidly rising sea levels. There is no need to worry about more severe and deadly weather events. There is no need to worry about profound impacts to agricultural production. At best, you will hear them say that the science is still unsettled. It isn't. Climate change is real—it is happening—and we need to figure out what we should do about it.

Sometimes they will say: Well, I am not a scientist, so I can't really comment about it. Mr. Speaker, I am not a scientist either, but I know that, if I drop my pen, it will fall to the floor because of gravity. No, most of us here in Congress are not scientists, but the overwhelming majority of the best and brightest scientific minds in the world have concluded that climate change is real, that it is happening, and humankind is currently making the problem worse.

It would be nice, given the enormity of this problem, if my Republican friends would work with Democrats and would work with the White House to try to fashion a response. Instead, they deny that it is a problem, and we get more of the same old-same old. I regret that very, very much, but I can't quite understand, Mr. Speaker, why my Republican friends continue to ignore this critically important issue. I hope it isn't because of their borderline pathological hatred of President Obama. I hope that it isn't because of the Big Oil special interests and the millions and millions of dollars they pour into Republican campaigns. Whatever the reason, I hope that future generations will forgive them, because this is something that we should have been addressing years and years and years ago, and the continued blocking of any serious attempts to deal with climate change by the majority in this House, I think, is unconscionable.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, vote against the rule because it is not an open rule, and a lot of germane amendments—they were germane—were not made in order. I am glad one of the authors of the bill got his amendment made in order, but he authored the bill, so I guess he gets special preference. There is no reason why all of the amendments couldn't have been made in order, and there is no reason why this couldn't have been an open process, because we are not really doing much this week. As for this legislation we are dealing with here today, my guess is it ain't going anywhere.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of a response.

Two months ago, in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, this House agreed to loan guarantees for the country of Ukraine as they dealt with an internal crisis in their country. It is interesting that, probably less than 24 hours after this House passed that loan guarantee, Vladimir Putin said: Do you

know what? Your natural gas price just doubled. In fact, next year, it is going to cost you an extra $1 billion. So, in effect, he used natural gas pricing policy to offset the loan guarantees that we had provided to the country of Ukraine to deal with their internal problems.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that this Congress can adjust and affect right now. We can remove the stranglehold that Vladimir Putin holds over Ukraine and, indeed, over the entirety of Eastern Europe, and we can do it with the passage of this bill today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the rule for both H.R. 6 and H.R. 3301, and I will address both of these bills. I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 3301 and a recent cosponsor to H.R. 6 after we amended it out of our committee.

As for H.R. 3301, this legislation would create a North American energy market with our free trading partners Canada and Mexico.

If we want to create this market, we need to have statutory authority. It is true that the Presidential permitting process dates back through many administrations, but to really create this market, we need some certainty, and that is why it should be in statute. These past administrations were forced to use executive orders, but Congress has failed to act. Congress has the duty to regulate the commerce of the United States, and cross-border energy infrastructure projects fall well within that space. Unfortunately, cross-border decisions have now fallen victim to election cycles and political considerations. H.R. 3301 will resolve these issues and those proposed by the amendments debated here today.

Let me say that I wish we had an open rule. Some of the amendments considered by the Rules Committee I would have liked to have voted for, but let's not take that away from the quality of these two pieces of legislation.

H.R. 3301 provides for an environmental review of the cross-border segment of the pipeline. The entire length of the pipeline is reviewed for environmental impacts under existing law. Any time a pipeline crosses Federal lands, waters, endangered habitats, a National Environmental Policy Act review—also known as ''NEPA''—must be completed by the Federal Government. Otherwise, the environmental permit must come from the State environmental agency if it is within the State. There are more than 40,000 miles of pipeline in the U.S. that have been constructed with in-depth environmental reviews. This will continue to be the case. H.R. 3301 doesn't take anything away except the State Department only has to deal with their responsibility in its coming from Canada to the United States or from Mexico to the United States or vice versa. There will be environmental reviews by Federal agencies and State agencies, and this will continue to be the case.

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

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Also, this bill doesn't deal with the Keystone XL. Pending applications for permits are grandfathered into the current process, and as a fail-safe, we have pushed the effective date of the legislation back to July 1 of 2016. This legislation isn't about Keystone no matter how badly opponents want to make it. It is about future projects and how to meet the energy needs of the 21st century.

Let me talk about H.R. 6. H.R. 6 would actually quantify how this should be done on exporting LNG, and most of those permits are in Louisiana and Texas. Most of the responsibility is with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, and they take 12 to 18 months to do the environmental reviews. The Department of Energy's only responsibility is if it is in the national interest to export LNG. We are going to keep that in the law, but we want to make sure they give a 30-day response because they have actually already had a possible 18 months to review these applications.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have very little to add to what my colleague from Texas just said.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want my colleagues to understand why I think we should reject this rule. Let me just mention two amendments that were germane and that were brought to the Rules Committee by our colleague from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

One amendment clarifies that a viable merchant marine is in the public interest and should be taken into consideration when processing applications under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act. The other grants priority to the processing of approvals for LNG facilities that will be supplied with or will export LNG by U.S. flag vessels.

These are, basically, two amendments that are germane to this bill that would strengthen our shipping industry, and they were ruled out of order. For no reason, they were just randomly ruled out of order. Those are the kinds of things that Members of Congress do not have an opportunity to vote on when you close the process. Again, this is the most closed Congress in the history of our country—with more closed rules than any other Congress in history. So the tendency of this leadership, notwithstanding what the Speaker promised, which was to have a more open and transparent process, has been to become the most closed Congress in history.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that mirrors the bipartisan measure that overwhelmingly passed the Senate this month. It takes aim at some of the VA's most pressing problems, including the expansion of veterans' access to care, holding VA officials accountable, and increasing medical personnel and needed facilities.

This issue of the VA is something that we need to address. It is important, and it is something on which, I think, there is bipartisan agreement that we ought to focus on, and our use on this floor would be better spent dealing with that.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the Congresswoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

□ 1300

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4841, the bill I introduced to overhaul the VA. The Senate has passed this legislation, and now, we must act swiftly and pass the Veterans' Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 without delay.

Over the past several weeks, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has held hearing after hearing on the multitude of issues that plague the VA. These hearings have covered everything from the gaming strategies to hide long patient wait times and bonuses received by VA executives, to capacity problems in the VA health system, and outdated appointment scheduling software.

These hearings clearly demonstrate that the VA needs an overhaul, and H.R. 4841 seeks to accomplish this. Our veterans have sacrificed so much for us. We have a moral obligation to ensure that sweeping reforms are implemented across the VA, making it an organization that exists with one purpose: to serve our veterans.

As lawmakers, we cannot address these multiple issues through piecemeal legislation. We must pass legislation that addresses the patient access crisis, manages patient care, and holds employees accountable.

H.R. 4841 addresses patient access by expediting the hiring of more VA health care providers and authorizes leases for 26 more health care facilities. It allows our rural veterans who have waited too long for appointments to see a doctor in their community.

It improves access to mobile vet centers for our rural veterans and expands access to survivors of military sexual assault. It strengthens partnerships between the VA and the Indian Health Services, an arrangement that is successfully working on the Navajo Nation in my district.

This bill addresses the VA's outdated appointment scheduling system and outdated IT infrastructure through a technology task force. It prohibits the

falsification of data to report patient wait times and mandates transparency by requiring the VA to publish patient wait times and data that measures the quality of care at all VA medical facilities.

It holds employees accountable by giving the Secretary the authority to immediately fire senior executives who fail to serve veterans.

This bill even helps our student veterans receive instate tuition at public colleges and universities and extends GI benefits to surviving spouses.

This bill is truly an overhaul of the way our veterans access care, of the way the VA manages care, and of the VA culture.

I will fight for the provisions in H.R. 4841 in the conference committee that convenes later today. However, a conference committee is not needed if the House passes this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. The Senate overwhelmingly agreed that these reforms are necessary, and now, the House must act without delay to make these sweeping reforms law.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The fact of the matter is that a conference committee is meeting on this very issue. In fact, they are having their first meeting this afternoon.

The issues of access, the issues of accountability for VA personnel who have not held themselves to high standards, those are provisions that have already passed the floor of this House, some on suspension and some under a rule.

These bills are before the conference committee with the Senate. It is appropriate that they be acted upon expeditiously, but in no way does defeating the previous question enhance that flexibility or the rapidity with which those questions are taken up.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I will insert into the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy on H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 3301—NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

(Rep. Upton, R-Michigan, and 20 cosponsors, June 24, 2014)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3301, which would require the specified Secretary to issue a ''certificate of crossing'' for any cross-border segment of an oil pipeline (Secretary of State) or electric transmission facility (Secretary of Energy) within 120 days after the completion of the environmental review, unless the Secretary finds that the cross-border pipeline or electric transmission facility ''is not in the public interest of the United States.''

The bill's 120-day approval requirement would circumvent the current authority for issuing Presidential Permits for cross-border pipelines and transmission facilities provided by Executive Orders 13337 and 10485, as amended, which allow for the full consideration of the complex issues raised by the building of such infrastructure. That process dates back through many Administrations and has effectively addressed cross-border permitting decisions in a manner that serves the national interest.

H.R. 3301 would impose an unreasonable deadline that would curtail the thorough consideration of the issues involved, which could result in serious security, safety, foreign policy, environmental, economic, and other ramifications. By preventing the opportunity for the necessary assessment of all factors relevant to the national interest, the bill would create significant policy risks and create legal uncertainty for permitting applicants. Additionally, the bill would prevent assessment of whether modifications to border-crossing pipelines or electric transmission facilities are in the national interest, which is provided for through the current process.

H.R. 3301 would also raise serious trade implications by eliminating the current statutory requirement that the Department of Energy authorize orders for exports and imports of natural gas to and from Canada and Mexico.

Because H.R. 3301 would circumvent longstanding and proven processes for determining whether cross-border pipelines and electric transmission facilities are in the national interest by removing the Presidential permitting requirement, if presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me just read one line here. It says:

Because H.R. 3301 would circumvent longstanding and proven processes for determining whether cross-border pipelines and electric transmission facilities are in the natural interest by removing the Presidential permitting requirement, if presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this bill.

So we are discussing—we are spending time here discussing a bill that will probably not be brought up at all in the Senate and will be vetoed by the White House. So this is just kind of an exercise in futility, when we should be here trying to figure out how to deal with some of the bigger issues like climate change.

If you don't want to talk about climate change, let's talk about increasing the minimum wage. If you don't want to talk about that, let's talk about extending unemployment insurance for people who have lost their jobs.

If you don't want to talk about that, let's talk about immigration reform. Let's talk about something that actually matters, something that—quite frankly, some of the things that are urgent for us to focus on.

Instead, we get these bills that are being brought before us, under a restrictive process, again, which is in keeping with the mindset of this Congress, which is closed.

Notwithstanding what the Speaker said, that there would be this new commitment to openness, this is now the most closed Congress in history.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague from Arizona's motion because Arizona veterans demand immediate action.

At the Phoenix VA, managers and employees placed veterans on secret lists where they had to wait months to see a doctor. Even more horrifying are new whistleblower allegations that veterans died while waiting on these lists and that VA managers ordered the records altered to cover up these deaths.

This is not just immoral; it is criminal. Those responsible for this disaster must be prosecuted and held accountable. They should also take responsibility for what they have done to our veterans.

I call on the Phoenix VA management currently on administrative leave to resign immediately and return the bonuses they received over the past 2 years and the pay they have received while on administrative leave.

Ongoing audits by the VA and the VA Office of Inspector General reveal systemic problems with wait times, with the scheduling process, and with the honesty and integrity of the system.

In a letter to the President sent yesterday, the Office of Special Counsel revealed that the VA's procedures for responding to whistleblower disclosures are woefully inadequate. This is totally unacceptable.

VA and Congress must take action to provide our veterans the care they need now, recoup bonuses paid to VA executives who fraudulently manipulated the data, and fire VA executives responsible for these inexcusable actions.

I appreciate the bipartisan work taking place to reform the VA and to provide our veterans the care that they need. In fact, I cosponsored and voted for both House bills.

The bottom line is that there is bipartisan legislation that can help our veterans get the care they need and hold bad actors accountable right now, so that is why I support this motion to send a bill to the President's desk as quickly as possible.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Again, access and accountability are parts of the VA reform bills that have been passed by this House and currently that is in conference. Even today, they are having their first meeting of the conference committee.

I, too, wish the administration would fire someone for incompetence. Whether it be at the VA, the Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service, healthcare.gov, the list of incompetencies grows larger every day and just begs the question: What do you have to do to get fired by the Obama administration?

I have got to share with you something else. This Statement of Administration Policy—and this is the first time I have seen it here as we are presenting the bill today—but it closes with the statement: ''Because H.R. 3301''—that is the permitting bill—

''would circumvent longstanding and proven processes.''

Proven processes? These processes are broken. That is why the legislation is necessary—because the administration refuses to act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I find it somewhat interesting here that my colleague from Texas is all upset about the slowness of the permitting process when it comes to these pipelines.

I think that there is bipartisan concern about the way the VA is currently being managed. I think there is bipartisan concern that we ought to make sure that the system is more responsive to our veterans.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK came to the floor and offered a statement, which will be the subject of the previous question, that I think makes a lot of sense. I mean, what she is talking about is a bill that is the companion to the one that Senator MCCAIN introduced in the United States Senate.

I am a little kind of bothered by the fact that there is not more impatience on the other side of the aisle to fix this VA system, to get it right. Again, you could point all the fingers you want at the administration, and they are trying to get it right.

There are things that we can do right now to more aggressively and quickly address some of these issues, and that is what Mrs. KIRKPATRICK was talking about. That is what Ms. SINEMA was talking about. That is what Senator MCCAIN is talking about in the United States Senate, Senator SANDERS as well.

That, to me, seems urgent. We ought to do this right now, and to kind of use the excuse that, well, we passed a couple of these things and maybe there will be a conference committee that will resolve all this stuff—let's just do it. Let's just get this done.

Again, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, so that we can bring up the very legislation that Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Ms. SINEMA talked about.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Again, I would reiterate that the veterans bills passed by this House, passed by the House of Representatives, have now gone to conference with the Senate. The most expeditious way to accomplish the goals the gentleman referred to is for the conference committee to give its report and bring that back to the floor of the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just—I mean, there is just so much that I want to say here, given the fact that there is so much that we need to do to help the American people, and we are not doing it in this Congress.

We are bringing up kind of the same old-same old energy bills that are going nowhere, that don't respond to the needs of our country, and certainly don't address the issue of climate change.

My colleague talks about how the process is broken. He says the Keystone XL has taken 5 years and counting and that shows that the process is broken.

Let me just say that that project is a highly controversial project, with significant environmental impacts. Because the Obama administration took the time to do the environmental review, we have more information on the project's impacts on climate change.

The State Department's final environmental review found that tar sands produce significantly more carbon pollution than conventional oil, that building the Keystone XL pipeline could allow more rapid expansion of the tar sands, and that this expansion would exacerbate climate change. That is something that we can't afford to do.

Last month, our Nation's leading climate scientists released the country's third national climate assessment. The report confirms that climate change is real, is being caused by humans, and is already harming communities across America.

The report tells us the scientific evidence is unequivocal. The impacts are being felt in every region. They are growing more urgent, and they are going to get worse if we don't act.

A record drought is continuing to destroy crops in California. Torrential rains have flooded Florida. Wildfires are getting more intense. Coastal areas are being inundated as sea levels rise.

No sector of our economy, from oyster hatcheries on the West Coast to maple syrup producers in New England, are untouched. Business as usual is no longer an option. The same old-same old doesn't work.

If we are serious about taking action on climate change, saying no to the Keystone XL pipeline, to me, is an obvious place to start; and the pipeline would produce more carbon pollution than any other project pending in the United States.

The additional carbon pollution from this single project is equivalent to building seven new coal-fired power plants.

Now, if we can't say ''no'' to this project on climate grounds, where are we going to draw the line?

□ 1315

So I commend the Obama administration for taking the time to get this decision right.

The environment matters. For years, my friends on the other side of the aisle ignored the environment. I mean, it was always that the environmentalists were the enemy. You know, being good stewards of the environment was somehow a bad thing to do. Well, look at what is happening around us.

So I think it is time that there be a change of attitude, and it is time that we actually bring serious legislation to the floor that deals with, how do we meet our energy needs but how do we also deal with this issue of climate change?

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, the oil produced in the Province of Alberta belongs to the country of Canada. Yes, it may traverse the United States, if the Keystone pipeline is built. But if it is not, the oil will traverse western Canada and be shipped to China. The oil will still be burned. The carbon will still go into the air.

Who would you rather have in charge of the refining process: refineries in China who do not have the environmental controls, or refineries in Texas who do?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I am going to offer if we defeat the previous question in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Again, I just want to remind my colleagues what we would like to bring up. If we defeat the previous question, we will bring up an amendment to the rule that brings legislation forward that mirrors the bipartisan measure that overwhelmingly passed in the Senate this month dealing with some of the VA's most pressing problems. So that is why defeating the previous question would be important.

Let me just close by saying, again, on the environmental issues here, listening to my friend from Texas talk about the issue of climate change, all you hear is excuses why we can't do something, and why we need to do the same old-same old.

I have to tell you that if we don't deal with this issue sooner, rather than later, then history will not look kindly upon us. We may not have a history in the future if we don't address this issue sooner, rather than later.

This is a big deal. This is a big deal. This is something that we ought to be talking about on the House floor at this very moment. If you want to talk about an energy policy, we ought to also talk about climate change. But

yet there is nothing. There is nothing. It really is appalling.

And the legislation that is being brought before us today is going nowhere. So we are wasting our time talking about bills that are going nowhere. They are going nowhere in the Senate. The White House has already issued a veto threat. So we are just kind of spinning our wheels here.

Instead, maybe we could use this week to do something productive. If you defeat the previous question, we could actually bring up the Senate-passed VA bill and get that done and help our veterans. And get it done quickly. Maybe that would be a good thing to do. Maybe that would make this week worth it, rather than a week spent talking about things that are going nowhere.

So with that, Madam Speaker, I'm going to urge my colleagues again to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule. And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, if it were really true that the actions we take here don't mean anything, then why did the Department of Energy suddenly release one of the export licenses merely on the fact that the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on H.R. 6, the bill offered by the gentleman from Colorado, CORY GARDNER, to require a time certain for the export license to be decided upon?

Why does the gentleman from New Mexico, Senator UDALL, have very similar legislation pending over in the Senate? I would say this is one proposal that perhaps has a very good chance of becoming law, even in divided governments, such as we have today.

On the issue of the previous question, I would remind the body that the most expeditious way to get to a solution for the problems that are being experienced by our Nation's veterans within the VA system is for the conference committee to proceed.

If we pass something today, it still goes back over to the Senate. It doesn't expedite a darn thing. The conference committee is the correct way for that to go. So I do urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the previous question.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of two key pieces of legislation to move our country toward a more energy-independent environment. I certainly thank Chairman UPTON and CORY GARDNER for producing bipartisan pieces of legislation to address real problems that have arisen in the permitting process, when politics are injected into what should be a merit-based system.

H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, are thoughtful pieces of legislation that deserve the support of this body.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 636 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4841) to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4841.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 184, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—184

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

McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—28

Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanabusa
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo
Rangel
Rush
Scott, David
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stutzman
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1347

Messrs. GARCIA, GALLEGO, AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. LUETKEMEYER and TIBERI changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 186, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—221

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

NOES—186

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

NOT VOTING—24

Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Crowley
Fitzpatrick
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Loebsack
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Walberg
Williams

□ 1355

Messrs. CUMMINGS and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BARBER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUSTOMER PROTECTION AND END USER RELIEF ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 629 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4413.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1352

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4413) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end users manage risks to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, June 23, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–476 by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–476 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. WATERS of California.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 249, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—163

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

NOES—249

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

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1401

Mr. VEASEY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 242, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—168

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus

Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

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

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Ellison
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Velázquez
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1405

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I'd like to note that I intended to vote in support of the Waters amendment to H.R. 4413, the Customer Protection and End User Relief Act, when it came up for a vote earlier today.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 239, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

AYES—173

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

NOES—239

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

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo

Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1409

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 233, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—177

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

NOES—233

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

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo
Rangel
Rush
Sanford
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Velázquez
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1412

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 158, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—252

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—158

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Fitzpatrick
Grayson
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo
Rangel
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1417

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4413) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end users manage risks to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 629, reports the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KUSTER. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kuster moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4413 to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 10, after line 12, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITING EXCESSIVE OIL AND GAS SPECULATION THAT INCREASES PRICES FOR CONSUMERS.

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall utilize all its authority, including its emergency powers, to—

(1) curb immediately the role of excessive speculation in any designated contract market and swap execution facility within the jurisdiction and control of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, on or through which oil and gasoline futures or swaps are traded; and

(2) eliminate excessive speculation, price distortion, sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in prices, or other unlawful activity that is causing major market disturbances that prevent the market from accurately reflecting the forces of supply and demand for energy commodities.

Page 52, after line 14, insert the following:

(f) TRACKING EVADERS OF UNITED STATES LAW.—The Commissions shall investigate and report back to the Congress within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the number of swap and security-based swap market participants that have moved their headquarters or operations out of the United States in order to avoid compliance with United States swaps requirements.

Page 52, line 15, strike ''(f)'' and insert ''(g)''.

Page 53, line 18, strike ''(2) The'' and insert ''(2)(A) The''.

Page 54, after line 3, insert the following:

(B) REQUIRING OVERSEAS DERIVATIVES USERS TO OBEY UNITED STATES LAWS PROHIBITING FRAUD AND MANIPULATION OF UNITED STATES MARKETS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the term ''United States swap requirements'' does not include the provisions relating to swaps or security-based swaps concerning fraud, manipulation, or position limits on a United States designated contract market, swap execution facility, national securities exchange or security-based swap execution facility contained in the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 that were added by title VI of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, or any rules or regulations prescribed by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission or the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to such provisions.

Page 54, line 4, strike ''(g)'' and insert ''(h)''.

Ms. KUSTER (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Madam Speaker, I commend Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON for their bipartisan leadership of our committee. Their pragmatic work together across the aisle is exactly what the American people expect but so rarely get from this Congress. I am proud to serve with them and all of our colleagues on the Agriculture Committee, Republican and Democrat, to address the issues important to rural America and to communities all across our country. This includes reauthorizing the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, the sheriff overseeing much of Wall Street.

Every day, the CFTC defends the Main Street businesses and middle class families from the same reckless behavior that crashed our economy just a few years ago. We must reauthorize the CFTC and ensure that the cops on the beat have the authority they need to protect our farmers, consumers, investors, and retirees from

fraud and abuse by the very worst actors on Wall Street.

Now, don't get me wrong, this bill is far from perfect. My amendment would address some of its flaws, including its failure to address the prospect of soaring energy prices facing American consumers, which should be a top priority for the CFTC.

Madam Speaker, when gas prices spike, they immediately hit the pocketbook of every consumer, especially the constituents that I represent in New Hampshire's North Country and communities all across our State, some of which are already paying close to $4 per gallon of gasoline. When Americans pull up to the pump, they deserve to pay a fair price and not be gouged because of excessive speculation. My amendment would help keep gas prices in check by requiring that the CFTC use its full authority to immediately curb excessive speculation and price distortion in economic markets.

In addition, this amendment would require the CFTC to report when companies move their operations abroad simply to avoid the rules governing U.S. markets. When companies relocate their headquarters or outsource jobs to evade consumer protections, the American people deserve to know.

Finally, my amendment would ensure that foreign businesses comply with U.S. laws to prevent fraud and manipulation in our markets. American companies must already follow antifraud and antimanipulation rules, which protect consumers and the integrity of our markets. Surely, we can all agree that foreign companies must also follow the same safeguards against fraud and abuse that apply to American companies.

So, let's put partisanship aside and give the sheriff of Wall Street the backup it needs to protect Main Street. Let's vote to keep gas prices in check for the middle class families all across this country; let's vote to hold companies accountable when they outsource jobs; and let's vote to prevent foreign firms from defrauding our constituents. Let's vote for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to state that I really do appreciate the cooperative nature of the Ag Committee and the way that we have worked hard to put this very logical piece of legislation together to address a variety of issues.

I must say, though, in all respect to my colleague, I don't believe this particular language ever came up in any of the markups; so I must respectfully, in that regard, say that this is the wrong hour to be suggesting this language.

But I will go farther than that to say to my friends, if you are concerned about the price of fuel, if you are concerned about the availability of energy for industry and for individuals, we have some really good legislation out here that you should consider.

You should be looking at H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act; you should be looking at H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act; you should be looking at H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act. If you really want to make a difference, work for those pieces of legislation, support those pieces of legislation; but otherwise, let's take the bill that has been so carefully crafted, let's reject the motion to recommit with instructions, and let's just pass the bill.

With that, I do the greatest thing I can do for you: I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 220, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—191

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

NOES—220

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

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Duncan (TN)
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1433

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 265, noes 144, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—265

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

NOES—144

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

Barber
Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Nunnelee
Polis
Pompeo
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Terry
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1440

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on June 24, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: rollcall No. 349: H.R. 4413, "aye."

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I missed one recorded vote on June 24. I would like the RECORD to indicate at this point how I would have voted had I been present for that vote.

On rollcall No. 349, passage of the Customer Protection and End User Relief Act to reauthorize and improve the operations of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 24, I was unavoidably detained. On rollcalls 343, 344, 345, 346, and 348, I would have voted "no." On rollcalls 341, 342, 347, and 349, I would have voted "aye."

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3301.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3301.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1443

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), chairman of the full Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1445

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chair, it is a new era for North American energy,

and it is time for the continent's infrastructure to finally catch up. That is why I wrote H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, with my friend and colleague GENE GREEN from Texas. With lessons learned from the Keystone XL pipeline debacle, we are creating a fair and transparent approval process for cross-border energy projects, putting them all on a level playing field, finally, for the benefit of North American energy security, lower energy prices, and, yes, plenty of jobs.

North America's growing energy abundance has truly been a global game changer. Our continent, indeed, has the potential to become the world's leading energy-producing region, and the economic and geopolitical benefits are almost too good to believe. However, outdated or unnecessary Federal regs are standing in the way of this potential, including red tape surrounding energy infrastructure projects that cross the Canadian or the Mexican border. These job-creating projects are a critical part of the architecture of abundance, and, yes, they can provide a cheaper and more secure energy supply. Simply put, we cannot become an energy superpower without upgrading the energy infrastructure linking us with our neighbors.

We all know about the Keystone XL—the oil pipeline that would bring enough Canadian oil into the U.S. to displace OPEC imports while supporting up to 42,000 jobs, according to the Obama administration's own estimates. Many of us also know that the project has been extensively studied and has been found to be environmentally safe. Nonetheless, for nearly 6 years, this administration has come up with one excuse after another for delaying its decision on the project.

Keystone XL has yet to deliver any oil, but it has already delivered a message—that our process for approving such projects is, yes, badly broken. Yet the White House is threatening to veto the bill, claiming the bill would ''circumvent longstanding and proven processes.'' While H.R. 3301 does not address Keystone XL's permit—that is right; it does not address it—this House has already passed legislation that does exactly that. This bill would ensure that important projects would not be stuck in limbo once they were fully vetted. It would update and modernize the process for future cross-border energy infrastructure projects, eliminating the opportunities for delay and putting in place the same standards of review for oil pipelines, electrical transmission facilities, and natural gas lines.

I should also emphasize that the pipeline and transmission line projects impacted by this bill would still be subjected to the same environmental and safety reviews as would a comparable project that stayed within the United States. Those safety measures have been an important priority for our committee and for the Congress, including through the tough new pipeline safety measure that we enacted 2 years ago, signed by President Obama, but these cross-border projects would no longer face additional red tape and open-ended delays simply because they would cross a national border, which is what this bill does.

This commonsense bill enjoys bipartisan support, especially from border State Members who know full well the economic benefits to the U.S. of such projects. I urge all of us here this afternoon to join us in supporting the North American Energy Infrastructure Act. We need to stand together and say ''yes'' to American jobs and ''yes'' to energy.

Madam Chair, I submit for the RECORD a series of letters between me and the chairmen of the Natural Resources Committee and of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review the relevant provisions of the text of H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, while the Committee on Natural Resources received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 3301 from further consideration by the Committee on Natural Resources. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Natural Resources reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3301, the ''North American Energy Infrastructure Act.'' As you noted, H.R. 3301 was referred to both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Natural Resources.

I appreciate your willingness to discharge H.R. 3301 from further consideration by the Committee on Natural Resources so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

I agree that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources preserves its right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

Finally, I would be pleased to insert a copy of our exchange into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you again for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, as ordered reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce on May 8, 2014. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, while the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure received an additional referral.

In order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 3301, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

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

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2014.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3301, the ''North American Energy Infrastructure Act.'' As you noted, H.R. 3301 was referred to both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 3301 in order to expedite the House's consideration of the bill.

I agree that forgoing consideration of H.R. 3301 does not prejudice the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I will encourage the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would be pleased to insert a copy of our exchange on this matter into the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Thank you again for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Climate change is the biggest energy challenge we face, so before approving a multibillion-dollar energy infrastructure project that will last for decades, we need to evaluate its climate impacts. That is the standard the President rightly set last June, but this test is a significant obstacle for tar sands pipelines because they would carry the dirtiest fuel on the planet. Over the last few years, House Republicans have repeatedly tried to short-circuit the process and mandate the approval of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. The bill we are considering today goes even further. It creates a new process to rubberstamp every pending and future tar sands pipeline.

The bill makes an end run around the National Environmental Policy Act. Under this bill, instead of conducting an environmental review of a whole pipeline that crosses the border with Canada or Mexico, the NEPA review, which is the environmental review, would be limited to just the small segment of pipeline crossing the border. That eliminates any meaningful Federal review of the environmental impacts of oil pipelines.

For example, under this bill, the environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline would only examine the environmental impacts of that small piece of pipeline that crosses the border with Canada. The review could not look at the impacts on climate change of all of the other tar sands oil moved through the pipeline. It could not look at the impacts on the aquifers or landowners in Nebraska, for example, or at the public safety or oil spill concerns here in the United States. That dramatically narrowed scope of review is just another way to gut the Federal environmental review of tar sands pipelines.

The bill doesn't stop there. It also creates a rebuttable presumption that the Keystone XL and other tar sands pipelines are in the public interest, which tips the scale in favor of their approval. That is a subtle but significant change that makes it much more likely that these projects will go forward; and if the President rejects the Keystone XL or another pipeline because it is not in the national interest, which is a requirement in the law today, the bill would allow the rejected project to rise from the grave and reapply under the new, much weaker process. That is why I call this bill the ''zombie pipeline'' bill.

In the northeastern part of the United States, another controversial pipeline project would carry tar sands oil from Canada through New Hampshire and Vermont to Portland, Maine, where it would be loaded onto tankers. That project wouldn't require any approval at all under this bill's new permitting process because the bill exempts major expansions of existing pipelines and reversals of pipeline flows from even that minimal process. The bill would also allow for unlimited exports of liquified natural gas through Canada and Mexico with absolutely no controls or conditions. That is why domestic manufacturers like Dow, Alcoa, and Nucor have criticized this bill.

The administration strongly opposes H.R. 3301, citing the unreasonable 120-day deadline imposed by the bill, which would curtail the thorough consideration of issues involved with these projects, noting that the bill's provisions on natural gas exports would raise serious trade implications. The Statement of Administration Policy says that, if H.R. 3301 is presented to the President, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

Faced with the threat of dangerous climate change, we have a responsibility to think through the impacts of proposed cross-border energy infrastructure projects. If Congress is going to establish a new permitting rule or rules through legislation, it should do so in a thoughtful and balanced way. Instead, this bill creates a process that rubberstamps projects and eliminates meaningful environmental review and public participation. This will undoubtedly benefit TransCanada and other multinational oil companies. It will undoubtedly help them, but it will harm the American people, whom we are here to represent.

I oppose the Keystone XL pipeline. Even if you support the XL pipeline, this is a bad bill, and I would urge all Members to vote against this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, today marks the 2,104th day since the original Keystone XL pipeline application was filed at the U.S. State Department, as required by law. For 5 years, this administration has either just been completely incompetent or has, for political purposes, decided to placate its radical environmental political base—the very same folks who said that they would boycott the election if he signed this permit.

Regardless, this administration's failure to make a decision on a single project in over 2,100 days should leave every one of our constituents shaking his head. I have led on this issue, and we have given this President numerous opportunities to get this process right, which he has not done to date.

I introduced the first bill in May of 2011 to turn on the shock clock for the President's decision. The bill passed, and it was even signed into law, but, later, he went ahead and killed the permit instead of following through. Later that year, on December 1, we introduced a second bill to move the decision from the State Department to FERC. In June 2012, we introduced another bill, declaring no Presidential permit is needed for a border crossing. Then last year, in March, I introduced H.R. 3, the Northern Route Approval Act, which stated that no Presidential permit shall be required for the Keystone XL pipeline.

We are doing this because we understand that, if we are energy independent, we are more secure. This is an issue of national security, and we are going to take as many whacks at trying to get this passed as it takes. The legislation we are considering today is almost 5 years in the making, and I am happy to join with Chairman UPTON in supporting this bill that comes from our committee with bipartisan support.

As our energy future and security go, so go our economy and our Nation. The President has failed in his leadership. He has hurt job creation, hurt our economy, has made us more dependent on OPEC and Venezuela, and has diminished our standing with our Nation's number one trading partner. His failure to lead on this issue shows that his process is clearly broken.

Today, we consider a different process, and if signed into law, the Department of Commerce would be in charge of permitting oil pipelines that cross our border, which would be based on the same standard of whether it is in our national interest. FERC would be in charge of permitting natural gas pipelines that cross our border. The Department of Energy would be in charge of permitting electrical transmission lines that come over our border—again, under the same standard of: Is it in our national interest? Where I come from, that is called common sense. We need to take the election politics out of this and go with the experts, who will determine whether or not, based on the facts, it is in the national interest.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STEWART). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. TERRY. I appreciate all of that.

Mr. Chairman, by the way, I would disagree with the last speaker on whether or not there would be no environmental oversight. The State Department has over 10,000 pages of environmental studies that were done.

□ 1500

Even under this process, where you let the experts in the respective areas do their job, if there is a Federal trigger in here, all of that has to occur, just like with any other project.

Now, we also heard that there would be this tremendous amount of natural gas exporting without permitting. What was left out of that sentence is that, for there to be an export facility, it has to be permitted, and all of the environmental studies and all of the other studies that are required will be done on behalf of the export facility.

So I think we need to put those in context because you just can't have half the facts laying out there. You need all the facts to make the decision.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a very important member of our committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3301.

My Republican colleagues argue that we need more bills like H.R. 3301 to transport oil and gas as quickly as possible, but building a modern energy infrastructure for the 21st century requires more than just drilling more wells, laying more pipelines, filling more rail cars with crude oil, and putting more tanker trucks on our highways.

A modern 21st century infrastructure must address the threat of climate change, the biggest energy challenge we face as a country.

Republicans can deny it all they want, but we can't have a meaningful conversation about America's energy infrastructure without also having a conversation about climate.

We have a rapidly diminishing window to act to reduce our carbon pollution before the catastrophic impacts of climate change are irreversible. In fact, we are seeing, today, the devastating consequences in many parts of our country.

The International Energy Agency has concluded that, if the world does not take action to reduce carbon pollution before 2017, then dangerous levels of carbon emissions will be locked in by the energy infrastructure existing at that time.

The energy infrastructure decisions that we make today will have a real impact on whether we can mitigate climate change in the future or lock in carbon pollution for generations to come.

My Republican colleagues don't like to hear this message, and that is reflected in the bill we are discussing today. If enacted into law, H.R. 3301 would move us backward in our fight to address climate change. It essentially pretends that climate change doesn't exist.

H.R. 3301 would rubberstamp permits for pipelines to carry tar sands crude from Canada into the United States. Tar sands crude is the dirtiest fuel on the planet, from a climate perspective, but this bill creates a permitting process for cross-border pipelines that makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the Federal Government to say no.

The bill even allows the oil industry to make major modifications to its pipelines without getting any approval at all. That means, if a company wants to increase its pipeline capacity or reverse an existing pipeline to carry more tar sands crude from Canada into the United States, the company can just do it, no questions asked.

Building new tar sands pipelines or expanding existing ones could have a profound environmental impact, but the bill allows for no meaningful environmental review.

For a cross-border pipeline, the bill says the Federal Government can only examine the environmental impact of the cross-border segment of the project. It is almost hard to believe that that is what the bill does, but it is true.

For a pipeline spanning hundreds of miles, the environmental review will focus on only a tiny part that crosses the U.S. border. That eliminates the possibility of any meaningful examination of the carbon pollution impacts of these pipelines. That is irresponsible.

We know, from our examination of the Keystone XL pipeline, that it will facilitate the production of tar sands crude which is, on average, 17 percent more greenhouse gas intensive than the average crude refined in the United States. We should be examining the carbon impact of every pipeline before we approve it, not ignoring the problem altogether.

That brings us back to Keystone XL. This bill gives TransCanada virtual assurance that Keystone XL will be approved. Even if President Obama finds that the Keystone XL pipeline is not in the national interest and denies the national permit, this bill allows TransCanada to simply reapply and approve it under the new rubberstamp process, with no consideration of the profound environmental climate.

I want to remind my colleagues that this debate and this vote are part of the permanent record. Don't betray your grandchildren and their grandchildren by condemning them to a planet where it is hard to breathe and agriculture is affected.

The future will belong to the country that builds an energy infrastructure to support a cleaner, low-carbon economy. It is our responsibility to lead the country and even the world in that direction.

This bill takes us backwards. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 3301.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, for yielding. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, American innovation in advanced drilling technologies has unleashed an abundance of domestic energy resources. For the 60,000 manufacturing jobs I represent, the U.S. energy renaissance has increased our global competitiveness, resulting in expanded operations and new jobs.

Ramped-up domestic energy production has also helped absorb recent crude oil price volatility amid the turmoil in the Middle East. When it comes to natural gas, we now have more than enough that surplus can be exported to other countries, without impacting the affordability of our domestic supply.

For our allies looking to diversify their energy supply, especially in the European markets, American natural gas can provide secure access, while bolstering our geopolitical standing.

While the energy industry has been a story of positive growth and American innovation at its best, it is also a source of unnecessary frustration. President Obama likes to take credit for this growth, but growth in the energy industry has occurred, despite his best efforts to lock up access and regulate producers out of business.

Recent studies have made clear that virtually all the increases in production have occurred on State and privately-owned lands, while overall production on Federal lands has decreased.

Beyond limiting access to domestic resources, the Obama administration has also been creating unnecessary obstacles for developing much-needed energy infrastructure.

As previous speakers have already stated, we are aware of the unnecessary delays that the President has placed on the Keystone XL pipeline, the 830,000 barrels of oil it would bring into the United States each day, and the over 40,000 jobs it would create.

We can't afford to have more pipelines delayed that would help America's energy security. This is why the North American Energy Infrastructure Act is an important and necessary piece of legislation.

I thank Chairman UPTON for his leadership on the issue. This bill embodies the type of good governance hardworking American taxpayers deserve, and I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from California (Mrs. CAPPS), who is a senior member of our committee and a very respected Member as well.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague—my respected colleague—Mr. WAXMAN for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3301. H.R. 3301 would eliminate meaningful review of the environmental impacts of proposed cross-border energy projects.

The bill dramatically narrows the scope of environmental review to only the cross-border segment of the energy project, that tiny portion that actually physically crosses the national boundary. Now, this makes no sense.

These pipelines, these transmission lines, they are major infrastructure projects. They can span hundreds of miles. They cross through private property, water bodies, farms, and many other sensitive areas, and they carry substances that can catch fire or spill and pollute the environment.

To understand the potential environmental impact of such an energy project, we need to look at the project as a whole. Ignoring the potential environmental or safety risks for every part of the project, except that tiny sliver of land at the national boundary, this defies common sense.

Imagine going to the doctor if you are feeling sick and the doctor gives you a clean bill of health, but he has only looked at your elbow.

That is exactly what this bill does. It green-lights these projects without any meaningful environmental review, and no meaningful review means no opportunity to mitigate potential harm to

public health, to public safety, or the environment. That is just reckless.

The White House has threatened to veto this bill because it provides inadequate time for environmental reviews, and environmental organizations are universally opposed to it.

Thirteen environmental groups, including the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Sierra Club, sent a letter emphasizing—and I quote from their letter: ''This legislation could severely limit environmental review and public input to a narrow cross-border segment of projects, thereby precluding review of the full project's impacts.''

Then National Wildlife Federation says—and I quote from their statement—that this bill ''takes a hatchet to the National Environmental Policy Act.''

The League of Conservation Voters warns that this dangerous bill would gut the review process and effectively exempt the projects from the National Environmental Policy Act.

These environmental projects—these energy infrastructure projects will last for decades. We need to understand the impacts of these projects before they are constructed, so that we can protect public health and safety and the environment. Ignoring the impacts will not make them disappear.

H.R. 3301 defies common sense, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, this act is important. It is important for Americans.

Now, first, just to allay some fears, actually, this does not eliminate the need for Federal permitting for the entire process, but what it does is eliminate the President's ability to sit on a project, not allowing it to go forward, abusing the trust of the American people, that he is actually working in their interest, as opposed to pursuing his own narrow agenda.

Now, let's make this very clear: the fact that the President is just reviewing this is beyond credibility, but what it does do—his kind of interminable delays eliminates 20,000 to 40,000 jobs just on the one project, Keystone XL pipeline—which the other side is speaking so much of—and 100,000 indirect jobs.

By the way, when we buy products from Canada, 80 percent of the dollars that we spend there stay on the North American continent, improving the economy, not just in Canada, but also in the United States.

If we buy oil from overseas—say the Middle East—only about 40 percent of those dollars return. This is beyond the impact of building pipelines themselves, but also a global economy.

Now, the State Department—this administration's State Department has said that this project, Keystone XL pipeline, will have negligible impact on the economy. Indeed, if we continue to truck or ship by rail, more people will die—Americans will die, Mr. Chairman—than if we build a pipeline in which they anticipate, of course, there is no deaths.

One thing this will do is this will really—the opposition of the President and the other side, it will do wonders for China's economy.

Canada has just announced they are going to build a pipeline to their west coast to send these oil sands to China, creating Chinese jobs, but also Chinese pollution that, once it is into the atmosphere, will blow over onto the United States. Talk about a fruitless policy of delay.

Now, let me just finish by saying there is one more aspect of this. It helps create North American security. No longer are we buying oil from countries which hate us, financing their efforts to undermine our society; rather, we keep that money with our closest ally who, in turn, buys goods for us.

We should approve this bill and this project in particular. We should build it for Americans. It is better for the environment. It is better for our economy. Most of all, it is better for our workers.

□ 1515

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the State of New York (Mr. TONKO), our colleague who is an active leader in energy policy.

Mr. TONKO. I appreciate the gentleman from California, our distinguished ranker on the committee and former chair, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the energy bills before us this week do not lay out a roadmap for where we truly need to go; that is, to a future in which we have reduced our reliance on fossil fuels, greatly increased our focus on energy efficiency, and expanded our use of renewable energy.

H.R. 3301 and H.R. 6 are all about keeping us dependent upon fossil fuels, especially oil and gas. H.R. 3301 establishes a new process for considering and approving cross-border energy projects—pipelines and certainly transmission lines. In fact, it would be good to have a defined and predictable process for evaluating these projects and either approving or rejecting them within a reasonable timeframe.

Unfortunately, this bill is all about approving these projects quickly, with minimal consideration of their value to all sectors of our economy, the value to our consumers, and certainly the value to our environment.

The advocates for this bill and this infrastructure approval process sound as if we have never approved cross-border projects. But, in fact, we have many cross-border pipelines and transmission lines. This infrastructure, once in place, operates for decades. And all projects are not all equal in their impacts and are certainly not all equal in their size.

This bill does not require a sufficient analysis of the overall benefits of proposed projects. It is not enough to determine if any project is in our national security interests. Those are important interests, of course, but there are many others as well. The public, State and local governments, nonfossil fuel business interests, and others should be able to offer their views on a proposed project. This bill virtually cuts them out of that effort. You do not gain public support for infrastructure projects by cutting the public out of the decisionmaking.

H.R. 3301 does not provide for sufficient public input or sufficient weighing of overall national benefits and costs of these projects. Supporters of H.R. 3301 claim that this bill is not about the Keystone XL pipeline.

Well, H.R. 3301 is not a Keystone XL approval bill, per se, but that project would certainly be resurrected and approved if this bill were to become law.

This bill should not become law. It does not provide the type of thoughtful, comprehensive, and certainly inclusive process that should guide decisions that impact energy resources for many decades to come. I urge defeat of this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. May I inquire how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 17½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to point out that H.R. 3301 really, in a way, corrects the inequity. Today, natural gas pipelines are treated one way if they cross international boundaries, and oil pipelines and transmission lines are treated in a different way.

For example, a natural gas pipeline crossing into Canada would not require a Presidential permit, but oil pipelines and transmission lines crossing international boundaries do require a Presidential permit. And I might add that Congress never passed legislation requiring a Presidential permit. That was a power that a President, by executive order, took even before President Obama did it.

But here is the key factor. This law, H.R. 3301, would treat all pipelines the same, whether it is natural gas, whether it is oil, or whether it is a transmission line.

Now, I know that arguments are being made here primarily based on Keystone, and a lot of arguments are being made about climate change.

I would say to all of the American people that we have people coming into Congress on a regular basis from developing countries of the world who say that climate change is not their number one concern. They are more concerned about food. They are more concerned about sanitary living conditions. They are more concerned about

clean water. They are more concerned about jobs and the ability to provide income for their families. And, as a matter of fact, polls in America have shown that climate change is way down the list of primary concerns of people.

Now, I know that for Tom Steyer—who I understand is at the White House today—it is his number one issue. And he has said that he is going to spend $100 million against Republican candidates or any candidate that does not recognize climate change as one of the most important issues facing mankind.

So I simply wanted to make that comment. Sure, climate change is important. And I might add that emissions from energy-produced causes in America today are the lowest that they have been in 20 years. So America does not have to take a back seat to anyone on addressing emissions from greenhouse gases.

And I will tell you that we are the only country in the world where, if natural gas prices go up, we won't even be able to build a new coal plant in America because the technology is not commercially available at a cost that any utility could afford.

So even in Europe, natural gas prices went up. They mothballed natural gas plants. And last year in Europe, they imported 53 percent of all our coal exports.

But yet this President, in the White House today, has such extreme views that if our gas prices go up, we don't have the option in an affordable way to build a new coal plant to help us meet our base loads. And if we are going to have an economy that is not sluggish—the way it has been consistently under President Obama—we have to have affordable, abundant, and reliable energy. And that is what this bill is about.

Now people are saying, if you pass H.R. 3301, you are exempting oil and transmission lines from a NEPA review. But I want you to know, there are 33 other environmental laws—like the Endangered Species Act, Clean Water, Rivers and Harbors, National Historic Preservation, Clean Air Act—that would trigger. If Federal action is triggered, then it would be triggered even under H.R. 3301. That is, unless, of course, it is the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, which this administration has granted windmills an exemptions from. So you can kill all the migratory birds you want and bald eagles. If you are a windmill company, you won't be prosecuted, but if you are an individual timber owner in North Carolina, you will be find $100,000 and convicted of a felony.

So in conclusion of my remarks at this point, I would simply say that the bill is not designed to expedite the Keystone pipeline, because it can't be approved under H.R. 3301. It is under the Presidential permit process. But the Presidential permit process is arbitrary. Even the State Department has said that it would be of negligible environmental impact to approve the Keystone pipeline. But all H.R. 3301 does is it says, we are going to treat oil pipelines and transmission lines that cross international boundaries with Canada or Mexico exactly the way natural gas pipelines are treated today.

So it is not anything extraordinary. It is not anything radical. It is the way natural gas pipelines are created today. And we believe that is the way to go, and that is what H.R. 3301 is all about.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the comments of the gentleman from Kentucky, and I couldn't really follow a lot of it.

After all, if the price of natural gas goes up, that would perhaps help the coal industry because the coal industry is not able to compete economically when the price of natural gas is low because if you are building a utility, you might as well buy natural gas because it is cheaper. Of course the coal people say, it is the government that is doing it. But it is the marketplace that is doing it.

And the other comment that I found peculiar was, we don't need to have the National Environmental Policy Act evaluation because we have got the Endangered Species Act evaluation.

Well, the Endangered Species Act is looking at endangered species. But what about the rest of the environmental review that would be eliminated if this bill were adopted, especially when we are talking about the impact on climate change and all of the other environmental considerations?

So I must say that, while I came here with a clear view, I am reaffirmed in my view. The gentleman from Kentucky did not even come close to persuading me.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the ranking member of the committee for yielding. Maybe in my 4 minutes, I can convince him.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a proud cosponsor and in support of H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act.

Passing H.R. 3301 will help create the North American energy market. It will help make us energy-independent for North America, between our two free trading partners, Mexico and Canada.

But I also need to correct the record. There is a lot of misinformation about this legislation, and I hope to make a few things clear.

Commerce decisions are the responsibility of Congress. Today we can have 1,000 tank-car trains with crude oil come from Canada without a permit, but to build a pipeline, it has been delayed for years because it couldn't get a Presidential permit. We can bring the same substance from Canada in train cars, but we can't put it on a safer mode of pipelines.

Congress has not acted on legislative cross-border infrastructure since 1850. I think it is time to change that.

The Presidential permit process that my colleague is defending so vigorously is an executive order process that could be changed depending on who is in the White House. My colleague may support the process now but may oppose the process later.

H.R. 3301 gives statutory certainty to build transmission lines, oil pipelines, or natural gas pipelines with our two free trade neighbors, Canada and Mexico. H.R. 3301 eliminates uncertainty that has crippled infrastructure development.

These pipelines are not paid for by tax money. They are paid for by investors.

H.R. 3301 does not eliminate or limit environmental reviews of cross-border infrastructure. In fact, the bill cements environmental reviews by putting it into law. The bill does not eliminate the public interests or deem applications approved. The bill guarantees the public interest must be met but in a timely fashion.

Finally, the bill does not apply to the current project applications, like Keystone XL. This bill doesn't go into effect if it is passed by the Senate until 2016. Keystone may or may not have their project approval or their plan approval by then, but they would have to get back in line with everyone else after this bill goes into effect. We have safeguarded against this by grandfathering current applications and delaying the effective date until mid-2016.

There are more than 60 cross-border projects that have been built over the last few decades. But today, there are more than 10 applications at the State Department awaiting action because political decisions have been bogged down in the process.

Cross-border infrastructure is important in the public interest. The State Department has stated: ''Additional pipeline capacity will advance the strategic interests of the United States, send positive economic signals, and provide construction jobs for workers in the U.S.''

We can build cross-border infrastructure while protecting the environment. Federal agencies are required to consider the environmental impacts of the actual infrastructure. Federal, State, and local agencies approve domestic projects every single day. All the opponents of H.R. 3301 want to talk about is Keystone XL and the environmental review.

We have solved both of these issues, advanced the public interest of the United States, secured our domestic energy needs for decades to come, solidified our relationships with our two closest partners, Canada and Mexico; and made North America a new global powerhouse in the energy sector.

H.R. 3301 is not about the past. H.R. 3301 is about securing the economic, security, and environmental needs of the future.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

□ 1530

Mr. MATHESON. I thank my ranking member for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, and I want to thank Mr. GREEN, my colleague, and also Mr. UPTON who worked so much on this bill.

Our country is on the cusp of not only becoming the world's leading energy producer, but we are also close to achieving North American energy independence with our allies to the north and south: Canada and Mexico. With this can come jobs and economic growth, greater energy security, and less uncertainty in our economy.

However, unnecessarily complicated, outdated, and political roadblocks are currently in place that can encumber this progress. We should remember the current Presidential permitting process for cross-border energy infrastructure projects was developed through a series of ad hoc executive orders, which has created a high level of uncertainty for everyone involved.

This bill would work to modernize and streamline the process, providing producers and consumers with a greater degree of clarity about the process. This is a process that is in desperate need of reform, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the time as well.

I am not much for hyperbole or finger-pointing. I want to talk about what it is that is important about this bill for me as the representative of much of the Eagle Ford area in Texas and the Permian Basin. It is not about Keystone or even the President because it doesn't go into effect until 2016.

All my life, I grew up hearing about the Arab oil wars, and I remember well the Arab oil embargo as a kid growing up in west Texas. I think we can do something today that secures our energy future for our kids and our grandkids. We can do this carefully, making sure that we preserve the environment for future generations.

Sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act, which apply to the construction of facilities, still apply here. These facilities are still subject to NEPA review. They must still meet the same safety standards, which we all know are very important.

As Mr. MATHESON indicated, our neighbors to the north and south are increasingly vital partners as the rest of the world goes into the global economy. We need not constantly rely on oil from unstable parts of the world when we can get it here at home and get it safely—underscore safely—and cleanly, and we can help our neighbors get it safely and cleanly, too.

My hometown of Alpine is not located near oil or gas fields, but it is on the main line of a railroad, and in 2010, only 1 percent of U.S. oil production was moved by rail, and last year, it was up to 10 percent, and I have personally seen several derailments. One year, many of us in town had soap for a year as a result of a railroad derailment.

I want my son to play in the Big Bend and float the Devils River with his kids, just as I did, and I also want to be sure that, when he flips the switch, the lights come on, or when he and his kids cook or use their air conditioners or their heaters, the energy is there to do what they need.

Again, I want to thank the ranking member for the use of the time and the Chair and the ranking member for their work, and thank you for letting me share my thoughts.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry on the amount of time remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we don't have any more speakers on our side, so I will reserve the balance of my time and let the gentleman from California proceed.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes just to say that the President has looked at this bill, and they just cited a number of concerns about it, and they very seldom come in with a Statement of Administration Policy, but they did say on this bill that they would be against it.

They think that this bill raises serious trade implications by eliminating the current statutory requirement that the Department of Energy authorize orders for the natural gas exports. I don't think this bill is going anywhere because I think the Senate is unlikely to take it up.

There are serious and urgent problems facing this Nation: unemployment, the need for immigration reform, climate change, gun violence in our children's schools, foreign policy challenges; but, once again, House Republicans are ignoring the real issues. Instead, they are wasting time on counterproductive legislation that has no prospect of enactment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have better things to do. I would urge opposition to the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the American people that, certainly, energy is vitally important, and that is why we have introduced this bill, and that is why we brought this bill to the floor.

Because when you talk about creating jobs and stimulating the economy, you have to have low-cost, affordable, abundant, and reliable energy, or you cannot compete in the global marketplace.

As I had said earlier, I just want to reiterate, once again, that this bill does nothing but make the decision that we are going to treat oil pipelines, natural gas pipelines, and transmission lines all the same.

Right now, a natural gas pipeline that crosses an international boundary does not require a Presidential permit, but an oil pipeline and a transmission line to bring electricity across the border does require a Presidential permit.

As many speakers have said today, that Presidential permit or authority was not granted by the Congress; it was taken by executive orders. So all we are doing is saying that we are going to treat all of them the same.

Now, some people are saying that: well, you are eliminating the need for NEPA, you are not allowing NEPA review.

I had pointed out that there are 33 environmental laws that all of these pipelines or transmission lines would be subject to, and any Federal action, like crossing a stream that would create a necessity for a Clean Water Act permit, could very well generate a need for a NEPA review.

Nothing in this bill would limit the application of NEPA to the rest of the project. It would certainly apply to the cross border, but it would not limit application to the rest of the project.

So if a project required a right-of-way across Federal lands, the NEPA review would be initiated. Nothing in the bill would exempt the project from requiring applicable Clean Water Act permits, clean air permits, endangered species permits, or any other Federal permit.

So I would respectfully request the Members to support this commonsense bill. It would bring certainty to entities that are trying to bring more energy to America by treating gas pipelines the same as oil pipelines, the same as a transmission line.

In concluding, I would just like to say this: nothing in the bill creates a Federal right of eminent domain or supersedes a State's exercise of eminent domain authority.

In concluding, I would just like to say that, while the gentleman from California and I are on opposite sides of this issue—and a lot of issues—he has been a real leader in the U.S. Congress.

He announced earlier that he is not going to be seeking reelection, but the gentleman from California, HENRY WAXMAN, has been a leader in the U.S. Congress and recognized so throughout the country.

Even though he is going to be with us for 6 or 7 more months until the end of the year, I did want to acknowledge that he is recognized as a congressional leader, with great empathy and commitment to his views, although sometimes we disagree with his views.

With that, I urge the adoption of H.R. 3301 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, of which I am a cosponsor. This legislation will ensure that transnational pipeline construction permits are considered on their merits instead of politics. Importantly, it is a substantive step towards more affordable energy prices. People are hurting, Mr. Chair. According to the American Automobile Association's daily fuel guage report, today's average gas price in the Tampa Bay market: $3.64, well up from $2.35 per gallon in 2009. Not only are gas prices up, but so too are the price of groceries and costs of heating and cooling your home or apartment. Domestic energy production helps Americans with their everyday costs. This is the bottom line. H.R. 3301 will aid in that effort. Support this bill and help lower energy costs for all Americans. I yield back.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–49. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3301

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 ''North American Energy Infrastructure Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDING.

Congress finds that the United States should establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process for the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity to and from Canada and Mexico, in pursuit of a more secure and efficient North American energy market.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT THE NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c) and section 7, no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment under this section.

(b) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a cross-border segment for which a request is received under this section, the relevant official identified under paragraph (2), in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment unless the relevant official finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment is not in the public interest of the United States.

(2) RELEVANT OFFICIAL.—The relevant official referred to in paragraph (1) is—

(A) the Secretary of State with respect to oil pipelines; and

(B) the Secretary of Energy with respect to electric transmission facilities.

(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing for the request under paragraph (1), that the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(A) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(B) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility.

(c) EXCLUSIONS.—This section shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico—

(1) if the cross-border segment is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) if a permit described in section 6 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued;

(3) if a certificate of crossing for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has previously been issued under this section; or

(4) if an application for a permit described in section 6 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(A) the date on which such application is denied; or

(B) July 1, 2016.

(d) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(1) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section or section 7 shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment is sought under this section.

(2) NATURAL GAS ACT.—Nothing in this section or section 7 shall affect the requirement to obtain approval or authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act for the siting, construction, or operation of any facility to import or export natural gas.

(3) ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.—Nothing in this section or section 7 shall affect the authority of the President under section 103(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

SEC. 4. IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''No order is required under subsection (a) to authorize the export or import of any natural gas to or from Canada or Mexico.''.

SEC. 5. TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is amended by striking ''insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission's powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)''.

(2) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a–4(b)) is amended by striking ''the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.''.

SEC. 6. NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.

No Presidential permit (or similar permit) required under Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, Executive Order 12038, Executive Order 10485, or any other Executive Order shall be necessary for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any cross-border segment thereof.

SEC. 7. MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.

No certificate of crossing under section 3, or permit described in section 6, shall be required for a modification to the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility—

(1) that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico as of the date of enactment of the Act;

(2) for which a permit described in section 6 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or

(3) for which a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment of the pipeline or facility has previously been issued under section 3.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Sections 3 through 7, and the amendments made by such sections, shall take effect on July 1, 2015.

(b) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official described in section 3(b)(2) shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of section 3; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of section 3.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''cross-border segment'' means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at the national boundary of the United States with either Canada or Mexico;

(2) the term ''modification'' includes a reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, volume expansion, downstream or upstream interconnection, or adjustment to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations);

(3) the term ''natural gas'' has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a);

(4) the term ''oil'' means petroleum or a petroleum product;

(5) the terms ''Electric Reliability Organization'' and ''regional entity'' have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o); and

(6) the terms ''Independent System Operator'' and ''Regional Transmission Organization'' have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113–492. Each such amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–476.

Mr. PALLONE. 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:

Page 1, line 18, strike ''a cross-border segment of''.

Page 2, beginning on line 3, strike ''a certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approval of''.

Page 2, line 5, strike ''the cross-border segment'' and insert ''the pipeline or facility''.

Page 2, line 6, strike ''CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING'' and insert ''APPROVAL''.

Page 2, line 10, strike ''cross-border segment'' and insert ''project''.

Page 2, beginning on line 14, strike ''issue a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment'' and insert ''approve such project''.

Page 2, line 17, strike ''of the cross-border segment''.

Page 3, line 3, strike ''a certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approval of''.

Page 3, beginning on line 4, strike ''a cross-border segment of''.

Page 3, line 7, strike ''issuing the certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approving''.

Page 3, beginning on line 8, strike ''the cross-border segment of''.

Page 3, beginning on line 16, strike ''the cross-border segment of''.

Page 3, beginning on line 20, strike ''a cross-border segment of''.

Page 4, line 1, strike ''cross-border segment'' and insert ''pipeline or facility''.

Page 4, line 7, strike ''a certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approval of''.

Page 4, line 21, strike ''a certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approval of''.

Page 4, beginning on line 22, strike ''of a cross-border segment''.

Page 6, line 24, strike '', or any cross-border segment thereof''.

Page 7, line 2, strike ''certificate of crossing'' and insert ''approval''.

Page 7, beginning on line 14, strike ''a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment'' and insert ''approval''.

Page 8, strike lines 7 through 11.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 629, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

My amendment ensures that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to full environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

NEPA was created to provide transparency so people would know what the impact of a project will be on their communities. However, H.R. 3301 will circumvent that transparency, making our lands vulnerable to spills, leaks, and other pipeline hazards, and this is why I have introduced this amendment, which will make certain proper diligence is given to protect the public's interests.

By ensuring a Federal NEPA review is conducted for the entire length of all cross-border projects, we can guarantee all proposals will get the full scope of review necessary to preserve our tremendous natural resources.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3301 makes an end run around NEPA. The bill redefines and significantly narrows the scope of NEPA's environmental review. While traditional NEPA review looks at the impacts of an entire project, this bill restricts NEPA review to only that portion of a project that physically crosses the border, and this restriction doesn't make any sense.

These massive projects are more than just a border crossing. When we approve transboundary pipeline or transmission line, we are approving a multibillion dollar infrastructure that may stretch hundreds of miles and will last for decades.

These projects pass through private property and sensitive lands and over aquifers. They transport hazardous substances that, if spilled or ignited, can cause serious damage.

Before making decisions about whether to approve such projects, we need to carefully consider their potential impacts on environment and on communities along their routes. Simply put, we should be looking at the effects of projects as a whole.

That is not what the bill before us does. Instead, it redefines the scope of NEPA's inquiry to only encompass the step across the border, and this is a nonsensical approach. It makes the process of environmental review essentially meaningless.

When Congress passed NEPA, it never intended this law to provide such a narrow review. Congress intended NEPA to provide policymakers with a critical tool to understand a project's full environmental impacts and consider lower-impact alternatives.

NEPA doesn't dictate the outcome or impose any constraint on projects. It simply requires the Federal Government to make some effort to understand the environmental impacts of major Federal actions and to inform the public of those impacts.

We should not be carelessly narrowing or creating loopholes in this law. When the Federal Government makes a decision about a major project, it should understand what it is doing.

As we have seen with Keystone XL, large energy projects often raise safety issues, economic implications, and environmental concerns, both for the local and global environments.

These projects affect communities all along their routes. It is simply common sense that we should understand the broad scope of these impacts before deciding to approve a project.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today prevents this review, which is why I urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment that ensures that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to a full NEPA review.

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

□ 1545

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

While I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), his amendment would, in effect, codify the Presidential permit not only for oil pipelines and transmission lines, but also for natural gas pipelines, which are now exempt from the Presidential permit. So he is going in the wrong direction, and would make it even more difficult.

As I said earlier, NEPA would apply anytime Federal action is triggered, and there are 33 different environmental laws that can trigger Federal action. So I am very much opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me. As ranking member on the Health Subcommittee, I, too, am hesitant to rise and oppose your amendment. What the amendment would do is it would ensure that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to full environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act.

The bill already guarantees that review at the national boundary based with the Department of Energy.

Existing Federal and State law guarantees an environmental review on the complete length of the project.

Current Federal laws that trigger NEPA reviews in addition to H.R. 3301 include the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Mineral Leasing Act, the Rivers and Harbors Act, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination for Fish and Wildlife Service consultation, the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

The intent of this bill is not to eliminate any of the NEPA reviews within the continental United States. The problem we have right now is the Department of State is making a decision that really ought to be Federal agencies and even State governments who would need that.

If this amendment was adopted, it would require a State Department or a Presidential permit, and then all of the other agencies, and so it would make it impossible.

The argument for this bill, if you are opposed to Keystone, then you are allowing literally a thousand-car train of crude oil to come across the border now without any of these reviews. A pipeline is inherently safer. That is why we need to bring that crude oil by pipeline from Canada to the gulf coast, where our refining capacity is.

The amendment would actually expand what is under current law. It would make it even harder. The goal of the legislation is to have this North American energy independence market, and we don't need to throw up more roadblocks to keep companies from importing or exporting to Canada or importing or exporting to Mexico, where we already have free trade agreements.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides, if it is a cross boundary with Canada or Mexico, you cannot have a NEPA review, an environmental review, except right around there, right around where the boundary is. Now, if you built a pipeline in the United States and it went a thousand miles, you would have a review of it. But they are saying just because it goes across the boundary for a thousand miles, let's say, there would be no review. Even though it crosses streams and aquifers, it would not get a real environmental review that would be required if it were solely domestic. That makes no sense.

I urge support for the Pallone amendment because it fixes a problem and preserves meaningful environmental reviews. That is what we need for these projects. It corrects that part of the bill which I think is a glaring, glaring loophole.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–492.

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 section 3(c)(4) and insert the following:

(4) if an application for a permit described in section 6 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance, or for a substantially similar project, is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 636, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill's supporters claim that it is just about the approval process for cross-border energy projects. They say it is not about approving the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline because that is under review now. But, in fact, that is what this bill really does.

If the President determines that the Keystone XL pipeline is not in the national interest, this bill would allow TransCanada to reapply under this new process designed to rubberstamp permits, and Keystone XL would almost certainly be approved under that process.

This bill establishes a new permitting process which would ensure rapid approval, and not particularly a clear evaluation. The bill makes it very difficult for Federal agencies to do anything other than approve the proposed project for two reasons.

First, the new permitting process narrows the approval and environmental review. And, secondly, the bill establishes this rebuttable presumption of approval, meaning the Federal agency must approve the project unless it finds that the cross-border segment of the project is not in the public interest.

I think this bill, which I have called the ''Zombie Pipeline Act,'' is just for the Keystone XL pipeline. They keep on trying to push that thing and not let it go through the process by which it is still being evaluated. So I urge that we close this backdoor way to ensure Keystone XL itself is brought up again, and I would urge support for this amendment because this bill is not a proper way to deal with that particular project.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

Ranking Member WAXMAN's amendment excludes any project with a pending permit application from the new approval requirements in the bill. The bill does not deal with Keystone XL. The bill shall not apply if an application for a permit for construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending. That is what the bill does, H.R. 3301.

The bill does not apply until after July 1, 2016. We are in 2014 now. Keystone XL has been at the State Department and White House for at least 5 years, and are they going to wait another 2 years? Now, if they want to wait until July 1, 2016, they would have to refile and start all over. But this bill has nothing to do with the Keystone permit. They could stand in line like anyone else after July 1, 2016, stand in line and get their permit. I would assume we would have a number of them.

But let me first take some time, and I appreciate my colleague, Ranking Member WAXMAN. I have been on the Energy and Commerce Committee since 1997, and most of the time we agree, but we do represent individual districts. But I want to say that I appreciate Mr. WAXMAN's service. We have worked together on a lot of legislation in the committee and even on the floor, but, obviously, we have a disagreement on energy. That is why I think the amendment is not needed, because the bill already prohibits it from applying to any current permit in the law.

Again, Mr. WAXMAN, I thank you for your service. I will miss you because I enjoy our discussions.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all of the nice words, but let's recognize this amendment. We just heard the statement that this doesn't apply to the Keystone XL pipeline because that is pending, and the bill says it doesn't apply to any project with permit approval pending on the date of enactment. But that doesn't exclude them if they are denied from coming right back and getting rubberstamped under the easier process under this bill.

So if this is not about the Keystone XL pipeline, adopt this amendment which says that the Keystone XL pipeline may not come back as a zombie for approval later if it doesn't get approved under the existing process.

I am just trying to keep people honest. I still have got 6 months to do that, so don't say good-bye to me yet. While I am here, and even after I have left the Congress, I will continue to point out when things are said that just don't add up. It doesn't add up to say that this doesn't apply to the Keystone XL pipeline; it could, and in fact it is a backdoor way to do that. And one might suspect that that is the whole purpose of the legislation. I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that if we pass H.R. 3301, the Keystone pipeline is still caught up in the Presidential permitting process. And if we adopt the Waxman amendment, the Keystone pipeline

would never, ever be able to come back with a new application.

Since they filed an application in September of 2008, and despite the State Department saying that there is no negligible environmental impact by approving it, President Obama continues not to approve it. So if after 2016 the Keystone pipeline entity wants to submit a new application under the new law, they would certainly and should have a right to do that. That is the only reason we oppose the Waxman amendment. I urge that Members vote against the Waxman amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–492.

Mr. WELCH. 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:

Page 7, line 3, insert ''minor'' before ''modification''.

Page 7, line 6, insert '', such as a change in ownership'' after ''fac

Page 8, strike lines 12 through 17.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 636, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the Welch-Pingree-Michaud-Kuster-Shay-Porter amendment, and I want to thank my colleagues from northern New England for cosponsoring this amendment with me.

H.R. 3301, as we have been hearing, exempts literally all modifications of cross-border pipelines from Federal approval and environmental review without any regard to the impacts on public health, safety, and the environment. My view: that is a terrible idea.

Some pipeline modifications, in fact, are truly minor and are unlikely to affect the environment or put public safety at risk. For example, if the pipeline is sold to a new owner, there is no need for a Federal review. So there is a place here for no review.

But many modifications could have just as much impact as a brand new pipeline, and there is no justification to exempt from consideration those issues that would be reviewed if it were a new pipeline.

□ 1600

The Portland Montreal Pipe Line reversal is an exact example of a pipeline modification that could have very significant impacts. Currently that pipeline carries light sweet crude from the U.S. to Canada, but a proposal in the works is to reverse that pipeline to carry tar sands oil from Canada, through New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine, to ports of Casco Bay, where it would be loaded on the ships for export. That has raised a lot of concerns in these States.

Any spill of tar sands crude is a very big deal, far worse than any other type of oil spill. Vermonters are concerned about reversing of the pipeline to transport those tar sands, that it would accelerate the development of the tar sands oil, which is the dirtiest and most carbon intensive in the universe.

Forty-two towns and municipalities in the State of Vermont have passed resolutions opposing this project. Concerned citizens deserve to have their voices heard. Under H.R. 3301, the pipeline owners could completely skip the process. I oppose this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I might say I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) on the committee, and he does great work in the area of efficiency and other areas relating to energy, but I do oppose this amendment.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for his comments on the amendment.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

I, too, understand where my colleague on the committee and Congressman WELCH—let me leave with you one of our examples. You include also pipeline name changes in here. I understand your issue is reversing the flow. I would be glad to work with you, but I have a company that has been waiting years. They bought a pipeline coming from Canada into the United States. They have waited years just for the State Department to change their name.

What really bothered me—and I have contacted the State Department—the State Department said: Oh, well, we are looking at it, but we know you are going to build a lateral from North Dakota into your U.S. part of the line, and we do evaluate that.

The State Department has no right to evaluate those pipelines. It is on our property in the United States. They have the cross-border. What we are seeing is expansion of State Department authority.

I agree that you have an issue and I would like to see if we could work with you on it, but it shouldn't take 3 years to change a name because another company bought it. And believe me, I think the State Department is trying to overreach by saying: By the way, we are going to evaluate what you are doing in the continental United States.

We already have Federal agencies—the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and a host of Federal agencies—that will evaluate that pipeline that is in our country. The State Department needs to take care of their business. That is what worries me about your amendment, so I ask for a ''no'' vote.

I would love to work with you, because I think if there is a reverse flow, I think somebody needs to look at it. I appreciate it. I still request a ''no'' vote.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine, Representative PINGREE.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you very much, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. Chair, I am very proud to sponsor this amendment, along with my colleagues from Vermont, New Hampshire, and my fellow Mainer, to exempt pipeline reversals from the provisions of this bill.

In my opinion, the way this bill is currently written, it is extremely irresponsible because it basically exempts cross-border pipeline projects from the National Environmental Policy Act and would reduce not only critical Federal reviews, but also limit the vital public input that NEPA brings. That would raise great concerns for the constituents in my district who have a lot that they want to say in the public input process.

The amendment scope is limited to pipeline reversals and would at least make it clear that the underlying bill's waivers do not apply to the so-called Portland Montreal Pipe Line and other pipeline reversals. The Portland Montreal Pipe Line proposal threatens the entire southern Maine watershed, where 15 percent of my State's population gets its drinking water.

Oversight by NEPA is essential for this pipeline and any other, and I strongly oppose any attempts to waive NEPA or other reviews for this project. That is why I am here, to urge all my colleagues who care about ensuring that there is strong oversight and environmental review to support this amendment.

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

I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. First of all, ''minor'' is an undefined term that gives little certainty to agencies or industry. One of the things that we are trying to get away from is the uncertainty of a Presidential permit and be treated like natural gas pipelines. As I said, in H.R. 3301, we are trying to treat all of them exactly the same: transmission lines, oil pipelines, natural gas lines.

I would also say that, under the gentleman's amendment, any modifications, such as volume expansion, downstream or upstream interconnections, or adjustments to maintain flow, would potentially be required to obtain a Presidential permit for the modification, even if the original project already has one. Then even operational changes may be subject to a Presidential permit, and ownership changes would be.

So, for those reasons, as I said, I respectfully would oppose the gentleman's amendment and ask the Members to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, two things. I want to speak to the leader of our Energy and Commerce Committee, but also to the proponent of this bill, Mr. GREEN.

We can have too much regulation or we can have too little regulation, and they both have problems. Mr. GREEN talks about the hassle his company is having getting a name change. That is ridiculous. That company should be able to change its name and not have to go through the hassle of a permit. Then when the agency holds back and doesn't even give them an answer for 3 years, we have a problem, and I agree with that. Under my amendment, those issues like a name change would not be at all subject to the permitting process.

On the other hand, we in Vermont are concerned about a reversal of flow and having tar sands go through. It is a really big deal. Forty-two towns in my State passed resolutions saying that they wanted to have a say in this. It is known that spills happen, and tar sands bills are a much bigger deal than other kinds.

What we have in the legislation is not working together to find what is the balance or to try to move us towards a balance so there are not unnecessary burdens for a name change and simple things, but, on the other hand, we don't abolish the review process altogether.

This legislation doesn't seek that balance. What this legislation does is, in effect, abolish the review process, and that is a problem, so our going from too much review on a name change to no review on tar sands coming through Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine.

Our legislation, I think, is the only thing that is being considered that, in fact, offers a balance. If it is a name change, a minor deal, no permit required. If it is significant, then, yes, you are going to have to go through the review.

I want to thank the chairman and the Speaker and the body for its time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont will be postponed.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DOMESTIC PROSPERITY AND GLOBAL FREEDOM ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6.

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

□ 1610

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, America's natural gas output has been rising since 2006, and the Energy Information Administration expects the increases to continue for decades to come. As a result, we can meet domestic demand for affordable natural gas while also producing a surplus for export to our allies around the world. The only thing standing in the way is outdated Federal redtape that greatly delays the construction of LNG export facilities.

H.R. 6, the bill before us, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, is a targeted bill that cuts redtape and puts the Department of Energy on a reasonable deadline to act on LNG export applications.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, GENE GREEN from Texas, for his cosponsorship of this bipartisan bill, and I urge the support of every Member in this Chamber for H.R. 6.

According to the lead study conducted for the Department of Energy, natural gas exports would be a net benefit to the American economy. These exports would improve the balance of payments and support up to 45,000 jobs associated with additional natural gas production as well as the construction and operation of LNG export facilities by 2018. Needless to say, these new jobs could not come at a better time for our economy.

Remember the concerns many of us had over the U.S. economy hemorrhaging billions of dollars every year going overseas to pay for energy imports. Well, for natural gas, the roles can be reversed, and we could be the ones selling energy on the global market and bringing in billions of dollars in job-sustaining revenues.

The economic impacts alone make natural gas exports a winning policy, but the geopolitical impacts are an incredible benefit as well and have been ignored for far too long. Allies around the world have told us that they would greatly benefit from American LNG.

Last October, the Committee on Energy and Commerce held a forum that included ambassadors and other officials representing 11 U.S. allies, all of whom strongly urged us to enter the global LNG marketplace. Since then, several other allies have stepped forward with the same request. This includes our friends in eastern Europe unfortunate enough to be reliant on Russia for natural gas.

Not only do these nations face unfair pricing, but political pressure, as a result of their dependence on Russia. These nations believe that the very passage of this legislation, the signal that we are serious about LNG exports, would immediately reduce Russia's negotiating leverage even before the first molecule of LNG shipment actually goes out. H.R. 6 will start doing good the very day it is enacted.

I should note that our efforts on LNG exports began before the current crisis erupted in Ukraine. Russia's actions over the past several months demonstrate the importance of this bill, and Russia's recent decision to cut off supplies to Ukraine further underscore the need for America to provide Europe an alternative supply of natural gas. Indeed, we can effectively push back against Russia's aggression and help our friends without ever putting any troops in harm's way.

□ 1615

Beyond Europe, we can also strengthen our economic ties with allies in Asia, who would rather buy their energy from us than from less reliable Middle Eastern suppliers.

We can also assist nations in achieving their environmental goals by offering the option of clean-burning natural gas, and we can help many developing countries by providing them with an energy source that is cheaper than the choices available to them now.

The economic benefits alone—or the geopolitical benefits alone—make LNG exports a worthwhile policy; but taken together, they make it a no-brainer. Unfortunately, the decades-old Federal approval process for LNG export facilities is acting as an impediment.

Proposed projects have languished at DOE for years on end. While DOE has recently announced some changes to the process, the agency is still under no deadline to act.

The amendment that I am offering with Mr. GREEN changes that. It provides that, once the extensive environmental review conducted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act is complete for a project, the Department of Energy has a 30-day deadline to issue a final decision on the application pending before the agency.

It is a sensible and workable solution to the current regulatory bottleneck. It is an answer to a call from our allies for energy security.

It is time to help our friends abroad. It is time to create jobs here at home.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 6.

I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON, I am writing concerning H.R. 6, the ''Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act,'' which the Committee on Energy and Commerce reported on June 19, 2014.

As reported, H.R. 6 contains a section on judicial review, which is within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 6, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert is jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 6, the ''Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.'' As you noted, the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce contains a provision that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Specifically, subsection 2(b) provides for judicial review of U.S. Department of Energy orders and failures to issue a decision on applications for authorization to export natural gas.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo seeking a sequential referral on H.R. 6, and I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and you will have my support for any such request.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 6 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

I was going to talk about this bill, and I will, but I really want to talk about the inflation in the naming of these bills. This is a bill to allow a faster process for exporting natural gas to other countries.

So what is it called? The Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. What do you follow after that? Peace and prosperity in our time, whatever that may, in fact, involve. I just think this bill is overrated in its title. I also want to say it is overrated in what it does.

There are 17 or 18 free trade countries, and they can have the export of natural gas to them right away. They are free trade countries that have an agreement with us. There is no problem in getting the approval for them. The question is: Are we going to approve export of natural gas to non-free trade countries?

The premise of this bill is that we are not doing enough to export natural gas to them or anyone else, I guess. Congressman GARDNER's bill would change the approval process for liquefied natural gas exports, presumably because the Department of Energy is moving too slowly, because they can approve an application now for export anywhere around the world.

In fact, DOE has moved—quite properly, it seems to me—to authorize these LNG exports. They have already approved seven export proposals, and they are continuing to evaluate additional applications.

What these approvals that we have already granted—had granted—the U.S. is poised to transform into the world's second largest exporter of LNG in the world, just behind Qatar. If they approve one more application, we would go from exporting no LNG today to being the largest exporter in the world in just a few years.

So why do we need this legislation? Certainly not to get domestic prosperity and global freedom because this bill doesn't accomplish either goal.

Currently, the Department of Energy goes through a process, and they perform a public interest determination when reviewing export applications, so they can carefully consider the effect of LNG exports on natural gas prices here and the impact of higher prices here on American consumers and these manufacturers that are benefiting from the lower price that they have seen for LNG here.

The public interest determination provides DOE an opportunity to examine a number of factors: energy security, geopolitical, and environmental considerations.

If we would have this bill adopted, it would short circuit this established review process for pending and future LNG export applications. The bill establishes a new deadline for DOE to decide on applications within 90 days of the close of the public comment period or enactment of the bill, whichever comes later.

That is a deadline that is established, so they are forcing the DOE to act, but if DOE looks at an application and they don't feel that they are ready to make a decision in that period of time, they are more likely than not to just turn it down. That doesn't seem to be a worthwhile goal, if we want to have more export of LNG.

This provision would require DOE simultaneously to review and make a decision on all the pending applications within 90 days. It is not realistic, and it certainly isn't responsible.

With few exceptions, environmental reviews haven't been completed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for any of these applications, so the deadline would force DOE to rush its review of each application and make its final decision without a final environmental review.

The other thing I want to comment on is all those ambassadors that told us they want this bill—because of the hold that Russia has over them—they might not even benefit if this bill were adopted because they are not free trade countries.

So there has to be an approval of an export for LNG to a non-free trade country. There is not an approval through the Department of Energy to any particular country. It simply approves the request of a company here to export the LNG.

Under our capitalist system, a business usually seeks the highest reward for its investment. The export of LNG to a non-free trade country is going to be better rewarded in Asia than it will be in Ukraine or in Eastern Europe, where they are so concerned, rightfully so, about what Russia is going to do. It

may not even help those countries, as so many of these ambassadors hoped it will.

I would say that this bill is not going to get us to export LNG any faster. Nothing in the bill affects the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's permitting of the actual LNG export terminals.

Rushing the DOE review is not going to speed up the construction of these projects. We need the construction of the infrastructure for the export of natural gas.

The last thing I want to say is there are some controversies about exporting LNG, not exporting it at all, but opening it up to export in a process where the export will be wide open.

A lot of manufacturers in this country are worried that, if we are exporting our LNG, that is going to raise the price of natural gas here at home. Well, of course it will. It will go to a lower price of LNG here at home to eventually a world price, if it could be freely exported around the world the way we have for oil. If that happens, they are afraid that this boom we have seen in manufacturing in the United States may be curtailed.

So it is not without controversy that people are looking at this legislation. In other words, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, if you lose your job because the price of natural gas goes up and you are working for a manufacturer that is benefiting from a lower price for natural gas here in the United States, they are not going to look at this as a bill that leads to domestic prosperity and global freedom, as the authors of this bill would have us believe.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that nothing in this bill changes the requirements of a NEPA analysis to be completed.

I share your frustration with the titles of bill names—the bill titles. Imagine our consternation over the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this bill to the floor.

I wholeheartedly support H.R. 6 for a number of reasons. I also want to address some of the issues that the gentleman from the other side raised.

First of all, let's consider international trade is the key to growth, it is the key to job creation, it is the key to reducing our deficits, and it is important geopolitically for the United States.

Because of this great advance in technology with hydraulic fracturing and drilling, we now have unprecedented levels supply of gas that we can use domestically for manufacturing, and we are seeing a domestic manufacturing renaissance.

Secondly, the amount of gas that we will export from this country, for a number of reasons, will not cause significant price spikes. In fact, it will add stability to the pricing of gas in this country and promote more drilling, which is what we need to do.

We need to take care of our own energy security here, and we can provide energy security for our partners—our trading partners—around the world. This is why we need to move forward on this.

It is clear that, over the last 2 years, the U.S. Department of Energy has raised its long-term forecast on gas production by nearly 40 percent, with price expectations having declined 15 percent over the same period.

So the point that the gentleman makes about price spikes because of LNG exports is really, really unfounded—an unfounded point.

LNG exports could contribute up to 450,000 jobs between the years 2016 and 2035 and add $73.6 billion annually to our GDP.

My home State of Louisiana—in fact, the Third Congressional District, my district, is the leading area in this whole effort. We have currently the first two Department of Energy and FERC-approved facilities that are undergoing construction today.

The first one, the Sabine Pass facility, will see its exports probably the end of 2015, early 2016. The others will follow.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. We currently have eight—eight—that are waiting and have been waiting over a year—eight facilities waiting over a year for approval from the Department of Energy. That is before they go through the expensive FERC process.

This is why we need this legislation: to get the Department of Energy to move forward on this, so that we don't hold up something that is going to help us grow our economy, create jobs, and be very important geopolitically.

Trade not only acts as a catalyst for creating jobs, it reduces deficits, promotes American goods and services internationally, and energy should be no different.

That is why we need to move forward. We have a unique opportunity. Let's embrace it now, and let's do the right thing for our country.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana, I respect him greatly, and he made an argument. I don't fully agree with his argument, but that is the purpose of the debate, to discuss ideas and air our point of view.

The author of this legislation, I guess, couldn't help himself because he said: imagine the consternation when they found that the Affordable Care Act was named the Affordable Care Act. There are millions of people around the country, for the first time, who are able to buy insurance that is affordable.

I don't believe, if this bill passed, that it would lead to domestic prosperity and global freedom. With all due respect to those who have a different point of view, what gall to say that this bill, which is controversial, and many Americans oppose because they feel it will hurt their prosperity here at home or our national security here at home, would think that an appropriate name is to say this bill is the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

Now that I have got that off my chest, Mr. Chairman, I want to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I don't think this bill is needed. LNG permits are being issued faster than they can be built.

This bill establishes a rigid deadline for DOE to complete its public interest review of LNG export applications. That approach raises significant concerns.

□ 1630

I would like to talk about two of the concerns: climate change and economics.

Mr. WAXMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCNERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. You don't think the bill is needed. Does that mean you are against domestic prosperity and global freedom?

Mr. MCNERNEY. No, I don't think that is what it means, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you. I just wanted that clarification.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Reclaiming my time, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change recently released its multiyear report on the state of climate science. The world's leading climate scientists examined the peer-reviewed science and confirmed that climate change is already happening on all continents and across the oceans and will get much worse if we don't act.

The impacts of runaway climate change will be severe: reduced crop yields, more heat waves and diseases, decreased water availability, and more extreme weather events.

That means that we need to scrutinize the energy infrastructure decisions that we make today because of their impacts on climate change in the future. Every decision to build a new LNG export terminal has climate implications. We need to understand and weigh those effects. Otherwise, we risk locking in infrastructure that will produce carbon pollution for decades to come or creating stranded investments that must be shut down before they have paid for themselves.

Natural gas combustion for electricity does emit less carbon pollution than coal, but natural gas production

does result in gas escaping, and natural gas is a much more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. We need to consider the effect of carbon emissions in the United States.

In addition, liquefying natural gas and shipping it overseas is an energy-intensive process that will result in some significant domestic carbon emissions. For example, the direct emissions from the Sabine Pass process will represent 2 percent of the entire State of Louisiana's emissions.

The Energy Information Administration's modeling shows that LNG exports would increase domestic natural gas production in the United States. Of course, that is obvious. This could increase emissions of methane, which is, as I mentioned, a potent greenhouse gas, unless we take very severe measures to control that pollution at the wellhead and throughout the natural gas system.

In a carbon-constrained world, we need to understand all of these domestic emissions' impacts and how they compare with emission impacts abroad. The DOE has taken a first step to begin looking at these issues but has not completed a rigorous study of the effects of the different levels of LNG exports on carbon emissions.

We need to make sure we understand the effects on climate change of major energy infrastructure investments that will last for decades.

My second concern is economic. Shipping natural gas overseas will raise domestic natural gas prices. That is basically the law of supply and demand—unless that law is no longer valid.

Manufacturing is seeing a domestic renaissance here in this country because of natural gas prices being lower. This is domestic manufacturing. We want to make things in America. We want to make it in America. We want to continue to see that renaissance. We want to see manufacturing increase throughout the country and throughout the States.

Therefore, I oppose the bill.

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

I would point out that our colleagues in the Senate have introduced legislation similar to our legislation here on LNG exports titled, the Freedom Through Energy Export Act, by our colleague from Alaska, Mr. BEGICH.

I point out, too, that when it comes to domestic prosperity, the fact that this could create 45,000 job opportunities, increasing the employment in energy to 3 million people by 2020, that is prosperity and freedom.

Hungary's Ambassador at Large for Energy Security, Dr. Anita Orban, testified that this legislation ''sends a clear signal that the global gas market is changing, that there is the prospect of much greater supply coming from other parts of the world.''

That is world security, freedom, prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), who has been a true leader on the issue of LNG exports.

Mr. TURNER. I want to thank the author of H.R. 6 for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, lifting self-imposed restrictions on natural gas exports is a win-win situation for the American people. It will create American jobs and strengthen our allies' independence, bolstering our economic and strategic partnerships.

As chairman of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, many foreign leaders have expressed to me the need for energy diversification and its importance to strengthen our strategic partnerships. We already cooperate with our allies on a variety of security issues. Energy security must also be a component of our strategic alliances.

America's emerging role as an energy producer has the potential to enhance our security relationships and influence the global marketplace.

As we have seen in Ukraine, Russia will not hesitate to use its energy resource dominance to expand its sphere of influence. Just last week, Russia's state-owned monopoly, Gazprom, cut off natural gas supplies to Ukraine.

In the Asia Pacific, Japan is a critical security partner as we counter threats posed by countries such as North Korea. Already the world's largest importer of natural gas, Japan is dependent on Russia, the Middle East, and Africa for nearly 50 percent of its natural gas imports and is seeking greater imports as a result of its 2011 nuclear power plant disaster.

Increasing U.S. natural gas exports, along with the development of other sources, such as the Southern Gas Corridor and the Eastern Mediterranean, will help diversify world natural gas supplies and create a more competitive, transparent, and diversified global natural gas marketplace. In fact, U.S. natural gas production has already influenced global markets.

Natural gas previously destined for the United States but no longer needed as a result of increased production was diverted to other markets. This increased supply has made the global natural gas market more competitive, helping to put more pressure on contracts indexed to the price of oil and allowing several European countries to renegotiate their long-term contracts with Gazprom.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TURNER. In fact, President Obama, Secretary of State Kerry, and Secretary of Energy Moniz have welcomed LNG exports to strengthen our strategic alliances. Mr. Chairman, I will submit their statements for the RECORD.

PRESIDENT OBAMA, CURRENT AND PAST ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS WELCOME U.S. LNG EXPORTS

President Barack Obama, in a joint statement with European leaders at the EU–US Summit on March 26, 2014: The situation in Ukraine proves the need to reinforce energy security in Europe and we are considering new collaborative efforts to achieve this goal. We welcome the prospect of U.S. LNG exports in the future since additional global supplies will benefit Europe and other strategic partners.

Secretary of State John Kerry, in a joint statement with European energy leaders at a meeting of the EU–US Energy Council on April 2, 2014: The Council further welcomed the prospect of US LNG exports in the future since additional global supplies will benefit Europe and other strategic partners.

Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz, in a joint statement with European energy leaders at the G7 Rome Energy Ministerial meeting on May 6, 2014: No country should depend totally on one supplier. We intend to promote a more integrated LNG market, including through new supplies, the development of transport infrastructures, storage capacities, and LNG terminals.

Mr. TURNER. Regardless of where U.S. natural gas is shipped, increasing supply in the global marketplace will provide international consumers with greater choice and thus increased leverage to negotiate prices.

U.S. natural gas exports will create jobs right here at home and will help foster a more competitive natural gas market.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 6.

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

Mr. Chairman, 7 percent of the American people approve of the United States Congress. I think one of the reasons for that low approval rating is that we have overpromised and underperformed what they expect of us.

If anybody would think that this bill in and of itself deserves to be called the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, I think they lose credibility with the American people. And there is not much more credibility to lose when they only support us at a rate of 7 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), for whom I have an enormous amount of affection, even though today we have had two bills where we have disagreed. He doesn't overpromise. He just states his views and supports what he believes in. Sometimes he even convinces me, but he is not doing a good job today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me. I have to admit that the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act is a bipartisan problem we have in this Chamber.

I rise as a cosponsor in support of H.R. 6.

H.R. 6 represents a bipartisan effort to legislate. I want to thank my colleague from Colorado, Congressman GARDNER, for working with me. I wasn't an original cosponsor, but through our committee process we

have worked it out. We achieved bipartisan support in the committee because we were working together. I think that is what the American people want Congress to do.

It is important to recognize that there are more than 30 export permits to export LNG. These permits represent more than 35 billion cubic feet a day in LNG exports.

Currently, the Department of Energy has conditionally approved six of them, but only one project has received final approval through DOE and through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

DOE has an important role in export to make sure that we don't increase our natural gas prices to where they are not affordable to our country. We are in an energy renaissance because of the success of natural gas, fracking, and directional drilling in our country, and we are producing more natural gas than we can use, whether it be for electricity production or for our chemical industry.

I represent a huge chemical complex in East Harris County. There is literally a renaissance in the expansion of those chemical industries. It is increasing jobs and our exports because a lot of those chemicals we are producing from our U.S. natural gas will be exported. So someone else will pay for those jobs in our district in East Harris County.

The Department of Energy has a role in this. The problem we have is that the Department of Energy has taken so long to approve these permits. The DOE really just needs to look if it is in our national interest. They include all these things under it. And that is correct.

Let me give you an example.

In Texas and North Dakota, we are flaring natural gas right now because we don't have customers in our country and we don't have a way to export it. It is bad for the environment. It is bad for the people who own those royalties because they are not getting paid for them. And it is just terrible to see something we can sell to someone else not be utilized.

So that is why I support this bill.

We wanted to find that sweet spot, so to speak, on where we can export what we are not using.

Those of you who are familiar with Texas, we hold in reverence our Blue Bell Ice Cream. If you are there, in their commercials they will say:

We eat all we can and sell the rest.

That is what I want to do with natural gas. I want to use all we can, but I want to sell all the rest we can't use so it will help our balance of trade, help some of our allies who need it, but also keep our workers working in both the oil patch and the gas patch.

My colleague states that one more approval would make us the largest LNG exporter in the world. But not all of these projects will be constructed. Only one has been approved all the way. Of the more than 30 applications, no more than a handful of these projects will be constructed and ultimately export LNG.

Further, it is important that we clarify the LNG permitting processing before we discuss H.R. 6.

There are two completely separate processes. First, a project must submit an application to export. If the project will send LNG to a country with which the U.S. has a free trade agreement, the application is automatically approved. In fact, the Port of Brownsville got their application approved in 30 days.

If the project sends LNG to a country without a free trade agreement—non-FTA—the DOE must issue a permit based on the public interest. For a project to actually export LNG in either case, the applicant must receive a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission permit.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reviews the environmental impacts of the actual LNG facility. The FERC process takes 12 to 18 months and costs approximately $100 million.

The issue H.R. 6 seeks to deal with is the non-FTA permits through the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy currently has 25 permits awaiting decision. The Department of Energy held most of these permits for more than 3 years. Even the DOE recognizes this is a huge problem and proposed changing the approval process.

While I support the DOE changes, unfortunately, they fail to provide any certainty. H.R. 6 would place a timeline for the DOE to issue a decision. Again, remember, the DOE is going to have 12 to 18 months to know that permit because it is going through the Federal regulatory process already.

We need to make sure that the environmental review process is protected—and that is what FERC does—but we also need to make sure that the DOE makes those decisions timely so they can get those permits issued.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 6 and provide certainty to the market.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. I would like to thank my colleague from California for his leadership on the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

This legislation would require the DOE to act quickly in considering applications to export liquefied natural gas.

New technologies have unlocked vast resources of natural gas across the country. Our natural gas production will increase by 56 percent between 2012 and 2014.

□ 1645

If you want to see what real natural gas development looks like in a place that could really use the economic development, come to northern West Virginia or to southwest PA. More production means more American jobs and more West Virginia jobs.

The Marcellus shale production in West Virginia is surging, and the possibility of LNG exports will mean more good-paying jobs here at home—and a lot of them. By 2035, LNG exports are expected to create 8,600 West Virginia jobs and put $1.7 billion in State revenues.

We need to do everything possible to put West Virginia resources to work for West Virginians, and today's legislation will make a real, positive difference for working families and communities in my State and in States across the Nation.

This bill would allow us to import jobs and economic opportunity, while we export both energy and physical security to our friends and allies. More than a third of the natural gas consumed in Europe comes from Russia, and I am sure our allies would rather be buying natural gas from the United States.

Passing this bill will create jobs in West Virginia and across the country. It will grow our Nation's economy and strengthen our relationships with our allies. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. I want to thank Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. I am a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation that will help to increase U.S. liquefied natural gas exports and help boost our economy.

In my 15th Congressional District in Texas, oil and natural gas extraction from the Eagle Ford shale has transformed this region, bringing thousands of new jobs, and growing wealth to many rural communities in South Texas.

A study by the University of Texas showed that the Eagle Ford shale has provided a $61 billion impact to Texas and has supported over 116,000 new jobs. More importantly, the boom in American natural gas production has drastically changed our many counties' energy future.

The United States is now the number one natural gas-producing nation in the world. The USA has more than enough natural gas to meet its domestic needs while also exporting to foreign countries at a huge benefit to the United States' economy.

Unfortunately, the existing application process at the Department of Energy has made it burdensome for companies to export liquefied natural gas to non-FTA countries. This bill will address that problem.

Mr. Chairman, this is a truly bipartisan effort that will resolve a longstanding issue within our administration on expediting exports of natural gas. Our bill, H.R. 6, will cut the red tape and move quickly to approve all pending liquefied natural gas applications at the Department of Energy for

our WTO allies, and it will provide future applicants with a much more reasonable process.

I want to thank Representatives CORY GARDNER and TIM RYAN for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes.''

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and I applaud my colleague from Colorado for his leadership.

This bill will expedite exports of liquefied natural gas, or LNG, to our allies abroad by cutting the red tape and streamlining the regulatory process. As a Nation, this has the potential to revitalize our economy, allow us to become energy independent, and to strategically advance our interests overseas.

Now, I know many Hoosiers back at home might be asking themselves: How does this help me? After all, we have limited natural gas wells and processing plants in Indiana. Let me state clearly that the answer is: yes, it will help them.

The bill would be an economic boon to the Hoosier economy. As the Nation's leading manufacturing State, Indiana contributes to the LNG business heavily by making and manufacturing the equipment that makes the gas extraction possible.

The natural gas and oil industry has already created 136,000 jobs in Indiana, and it makes up over 4.1 percent of our entire labor income.

The future for Indiana looks even brighter with the expansion of LNG exports. It is estimated that Indiana's economy would grow by $2.2 billion a year and produce as many as 12,800 new jobs by simply allowing shipments of gas to our trusted allies.

Just last week, I received a letter from the CEO of the Ports of Indiana that urged the passage of this legislation. He supports the passage because of the significant competitive advantage it will give our State, in terms of our geography and infrastructure, which will allow Indiana to further capitalize on LNG exports.

Now is the time to allow American entrepreneurship to increase domestic energy production and fuel job creation, but unfortunately, the administration has refused, time and time again, to get out of the way of this entrepreneurship.

The administration refuses to approve licenses for LNG exports, and as I speak now, there are 24 pending applications awaiting action from the Department of Energy. One has been waiting 917 days and counting.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is time to unleash the power of America's abundant natural resources in order to capitalize on our ingenuity and create thousands of good-paying jobs in my home State of Indiana and across the Nation. I urge its passage.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman for his yielding, and I thank him for his work as ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Chairman, with H.R. 6, we are embarking on a policy that will lock us into higher and more volatile natural gas prices, and that will erode a key advantage we have for domestic manufacturing, that being low natural gas prices.

Natural gas is used widely throughout our economy. It is, indeed, a valuable commodity, and we should be setting policy to ensure that we use it efficiently and effectively. LNG terminals are expensive to build and require a lot of energy to operate. The contracts signed by exporters commit them to exporting LNG for anywhere from 10 to 20 years.

We already had a small taste of what happens if there is an unexpected event that increases domestic demand when ready supplies are low and exports have increased.

At a time when we are producing record amounts of propane, we had some of the worst shortages and price spikes we have seen in years. It was not entirely due to export increases, but it was definitely a factor. Many of our communities are paying the environmental costs of this natural gas boom. This bill is now going to deny them the benefits associated with sacrifices.

There are very real concerns that this legislation would harm economic growth, job creation, and American manufacturing. This bill will not allow the adequate consideration of the public interest, including impacts on United States' consumers and manufacturers, before granting the approval of natural gas exports to countries with which we do not have a free trade agreement.

In fact, because we do have free trade agreements with a number of countries, exports of LNG to them do not require any public interest analysis. The DOE has approved billions of cubic feet to be exported to nations with which we have free trade agreements and to others as well.

We are in the midst of a manufacturing renaissance due, in part, to an abundance of affordable domestic natural gas. We have seen 12 consecutive months of growth in the manufacturing sector and a growing trend of the reshoring of jobs back to the United States.

Why would we want to turn that trend around?

Exports on the scale that this legislation would enable will raise domestic natural gas and electricity prices for every American and undermine our manufacturing competitiveness.

The United States' natural gas prices are less than one-half of Europe's and one-third less than in places like Japan and South Korea. The integration of the United States' and Asia's natural gas markets would lead to increases in prices for consumers and businesses, undoing the economic conditions that have led to the recent growth in American manufacturing.

The industrial sector represents some 22 percent of American energy use, with natural gas being the single largest input. Energy is consumed in the industrial sector for a wide range of purposes—from processing to heating, cooling, and as feedstocks to produce non-energy products.

The chemicals, pulp and paper, iron and steel, refining, and nonmetallic minerals industries account for about one-half of all energy used in this sector.

These industries alone represent millions of American jobs. That is why I am so concerned that the Energy Information Administration, the EIA, found that increased natural gas exports will ''lead to increased natural gas prices,'' and ''larger export levels lead to larger domestic price increases.''

The EIA looked specifically at the potential impact of these price increases on United States' manufacturers, and it found that a high level of LNG exports could increase natural gas costs for the industrial sector by between 5 and 27 percent annually.

The amendment I offered to the Rules Committee, an amendment which was not made in order, would have prevented section 2 of this bill from taking effect until there would be a determination that LNG exports would not adversely impact the competitiveness of the United States' manufacturing community.

American employers are struggling to compete in this global economy, especially with the jobs in the manufacturing sector. Domestic manufacturers are competing with countries that have low wages, limited environmental and worker protections, and manipulated currencies. Low-priced, abundant natural gas is a competitive advantage for domestic manufacturers. Let's not give that up.

This Congress has an obligation to prevent the loss of American manufacturing jobs. The revitalization of the American manufacturing industry and the bringing back of quality jobs from overseas should be the cornerstone of our efforts in Washington in order to help the private sector thrive and to put our people back to work.

This bill is only good for the natural gas-producing industry, and its increased benefits will be coming at everyone else's expense.

With that, I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, the Energy and Commerce Committee has

been tackling the issue of LNG exports for quite some time now.

What began as a solid case in favor of these exports has only grown stronger. I support this bill, H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and I applaud, in particular, the sponsor, CORY GARDNER, for his efforts on this important bipartisan bill.

Last October, we held a forum that consisted of nearly a dozen representatives of foreign governments, as well as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, all of whom expressed their strong interest in buying LNG from the U.S.

Three of them—Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Lithuania—are Eastern European allies that are currently dependent on Russia for natural gas. They described in great detail how Russia wields natural gas as a weapon against them, threatening to raise prices or to even cut off supplies as a means of exerting political pressure.

We need to respond, as we are seeing their warnings playing out with the ongoing crisis, obviously, today in Ukraine. If Putin is not deterred, he will likely use the same tactics on other Eastern European countries in the years ahead. Russia's aggression is real, and American LNG can provide a much-needed lifeline away from Putin's grip as an alternative supply source.

The Energy Information Administration's estimated reserves of natural gas continue to be revised upward, ensuring that we can continue to provide American manufacturers with low-cost supplies, while having enough for export markets, and the Department of Energy has even concluded that natural gas exports will be a net benefit to our economy.

Early in our efforts, the DOE insisted that its process for approving LNG export facilities wasn't broken, but over the last year, there have been very few approvals, and most applications continue to languish—some for even more than a year—and the line continues to grow.

The DOE's most recent changes to the process, while a slight improvement from the existing queue, are still very disappointing. They do nothing to address the core problem of open-ended delays. Congress needs to act.

□ 1700

Throughout our efforts on this topic, there has been bipartisan interest in LNG exports. Since the bill was first introduced, the bipartisanship has only grown, and for that, I commend the bill's author, CORY GARDNER, for working with GENE GREEN and others on an amendment adapting the bill's language to address a number of concerns.

I know that we have reached the point where the passage of this bill, H.R. 6, will be seen as a bipartisan success story, as it should; and the Senate should follow our lead, stand up for jobs, as well as our allies, and quickly send this bill to the President's desk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. UPTON. Because of advances in technology and innovation, we are now entering a new era of abundance. America is emerging, yes, as an energy superpower. We can enjoy the domestic benefits of being an energy superpower while also projecting our influence as a force for good abroad. The Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act allows us to do both.

This commonsense bill says ''yes'' to jobs, ''yes'' to energy, and I would urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 6.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for bringing this bill to the floor. It is so important that we exploit American domestic resources to create jobs, create global stability, and make lower prices for consumers. This bill does all those things.

So we have a lot to thank you for, Congressman GARDNER, for what this bill could accomplish, and I appreciate that.

Let me address a couple of points that I think have been erroneously made. Some said that current users of natural gas won't benefit as much if this bill were to become law. That is simply not true.

There is such an abundance of natural gas in this country that we can supply domestic needs and, at the same time, have liquefied natural gas exports to our friends and allies. We can do both, and everyone will benefit. The shale gas revolution in this country is so amazing that that has made this possible.

Secondly, some have said that there will not be the same quality of environmental reviews of LNG if this takes place, and that is simply not true either. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission maintains its role to permit the siting of facilities, just as under current law, and FERC, as they are known, is required by the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, to conduct an environmental assessment and, if necessary, an EIS, an Environmental Impact Statement, if that is required. That does not change either. The same requirements under NEPA will still be met under this law, should it become law. So we are not in any way degrading or compromising environmental standards. They are still going to be satisfied.

So, for all those reasons, I want to thank the sponsor of this bill, Representative GARDNER, and I ask all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado how many more speakers you have?

Mr. GARDNER. We have two additional speakers.

Mr. WAXMAN. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Then I presume the gentleman from Colorado will want to close on his bill. So after your two speakers, we will close on our side, and then you can close.

Mr. GARDNER. At this point, we only have two remaining speakers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago, companies were building terminals to import natural gas at the cost of billions of dollars because analysts agreed that the United States economy was going to need natural gas from overseas. Today that scenario has flipped on its head, and import terminals are dormant. The Department of Energy has 19 applications waiting to get permission to export U.S. natural gas.

Thanks to technology breakthroughs, U.S. natural gas reserves have climbed 72 percent since 2000. We have more gas than we can use here in the United States. Mr. Chairman, we have the best ice cream company in the world in Brenham, Texas, and their motto is: ''We eat all we can, and we sell the rest.'' That is what our motto should be with natural gas. We should use all we can and sell the rest everywhere in the world that wants to buy it.

As chairman of the Trade Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, I did a hearing on more LNG exports in April. Every witness at the hearing, from the union representatives to a professor, agreed that we should export natural gas. We have too much gas and our allies have too little.

And then there is Russia. Russia has an energy stranglehold over Europe, including Ukraine. Just this past week, Russia announced it was going to require payments up front from Ukraine. Russia has already increased the price of natural gas and even stopped sending natural gas to Ukraine.

Isn't that lovely?

Ukraine needs access to natural gas down the road, and that could be the United States. We need to compete with Gazprom. That could be the United States. That is how we can help thwart Russian aggression in Eastern Europe.

Technically, the United States can export natural gas, but the approval process is slow as molasses. It is the government. The government takes too long to make a decision, and the Department of Energy wraps companies in red tape. Many times we can lose these natural gas contracts to our competitors.

So I support this legislation. I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the floor.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6, the

Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, championed by my friend and colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Congressman GARDNER of Colorado, a true leader in this area. This Act will help expedite approval of U.S. liquefied natural gas exports to our allies.

The United States is experiencing a North American energy boom that analysts predict can produce enough natural gas to meet our domestic demands as well as that of our global allies, including Ukraine and other Eastern European nations currently at the mercy of Russian energy supplies. Expediting U.S. liquefied natural gas exports serves our national security interests as an aggressive Russian regime looks to expand power in former Soviet Union countries. This legislation helps our allies in eastern Europe and across the globe, while creating jobs here at home through private investment and economic opportunity essential to improving the American economy.

As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, I am proud to have helped bring this important energy global security measure to the floor today, and I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage. This is in the national security interest of the United States of America.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), a sponsor of H.R. 6, somebody who has been with this bill, this legislation, from the beginning as we have worked on this bipartisan process.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I probably won't take all the time, but I did want to stand up in support of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chair, in my district in eastern Ohio, we have been—and I have heard speaker after speaker talk about the potential boom for our country and different regions of America. And my region that I represent is one of those areas along eastern Ohio.

I think if we are looking to address many of the issues of global warming, and I know there would be a lot of different discussions and opinions that I may have compared to a lot of people on the other side, but I believe that this is an opportunity for us to address that issue with liquid natural gas, to get it out into the marketplace, to make sure that the economic benefits are here in the United States, that our people in eastern Ohio, western Pennsylvania, into New York and the upstate New York area are able to benefit from this. FERC is going to have to approve these ultimately, at the end of the day, and so I don't think that we can pass up this opportunity to have a transition.

Now, I think, quite frankly, we missed the boat a few years ago when we had an opportunity to pass a comprehensive energy bill that would invest into—in the bill that came before this House, money into coal research was an opportunity that I think we missed.

There was an opportunity for wind and solar and the alternatives that I think, ultimately, will be a part of an extended portfolio here in the United States. But today, the opportunity is with liquid natural gas and getting it abroad.

In one of my positions on the German Study Group, we were in Germany talking to Chancellor Merkel, and the first thing she said to us, as our delegation was over there, was let's talk about natural gas, the first thing, because she had Putin at that time, a year, year and a half ago, breathing down her neck, and now here we are. So I think there is an opportunity here. This is one step in a long process.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and hope we can continue to build out this energy portfolio with natural gas and the others that will come along the way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For those who want to export natural gas, this bill really isn't necessary because the Department of Energy is approving enough export of natural gas that will allow us, in a few years, to be the largest exporter of LNG in the world. So DOE is acting.

For those of you who are concerned about global freedom, well, when we get all the facilities going to be able to export the natural gas and once we get all of the approvals to export natural gas, the countries who are going to receive this natural gas are most likely going to be China, Japan, and India, because that is where they are paying higher prices for natural gas. It is going to be more profitable to ship the LNG there.

I don't fault the companies for doing that. They are in business to make money. It is going to provide more money to ship the natural gas there.

Well, what about Ukraine? What about the countries that are under threat from Russia?

Angela Merkel, the head of Germany, may not realize it, but natural gas is not going to be there for quite a long time. It is going to take years. Therefore, if you think domestic prosperity is hinging on the ability to export natural gas, we don't need this bill.

If you think global freedom is hanging on the balance waiting for this bill to become law—and by ''global freedom'' you don't mean freedom for China to get more natural gas or India or Japan, but Ukraine and countries in eastern Europe—don't count on this bill to bring about global freedom.

The bill is grossly titled because it is promising more than this bill can ever deliver, and I would urge that this bill is not necessary and ought to be rejected.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman for your leadership over this hour and thank the gentleman from California for the debate and the Members who came and debated this important piece of legislation today.

Look, we know this bill has the support of organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. People who represent the businesses of this country, the industrial might of this country, support H.R. 6 because they know that when we can produce our energy in our own backyard and help our allies to a greater prosperity for themselves, we are doing the right thing with H.R. 6.

□ 1715

This bill is the confluence of two policies that we try to promote but often fail to achieve: the policy of domestic job creation, where 45,000 people could be taken off the unemployment rolls because of H.R. 6. The other policy that we achieve with this legislation is to give our friends and allies a greater degree of freedom, a greater ability to be independent from Russia, their aggressive neighbors that just decide one day to invade.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6 is the work of a bipartisan group of lawmakers who have worked over the past several months to make sure that we have the support—not just from the Republican side of the aisle, but strong support from both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans who believe that we should answer the call from our friends and allies for energy security, for economic opportunity at home, and to make sure that we continue the energy revolution in this country.

Opposition to the bill, as I said in committee, is like hanging up on a 911 phone call from our friends and allies.

Let's pass this legislation. Let's achieve exactly what the title of this bill says: prosperity at home and help for our allies.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3301.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1716

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes, with Mr. MILLER of Florida (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–492 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–492 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 233, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—176

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

NOES—233

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

NOT VOTING—22

Campbell
Cantor
Cohen
Costa
Crowley
DeLauro
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1742

Messrs. POE of Texas, DUNCAN of Tennessee, HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. PETERS of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Tuesday, June 24th, 2014, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 350 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Pallone of New Jersey Amendment that ensures that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to full environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 240, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—171

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

NOES—240

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

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Cantor
Costa
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1748

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Tuesday, June 24th, 2014, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 351 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Waxman of California Amendment that excludes any project with a pending Presidential permit application from using the new approval requirements in the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 234, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—176

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

NOES—234

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Cantor
Costa
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1752

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Tuesday, June 24th, 2014, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 352 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Welch/Pingree/Kuster/Shea-Porter Amendment that ensures that major pipeline modifications receive a thorough environmental review.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 636, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Schneider moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3301, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 9, after line 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. 10. PROTECTING THE GREAT LAKES AND OUR NATION'S DRINKING WATER SUPPLY.

The Secretary of State shall not approve an oil pipeline under section 3 if—

(1) a rupture or spill from such pipeline would result in toxic and cancer-causing chemicals, such as benzene, entering into the Great Lakes, the Ogallala Aquifer, or a community's drinking water supply; or

(2) the owner or operator of the oil pipeline was responsible for a major oil spill affecting a community's drinking water supply or has failed to properly clean up such a spill.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, this amendment would ensure that our Great Lakes and the Ogallala Aquifer, and the tremendous economic benefits that come from them, will remain protected and safe from toxic chemicals.

As stewards of the health and safety of our communities, we should take sensible approaches to protect our most valuable assets. This amendment would safeguard our drinking water in 16 States for millions of our constituents—in Illinois, Minnesota, Michigan, Indiana, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas.

The Great Lakes provide 56 billion gallons of fresh water per day for agriculture, municipal drinking water, and electricity production. Over 30 million Americans rely on the Great Lakes every day for their safe and clean drinking water.

This amendment would protect the Great Lakes from being put at risk by preventing the Department of State from approving projects that have the potential to contaminate the Great Lakes and their aquifers.

We owe it to our future generations to keep the Great Lakes healthy and to use the resources we have in a responsible and sustainable way.

This amendment also ensures that the owners and operators of pipelines who have been responsible for major spills in the past that resulted in contaminated community drinking water supplies will not receive special treatment to build additional pipelines across our borders.

When accidents occur in our Great Lakes, it is not a simple fix to restore the ecosystem and return to business as usual. The time it takes our Great Lakes to naturally rid themselves of pollutants can take up to 191 years. This is why we must take every precaution now to make sure that the health of our Great Lakes and the health of our economy are not put at risk for short-term gains.

□ 1800

Energy independence remains one of the primary drivers of our economy and will continue to have a major role in our future competitiveness and the health of our future generations. By eliminating commonsense environmental regulations and evaluations for projects with potentially massive public health consequences, it is a dereliction of our duty to protect our families, protect our communities, and protect our businesses that rely on the Great Lakes.

Instead of assessing the impact of the full project, the underlying bill would limit environmental review for new infrastructure projects to only the cross-border sections. We live in an interconnected environment, and the Great Lakes system is not an isolated resource but, rather, a complex ecosystem intertwined with the health and vibrancy of countless communities across two countries and eight States. What happens to one has an impact on all.

This amendment would ensure the proper planning and environmental impact evaluations are complete and that the total scope of projects are known and assessed.

The Great Lakes represents more than 1,000 miles of border between the United States and Canada. It is irresponsible to take on all the environmental risks to our drinking water, our $4 billion fishing industry, and the 200

million tons of shipping that occur on the Great Lakes, including 90 percent of the Nation's iron ore and 58 percent of the automobiles produced here.

It is irresponsible to put at risk the millions of Americans who rely on the Great Lakes and the Ogallala Aquifer for their basic human needs. It is irresponsible to take on the risk of chemical and toxic contaminants permanently changing our environment for the worst without doing our own due diligence.

For all Great Lakes and Great Plains communities, I ask that you take this commonsense step with us to protect our safe access to clean drinking water and to deny companies who have a track record of contamination from being given the opportunity to do so again.

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

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, I would just say that H.R. 3301 is designed to do one thing: to treat all pipelines and electric transmission lines exactly as natural gas pipelines are treated.

The Great Lakes, we are all committed to. There are 33 separate environmental laws that would not be changed by this legislation.

With all due respect, I view this as a procedural vote that says ''no'' to North American energy security and lower prices. It is time to say ''yes'' and end procedural delays. Please vote ''no'' on this motion and say ''yes'' to North American security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 227, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—185

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

NOES—227

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

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1808

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call vote #353 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3301—North American Energy Infrastructure Act.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 173, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

AYES—238

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent

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

NOES—173

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

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1817

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 354 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on final passage of H.R. 3301—North American Energy Infrastructure Act.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4899, LOWERING GASOLINE PRICES TO FUEL AN AMERICA THAT WORKS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4923, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–493) on the resolution (H. Res. 641) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015; and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AUTISM COLLABORATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND SUPPORT ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4631) to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4631

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 "Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act of 2014" or the "Autism CARES Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall designate an existing official within the Department of Health and Human Services to oversee, in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense and Education, national autism spectrum disorder research, services, and support activities.

(b) DUTIES.—The official designated under subsection (a) shall—

(1) implement autism spectrum disorder activities, taking into account the strategic plan developed by the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee under section 399CC(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–2(b)); and

(2) ensure that autism spectrum disorder activities of the Department of Health and Human Services and of other Federal departments and agencies are not unnecessarily duplicative.

SEC. 3. RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 399AA of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "for children and adults" after "reporting of State epidemiological data";

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking "establishment of regional centers of excellence" and inserting "establishment or support of regional centers of excellence"; and

(B) by inserting "for children and adults" before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "center to be established" and inserting "center to be established or supported"; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking "2014" and inserting "2019".

SEC. 4. AUTISM INTERVENTION.

Section 399BB of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting "culturally competent" after "provide";

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii), by inserting "(which may include respite care for caregivers of individuals with an autism spectrum disorder)" after "services and supports";

(3) in subsection (e)(1)(B)(v), by inserting before the semicolon the following: ", which

may include collaborating with research centers or networks to provide training for providers of respite care (as defined in section 2901)''';

(4) in subsection (f), by striking ''grants or contracts'' and all that follows through ''for individuals with'' and inserting ''grants or contracts, which may include grants or contracts to research centers or networks, to determine the evidence-based practices for interventions to improve the physical and behavioral health of individuals with''; and

(5) in subsection (g), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY AUTISM COORDINATING COMMITTEE.

Section 399CC of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''and annually update''; and

(ii) by striking ''intervention'' and inserting ''interventions, including school and community-based interventions'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (2), and inserting before such redesignated paragraph the following:

''(1) monitor autism spectrum disorder research, and to the extent practicable services and support activities, across all relevant Federal departments and agencies, including coordination of Federal activities with respect to autism spectrum disorder;'';

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking ''recommendations to the Director of NIH'';

(E) in paragraph (4), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', and the process by which public feedback can be better integrated into such decisions''; and

(F) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

''(5) develop a strategic plan for the conduct of, and support for, autism spectrum disorder research, including as practicable for services and supports, for individuals with an autism spectrum disorder and the families of such individuals, which shall include—

''(A) proposed budgetary requirements; and

''(B) recommendations to ensure that autism spectrum disorder research, and services and support activities to the extent practicable, of the Department of Health and Human Services and of other Federal departments and agencies are not unnecessarily duplicative; and

''(6) submit to Congress and the President—

''(A) an annual update on the summary of advances described in paragraph (2); and

''(B) an annual update to the strategic plan described in paragraph (5), including any progress made in achieving the goals outlined in such strategic plan.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking the paragraph designation, the heading, and the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(1) FEDERAL MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of the following Federal members—'';

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by inserting '', such as the Administration for Community Living, Administration for Children and Families, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Health Resources and Services Administration'' before the semicolon at the end; and

(II) by adding at the end ''and'';

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting ''and the Department of Defense'' after ''Department of Education''; and

(II) by striking at the end ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(iv) by striking subparagraph (E);

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''ADDITIONAL'' and inserting ''NON-FEDERAL'';

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Not fewer than 6 members of the Committee, or 1/3 of the total membership of the Committee, whichever is greater'' and inserting ''Not more than ½, but not fewer than 1/3, of the total membership of the Committee'';

(iii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''one such member shall be an individual'' and inserting ''two such members shall be individuals'';

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''one such member shall be a parent or legal guardian'' and inserting ''two such members shall be parents or legal guardians''; and

(v) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''one such member shall be a representative'' and inserting ''two such members shall be representatives''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—

''(A) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT FOR NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—Non-Federal members shall serve for a term of 4 years, and may be reappointed for one or more additional 4-year terms.

''(B) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall not affect the powers or duties of the Committee. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy for an unexpired term shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of the member's term until a successor has been appointed.'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (f), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

SEC. 6. REPORTS.

Section 399DD of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–3) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**REPORT**'' and inserting ''**REPORTS**'';

(2) in subsection (b), by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (9) as subparagraphs (A) through (I), respectively, and realigning the margins accordingly;

(3) by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and realigning the margins accordingly;

(4) by inserting after the section heading the following:

''(a) PROGRESS REPORT.—'';

(5) in subsection (a)(1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''2 years after the date of enactment of the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act of 2011'' and inserting ''4 years after the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2014'';

(B) by inserting ''and the Secretary of Defense'' after ''the Secretary of Education''; and

(C) by inserting '', and make publicly available, including through posting on the Internet Web site of the Department of Health and Human Services,'' after ''Representatives''; and

(6) in subsection (a)(2) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), (as so redesignated), by striking ''Combating Autism Act of 2006'' and inserting ''Autism CARES Act of 2014'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated), by striking ''particular provisions of Combating Autism Act of 2006'' and inserting ''amendments made by the Autism CARES Act of 2014'';

(C) by striking subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), and inserting the following:

''(C) information on the incidence and prevalence of autism spectrum disorder, including available information on the prevalence of autism spectrum disorder among children and adults, and identification of any changes over time with respect to the incidence and prevalence of autism spectrum disorder;'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by striking ''6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Combating Autism Act of 2006'' and inserting ''4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2014 and, as appropriate, how this age varies across population subgroups'';

(E) in subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated), by striking ''6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Combating Autism Act of 2006'' and inserting ''4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2014 and, as appropriate, how this age varies across population subgroups'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''and, as appropriate, on how such average time varies across population subgroups'' before the semicolon at the end;

(G) in subparagraph (G) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''including by various subtypes,'' and inserting ''including by severity level as practicable,''; and

(ii) by striking ''child may'' and inserting ''child or other factors, such as demographic characteristics, may''; and

(H) by striking subparagraph (I) (as so redesignated), and inserting the following:

''(I) a description of the actions taken to implement and the progress made on implementation of the strategic plan developed by the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee under section 399CC(b).''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) REPORT ON YOUNG ADULTS AND TRANSITIONING YOUTH.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2014, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with the Secretary of Education and in collaboration with the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Attorney General, shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report concerning young adults with autism spectrum disorder and the challenges related to the transition from existing school-based services to those services available during adulthood.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain—

''(A) demographic characteristics of youth transitioning from school-based to community-based supports;

''(B) an overview of policies and programs relevant to young adults with autism spectrum disorder relating to post-secondary school transitional services, including an identification of existing Federal laws, regulations, policies, research, and programs;

''(C) proposals on establishing best practices guidelines to ensure—

''(i) interdisciplinary coordination between all relevant service providers receiving Federal funding;

''(ii) coordination with transitioning youth and the family of such transitioning youth; and

''(iii) inclusion of the individualized education program for the transitioning youth, as prescribed in section 614 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1414);

''(D) comprehensive approaches to transitioning from existing school-based services to those services available during adulthood, including—

''(i) services that increase access to, and improve integration and completion of, post-secondary education, peer support, vocational training (as defined in section 103 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 723)), rehabilitation, self-advocacy skills, and competitive, integrated employment;

''(ii) community-based behavioral supports and interventions;

''(iii) community-based integrated residential services, housing, and transportation;

''(iv) nutrition, health and wellness, recreational, and social activities;

''(v) personal safety services for individuals with autism spectrum disorder related to public safety agencies or the criminal justice system; and

''(vi) evidence-based approaches for coordination of resources and services once individuals have aged out of post-secondary education; and

''(E) proposals that seek to improve outcomes for adults with autism spectrum disorder making the transition from a school-based support system to adulthood by—

''(i) increasing the effectiveness of programs that provide transition services;

''(ii) increasing the ability of the relevant service providers described in subparagraph (C) to provide supports and services to underserved populations and regions;

''(iii) increasing the efficiency of service delivery to maximize resources and outcomes, including with respect to the integration of and collaboration among services for transitioning youth;

''(iv) ensuring access to all services necessary to transitioning youth of all capabilities; and

''(v) encouraging transitioning youth to utilize all available transition services to maximize independence, equal opportunity, full participation, and self-sufficiency.''.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 399EE of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''fiscal years 2012 through 2014'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2019'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''fiscal years 2011 through 2014'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2019''; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking ''$161,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2014'' and inserting ''$190,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of H.R. 4631, the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support—CARES—Act of 2014, introduced by Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey.

Autism CARES demonstrates our continued effort to address the needs of children and adults with autism spectrum disorder, ASD.

Thanks to the monitoring done by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, we know that as many as 1 in 68 children have ASD.

With recent studies showing that ASD can be detected in the first 6 months of life, the screening and diagnosis funded in the bill will mean early diagnosis and improved health and behavioral outcomes.

Many of these children are now transitioning into adulthood and will need community-based services to replace those provided by the schools. As a part of this bill, HHS will be required to study their needs and available services to identify gaps and make their transition seamless and productive.

The bill would also fund important research at the National Institutes of Health to understand and treat ASD and the operation of the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4631, the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act of 2014.

Autism spectrum disorder, or ASD, is a developmental disability that can lead to significant social, communication, and behavioral challenges.

We still do not know all the causes of autism, and we do not have a cure, but we do know that early intervention services can improve a child's development.

Recent data for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show more children than ever before are receiving an autism diagnosis. This is due, at least in part, to a broader definition of ASD and better diagnosis, but we cannot rule out the possibility of a true increase in the number of Americans with ASD.

Continued Federal support for autism activities at HHS will help us learn more about the causes of autism. It will help more children receive early diagnosis and intervention, as well as access to services that they need throughout their lives.

I want to acknowledge the sponsor of this legislation—Congressman SMITH and Congressman DOYLE; the sponsors of the Senate companion legislation, Senators MENENDEZ and ENZI; and leaders on the Energy and Commerce Committee and on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—for making it possible to have a consensus bill before the House today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, so we can send it to the Senate and on to the President for his signature, well in advance of the September 30 sunset provisions in current law.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, the distinguished prime sponsor of the legislation, who has really provided the leadership on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the chairman for yielding and thank him for his strong support, along with Chairman FRED UPTON, former Chairman HENRY WAXMAN, and so many others—MIKE DOYLE, my good friend and colleague, who together, since 2000, headed up the Coalition for Autism Research and Education. We have done everything bipartisan. We have 91 members in the coalition right now.

I would also like to thank the staff, who have helped us move this bill and negotiate text, including Gary Andres, Cheryl Jaeger, Brenda Destro, Jean Roehrenbeck, Katie Novaria, Cate Benedetti, and, of course, Neil Bradley, and so many others who have been so critical to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, previous autism law, including the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act of 2011, made critical investments—continued by this bill—that are working to determine the causes of autism spectrum disorder, identify autistic children as early as possible to begin treatment, raise critical awareness, and develop new therapies and effective services.

The latest prevalence data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Mr. Speaker, is shocking. One in every 68 American children are on the autism spectrum, a tenfold increase over the last 40 years. Boys on the spectrum outnumber girls 5 to 1.

In my home State of New Jersey, one in every 45 children has ASD, the highest rate in the CDC study.

I would note parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, I have chaired two congressional hearings on global autism, and this developmental disability is everywhere—one conservative estimate, 67 million worldwide.

Looking back, Mr. Speaker, it was two dedicated parents from New Jersey who helped launch the comprehensive Federal policy we seek to reauthorize today.

Almost 17 years ago, September 1997, Bobbie and Billy Gallagher of Brick, New Jersey, and parents of two small autistic children, walked into my Ocean County office looking for help.

They believed Brick had a disproportionate number of students with autism and wanted action, especially for their son Austin and daughter Alana, so I invited CDC and other Federal agencies to Brick for an investigation, only to learn that prevalence rates were high not only in Brick, but in nearby communities as well.

Believing we had a serious spike in prevalence, I introduced the ASSURE Act, and that was incorporated as title I of the Children's Health Act of 2000.

Mr. Speaker, much progress has been made since. Today, the evidence suggests there is no single cause of autism or type. Genetic risk, coupled with environmental factors, including advanced parental age, low birth weight, and prematurity—among other factors—may be triggers.

Signs of autism in a child usually manifest between 12–18 months, some as early as 6 months, while some regress after the age of 2, yet transformative early intervention continues to lag.

According to the IACC:

The clinical reality is that, currently, only about 20 percent of children with ASD are being identified early (by 3 years of age).

That, Members of the House, is not good, and it has got to change. The research clearly shows that early diagnosis means early intervention and much better outcomes.

The most recent IACC strategic plan—and I encourage Members to read it. It is a textbook on how the Federal Government should do anything when it deals with research. They have pointed out that:

During the past few years, there has been a major revolution in ASD genetics research.

Research on the potential relationship between the immune system and ASD has grown considerably, resulting in ''major breakthroughs.''

They go on to say:

Much progress has been made in understanding the prevalence and biology of conditions that commonly co-occur with ASD, including epilepsy, sleep disorders, GI disturbances, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and other psychiatric comorbidities.

They also point out:

Particularly intriguing are the results of prenatal vitamin intake through supplements and diet, showing a 40 percent reduction in risk of ASD with prenatal vitamin supplements taken in the 3 months before or during the first month of pregnancy.

Daily folic acid is also highly recommended.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue that this bill seeks to address. Every year, 50,000 young people on the autism spectrum matriculate to adulthood and are in the process of losing services.

Jonathan Kratchman, a 16-year-old with Asperger's from New Jersey, was the keynote speaker at a Dare to Dream conference at Mercer County Community College last year. He stated:

I know I can be a great contributor to society when I graduate. However, I need continuing support to get there.

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

Mr. PITTS. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Kratchman said:

If you take your high school diploma at age 18, you automatically lose services from your school district.

Both individuals with autism—like Jonathan—and their parents find themselves confronted with almost unimaginable challenges, including loss of school, housing, and then they have job needs.

□ 1830

We are in the midst of a huge yet largely invisible crisis that begs serious focus and remedies.

The Autism CARES Act tasks multiple Federal agencies to comprehensively study and report back to Congress on the special needs of autistic young adults and transitioning youth.

Additionally, Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS are in the process of requesting a comprehensive aging-out GAO report that will include key stakeholder involvement.

Passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is an important investment in a very important special group of people who, along with their families, caregivers, and friends, face seemingly endless challenges and struggles.

I strongly urge Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H.R. 4631, the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education and Support Act of 2014—Autism CARES ACT of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, previous autism law including the Combatting Autism Act of 2011 made critical investments—continued by this bill—that are working to determine the causes of autism spectrum disorder (ASD), identify autistic children as early as possible to begin treatment, raise critical awareness and develop new therapies and effective services.

According to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), ''ASD is a range of complex neurodevelopment disorders, characterized by social impairments, communication difficulties, and restricted, repetitive, and stereotyped patterns of behavior. Autistic disorder, sometimes called autism or classical ASD, is the most severe form of ASD, while other conditions along the spectrum include a milder form known as Asperger syndrome . . .''

The latest prevalence data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is shocking: 1 in every 68 American children are on the autism spectrum—a tenfold increase over the last 40 years. Boys on the autism spectrum outnumber girls 5 to 1.

In my home state of New Jersey, 1 in every 45 children has ASD, the highest rate in the CDC study.

I've chaired two congressional hearings on global autism—and this developmental disability is everywhere. One conservative estimate: 67 million worldwide.

Looking back, it was two dedicated parents from New Jersey who helped launch the comprehensive federal policy we seek to reauthorize today.

Almost 17 years ago—September 13, 1997—Bobbie and Billy Gallagher of Brick, New Jersey and parents of two small children with autism, walked into my Ocean County district office looking for help. They believed Brick had a disproportionate number of students with autism and wanted action especially for their son Austin and daughter Alana. So I invited CDC and other federal agencies to Brick for an investigation only to learn that prevalence rates were high not only in Brick but in nearby communities as well. Believing we had a serious spike in the prevalence of autism, I introduced H.R. 274—the Autism Statistics, Surveillance, Research and Epidemiology Act (ASSURE) which was enacted as Title 1 of the Children Health Act of 2000.

Much progress has been made since. Today, the evidence suggests that there is no single cause or type of autism. Genetic risk coupled with environmental factors including advanced parental age, low birth weight and prematurity among other factors may be triggers. Signs of autism in a child usually manifest between 12–18 months—some as early as 6 months—while some ''regress'' after 2.

Yet, transformative early intervention continues to lag. According to the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee (IACC): ''The clinical reality is that currently only about 20 percent of children with ASD are being identified early (by 3 years of age)'' and that members of the House is not good and has got to change. Early diagnosis means early intervention and better outcomes. IACC says ''More needs to be done to raise awareness in the practitioner community of the current capabilities and benefits of early, repeated screenings, early diagnosis, and early intervention.''

Research on autism is showing tremendous promise. The most recent IACC strategic plan—which is reauthorized for five years by Section 5—is filled with insight and actionable information:

''During the past few years there has been a major revolution in ASD genetics research. Using the newest molecular and epidemiological methods, recent data continues to strongly support the role of genes in ASD, and the understanding of this role has been greatly refined.''

''In infants at high genetic risk for ASD due to having an older sibling with autism, symptoms of autism begin to emerge as young as 6 months of age in those who later develop ASD. These new findings suggest that it may someday be possible to screen for children at risk for ASD before the emergence of the full symptoms of autism and early enough to facilitate even more effective intervention.''

''Research on the potential relationship between the immune system and ASD has grown considerably over the past 2 years, resulting in several major breakthroughs. In the realm of basic developmental research, immune cells and immune signaling molecules have been identified as essential for establishing stable connections between neurons during early brain development.''

''Much progress has been made in understanding the prevalence and biology of conditions that commonly co-occur with ASD, including epilepsy, sleep disorders, gastrointestinal (GI) disturbances, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and other psychiatric comorbidities.''

''The time around conception and during pregnancy are likely the most important time windows of heightened vulnerability for the development of the brain with supporting evidence from early reports linking autism symptoms to maternal ingestion of drugs.''

''Particularly intriguing are the results of prenatal vitamin intake through supplements and diet, showing a 40 percent reduction in risk of ASD with prenatal vitamin supplements taken in the 3 months before or during the first month of pregnancy.''

"A trend of decreasing ASD risk as mothers consumed greater daily folic acid intake from foods, vitamins, and supplements in the first month of pregnancy was also reported."

Over the past 5 years, progress has been made toward developing tools and practices for more effective screening and early diagnosis—and I am pleased that the Committee reports includes language that will ensure federal agencies pay particular attention to the need to focus on early diagnosis and intervention in children.

While biological differences in individuals with ASD were hypothesized earlier, there is now "data demonstrating specific changes in the genome and epigenome, gene expression, cell structure and function, brain connectivity, and behavior that have been linked to the causes and underlying biology of ASD."

I mentioned Bobbie and Billy Gallagher's children earlier because they represent a generation of young men and women who are aging out—both are now over 21 years old, which means far too much of their support system no longer exists.

Mr. Speaker, every year 50,000 young people on the autism spectrum matriculate to adulthood.

Jonathan Kratchman, a 16-year-old with Asperger's from New Jersey, was the keynote speaker at a "Dare To Dream Conference" at Mercer County Community College last year, where he stated: "I know I can be a great contributor to society when I graduate. However, I need continuing support to get there... Here is a fast fact. If you take your high school diploma at age 18, you automatically lose services from your school district."

Both individuals with autism, like Jonathan, and their parents find themselves confronted with almost unimaginable challenges including loss of school instruction, housing and job needs. We are in the midst of huge yet largely invisible crisis that begs serious focus and remedies.

The Autism CARES Act tasks multiple federal agencies to comprehensively study and report back to Congress on the special needs of autistic young adults and transitioning youth.

While studies show that young adults with autism appear to fare worse in employment outcomes—including when compared to young adults with other types of disabilities—there is evidence that with specialized support programs employment is feasible even among individuals with higher support needs.

I'm planning a congressional hearing next month in my global health committee on employers like software giant SAP which has actively recruited and hired over 700 young adults on the autism spectrum and recently told me these diligent young employees are extraordinarily effective workers.

Well planned transition programs will not only assist families and help shape a brighter future for individuals with ASD, they are also a smart investment that will reduce government spending in the long-term. The University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities recently estimated that: "Diverting just one young person into living-wage employment could save an average of $150,000 in SSI benefits over their lifetime. According to the Social Security Administration, transitioning just one half of one percent of current SSDI and SSI beneficiaries from benefits to self-sustaining employment would save $3.5 billion in cash benefits over the work-life of those individuals."

IACC recently concluded that since 2009, the adult services research field has made some important advances, including gathering of new data on the services available across the states, information about how adults are interacting with the service system, and data on the service needs of adults on the autism spectrum.

But in light of the severity of the aging out crisis, we must do more and do it fast and ensure we are providing a comprehensive and thorough review of available services—and those that need to be established. Additionally, Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS are in the process of requesting a comprehensive autism aging-out GAO report that will include key stakeholder involvement.

We are making real progress, but we still don't have all the answers.

Specifically, the Autism Cares Act of 2014 authorizes funding for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 at $22 million for the CDC, $48 million for the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) and $190 million for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and IACC activities—for a total of $1.3 billion.

I especially want to thank Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR, Chairman FRED UPTON and former Chairman HENRY WAXMAN as well as Chairman JOE PITTS—all strong and committed friends of persons with autism—for their critical support of this legislation.

Special thanks to my friend MIKE DOYLE. Since 2000, MIKE and I have co-chaired the 91 member congressional autism caucus—the Coalition on Autism Research and Education (CARE).

I am very grateful to the many excellent, professional staff who played key roles in helping move the bill and negotiate text including Gary Andres, Cheryl Jaeger, Brenda Destro, Jean Roehrenbeck, Katie Novaria, Cate Benedetti and of course Neil Bradley.

I also want to express my deep appreciation for the extraordinary contributions made by Autism Speaks, the Autism Society, the Association of University Centers on Disabilities and the American Academy of Pediatrics—all of whom strongly endorse H.R. 4631.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill today is an investment in a very important group of people who, along with their families, caregivers and friends, face seemingly endless challenges and struggles. I urge support.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Mr. GREEN, for yielding and for your support of the Autism CARES Act.

First off, I want to thank my good friend and Autism Caucus cochair CHRIS SMITH for his leadership and work on this critical legislation over the past 11 years. It has been a real pleasure and a labor of love to work with CHRIS on these issues. He is truly a champion in the autism community. I look forward to continuing that great working relationship with him.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that every time new data is released on autism spectrum disorders, the numbers become more and more troubling. In fact, the Centers for Disease Control's most recent data show a continued rise in autism prevalence rates: 1 in every 68 American children. That is 1 in 189 girls and 1 in 42 boys.

These are staggering numbers with serious implications for many aspects of American life. That is why passage of the Autism CARES Act today is so important: to continue research into the causes of autism, to educate health care providers and the public, to improve early diagnosis and intervention, to identify effective treatments, and to evaluate the types of services available to young adults with ASD. We can and must do better for the millions of Americans living with ASD and their families.

Many Federal autism programs were first authorized by the Combating Autism Act of 2006, which has made a huge difference in the lives of autistic Americans and their families. Since its inception, Congress has reauthorized these Federal autism programs twice. Without new legislation to reauthorize them, the funding for these important programs will expire on September 30 of this year.

We have made tremendous advances in understanding autism spectrum disorders, but this progress will be lost if Congress allows these programs to expire. This is why it is so important that Congress pass this commonsense, bipartisan, bicameral legislation like the bill that is before us today.

The autism programs this legislation would reauthorize are vitally important to many families and individuals across the country. Early diagnosis and intervention can make a huge difference in an autistic individual's life and can have a dramatic impact on the individual's family and community as well.

With the prevalence of autism spectrum disorders much higher than we thought just a few years ago, inaction is simply not an option.

I urge my colleagues to support the Autism CARES legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valued member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4631, the Autism CARES Act, of which I am an original cosponsor. I want to commend a sponsor, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, as well as a Democratic prime cosponsor, Mr. MIKE DOYLE from the great State of Pennsylvania, for sponsoring this bill.

Autism is serious and it does not discriminate. People in all racial, socioeconomic, and ethnic groups are impacted, Mr. Speaker. Autism awareness and research is something people from all walks of life can support.

One in 68 children is diagnosed with autism. That is a disturbing statistic. This legislation will help direct autism research on a Federal level. This research is vital, and I am glad my colleagues and I have come together in a

bipartisan manner to continue autism research, early identification, intervention, and education.

I am proud to support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support final passage of this legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), my good friend and desk mate on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for yielding me the time. I want to thank my good friend, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey. I have so much respect for his hard work in doing this. Anyone who knows Chris knows that when he wants something done, he is tenacious. MIKE DOYLE has been his really good partner. We all take pride in this legislation.

I rise to support the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act, or the Autism CARES Act. I am pleased that we have an opportunity to pass this today.

Autism, as my colleagues have said, affects more than 2 million individuals and their families across our country. The rate of diagnosis has climbed dramatically in recent years. Today, 1 out of every 68 American children is diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder by the age of 8. That is really shocking. These individuals and their families are counting on us to pass this bill.

The Autism CARES Act will extend and strengthen the efforts we established under the Combating Autism Act of 2006 and the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act of 2011. I was proud to support both of these bills on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, and the full House. I am pleased to see that this legislation will give our autism programs the continued support they deserve.

With this bill, we will extend Federal autism programs for another 5 years, including vital autism research and prevalence monitoring, as well as training for medical professionals. This bill will also provide valuable updates to the law. It will increase coordination across Federal agencies and improve our understanding of the issues youth and young adults face as they transition out of school-based services.

These changes will advance our understanding of autism spectrum disorder and allow us to better assist the millions of Americans it impacts.

The programs provided for this in bill have traditionally enjoyed strong bipartisan support in the Energy and Commerce Committee. It enjoyed strong bipartisan support, as I guess it will as well here, because this is a strong bipartisan issue.

So I urge my colleagues to continue this commitment by voting for the Autism CARES Act today.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), one of our distinguished leaders.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One in 68 is diagnosed with autism, Mr. Speaker, and we have an opportunity to come alongside those families that are dealing with this diagnosis by supporting the Autism CARES Act. It is a holistic approach, one that takes on research, education, early detection, and intervention for those all across the autism spectrum.

There are so many times that we can get into dollars and cents and chapter and verse and future savings in all of these things, but think about it. Beyond all of that is something that is much more important, and it is this: we can be a part of helping children reach their potential as adults. It is the desire of every parent to see their child reach full potential. So we can do that by coming together with this legislation. Think about the joy that is involved in that.

I am pleased to associate myself with the work of Congressman SMITH in this effort and to be a cosponsor of the Autism CARES Act.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support this very important bipartisan legislation. I urge all Members to do so, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4631, the Autism CARES Act, which reauthorizes the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act. I want to commend my colleague, Representative CHRIS SMITH, for bringing this measure forward.

Our understanding of autism remains an unsolved puzzle. More children than ever are being diagnosed with communication and behavior disorders that lead to a diagnosis of autism.

Though our understanding of autism is limited, what we do know is that autism affects too many children, strains families, costs too much, and puts those it afflicts at an educational, professional, and social disadvantage compared to their peers.

Families with autistic children do everything they can to help their kids maximize their God-given abilities whatever those may be. But it's not always easy especially in a world where many don't understand the unique challenges autism presents. Helping these families better navigate this treacherous world would make a huge difference.

The Autism CARES Act provides federal support for critical autism research by reauthorizing research programs at the National Institute of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Department of Health and Human Services. The bill will help better coordinate federal autism research and ensure more focused efforts to maximize the benefits of the resources we invest in such research.

This bill also will begin efforts to determine how best to meet the needs of young adults with autism as they face the new challenges that come with being an adult.

These investments are extremely important because autism imposes tremendous emotional and financial costs on families and economic impact on the health care system. The investments called for by this bill will pale in comparison to the personal and financial benefits they will yield in the future.

Families struggling with autism face challenges many of us can't imagine. They need and deserve our help. It is time to commit ourselves to solving this puzzle today so autism can be prevented, treated, and cured tomorrow.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4631, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAUMA SYSTEMS AND REGIONALIZATION OF EMERGENCY CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4080) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4080

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 ''Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN TRAUMA CARE PROGRAMS.

Section 1232(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–32(a)) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO CERTAIN TRAUMA CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR REGIONALIZED SYSTEMS FOR EMERGENCY CARE RESPONSE.—Section 1232(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–32(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(3) for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2014, not more than 50 percent of such amounts remaining for such fiscal year after application of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be allocated for the purpose of carrying out section 1204.''.

(b) CLARIFICATIONS UNDER TRAUMA SYSTEMS FORMULA GRANTS REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE AMERICAN BURN ASSOCIATION.—Section 1213 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–13) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting ''and (for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2014) contains national standards and requirements of the American Burn Association for the designation of verified burn centers,'' after ''such entity,'';

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(A), by striking ''and the American Academy of Pediatrics,'' and

inserting ''the American Academy of Pediatrics, and (for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2014) the American Burn Association,''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act'' after ''Act of 2007''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and the American Academy of Pediatrics'' and inserting ''the American Academy of Pediatrics, and (with respect to the update pursuant to the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act) the American Burn Association''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Part B of title XII of the Public Health Service Act is amended—

(1) in section 1218(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 300d–18(c)(2)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''1232(b)(3)'' and inserting ''section 1232(b)''; and

(2) in section 1222 (42 U.S.C. 300d–22), by striking ''October 1, 2008'' and inserting ''October 1, 2016''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support of H.R. 4080, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, introduced by Representative MICHAEL BURGESS.

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act by reauthorizing two important grant programs: the Trauma Care Systems Planning Grants and the Regionalization of Emergency Care Systems.

The first program supports State and rural development of trauma systems and the second funds pilot projects to design, implement, and evaluate innovative models of regionalized emergency care.

We know that immediate access to trauma care within the golden hour after injury is critical. By improving access to the specialized care designed to treat trauma injuries, both of these trauma bills will save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4080, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act. I am proud to be the lead Democratic sponsor on this important bill with my colleague from Texas, Dr. BURGESS. I want to thank him for his leadership and commitment to this issue.

This bill reauthorizes the programs that provide grants to States for planning, implementing, and developing trauma care systems, and establishes pilot projects that design innovative models of emergency care systems.

Ideally, trauma and emergency care systems respond quickly and efficiently to ensure that the seriously injured individuals receive the care they need within that golden hour—the time period when medical intervention is most effective at saving lives.

However, unintentional injury remains the leading cause of death for Americans aged 44 years and younger, and access to trauma centers is inconsistent throughout the country. In fact, 45 million Americans lack access to a trauma care center within that golden hour, which is the first hour after the injury.

Emergency departments and trauma centers are overcrowded, the emergency care system is splintered, and surgical specialists are often unavailable to patients who need them. This legislation helps establish the systems that save lives and improve the functioning of our trauma care systems.

Again, I want to thank Representative BURGESS for championing this effort with me. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Ranking Member PALLONE, and the work of the committee's staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee and bringing it to the floor today.

I support this bipartisan and I urge my colleagues to do the same, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, the distinguished vice chairman of the Health Subcommittee, who has been a real champion on this issue and is the prime sponsor of the bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, trauma is the leading cause of death for people under the age of 65. It is expensive, costing nearly $403 billion a year, third only to heart disease and cancer. It affects individuals of all ages, 35 million times each year, or one person every 15 minutes.

□ 1845

H.R. 4080 reauthorizes two existing, bipartisan grant programs that support the regionalization of emergency care and trauma systems across the country.

Trauma systems deliver a full range of care to injured patients. Most Members of the House have trauma systems either in their districts or nearby that are able to serve their constituents.

This bill is supported by the American Association of Neurological Surgeons, the American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons, the American Burn Association, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the American College of Surgeons, the Emergency Nurses Association, the American Trauma Society, the Congress of Neurological Surgeons, and the Trauma Center Association of America.

A study released in April found that patients living near a recently closed trauma facility were 21 percent more likely to die from their injuries. Two years after closure, the likelihood of death increased to 29 percent, emphasizing the importance of these grants.

This legislation passed out of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health by a voice vote and passed the full committee on April 3 unanimously. This legislation is broadly supported by medicine. It is bipartisan, and it has gone through regular order.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS as well as Ranking Members Waxman and Pallone, and the Energy and Commerce staffs on both sides of the dais: Clay Alspach, Robert Horne, Brenda DeStro, Katie Novaria, as well as Anne Morris Reid.

Mr. GREEN and I have worked on this issue for years, and I appreciate his continued partnership on the bill. I also want to thank his staff, Kristen O'Neill.

Finally, from my office, I want to thank Adrianna Simonelli and JP Paluskiewicz, who shepherded the bill through the process.

I urge all Members to vote in favor of this legislation. It is important for all of our districts.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise today in strong support of H.R. 4080, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act.

I would especially like to thank Dr. BURGESS of Texas and Representative GENE GREEN of Texas for introducing this very important, critical piece of legislation.

As has been mentioned, the leading cause of death for people under the age of 45 is trauma. It is, unfortunately, something a majority of States is not adequately prepared to handle. According to the CDC, trauma kills more Americans than AIDS and strokes combined. The Nation needs a robust network to respond quickly and efficiently to get seriously injured individuals to the appropriate trauma center within that golden hour that has been much discussed, which is the time period when medical intervention is the most effective in saving lives and in saving function.

H.R. 4080, if enacted, will allow for the development of innovative State and regionalized care, which is necessary to prevent these trauma deaths.

The bill would also direct States to update their model trauma care plans with the input of stakeholders. When the difference between life and death rests on the ability to deliver coordinated trauma care within the golden hour, we need legislation in place, such as H.R. 4080, in order to improve the delivery of emergency medical care to severely injured patients.

While we are at it, at some point, we should deal with the issue of liability reform for trauma centers because we need on-call specialists to deliver that care when we most need it, but that is a fight for another day. Today, let's get H.R. 4080 done.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation that was introduced by Dr. BURGESS and Mr. GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in closing, as a cosponsor of this bill and in working with my colleague Dr. BURGESS for a number of years on trauma care, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Again, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4080 is another very important and bipartisan bill, and I urge all of the Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4080, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING TRAUMA CARE ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3548) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3548

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 ''Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. TRAUMA DEFINITION.

(a) REVISED DEFINITION UNDER TRAUMA SYSTEMS GRANTS PROGRAMS.—Paragraph (4) of section 1231 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–31) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) TRAUMA.—The term 'trauma' means an injury resulting from exposure to—

''(A) a mechanical force; or

''(B) another extrinsic agent, including an extrinsic agent that is thermal, electrical, chemical, or radioactive.''.

(b) REVISED DEFINITION UNDER INTERAGENCY PROGRAM FOR TRAUMA RESEARCH.—Paragraph (3) of section 1261(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–61(h)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) The term 'trauma' means an injury resulting from exposure to—

''(A) a mechanical force; or

''(B) another extrinsic agent, including an extrinsic agent that is thermal, electrical, chemical, or radioactive.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 3548, the Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014, introduced by Congressman BILL JOHNSON of Ohio.

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act by expanding the current definition of ''trauma'' to include an injury resulting from exposure to thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other agents.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3548, the Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014.

This legislation amends the definition of the word ''trauma'' for the purpose of trauma care grants authorized in title XII of the Public Health Service Act to include burns and other injuries resulting from electrical, chemical, or other exposures.

Strengthening our Nation's trauma care services is an important priority on which I hope to continue to work with Members on both sides of the aisle to address.

I want to thank Congressman JOHNSON for his sponsorship of this legislation, and I want to acknowledge the work of our committee—Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Ranking Member PALLONE—and of all the staff in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3548, the Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014, bipartisan legislation I am proud to have sponsored with the support and counsel of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I commend the committee staff for their hard work to move this legislation forward through markup at the subcommittee and full committee levels and to steer it to the House floor today.

This simple but important bill seeks to refine inconsistent definitions of what constitutes ''trauma'' as outlined in the United States Code.

Common sense would certainly point to many burn injuries as a type of trauma, but the U.S. Code doesn't recognizes them as such. The failure to incorporate the full range of traumatic injuries in the description of ''trauma,'' including burns, can result in gaps in coverage and in provisions of care throughout the care system. By modernizing this term as federally defined, Congress can ensure that it accurately reflects the medical realities of trauma and protects access to the provision of trauma care.

There are important gains to be made in the field of traumatic medicine by the further integration of care and by finding synergies between burn and trauma centers. This has been all too evident in efforts to save lives after national tragedies, such as 9/11 and the Boston Marathon bombing. The importance of strengthening our Nation's burn care infrastructure can't be stressed enough. Inadequacy and inconsistency in the U.S. Code around the classification of burns further compound serious shortfalls in our Nation's traumatic emergency medical care system.

Traumatic injury is the leading cause of death for those under age 44, but getting a victim of trauma to a level 1 or 2 trauma center within the first golden hour can make all of the difference. However, 45 million Americans do not have access to a level 1 or 2 trauma center within an hour's travel.

I applaud the efforts of my colleague Dr. BURGESS to reauthorize trauma programs and improve this system with his bill H.R. 4080, which I am also proud to support. I thank him for his endorsement of H.R. 3548, and I am grateful for his efforts to improve trauma care more broadly.

In addition, this legislation has the strong support of a broad coalition of the major medical societies and associations representing the trauma care community, including: the American Burn Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma, the American Trauma Society, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the Trauma Center Association of America, and America's Essential Hospitals.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS for their hard work in promoting the Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014.

I hope my colleagues will support this commonsense legislation that prevents gaps in coverage and improves the provision of trauma care, and I strongly encourage a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I

urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3548.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I also urge Members to support this commonsense legislation, bipartisanly supported.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3548, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1281) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1281

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Improved newborn and child screening and followup for heritable disorders.
Sec. 3. Evaluating the effectiveness of newborn and child screening and followup programs.
Sec. 4. Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children.
Sec. 5. Clearinghouse of Newborn Screening Information.
Sec. 6. Laboratory quality and surveillance.
Sec. 7. Interagency Coordinating Committee on Newborn and Child Screening.
Sec. 8. National contingency plan for newborn screening.
Sec. 9. Hunter Kelly Research Program.
Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 11. Reports to Congress.

SEC. 2. IMPROVED NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING AND FOLLOWUP FOR HERITABLE DISORDERS.

Section 1109 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

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

(i) by striking ''subsection (j)'' and inserting ''section 1117''; and

(ii) by striking ''and in consultation with the Advisory Committee'' and inserting ''and taking into consideration the expertise of the Advisory Committee'';

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) to assist in providing health care professionals and newborn screening laboratory personnel with education in newborn screening, counseling, and training in—

''(A) relevant and new technologies in newborn screening and congenital, genetic, and metabolic disorders;

''(B) the importance of the timeliness of collection, delivery, receipt, and screening of specimens; and

''(C) sharing of medical and diagnostic information with providers and families;'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''treatment'' and inserting ''followup and treatment''; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) to improve the timeliness of—

''(A) the collection, delivery, receipt, and screening of specimens; and

''(B) the diagnosis of heritable disorders in newborns.'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''application submitted for a grant under subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''application for a grant under this section'';

(3) in subsection (h), by striking ''application submitted under subsection (c)(2)'' each place it appears and inserting ''application for a grant under this section''; and

(4) by striking subsection (j) (relating to authorization of appropriations).

SEC. 3. EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING AND FOLLOWUP PROGRAMS.

Section 1110 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–9) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND FOLLOWUP**'' after ''**CHILD SCREENING**'';*

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''of screening,'' and inserting '', including with respect to timeliness, of screening, followup,'';

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''counseling, testing'' and inserting ''treatment, counseling, testing, followup,''; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including, as appropriate, through the assessment of health and development outcomes for such children through adolescence'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''counseling, testing'' and inserting ''treatment, counseling, testing, followup,'';

(ii) by inserting ''in a timely manner'' after ''in newborns and children''; and

(iii) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) methods that may be identified to improve quality in the diagnosis, treatment, and disease management of heritable disorders based on gaps in services or care; or

''(5) methods or best practices by which the eligible entities described in section 1109 can achieve in a timely manner—

''(A) collection, delivery, receipt, and screening of newborn screening specimens; and

''(B) diagnosis of heritable disorders in newborns.''; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) (relating to authorization of appropriations).

SEC. 4. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITABLE DISORDERS IN NEWBORNS AND CHILDREN.

Section 1111 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–10) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (6) through (8), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3), the following:

''(4) provide technical assistance, as appropriate, to individuals and organizations regarding the submission of nominations to the uniform screening panel, including prior to the submission of such nominations;

''(5) take appropriate steps, at its discretion, to prepare for the review of nominations prior to their submission, including for conditions for which a screening method has been validated but other nomination criteria are not yet met, in order to facilitate timely action by the Advisory Committee once such submission has been received by the Committee;'';

(C) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by inserting '', including the cost'' after ''public health impact''; and

(D) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''achieve rapid diagnosis'' and inserting ''achieve best practices in rapid diagnosis and appropriate treatment'';

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting before the semicolon '', including information on cost and incidence'';

(iii) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iv) in subparagraph (K), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(L) the timeliness of collection, delivery, receipt, and screening of specimens to be tested for heritable disorders in newborns in order to ensure rapid diagnosis and followup.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''180'' and inserting ''120''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ''If the Secretary is unable to make a determination to adopt or reject such recommendation within such 120-day period, the Secretary shall notify the Advisory Committee and the appropriate committees of Congress of such determination together with an explanation for why the Secretary was unable to comply within such 120-day period, as well as a plan of action for consideration of such pending recommendation.'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) DEADLINE FOR REVIEW.—For each condition nominated to be added to the recommended uniform screening panel in accordance with the requirements of this section, the Advisory Committee shall review and vote on the nominated condition within 9 months of the date on which the Advisory Committee referred the nominated condition to the condition review workgroup.'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively;

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

''(f) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall meet at least 4 times each calendar year, or at the discretion of the Designated Federal Officer in consultation with the Chair.'';

(5) by amending subsection (g) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

''(g) CONTINUATION OF OPERATION OF COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Advisory Committee shall continue to operate through the end of fiscal year 2019.

''(2) CONTINUATION IF NOT REAUTHORIZED.—If at the end of fiscal year 2019 the duration of the Advisory Committee has not been extended by statute, the Advisory Committee may be deemed, for purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, an advisory committee established by the President or an officer of the Federal Government under section 9(a) of such Act.''; and

(6) by striking subsection (h) (relating to authorization of appropriations), as redesignated by paragraph (3).

SEC. 5. CLEARINGHOUSE OF NEWBORN SCREENING INFORMATION.

Section 1112 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–11) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''data'' and inserting ''information''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

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

''(4) maintain current information on the number of conditions for which screening is conducted in each State; and

''(5) disseminate available evidence-based guidelines related to diagnosis, counseling, and treatment with respect to conditions detected by newborn screening.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(4)(D), by striking ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2008'' and inserting ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''developing the clearinghouse'' and inserting ''carrying out activities''; and

(B) by striking ''clearinghouse minimizes duplication and supplements, not supplants'' and inserting ''activities minimize duplication and supplement, not supplant''; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) (relating to authorization of appropriations).

SEC. 6. LABORATORY QUALITY AND SURVEILLANCE.

Section 1113 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–12) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND SURVEILLANCE**'' before the period;*

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''and in consultation with the Advisory Committee'' and inserting ''and taking into consideration the expertise of the Advisory Committee''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''timeliness for processing such tests,'' after ''newborn-screening tests,''; and

(3) by striking subsection (b) (relating to authorization of appropriations) and inserting the following:

''(b) SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and taking into consideration the expertise of the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children established under section 1111, may provide, as appropriate, for the coordination of surveillance activities, including—

''(1) through standardized data collection and reporting, as well as the use of electronic health records; and

''(2) by promoting data sharing regarding newborn screening with State-based birth defects and developmental disabilities monitoring programs.''.

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING.

Section 1114 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–13) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''the Administrator, the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality,'' and inserting ''the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs,''; and

(2) by striking subsection (e) (relating to authorization of appropriations).

SEC. 8. NATIONAL CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR NEWBORN SCREENING.

Section 1115(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–14(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''consortia'' and inserting ''consortium''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''The plan shall be updated as needed and at least every five years.''.

SEC. 9. HUNTER KELLY RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 1116 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) providing research findings and data for newborn conditions under review by the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children to be added to the recommended uniform screening panel;

''(D) conducting pilot studies on conditions recommended by the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children to ensure that screenings are ready for nationwide implementation; and''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''of the National Institutes of Health Reform Act of 2006''.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Part A of title XI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end, the following:

''SEC. 1117. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEWBORN SCREENING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

''There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) to carry out sections 1109, 1110, 1111, and 1112, $11,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019; and

''(2) to carry out section 1113, $8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''.

SEC. 11. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) GAO REPORT ON TIMELINESS OF NEWBORN SCREENING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives concerning the timeliness of screening for heritable disorders in newborns.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An analysis of information regarding the timeliness of newborn screening, which may include the time elapsed from birth to specimen collection, specimen collection to receipt by laboratory, specimen receipt to reporting, reporting to followup testing, and followup testing to confirmed diagnosis.

(B) A summary of any guidelines, recommendations, or best practices available to States and health care providers intended to support a timely newborn screening system.

(C) An analysis of any barriers to maintaining a timely newborn screening system which may exist and recommendations for addressing such barriers.

(b) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on activities related to—

(i) newborn screening; and

(ii) screening children who have or are at risk for heritable disorders; and

(B) not less than every 2 years, submit to such committees an updated version of such report.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under this subsection shall contain a description of—

(A) the ongoing activities under sections 1109, 1110, and 1112 through 1115 of the Public Health Service Act; and

(B) the amounts expended on such activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1281, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014, introduced by Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD of California and Representative MIKE SIMPSON of Idaho, which now includes 120 cosponsors.

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act to extend and revise a grant program for screening, counseling, and other services related to genetic disorders. H.R. 1281 reauthorizes Federal programs that provide assistance to States to improve and expand their newborn screening programs, support parent and provider education, and ensure laboratory quality and surveillance.

Newborn screening is an important public health program for testing every newborn for certain conditions not apparent at birth. This early screening and diagnosis can be life changing for these children and their families. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1281, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Newborn screening is conducted for a number of genetic, metabolic, hormonal, and functional conditions that may not be apparent at birth. Approximately one in every 300 newborns has a condition that can be detected through screening. If diagnosed early, many of these disorders can be managed successfully.

H.R. 1281 reauthorizes the Department of Health and Human Services' Advisory Committee that recommends conditions to be included in the uniform screening panel; allows the Advisory Committee to begin the consideration of certain new conditions more quickly; and requires the Secretary of HHS to make determinations on the committee's recommendations in a shorter period of time.

The bill also extends support for State programs involving screening, counseling, education, and other services; demonstration programs to evaluate the effectiveness of services; and a clearinghouse of resources related to newborn screening.

This legislation puts a new emphasis on the timeliness of newborn screening in all of these activities, and it requires the GAO to report to Congress on this issue.

I want to thank the sponsors of this legislation, Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD and Congressman SIMPSON; the

sponsors of the Senate companion legislation, Senators HAGAN and HATCH; and the leaders on the Energy and Commerce Committee and on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, for their work on this bill.

I support H.R. 1281, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD, for her leadership on this important issue.

I come to the House floor tonight to speak in support of H.R. 1281, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act, which I am proud to cosponsor.

For the last 50 years, newborn screening services have played an important role for families across the country. Screening for developmental disabilities or diseases at birth can identify treatable diseases early and give a child the opportunity to live a healthy life.

I also want to take a moment to thank a leading advocate for newborn screening, Buffalo Bills Hall of Fame Quarterback Jim Kelly, who is from New York's 27th District.

In 1997, Jim and his wife, Jill, founded Hunter's Hope Foundation shortly after their son Hunter was diagnosed with Krabbe disease. Krabbe disease is fatal when left untreated and, tragically, cut Hunter's life short.

With universal newborn screening, the story of Hunter Kelly and countless others with developmental diseases could have been different.

I urge the House to reauthorize this vital program today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to my colleague from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD). We came in at the same time in 1993.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act. I introduced this bill to help ensure our babies continuing receiving lifesaving newborn screenings.

I extend my sincere thanks to my lead cosponsor, Congressman MICHAEL SIMPSON, for his support and his long history of championing newborn screening services.

I thank Senators KAY HAGAN and ORRIN HATCH for introducing the Senate companion bill, which passed by unanimous consent in January of this year.

I also thank the coalition of public health groups—especially the March of Dimes and the Association of Public Health Laboratories—for working with my office over the last 10 years on this critical issue.

Lastly, I would be remiss if I did not mention Debbie Jessup of my staff, for her outstanding management of my bill, and the work of two exceptional public health fellows, Arianna Baseman and Daphne Delgado, who provided strong leadership in moving the bill forward.

Newborn screening is a public health intervention that involves giving babies a simple blood test to identify many life-threatening genetic and metabolic illnesses before symptoms begin. Newborn screening is one of the great public health success stories of the 20th century.

Prior to the enactment of the original Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act in 2008, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required infants to be screened for a complete panel of recommended disorders, and there was no Federal repository of information on the diseases.

Today, 44 States and the District of Columbia require screening of at least 29 of the 31 core treatable conditions. Today, professionals and parents have centralized access to newborn screening information when their baby is diagnosed with one of these disorders.

Since the passage of the original bill, newborn screenings have improved, and new screenings have been added. These screenings are critical for the approximately 12,000 babies who, each year, test positive for one of these treatable diseases.

Fifty years ago, before newborn screening tests were developed, the conditions of these babies would have gone undetected until symptoms appeared. As a result, they would have unnecessarily died or suffered from their lifelong disabling disorder.

Today, because of newborn screening, they have an opportunity and they have hope for a relatively normal life.

The ability to rapidly identify and treat these disorders is making a difference between health and disability—and even life or death—for the children affected by these severe diseases. Unfortunately, critical gaps and challenges still remain.

Due to existing discrepancies in the number of tests given from State to State, each year, approximately 1,000 infants tragically die or are permanently disabled from otherwise treatable disorders.

The passage of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will help avoid these preventable tragedies by providing States with the resources they need to improve their newborn screening programs and to uniformly test for all recommended disorders.

It also provides States with assistance in developing followup and tracking programs. These provisions will help our financially burdened health care system by saving billions of dollars over the life of these children.

In addition, this bill renews the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders and requires the CDC to ensure the quality of laboratories involved in newborn screening.

The bill also continues the Hunter Kelly Newborn Screening Program, which helps NIH researchers develop better detection, prevention, and treatment strategies.

Mr. Speaker, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will continue to help parents and health providers to be knowledgeable about the importance of newborn screening tests, and it will help ensure all our newborn babies receive the comprehensive and consistent testing they need to have healthy, happy, and productive lives.

Where a baby is born should not determine its chance to have a healthy future.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the passage of H.R. 1281.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), one of the greatest champions that this Chamber has ever seen in the cause of human life, and I share that cause with him as well.

I thank the authors for their positive intentions on this bill. I am a mother of five biological children and 23 foster children, and that is what every parent and every mother and every father hopes, is to have the best possible health care for their children, the best possible outcome.

I do share concerns on this bill as well, as well intentioned as this is, and let me just list what my concerns are.

Number one, the Federal Government will have the ability to collect and automatically store the blood sample of every baby in the United States. There won't be any allowance for parental consent to be required before the storage of these blood samples are made.

Every baby's DNA, which is the entire genetic code of that baby, will be under the control of the government.

I have data privacy concerns. Why should anyone, especially our government, have everyone's identity at their disposal?

Third, there is no provision for any parent to opt out, so this legislation presumes that every parent of every newborn in the United States of America pre-agrees that the government can have their baby's blood sample, which contains their DNA code, and that the government can indefinitely store that data.

What limitations will there be on our government and what they can do with this information and how they will handle this data?

Now, Mr. Speaker, knowing that our government has the potential to control every American's health care under ObamaCare, how could government's control of a baby's DNA information impact the full access to health care or education opportunities or job opportunities for a child who is predetermined, by their DNA, to potentially have a problem later in life?

These are just a few of the questions, Mr. Speaker, that I believe need to be addressed.

I know this bill has passed the Senate. I know it will be voice-voted. I would like to ask for a rollcall vote, but I understand that the process is already deep on its way.

I do hope that these questions will be addressed in future legislation. It may not be done in this legislation. I hope it will be in the future because we should not be—Americans should not see the death of privacy, especially of the most sensitive private information that every American can have, their DNA, their genetic code, what God gave to them—that should be something that is between the individual, their doctor, and God; and it shouldn't be for the government to control that data.

I want to thank Mr. PITTS. I, in no way, cast any negative aspersion upon himself or any of the authors on this bill. These are just some of the questions that I have.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I urge support for the legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support, again, for this important and bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1281, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1098) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1098

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 ''Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. CDC PROGRAMS FOR PREVENTION AND SURVEILLANCE OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) PREVENTION.—Section 393B(b)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1c(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''health-status goals for 2010, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2010'' and inserting ''health-status goals for 2020, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2020''.

(b) SURVEILLANCE.—Subsection (b) of section 393C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1d) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) Not later than'' and inserting the following:

''(b) REPORTS.—

''(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SUBSEQUENT REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Director of the National Institutes of Health and in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to the relevant committees of Congress a report that—

''(A) identifies which recommendations in the report under paragraph (1) have been adopted and which recommendations in such report have not been adopted; and

''(B) includes a description of planned activities to address each recommendation in such report that has not been adopted.''.

(c) FUNDING.—Section 394A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–3) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' after ''1994,'';

(2) by striking the second period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''Of the amounts made available to carry out this part for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, there is authorized to be appropriated $6,100,000 to carry out sections 393B and 393C.''.

SEC. 3. STATE GRANTS FOR PROJECTS REGARDING TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 1252 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–52) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking '', acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration,'';

(2) in paragraphs (1)(A)(i) and (3)(E) of subsection (f), by striking ''brain injury'' and inserting ''traumatic brain injury'';

(3) in subsection (h), by striking the comma after ''under this section'' and inserting a comma before ''including''; and

(4) by amending subsection (j) to read as follows:

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For carrying out this section and section 1253, there is authorized to be appropriated $9,760,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''.

SEC. 4. STATE GRANTS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SERVICES.

Section 1253 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–53) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking '', acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration (referred to in this section as the 'Administrator'),'';

(2) in subsections (c), (d)(1), (e)(1), (e)(4), (g), (h), and (j)(1), by striking ''Administrator'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary'';

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting ''REPORTING'';

(B) by striking ''Each protection and advocacy system'' and inserting the following:

''(1) REPORTS BY SYSTEMS.—Each protection and advocacy system''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the services and activities carried out under this section during the period for which the report is being prepared.''.

(4) in subsection (i)—

(A) by striking ''Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration'' and inserting ''Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''by the Administrator'' and inserting ''by the Secretary'';

(5) in subsection (k), by striking ''subtitle C'' and inserting ''subtitle C of title I'';

(6) by striking subsection (l) (relating to authorization of appropriations); and

(7) by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (l).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1098, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act, introduced by Representative BILL PASCRELL of New Jersey, which will continue to provide the needed services that help patients with a traumatic brain injury, TBI.

More than 3.17 million Americans live with a disability that resulted from a TBI, including children and adults, athletes and soldiers.

The prevention and surveillance work done at the Centers for Disease Control keeps the public and providers aware of TBI research that leads to early diagnosis and treatment.

Research at the National Institutes of Health improves the understanding of TBI and identifies treatments that will improve lives. Programs available at the Health Resources and Services Administration help families to better care for their members who suffer from a TBI.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1098, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Traumatic brain injury, or TBI, is an unexpected blow or a jolt to the head. These injuries affect people of all ages. A soldier in a blast injury, an elderly person who has fallen, or a young driver involved in a car crash can experience TBI.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate more than 2 million Americans experience a traumatic brain injury each year.

The vast majority of these individuals have an injury that can be treated at a hospital emergency room, but not

all Americans are as fortunate. Their injuries can have more devastating consequences and may result in death or lasting disability.

The TBI program at the Department of Health and Human Services was first established in 1996 and has been reauthorized twice, in 2001 and, again, in 2008.

The legislation before the House today, once again, reauthorizes the TBI program. It would extend TBI surveillance and research activities. It will also extend programs for TBI services and support administered across Health and Human Services.

I want to commend the sponsors of the legislation, Congressman PASCRELL and Congressman ROONEY, and I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, and Ranking Member PALLONE and the work of our committee staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee and bringing it to the floor today.

I support this bipartisan bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

□ 1915

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman PASCRELL, my good friend and colleague.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the passage of this legislation, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN; Chairman PITTS; my friend from New Jersey, Ranking Member PALLONE; and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas for their thoughtful consideration and support for millions of traumatic brain injury survivors and their families. Additionally, I want to thank my fellow cochair of the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force, Congressman TOM ROONEY of Florida, for his leadership on this important issue as well.

Throughout my 13 years working on this issue, I have witnessed firsthand how these programs make a difference in people's lives.

You have heard the numbers, but let's go beyond the numbers. Traumatic brain injury has become the signature wound of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Twenty percent of our soldiers deployed are estimated to have experienced a brain injury. Many returning servicemembers suffering from TBI will receive care and rehabilitation services within the Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs.

But others suffering from TBIs that are initially undiagnosed or misdiagnosed will later look to the civilian community and local resources for information and service. That is why it is essential that we continue to foster civilian-military collaboration, like the Department of Defense Center of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury, to build a system that ensures returning troops receive what they need to put their lives back together again.

Unfortunately, TBI remains the silent epidemic in this country. That is why the legislation today is so critical.

The TBI Act is the only legislation that specifically allocates Federal funds for programs supporting individuals with brain injury.

Originally passed in 1996 and reauthorized in 2000 and 2008, the TBI Act represents a foundation for coordinated and balanced public policy on prevention, education, research, and community living for people living with TBI and their circles of support.

And it has produced results. For nearly 18 years, the Traumatic Brain Injury Act has successfully provided direction and legal authority for the vast traumatic brain injury community.

Grants within the TBI Act have helped States improve access to health and other services for persons with TBI. Prior to this law, they did not have the tools to even assess their own needs.

Thanks to the TBI Act and its directive to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, we now have a record of incidents, including details and prevalence, plans for prevention, and, finally, access to treatment. We have also begun to educate the public and provide much-needed scientific data for our scientists, health care providers, and policymakers.

Additionally, under this act, the National Institutes of Health is conducting basic and applied research in TBI, making great strides in our knowledge of the brain and the impact of TBI. Mr. Speaker, this is in direct correlation to the President's BRAIN Initiative. We keep on meeting together to explore this new horizon, which I think is going to dramatically have very positive consequences.

The Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014 will elevate the TBI program within Health and Human Services by moving the program from Maternal and Child Health's Children's Program, in acknowledgement of the impact of TBI across the age span, including older adults and returning servicemembers and veterans. Our intention is for the program to be relocated to the Administration on Community Living to better coordinate with Federal agencies regarding the long-term services and support available to individuals with other disabilities.

Brain injury survivors from all walks of life, and their families, look to community and local resources for all types of information and assistance. Regardless of the source of the injury, this legislation will ensure the framework, the information and research resources, are available to help.

Mr. Speaker, only a strong commitment will allow us to continue the incredible advances we have made in the area of basic brain injury: prevention, detection, early treatment, physical and mental rehabilitation, long-term care, and patient advocacy issues.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I urge support for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, this is another piece of important legislation, and it enjoys bipartisan support. I urge the Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1098, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1681

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations.
Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.
Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 202. CIARDS and FERS special retirement credit for service on detail to another agency.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.
Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.
Sec. 303. Specific authorization of funding for High Performance Computing Center 2.

Sec. 304. Clarification of exemption from Freedom of Information Act of identities of employees submitting complaints to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.
Sec. 305. Functional managers for the intelligence community.
Sec. 306. Annual assessment of intelligence community performance by function.
Sec. 307. Software licensing.
Sec. 308. Plans to respond to unauthorized public disclosures of covert actions.
Sec. 309. Auditability.
Sec. 310. Reports of fraud, waste, and abuse.
Sec. 311. Public Interest Declassification Board.
Sec. 312. Official representation items in support of the Coast Guard Attaché Program.
Sec. 313. Declassification review of certain items collected during the mission that killed Osama bin Laden on May 1, 2011.
Sec. 314. Merger of the Foreign Counterintelligence Program and the General Defense Intelligence Program.

Subtitle B—Reporting

Sec. 321. Significant interpretations of law concerning intelligence activities.
Sec. 322. Review for official publication of opinions of the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice concerning intelligence activities.
Sec. 323. Submittal to Congress by heads of elements of intelligence community of plans for orderly shutdown in event of absence of appropriations.
Sec. 324. Reports on chemical weapons in Syria.
Sec. 325. Reports to the intelligence community on penetrations of networks and information systems of certain contractors.
Sec. 326. Report on electronic waste.
Sec. 327. Promoting STEM education to meet the future workforce needs of the intelligence community.
Sec. 328. Repeal of the termination of notification requirements regarding the authorized disclosure of national intelligence.
Sec. 329. Repeal or modification of certain reporting requirements.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—National Security Agency

Sec. 401. Appointment of the Director of the National Security Agency.
Sec. 402. Appointment of the Inspector General of the National Security Agency.
Sec. 403. Effective date and applicability.

Subtitle B—National Reconnaissance Office

Sec. 411. Appointment of the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.
Sec. 412. Appointment of the Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office.
Sec. 413. Effective date and applicability.

Subtitle C—Central Intelligence Agency

Sec. 421. Gifts, devises, and bequests.

TITLE V—SECURITY CLEARANCE REFORM

Sec. 501. Continuous evaluation and sharing of derogatory information regarding personnel with access to classified information.
Sec. 502. Requirements for intelligence community contractors.
Sec. 503. Technology improvements to security clearance processing.
Sec. 504. Report on reciprocity of security clearances.
Sec. 505. Improving the periodic reinvestigation process.
Sec. 506. Appropriate committees of Congress defined.

TITLE VI—INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

Sec. 601. Protection of intelligence community whistleblowers.
Sec. 602. Review of security clearance or access determinations.
Sec. 603. Revisions of other laws.
Sec. 604. Policies and procedures; nonapplicability to certain terminations.

TITLE VII—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Sec. 701. Technical amendments to the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949.
Sec. 702. Technical amendments to the National Security Act of 1947 relating to the past elimination of certain positions.
Sec. 703. Technical amendments to the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means—

(A) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2014 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The Department of Defense.

(4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(5) The National Security Agency.

(6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(7) The Coast Guard.

(8) The Department of State.

(9) The Department of the Treasury.

(10) The Department of Energy.

(11) The Department of Justice.

(12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(14) The National Reconnaissance Office.

(15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

(16) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101 and, subject to section 103, the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2014, for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill S. 1681 of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY.—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President.

(2) DISTRIBUTION BY THE PRESIDENT.—Subject to paragraph (3), the President shall provide for suitable distribution of the classified Schedule of Authorizations, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

(3) LIMITS ON DISCLOSURE.—The President shall not publicly disclose the classified Schedule of Authorizations or any portion of such Schedule except—

(A) as provided in section 601(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 3306(a));

(B) to the extent necessary to implement the budget; or

(C) as otherwise required by law.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR INCREASES.—The Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2014 by the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed 3 percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such Schedule for such element.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish guidelines that govern, for each element of the intelligence community, the treatment under the personnel levels authorized under section 102(a), including any exemption from such personnel levels, of employment or assignment in—

(1) a student program, trainee program, or similar program;

(2) a reserve corps or as a reemployed annuitant; or

(3) details, joint duty, or long term, full-time training.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify the congressional intelligence committees in writing at least 15 days prior to each exercise of an authority described in subsection (a).

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2014 the sum of $528,229,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

(b) AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 855 positions as of September 30, 2014. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are

authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account for fiscal year 2014 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2014, there are authorized such additional personnel for the Community Management Account as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a).

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2014 the sum of $514,000,000.

SEC. 202. CIARDS AND FERS SPECIAL RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR SERVICE ON DETAIL TO ANOTHER AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(b) of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2013(b)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''service in the Agency performed'' and inserting ''service performed by an Agency employee''; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Agency activities'' and inserting ''intelligence activities''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applied to retired or deceased officers of the Central Intelligence Agency who were designated at any time under section 203 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2013) prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 303. SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FOR HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING CENTER 2.

Funds appropriated for the construction of the High Performance Computing Center 2 (HPCC 2), as described in the table entitled Consolidated Cryptologic Program (CCP) in the classified annex to accompany the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6; 127 Stat. 198), in excess of the amount specified for such activity in the tables in the classified annex prepared to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277; 126 Stat. 2468) shall be specifically authorized by Congress for the purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094).

SEC. 304. CLARIFICATION OF EXEMPTION FROM FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT OF IDENTITIES OF EMPLOYEES SUBMITTING COMPLAINTS TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 103H(g)(3)(A) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(g)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''undertaken;'' and inserting ''undertaken, and this provision shall qualify as a withholding statute pursuant to subsection (b)(3) of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act');''.

SEC. 305. FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS AUTHORIZED.—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 103I the following new section:

''SEC. 103J. FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

''(a) FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS AUTHORIZED.—The Director of National Intelligence may establish within the intelligence community one or more positions of manager of an intelligence function. Any position so established may be known as the 'Functional Manager' of the intelligence function concerned.

''(b) PERSONNEL.—The Director shall designate individuals to serve as manager of intelligence functions established under subsection (a) from among officers and employees of elements of the intelligence community.

''(c) DUTIES.—Each manager of an intelligence function established under subsection (a) shall have the duties as follows:

''(1) To act as principal advisor to the Director on the intelligence function.

''(2) To carry out such other responsibilities with respect to the intelligence function as the Director may specify for purposes of this section.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 103I the following new item:

''Sec. 103J. Functional managers for the intelligence community.''.

SEC. 306. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PERFORMANCE BY FUNCTION.

(a) ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS REQUIRED.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 506I the following new section:

''SEC. 506J. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PERFORMANCE BY FUNCTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2016, and each year thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall, in consultation with the Functional Managers, submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on covered intelligence functions during the preceding year.

''(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include for each covered intelligence function for the year covered by such report the following:

''(1) An identification of the capabilities, programs, and activities of such intelligence function, regardless of the element of the intelligence community that carried out such capabilities, programs, and activities.

''(2) A description of the investment and allocation of resources for such intelligence function, including an analysis of the allocation of resources within the context of the National Intelligence Strategy, priorities for recipients of resources, and areas of risk.

''(3) A description and assessment of the performance of such intelligence function.

''(4) An identification of any issues related to the application of technical interoperability standards in the capabilities, programs, and activities of such intelligence function.

''(5) An identification of the operational overlap or need for de-confliction, if any, within such intelligence function.

''(6) A description of any efforts to integrate such intelligence function with other intelligence disciplines as part of an integrated intelligence enterprise.

''(7) A description of any efforts to establish consistency in tradecraft and training within such intelligence function.

''(8) A description and assessment of developments in technology that bear on the future of such intelligence function.

''(9) Such other matters relating to such intelligence function as the Director may specify for purposes of this section.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'covered intelligence functions' means each intelligence function for which a Functional Manager has been established under section 103J during the year covered by a report under this section.

''(2) The term 'Functional Manager' means the manager of an intelligence function established under section 103J.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 506I the following new item:

''Sec. 506J. Annual assessment of intelligence community performance by function.''.

SEC. 307. SOFTWARE LICENSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 108 the following new section:

''SEC. 109. SOFTWARE LICENSING.

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR INVENTORIES OF SOFTWARE LICENSES.—The chief information officer of each element of the intelligence community, in consultation with the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community, shall biennially—

''(1) conduct an inventory of all existing software licenses of such element, including utilized and unutilized licenses;

''(2) assess the actions that could be carried out by such element to achieve the greatest possible economies of scale and associated cost savings in software procurement and usage; and

''(3) submit to the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community each inventory required by paragraph (1) and each assessment required by paragraph (2).

''(b) INVENTORIES BY THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community, based on the inventories and assessments required by subsection (a), shall biennially—

''(1) compile an inventory of all existing software licenses of the intelligence community, including utilized and unutilized licenses; and

''(2) assess the actions that could be carried out by the intelligence community to achieve the greatest possible economies of scale and associated cost savings in software procurement and usage.

''(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a copy of each inventory compiled under subsection (b)(1).''.

(b) INITIAL INVENTORY.—

(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELEMENTS.—

(A) DATE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the chief information officer of each element of the intelligence community shall complete the initial inventory, assessment, and submission required under section 109(a) of the

National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(B) BASIS.—The initial inventory conducted for each element of the intelligence community under section 109(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall be based on the inventory of software licenses conducted pursuant to section 305 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277; 126 Stat. 2472) for such element.

(2) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community shall complete the initial compilation and assessment required under section 109(b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a).

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended—

(1) by striking the second item relating to section 104 (relating to Annual national security strategy report); and

(2) inserting after the item relating to section 108 the following new item:

''Sec. 109. Software licensing.''.

SEC. 308. PLANS TO RESPOND TO UNAUTHORIZED PUBLIC DISCLOSURES OF COVERT ACTIONS.

Section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) For each type of activity undertaken as part of a covert action, the President shall establish in writing a plan to respond to the unauthorized public disclosure of that type of activity.''.

SEC. 309. AUDITABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 509. AUDITABILITY OF CERTAIN ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL AUDITS.—The head of each covered entity shall ensure that there is a full financial audit of such covered entity each year beginning with fiscal year 2014. Such audits may be conducted by an internal or external independent accounting or auditing organization.

''(b) REQUIREMENT FOR UNQUALIFIED OPINION.—Beginning as early as practicable, but in no event later than the audit required under subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, the head of each covered entity shall take all reasonable steps necessary to ensure that each audit required under subsection (a) contains an unqualified opinion on the financial statements of such covered entity for the fiscal year covered by such audit.

''(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The chief financial officer of each covered entity shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees an annual audit report from an accounting or auditing organization on each audit of the covered entity conducted pursuant to subsection (a).

''(d) COVERED ENTITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'covered entity' means the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 508 the following new item:

''Sec. 509. Auditability of certain elements of the intelligence community.''.

SEC. 310. REPORTS OF FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE.

Section 8H(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended in paragraph (1)—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) An employee of an element of the intelligence community, an employee assigned or detailed to an element of the intelligence community, or an employee of a contractor to the intelligence community, who intends to report to Congress a complaint or information with respect to an urgent concern may report such complaint or information to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.''; and

(3) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''Act or section 17'' and inserting ''Act, section 17''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or section 103H(k) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)).''.

SEC. 311. PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASSIFICATION BOARD.

Section 710(b) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–567; 50 U.S.C. 3161 note) is amended by striking ''2014.'' and inserting ''2018.''.

SEC. 312. OFFICIAL REPRESENTATION ITEMS IN SUPPORT OF THE COAST GUARD ATTACHÉ PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other limitation on the amount of funds that may be used for official representation items, the Secretary of Homeland Security may use funds made available to the Secretary through the National Intelligence Program for necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities for official representation items in support of the Coast Guard Attaché Program.

SEC. 313. DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW OF CERTAIN ITEMS COLLECTED DURING THE MISSION THAT KILLED OSAMA BIN LADEN ON MAY 1, 2011.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall—

(1) in the manner described in the classified annex to this Act—

(A) complete a declassification review of documents collected in Abbottabad, Pakistan, during the mission that killed Osama bin Laden on May 1, 2011; and

(B) make publicly available any information declassified as a result of the declassification review required under paragraph (1); and

(2) report to the congressional intelligence committees—

(A) the results of the declassification review required under paragraph (1); and

(B) a justification for not declassifying any information required to be included in such declassification review that remains classified.

SEC. 314. MERGER OF THE FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM AND THE GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of National Intelligence shall carry out the merger of the Foreign Counterintelligence Program into the General Defense Intelligence Program as directed in the classified annex to this Act. The merger shall go into effect no earlier than 30 days after written notification of the merger is provided to the congressional intelligence committees.

Subtitle B—Reporting

SEC. 321. SIGNIFICANT INTERPRETATIONS OF LAW CONCERNING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.), as added by section 309 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 510. SIGNIFICANT INTERPRETATIONS OF LAW CONCERNING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

''(a) NOTIFICATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c) and to the extent consistent with due regard for the protection from unauthorized disclosure of classified information relating to sensitive intelligence sources and methods or other exceptionally sensitive matters, the General Counsel of each element of the intelligence community shall notify the congressional intelligence committees, in writing, of any significant legal interpretation of the United States Constitution or Federal law affecting intelligence activities conducted by such element by not later than 30 days after the date of the commencement of any intelligence activity pursuant to such interpretation.

''(b) CONTENT.—Each notification under subsection (a) shall provide a summary of the significant legal interpretation and the intelligence activity or activities conducted pursuant to such interpretation.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—A notification under subsection (a) shall not be required for a significant legal interpretation if—

''(1) notice of the significant legal interpretation was previously provided to the congressional intelligence committees under subsection (a); or

''(2) the significant legal interpretation was made before the date of the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

''(d) LIMITED ACCESS FOR COVERT ACTION.—If the President determines that it is essential to limit access to a covert action finding under section 503(c)(2), the President may limit access to information concerning such finding that is subject to notification under this section to those members of Congress who have been granted access to the relevant finding under section 503(c)(2).''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 509, as so added, the following new item:

''Sec. 510. Significant interpretations of law concerning intelligence activities.''.

SEC. 322. REVIEW FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF OPINIONS OF THE OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CONCERNING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) PROCESS FOR REVIEW FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, establish a process for the regular review for official publication of significant opinions of the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice that have been provided to an element of the intelligence community.

(b) FACTORS.—The process of review of opinions established under subsection (a) shall include consideration of the following:

(1) The potential importance of an opinion to other agencies or officials in the Executive branch.

(2) The likelihood that similar questions addressed in an opinion may arise in the future.

(3) The historical importance of an opinion or the context in which it arose.

(4) The potential significance of an opinion to the overall jurisprudence of the Office of Legal Counsel.

(5) Such other factors as the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence consider appropriate.

(c) PRESUMPTION.—The process of review established under subsection (a) shall apply a presumption that significant opinions of the Office of Legal Counsel should be published when practicable, consistent with national security and other confidentiality considerations.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall require the official publication of any opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel, including publication under any circumstance as follows:

(1) When publication would reveal classified or other sensitive information relating to national security.

(2) When publication could reasonably be anticipated to interfere with Federal law enforcement efforts or is prohibited by law.

(3) When publication would conflict with preserving internal Executive branch deliberative processes or protecting other information properly subject to privilege.

(e) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE CLASSIFIED OPINIONS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that would have been selected for publication under the process of review established under subsection (a) but for the fact that publication would reveal classified or other sensitive information relating to national security shall be provided or made available to the appropriate committees of Congress.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR COVERT ACTION.—If the President determines that it is essential to limit access to a covert action finding under section 503(c)(2) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093(c)(2)), the President may limit access to information concerning such finding that would otherwise be provided or made available under this subsection to those members of Congress who have been granted access to such finding under such section 503(c)(2).

(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The determination whether an opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel is appropriate for official publication under the process of review established under subsection (a) is discretionary and is not subject to judicial review.

SEC. 323. SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS BY HEADS OF ELEMENTS OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY OF PLANS FOR ORDERLY SHUTDOWN IN EVENT OF ABSENCE OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the head of an applicable agency submits a plan to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in accordance with section 124 of Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11, pertaining to agency operations in the absence of appropriations, or any successor circular of the Office that requires the head of an applicable agency to submit to the Director a plan for an orderly shutdown in the event of the absence of appropriations, such head shall submit a copy of such plan to the following:

(1) The congressional intelligence committees.

(2) The Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(3) The Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(4) In the case of a plan for an element of the intelligence community that is within the Department of Defense, to—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(b) HEAD OF AN APPLICABLE AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''head of an applicable agency'' includes the following:

(1) The Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) Each head of each element of the intelligence community that is within the Department of Defense.

SEC. 324. REPORTS ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN SYRIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report on the Syrian chemical weapons program.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A comprehensive assessment of chemical weapon stockpiles in Syria, including names, types, and quantities of chemical weapons agents, types of munitions, and location and form of storage, production, and research and development facilities.

(2) A listing of key personnel associated with the Syrian chemical weapons program.

(3) An assessment of undeclared chemical weapons stockpiles, munitions, and facilities.

(4) An assessment of how these stockpiles, precursors, and delivery systems were obtained.

(5) A description of key intelligence gaps related to the Syrian chemical weapons program.

(6) An assessment of any denial and deception efforts on the part of the Syrian regime related to its chemical weapons program.

(c) PROGRESS REPORTS.—Every 90 days until the date that is 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a progress report providing any material updates to the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 325. REPORTS TO THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ON PENETRATIONS OF NETWORKS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS OF CERTAIN CONTRACTORS.

(a) PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING PENETRATIONS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish procedures that require each cleared intelligence contractor to report to an element of the intelligence community designated by the Director for purposes of such procedures when a network or information system of such contractor that meets the criteria established pursuant to subsection (b) is successfully penetrated.

(b) NETWORKS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUBJECT TO REPORTING.—The Director of National Intelligence shall, in consultation with appropriate officials, establish criteria for covered networks to be subject to the procedures for reporting system penetrations under subsection (a).

(c) PROCEDURE REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) RAPID REPORTING.—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall require each cleared intelligence contractor to rapidly report to an element of the intelligence community designated pursuant to subsection (a) of each successful penetration of the network or information systems of such contractor that meet the criteria established pursuant to subsection (b). Each such report shall include the following:

(A) A description of the technique or method used in such penetration.

(B) A sample of the malicious software, if discovered and isolated by the contractor, involved in such penetration.

(C) A summary of information created by or for such element in connection with any program of such element that has been potentially compromised due to such penetration.

(2) ACCESS TO EQUIPMENT AND INFORMATION BY INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PERSONNEL.—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(A) include mechanisms for intelligence community personnel to, upon request, obtain access to equipment or information of a cleared intelligence contractor necessary to conduct forensic analysis in addition to any analysis conducted by such contractor;

(B) provide that a cleared intelligence contractor is only required to provide access to equipment or information as described in subparagraph (A) to determine whether information created by or for an element of the intelligence community in connection with any intelligence community program was successfully exfiltrated from a network or information system of such contractor and, if so, what information was exfiltrated; and

(C) provide for the reasonable protection of trade secrets, commercial or financial information, and information that can be used to identify a specific person (other than the name of the suspected perpetrator of the penetration).

(3) LIMITATION ON DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall prohibit the dissemination outside the intelligence community of information obtained or derived through such procedures that is not created by or for the intelligence community except—

(A) with the approval of the contractor providing such information;

(B) to the congressional intelligence committees or the Subcommittees on Defense of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for such committees and such Subcommittees to perform oversight; or

(C) to law enforcement agencies to investigate a penetration reported under this section.

(d) ISSUANCE OF PROCEDURES AND ESTABLISHMENT OF CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall establish the procedures required under subsection (a) and the criteria required under subsection (b).

(2) APPLICABILITY DATE.—The requirements of this section shall apply on the date on which the Director of National Intelligence establishes the procedures required under this section.

(e) COORDINATION WITH THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO PREVENT DUPLICATE REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures to permit a contractor that is a cleared intelligence contractor and a cleared defense contractor under section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) to submit a single report that satisfies the requirements of this section and such section 941 for an incident of penetration of network or information system.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CLEARED INTELLIGENCE CONTRACTOR.—The term ''cleared intelligence contractor'' means a private entity granted clearance by the Director of National Intelligence or the head of an element of the intelligence community to access, receive, or store classified information for the purpose of bidding for a contract or conducting activities in support of any program of an element of the intelligence community.

(2) COVERED NETWORK.—The term ''covered network'' means a network or information system of a cleared intelligence contractor

that contains or processes information created by or for an element of the intelligence community with respect to which such contractor is required to apply enhanced protection.

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or limit any otherwise authorized access by government personnel to networks or information systems owned or operated by a contractor that processes or stores government data.

SEC. 326. REPORT ON ELECTRONIC WASTE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the extent to which the intelligence community has implemented the recommendations of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community contained in the report entitled ''Study of Intelligence Community Electronic Waste Disposal Practices'' issued in May 2013. Such report shall include an assessment of the extent to which the policies, standards, and guidelines of the intelligence community governing the proper disposal of electronic waste are applicable to covered commercial electronic waste that may contain classified information.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED COMMERCIAL ELECTRONIC WASTE.—The term ''covered commercial electronic waste'' means electronic waste of a commercial entity that contracts with an element of the intelligence community.

(2) ELECTRONIC WASTE.—The term ''electronic waste'' includes any obsolete, broken, or irreparable electronic device, including a television, copier, facsimile machine, tablet, telephone, computer, computer monitor, laptop, printer, scanner, and associated electrical wiring.

SEC. 327. PROMOTING STEM EDUCATION TO MEET THE FUTURE WORKFORCE NEEDS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Secretary of Education and the congressional intelligence committees a report describing the anticipated hiring needs of the intelligence community in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including cybersecurity and computer literacy. The report shall—

(1) describe the extent to which competitions, challenges, or internships at elements of the intelligence community that do not involve access to classified information may be utilized to promote education in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including cybersecurity and computer literacy, within high schools or institutions of higher education in the United States;

(2) include cost estimates for carrying out such competitions, challenges, or internships; and

(3) include strategies for conducting expedited security clearance investigations and adjudications for students at institutions of higher education for purposes of offering internships at elements of the intelligence community.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.—In developing the report under subsection (a), the Director shall take into consideration existing programs of the intelligence community, including the education programs of the National Security Agency and the Information Assurance Scholarship Program of the Department of Defense, as appropriate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HIGH SCHOOL.—The term ''high school'' mean a school that awards a secondary school diploma.

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(3) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term ''secondary school'' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 328. REPEAL OF THE TERMINATION OF NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS REGARDING THE AUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.

Section 504 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277; 126 Stat. 2477) is amended by striking subsection (e).

SEC. 329. REPEAL OR MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) THREAT OF ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES USING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—Section 114 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3050) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(2) TREATY ON CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE.—Section 2(5)(E) of the Senate resolution advising and consenting to ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) of November 19, 1990, adopted at Vienna May 31, 1996 (Treaty Doc. 105–5) (commonly referred to as the ''CFE Flank Document''), 105th Congress, agreed to May 14, 1997, is repealed.

(b) MODIFICATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 410(b) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (50 U.S.C. 3309) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) NOTIFICATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall each notify the congressional intelligence committees each time each such Director creates an advisory committee. Each notification shall include—

''(1) a description of such advisory committee, including the subject matter of such committee;

''(2) a list of members of such advisory committee; and

''(3) in the case of an advisory committee created by the Director of National Intelligence, the reasons for a determination by the Director under section 4(b)(3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) that an advisory committee cannot comply with the requirements of such Act.''.

(2) INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 102A(g)(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(g)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) The Director of National Intelligence shall, in a timely manner, report to Congress any statute, regulation, policy, or practice that the Director believes impedes the ability of the Director to fully and effectively ensure maximum availability of access to intelligence information within the intelligence community consistent with the protection of the national security of the United States.''.

(3) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION.—Section 506D(j) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3100(j)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2014''.

(4) ACTIVITIES OF PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OFFICERS.—Section 1062(f)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1(f)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''quarterly'' and inserting ''semi-annually''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the table of contents in the first section, by striking the item relating to section 114 and inserting the following new item:

''Sec. 114. Annual report on hiring and retention of minority employees.'';

(2) in section 114 (50 U.S.C. 3050)—

(A) by amending the heading to read as follows: ''**ANNUAL REPORT ON HIRING AND RETENTION OF MINORITY EMPLOYEES**'';

(B) by striking ''(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON HIRING AND RETENTION OF MINORITY EMPLOYEES.—'';

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subsections (a) through (e), respectively;

(D) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(I) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(II) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking ''clauses (i) and (ii)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A) and (B)'';

(E) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph), by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''section''; and

(F) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(ii) by striking ''subsection,'' and inserting ''section''; and

(3) in section 507 (50 U.S.C. 3106)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''(1) The date'' and inserting ''The date'';

(ii) by striking ''subsection (c)(1)(A)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)'';

(iii) by striking paragraph (2); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (F) as paragraphs (1) through (6), respectively;

(B) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) by striking ''(A) Except'' and inserting ''Except''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) in subsection (d)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(II) by inserting ''and'' after ''March 1;'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—National Security Agency

SEC. 401. APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.

(a) DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.—Section 2 of the National Security Agency Act of 1959 (50 U.S.C. 3602) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(b)'' before ''There''; and

(2) by inserting before subsection (b), as so designated by paragraph (1), the following:

''(a)(1) There is a Director of the National Security Agency.

''(2) The Director of the National Security Agency shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(3) The Director of the National Security Agency shall be the head of the National Security Agency and shall discharge such functions and duties as are provided by this Act or otherwise by law or executive order.''.

(b) POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may designate the Director of the National Security Agency as a position of importance and responsibility under section 601 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 402. APPOINTMENT OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 8G(a)(2), by striking ''the National Security Agency,''; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or the Federal Cochairpersons of the Commissions established under section 15301 of title 40, United States Code;'' and inserting ''the Federal Cochairpersons of the Commissions established under section 15301 of title 40, United States Code; the Director of the National Security Agency;''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or the Commissions established under section 15301 of title 40, United States Code,'' and inserting ''the Commissions established under section 15301 of title 40, United States Code, the National Security Agency,''.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the amendments made by sections 401 and 402 shall take effect on October 1, 2014, and shall apply upon the earlier of—

(1) in the case of section 401—

(A) the date of the first nomination by the President of an individual to serve as the Director of the National Security Agency that occurs on or after October 1, 2014; or

(B) the date of the cessation of the performance of the duties of the Director of the National Security Agency by the individual performing such duties on October 1, 2014; and

(2) in the case of section 402—

(A) the date of the first nomination by the President of an individual to serve as the Inspector General of the National Security Agency that occurs on or after October 1, 2014; or

(B) the date of the cessation of the performance of the duties of the Inspector General of the National Security Agency by the individual performing such duties on October 1, 2014.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR INITIAL NOMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(A) or (2)(A) of subsection (a), an individual serving as the Director of the National Security Agency or the Inspector General of the National Security Agency on the date that the President first nominates an individual for such position on or after October 1, 2014, may continue to perform in that position after such date of nomination and until the individual appointed to the position, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, assumes the duties of the position.

(c) INCUMBENT INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The individual serving as Inspector General of the National Security Agency on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be eligible to be appointed by the President to a new term of service under section 3 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Subtitle B—National Reconnaissance Office

SEC. 411. APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 106 the following:

''SEC. 106A. DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is a Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.

''(b) APPOINTMENT.—The Director of the National Reconnaissance Office shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(c) FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES.—The Director of the National Reconnaissance Office shall be the head of the National Reconnaissance Office and shall discharge such functions and duties as are provided by this Act or otherwise by law or executive order.''.

(b) POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may designate the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office as a position of importance and responsibility under section 601 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 106 the following:

''Sec. 106A. Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.''.

SEC. 412. APPOINTMENT OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)—

(1) in section 8G(a)(2), as amended by section 402, is further amended by striking ''the National Reconnaissance Office,''; and

(2) in section 12, as amended by section 402, is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office;'' before ''as the case may be;''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or the National Reconnaissance Office,'' before ''as the case may be;''.

SEC. 413. EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 411 and 412 shall take effect on October 1, 2014, and shall apply upon the earlier of—

(1) in the case of section 411—

(A) the date of the first nomination by the President of an individual to serve as the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office that occurs on or after October 1, 2014; or

(B) the date of the cessation of the performance of the duties of the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office by the individual performing such duties on October 1, 2014; and

(2) in the case of section 412—

(A) the date of the first nomination by the President of an individual to serve as the Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office that occurs on or after October 1, 2014; or

(B) the date of the cessation of the performance of the duties of the Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office by the individual performing such duties on October 1, 2014.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR INITIAL NOMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(A) or (2)(A) of subsection (a), an individual serving as the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office or the Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office on the date that the President first nominates an individual for such position on or after October 1, 2014, may continue to perform in that position after such date of nomination and until the individual appointed to the position, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, assumes the duties of the position.

(c) INCUMBENT INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The individual serving as Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be eligible to be appointed by the President to a new term of service under section 3 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Subtitle C—Central Intelligence Agency

SEC. 421. GIFTS, DEVISES, AND BEQUESTS.

Section 12 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3512) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting ''GIFTS, DEVISES, AND BEQUESTS'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by inserting ''by the Director as a gift to the Agency'' after ''accepted''; and

(B) by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''this subsection'';

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''this section,'' and inserting ''subsection (a),'';

(4) in subsection (c), by striking ''this section,'' and inserting ''subsection (a),'';

(5) in subsection (d), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''subsection (a)'';

(6) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(7) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f)(1) The Director may engage in fundraising in an official capacity for the benefit of nonprofit organizations that provide support to surviving family members of deceased Agency employees or that otherwise provide support for the welfare, education, or recreation of Agency employees, former Agency employees, or their family members.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'fundraising' means the raising of funds through the active participation in the promotion, production, or presentation of an event designed to raise funds and does not include the direct solicitation of money by any other means.''.

TITLE V—SECURITY CLEARANCE REFORM

SEC. 501. CONTINUOUS EVALUATION AND SHARING OF DEROGATORY INFORMATION REGARDING PERSONNEL WITH ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

Section 102A(j) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(j)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION'' and inserting ''CLASSIFIED INFORMATION'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(5) ensure that the background of each employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, each contractor to an element of the intelligence community, and each individual employee of such a contractor who has been determined to be eligible for access to classified information is monitored on a continual basis under standards developed by the Director, including with respect to the frequency of evaluation, during the period of eligibility of such employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, such contractor, or such individual employee to such a contractor to determine whether such employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, such contractor, and such individual employee of such a contractor continues to meet the requirements for eligibility for access to classified information; and

''(6) develop procedures to require information sharing between elements of the intelligence community concerning potentially derogatory security information regarding an employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, a contractor to an element of the intelligence community, or

an individual employee of such a contractor that may impact the eligibility of such employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, such contractor, or such individual employee of such a contractor for a security clearance.''.

SEC. 502. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CONTRACTORS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(x) REQUIREMENTS FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CONTRACTORS.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the head of each department of the Federal Government that contains an element of the intelligence community and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, shall—

''(1) ensure that—

''(A) any contractor to an element of the intelligence community with access to a classified network or classified information develops and operates a security plan that is consistent with standards established by the Director of National Intelligence for intelligence community networks; and

''(B) each contract awarded by an element of the intelligence community includes provisions requiring the contractor comply with such plan and such standards;

''(2) conduct periodic assessments of each security plan required under paragraph (1)(A) to ensure such security plan complies with the requirements of such paragraph; and

''(3) ensure that the insider threat detection capabilities and insider threat policies of the intelligence community apply to facilities of contractors with access to a classified network.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contracts entered into or renewed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 503. TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS TO SECURITY CLEARANCE PROCESSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall conduct an analysis of the relative costs and benefits of potential improvements to the process for investigating persons who are proposed for access to classified information and adjudicating whether such persons satisfy the criteria for obtaining and retaining access to such information.

(b) CONTENTS OF ANALYSIS.—In conducting the analysis required by subsection (a), the Director of National Intelligence shall evaluate the costs and benefits associated with—

(1) the elimination of manual processes in security clearance investigations and adjudications, if possible, and automating and integrating the elements of the investigation process, including—

(A) the clearance application process;

(B) case management;

(C) adjudication management;

(D) investigation methods for the collection, analysis, storage, retrieval, and transfer of data and records; and

(E) records management for access and eligibility determinations;

(2) the elimination or reduction, if possible, of the use of databases and information sources that cannot be accessed and processed automatically electronically, or modification of such databases and information sources, to enable electronic access and processing;

(3) the use of government-developed and commercial technology for continuous monitoring and evaluation of government and commercial data sources that can identify and flag information pertinent to adjudication guidelines and eligibility determinations;

(4) the standardization of forms used for routine reporting required of cleared personnel (such as travel, foreign contacts, and financial disclosures) and use of continuous monitoring technology to access databases containing such reportable information to independently obtain and analyze reportable data and events;

(5) the establishment of an authoritative central repository of personnel security information that is accessible electronically at multiple levels of classification and eliminates technical barriers to rapid access to information necessary for eligibility determinations and reciprocal recognition thereof;

(6) using digitally processed fingerprints, as a substitute for ink or paper prints, to reduce error rates and improve portability of data;

(7) expanding the use of technology to improve an applicant's ability to discover the status of a pending security clearance application or reinvestigation; and

(8) using government and publicly available commercial data sources, including social media, that provide independent information pertinent to adjudication guidelines to improve quality and timeliness, and reduce costs, of investigations and reinvestigations.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the analysis required by subsection (a).

SEC. 504. REPORT ON RECIPROCITY OF SECURITY CLEARANCES.

The head of the entity selected pursuant to section 3001(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(b)) shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report each year through 2017 that describes for the preceding year—

(1) the periods of time required by authorized adjudicative agencies for accepting background investigations and determinations completed by an authorized investigative entity or authorized adjudicative agency;

(2) the total number of cases in which a background investigation or determination completed by an authorized investigative entity or authorized adjudicative agency is accepted by another agency;

(3) the total number of cases in which a background investigation or determination completed by an authorized investigative entity or authorized adjudicative agency is not accepted by another agency; and

(4) such other information or recommendations as the head of the entity selected pursuant to such section 3001(b) considers appropriate.

SEC. 505. IMPROVING THE PERIODIC REINVESTIGATION PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until December 31, 2017, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a strategic plan for updating the process for periodic reinvestigations consistent with a continuous evaluation program.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of the costs and benefits associated with conducting periodic reinvestigations;

(2) an analysis of the costs and benefits associated with replacing some or all periodic reinvestigations with a program of continuous evaluation;

(3) a determination of how many risk-based and ad hoc periodic reinvestigations are necessary on an annual basis for each component of the Federal Government with employees with security clearances;

(4) an analysis of the potential benefits of expanding the Government's use of continuous evaluation tools as a means of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of procedures for confirming the eligibility of personnel for continued access to classified information; and

(5) an analysis of how many personnel with out-of-scope background investigations are employed by, or contracted or detailed to, each element of the intelligence community.

(c) PERIODIC REINVESTIGATIONS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''periodic reinvestigations'' has the meaning given that term in section 3001(a) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(a)).

SEC. 506. APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

TITLE VI—INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

SEC. 601. PROTECTION OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XI of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1104. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES IN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AGENCY.—The term 'agency' means an executive department or independent establishment, as defined under sections 101 and 104 of title 5, United States Code, that contains an intelligence community element, except the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(2) COVERED INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELEMENT.—The term 'covered intelligence community element'—

''(A) means—

''(i) the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the National Reconnaissance Office; and

''(ii) any executive agency or unit thereof determined by the President under section 2302(a)(2)(C)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, to have as its principal function the conduct of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence activities; and

''(B) does not include the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(3) PERSONNEL ACTION.—The term 'personnel action' means, with respect to an employee in a position in a covered intelligence community element (other than a position excepted from the competitive service due to its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character)—

''(A) an appointment;

''(B) a promotion;

''(C) a disciplinary or corrective action;

''(D) a detail, transfer, or reassignment;

''(E) a demotion, suspension, or termination;

''(F) a reinstatement or restoration;

''(G) a performance evaluation;

''(H) a decision concerning pay, benefits, or awards;

''(I) a decision concerning education or training if such education or training may

reasonably be expected to lead to an appointment, promotion, or performance evaluation; or

''(J) any other significant change in duties, responsibilities, or working conditions.

''(b) IN GENERAL.—Any employee of an agency who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or fail to take a personnel action with respect to any employee of a covered intelligence community element as a reprisal for a lawful disclosure of information by the employee to the Director of National Intelligence (or an employee designated by the Director of National Intelligence for such purpose), the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the head of the employing agency (or an employee designated by the head of that agency for such purpose), the appropriate inspector general of the employing agency, a congressional intelligence committee, or a member of a congressional intelligence committee, which the employee reasonably believes evidences—

''(1) a violation of any Federal law, rule, or regulation; or

''(2) mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

''(c) ENFORCEMENT.—The President shall provide for the enforcement of this section.

''(d) EXISTING RIGHTS PRESERVED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

''(1) preempt or preclude any employee, or applicant for employment, at the Federal Bureau of Investigation from exercising rights provided under any other law, rule, or regulation, including section 2303 of title 5, United States Code; or

''(2) repeal section 2303 of title 5, United States Code.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 1104. Prohibited personnel practices in the intelligence community.''.

SEC. 602. REVIEW OF SECURITY CLEARANCE OR ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.

(a) GENERAL RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3001(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(b)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Not'' and inserting ''Except as otherwise provided, not'';

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014—

''(A) developing policies and procedures that permit, to the extent practicable, individuals to appeal a determination to suspend or revoke a security clearance or access to classified information and to retain their government employment status while such challenge is pending; and

''(B) developing and implementing uniform and consistent policies and procedures to ensure proper protections during the process for denying, suspending, or revoking a security clearance or access to classified information, including the ability to appeal such a denial, suspension, or revocation, except that there shall be no appeal of an agency's suspension of a security clearance or access determination for purposes of conducting an investigation, if that suspension lasts no longer than 1 year or the head of the agency or a designee of the head of the agency certifies that a longer suspension is needed before a final decision on denial or revocation to prevent imminent harm to the national security.''.

(2) REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The policies and procedures for appeal developed under paragraph (7) of section 3001(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, as added by subsection (a), shall provide for the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, or the inspector general of the employing agency, to conduct fact-finding and report to the agency head or the designee of the agency head within 180 days unless the employee and the agency agree to an extension or the investigating inspector general determines in writing that a greater period of time is required. To the fullest extent possible, such fact-finding shall include an opportunity for the employee to present relevant evidence such as witness testimony.

(b) RETALIATORY REVOCATION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES AND ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.—Section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) RETALIATORY REVOCATION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES AND ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Agency personnel with authority over personnel security clearance or access determinations shall not take or fail to take, or threaten to take or fail to take, any action with respect to any employee's security clearance or access determination in retaliation for—

''(A) any lawful disclosure of information to the Director of National Intelligence (or an employee designated by the Director of National Intelligence for such purpose) or the head of the employing agency (or employee designated by the head of that agency for such purpose) by an employee that the employee reasonably believes evidences—

''(i) a violation of any Federal law, rule, or regulation; or

''(ii) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety;

''(B) any lawful disclosure to the Inspector General of an agency or another employee designated by the head of the agency to receive such disclosures, of information which the employee reasonably believes evidences—

''(i) a violation of any Federal law, rule, or regulation; or

''(ii) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety;

''(C) any lawful disclosure that complies with—

''(i) subsections (a)(1), (d), and (h) of section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.);

''(ii) subparagraphs (A), (D), and (H) of section 17(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)); or

''(iii) subparagraphs (A), (D), and (I) of section 103H(k)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)(5)); and

''(D) if the actions do not result in the employee or applicant unlawfully disclosing information specifically required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs, any lawful disclosure in conjunction with—

''(i) the exercise of any appeal, complaint, or grievance right granted by any law, rule, or regulation;

''(ii) testimony for or otherwise lawfully assisting any individual in the exercise of any right referred to in clause (i); or

''(iii) cooperation with or disclosing information to the Inspector General of an agency, in accordance with applicable provisions of law in connection with an audit, inspection, or investigation conducted by the Inspector General.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Consistent with the protection of sources and methods, nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to authorize the withholding of information from Congress or the taking of any personnel action against an employee who lawfully discloses information to Congress.

''(3) DISCLOSURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A disclosure shall not be excluded from paragraph (1) because—

''(i) the disclosure was made to a person, including a supervisor, who participated in an activity that the employee reasonably believed to be covered by paragraph (1)(A)(ii);

''(ii) the disclosure revealed information that had been previously disclosed;

''(iii) the disclosure was not made in writing;

''(iv) the disclosure was made while the employee was off duty; or

''(v) of the amount of time which has passed since the occurrence of the events described in the disclosure.

''(B) REPRISALS.—If a disclosure is made during the normal course of duties of an employee, the disclosure shall not be excluded from paragraph (1) if any employee who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action with respect to the employee making the disclosure, took, failed to take, or threatened to take or fail to take a personnel action with respect to that employee in reprisal for the disclosure.

''(4) AGENCY ADJUDICATION.—

''(A) REMEDIAL PROCEDURE.—An employee or former employee who believes that he or she has been subjected to a reprisal prohibited by paragraph (1) may, within 90 days after the issuance of notice of such decision, appeal that decision within the agency of that employee or former employee through proceedings authorized by subsection (b)(7), except that there shall be no appeal of an agency's suspension of a security clearance or access determination for purposes of conducting an investigation, if that suspension lasts not longer than 1 year (or a longer period in accordance with a certification made under subsection (b)(7)).

''(B) CORRECTIVE ACTION.—If, in the course of proceedings authorized under subparagraph (A), it is determined that the adverse security clearance or access determination violated paragraph (1), the agency shall take specific corrective action to return the employee or former employee, as nearly as practicable and reasonable, to the position such employee or former employee would have held had the violation not occurred. Such corrective action may include back pay and related benefits, travel expenses, and compensatory damages not to exceed $300,000.

''(C) CONTRIBUTING FACTOR.—In determining whether the adverse security clearance or access determination violated paragraph (1), the agency shall find that paragraph (1) was violated if a disclosure described in paragraph (1) was a contributing factor in the adverse security clearance or access determination taken against the individual, unless the agency demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that it would have taken the same action in the absence of such disclosure, giving the utmost deference to the agency's assessment of the particular threat to the national security interests of the United States in the instant matter.

''(5) APPELLATE REVIEW OF SECURITY CLEARANCE ACCESS DETERMINATIONS BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—

''(A) APPEAL.—Within 60 days after receiving notice of an adverse final agency determination under a proceeding under paragraph (4), an employee or former employee may appeal that determination in accordance with the procedures established under subparagraph (B).

''(B) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense, shall develop and implement policies and procedures for adjudicating the appeals authorized by subparagraph (A).

''(C) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Consistent with the protection of sources and methods, at the time the Director of National Intelligence issues an order regarding an appeal pursuant to the policies and procedures established by this paragraph, the Director of National Intelligence shall notify the congressional intelligence committees.

''(6) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit or require judicial review of any—

''(A) agency action under this section; or

''(B) action of the appellate review procedures established under paragraph (5).

''(7) PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit, authorize, or require a private cause of action to challenge the merits of a security clearance determination.''.

(c) ACCESS DETERMINATION DEFINED.—Section 3001(a) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) ACCESS DETERMINATION.—The term 'access determination' means the determination regarding whether an employee—

''(A) is eligible for access to classified information in accordance with Executive Order 12968 (60 Fed. Reg. 40245; relating to access to classified information), or any successor thereto, and Executive Order 10865 (25 Fed. Reg. 1583; relating to safeguarding classified information with industry), or any successor thereto; and

''(B) possesses a need to know under such an Order.''.

(d) EXISTING RIGHTS PRESERVED.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to preempt, preclude, or otherwise prevent an individual from exercising rights, remedies, or avenues of redress currently provided under any other law, regulation, or rule.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341), as amended by this title, shall be construed to require the repeal or replacement of agency appeal procedures implementing Executive Order 12968 (60 Fed. Reg. 40245; relating to access to classified information), or any successor thereto, and Executive Order 10865 (25 Fed. Reg. 1583; relating to safeguarding classified information with industry), or any successor thereto, that meet the requirements of paragraph (7) of section 3001(b) of such Act, as added by this section.

SEC. 603. REVISIONS OF OTHER LAWS.

(a) INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—Section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) If the head of an establishment determines that a complaint or information transmitted under paragraph (1) would create a conflict of interest for the head of the establishment, the head of the establishment shall return the complaint or information to the Inspector General with that determination and the Inspector General shall make the transmission to the Director of National Intelligence and, if the establishment is within the Department of Defense, to the Secretary of Defense. In such a case, the requirements of this section for the head of the establishment apply to each recipient of the Inspector General's transmission.'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

''(h) An individual who has submitted a complaint or information to an Inspector General under this section may notify any member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives or the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, or a staff member of either such Committee, of the fact that such individual has made a submission to that particular Inspector General, and of the date on which such submission was made.''.

(b) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.—Section 17(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting ''(i)'' after ''(B)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) If the Director determines that a complaint or information transmitted under paragraph (1) would create a conflict of interest for the Director, the Director shall return the complaint or information to the Inspector General with that determination and the Inspector General shall make the transmission to the Director of National Intelligence. In such a case, the requirements of this subsection for the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency apply to the Director of National Intelligence''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) An individual who has submitted a complaint or information to the Inspector General under this section may notify any member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives or the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, or a staff member of either such Committee, of the fact that such individual has made a submission to the Inspector General, and of the date on which such submission was made.''.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—Section 103H(k)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(I) An individual who has submitted a complaint or information to the Inspector General under this section may notify any member of either of the congressional intelligence committees, or a staff member of either of such committees, of the fact that such individual has made a submission to the Inspector General, and of the date on which such submission was made.''.

SEC. 604. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES; NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN TERMINATIONS.

(a) COVERED INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELEMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered intelligence community element''—

(1) means—

(A) the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the National Reconnaissance Office; and

(B) any executive agency or unit thereof determined by the President under section 2302(a)(2)(C)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, to have as its principal function the conduct of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence activities; and

(2) does not include the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) REGULATIONS.—In consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence shall develop policies and procedures to ensure that a personnel action shall not be taken against an employee of a covered intelligence community element as a reprisal for any disclosure of information described in 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 601 of this Act.

(c) REPORT ON THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report on the status of the implementation of the regulations promulgated under subsection (b) to the congressional intelligence committees.

(d) NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN TERMINATIONS.—Section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 601 of this Act, and section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341), as amended by section 602 of this Act, shall not apply if—

(1) the affected employee is concurrently terminated under—

(A) section 1609 of title 10, United States Code;

(B) the authority of the Director of National Intelligence under section 102A(m) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(m)), if the Director determines that the termination is in the interest of the United States;

(C) the authority of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency under section 104A(e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3036(e)), if the Director determines that the termination is in the interest of the United States; or

(D) section 7532 of title 5, United States Code, if the head of the agency determines that the termination is in the interest of the United States; and

(2) not later than 30 days after such termination, the head of the agency that employed the affected employee notifies the congressional intelligence committees of the termination.

TITLE VII—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 701. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949.

Section 21 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3521) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(D), by striking ''section (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(E), by striking ''provider.'' and inserting ''provider''.

SEC. 702. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947 RELATING TO THE PAST ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS.

Section 101(a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking the semicolon and inserting ''; and'';

(2) by striking paragraphs (6) and (7);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (6); and

(4) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by striking ''the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board,''.

SEC. 703. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 506 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277; 126 Stat. 2478) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Section 606(5)'' and inserting ''Paragraph (5) of section 605''; and

(2) by inserting '', as redesignated by section 310(a)(4)(B) of this Act,'' before ''is amended''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if

included in the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, S. 1681.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank my colleague from Maryland, DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, for the great work done by him and the entire Democrat caucus of the committee as well as all of my Republican members for what is a good bipartisan national security bill.

I also want to thank Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN and SAXBY CHAMBLISS for their work in the Senate to put a bill together that I think America will and should be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, the Intelligence Authorization Act is an annual blueprint for the work of the intelligence community. The bill sets the priorities for our critical intelligence efforts. Passing a yearly intelligence authorization bill is the primary method by which Congress exerts its budgetary and oversight authority over the intelligence community.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, the bulk of this committee's recommendations are found in the classified annex to the bill, which is the same fiscal year '14 annex the House recently passed as part of a combined fiscal year '14 and fiscal year '15 intelligence authorization bill.

At an unclassified level, I can report that the annex for fiscal year 2014 authorizes funding that is slightly below the President's budget request level. Its funding levels are in line with the levels appropriated by the enacted appropriation act for the National Intelligence Program and the National Defense Authorization Act for the Military Intelligence Program.

The House recently passed its version of the fiscal year '14 bill by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. The bill contained many of the same provisions in the same form as are contained in the Senate bill, S. 1681. And S. 1681 also contains a few additional provisions that were negotiated with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves at a very interesting time in history. Al Qaeda has metastasized into dangerous affiliates, and safe havens have emerged in Syria, parts of Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and the tribal areas of Pakistan. The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant is attempting to build a state across the Middle East, from Lebanon to Iraq, including Syria, Jordan, and, unfortunately, Israel as well.

They already control a jihadist Disneyland the size of Indiana. Without leadership from the United States, this will quickly devolve into a full-blown sectarian war, which only helps ISIL's political ambitions.

ISIL does not recognize a border between Syria and Iraq, and we have to remain focused on ISIL across the region so that a safe haven does not emerge on either side of that border.

The goal of our counterterrorism strategy is to deny safe haven from which terrorists can plan attacks against the United States—they can finance; they get breathing space; they can further radicalize individuals from around the world.

Al Qaeda is also regaining a foothold in northeast Afghanistan, just as the President announced a complete withdrawal of United States military forces, and the counterterrorism capability that comes with it, by the end of 2016. We are about to make the same mistake in Afghanistan that we did in Iraq.

Uneven leadership in recent years has also emboldened adversaries like Russia and China, who are increasing their military and intelligence spending and are working to change the international order, to the detriment of the United States and our interests.

We rightly demand that our intelligence agencies provide policymakers with the best and most timely information possible on the threats we face. We ask them to track terrorists wherever they train, plan, and fund-raise. We ask them to stop devastating cyber attacks that steal American jobs. We ask them to track nuclear and missile threats. And we demand that they get it right every day of the year.

The dedicated men and women of the intelligence community are some of the finest patriots I have had the privilege to meet. And within budget constraints and the often unclear policy guidance from the White House, this bill seeks to ensure that they have the resources and the authorities necessary to keep our Nation safe.

I urge the passage of S. 1681 and reserve the balance of my time.

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

I first want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman ROGERS, for his leadership. Once again, he has produced a bipartisan and bicameral Intelligence Authorization Act that we are taking up today.

I know he is retiring. He has served his country well as an FBI agent and on the Intelligence Committee, and now as chairman. We are going to miss him. But I know that whatever he does, he will always think of the United States of America first. So I thank the gentleman for his leadership and his friendship.

I also want to acknowledge the members of our committee, both Democrat and Republican, and our staff who have come together as a team in a bipartisan way to do what is right for our country.

Now, this Chamber passed its fiscal year 2014 and 2015 Intelligence Authorization Act less than a month ago, with over 300 votes in favor. Today we are taking up just the Senate's fiscal year 2014 bill, which the Senate recently passed by unanimous consent.

I hope the House passes this bill and sends it to the President's desk today. We need these annual intelligence authorization acts to ensure the most rigorous oversight and accountability over all U.S. intelligence agencies and over all U.S. intelligence activities. We must ensure that our intelligence agencies spend money only on programs of which Congress is informed and approves. This bill does that.

We also need these annual intelligence authorizations to set the priorities for our intelligence professionals and their agencies and to allocate resources to critical national security programs, including those that detect, prevent, and disrupt potential terrorist attacks. This bill does that, also.

And we need the intelligence authorization acts to promote fiscal discipline. This bill makes cuts to certain areas and adds money in other in a responsible, well thought-out, and fiscally prudent way. The result is a budget below the President's request. In fact, since Chairman ROGERS and I assumed leadership of the Intelligence Committee, we have reduced the Intelligence Committee's budget by 20 percent, without reducing capability. I am pleased to see the Senate is going along with us.

I do want to acknowledge, also, Senators FEINSTEIN and CHAMBLISS for working together with us in a partnership to do what is right for our country and our national security.

The unclassified legislative text in this Senate bill is very similar to what this Chamber debated last month. It makes substantial improvements to the security clearance process. It requires detailed reports on matters such as electronic waste and chemical weapons in Syria. And it promotes education in science, technology, engineering, and math.

□ 1945

The Senate also added three substantive provisions, all of which greatly promote transparency, oversight, and accountability.

First, the bill creates independent, Senate-confirmed NSA and National Reconnaissance Office directors, as well as independent, Senate-confirmed NSA and NRO inspectors general.

Second, the bill requires the Attorney General to establish a process for

the regular review for publication of Department of Justice legal opinions provided to the intelligence community.

It also requires that any classified opinions that can't be published be made available to the appropriate committees or Members of Congress. Third, it amends the National Security Act to prohibit any personnel actions against a lawful intelligence community whistleblower.

As for the classified schedule of authorizations, it is identical, except for some minor, prorated adjustments.

We encouraged all Members to review the classified schedule of authorizations, as well as the classified text, and I am pleased that so many have come down to the Intelligence Committee's classified spaces to do so.

We have spent a long time poring over every aspect of this bill—in our committee spaces, at the agencies, with the Senate, and in the remotest corners of the Earth, where our intelligence professionals operate—and I can say this is a very good bill, which I am proud to support.

For the sake of keeping the country and its allies safe, for the sake of vigorously overseeing even the most classified intelligence programs, and for the sake of our intelligence professionals who work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, often in harm's way, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and send it to the President today.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama, TERRI SEWELL, who is a very good member of our committee.

I just want to say that Ms. SEWELL is a new member of the Intelligence Committee, and through her dedication, intellect, and willingness to travel, she is quickly becoming a highly influential member on our committee.

She also keeps her focus on the people, both the American people as a whole, and the intelligence professionals who work every day to keep us safe.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the Fiscal Year 2014 Intelligence Authorization Act. The annual authorization act is the most substantial oversight mechanism Congress has over the intelligence community.

Most of the work within the intelligence community and our work on the Intelligence Committee happen behind closed doors and, therefore, far from the television cameras. Let me assure you, though, just because C–SPAN is not in the room when we have our regular meetings and hearings does not mean there is a lack of opinion, discussion, and debate.

There is rigorous back and forth about the necessity and the necessary number of core contractors within the intelligence community, how to best exploit and preserve the documents from the Osama bin Laden raid, and the appropriate ways to respond to unauthorized public disclosure of covert actions.

We ask hard questions in this committee of our witnesses. We read and study legal authorities for U.S. engagement around the world and ensure that the intelligence professionals tasked with protecting America not only have the tools they need to do their jobs, but are held accountable for their actions.

Director Clapper said recently that ''at the heart of our work is our people.'' This bill makes some important changes in the workforce of the intelligence community. It requires the Director of National Intelligence to ensure that contractors have in place security measures consistent with the DNI standards for intelligence community networks.

It requires the DNI to ensure insider threat capabilities of the IC apply to contractors. The bill also requires the DNI to submit a strategic plan for improving the process of reinvestigation, so those individuals who have security clearance are interviewed on a routine basis, to ensure they continue to uphold the standards and requirements necessary to access classified information.

On a final note about the workforce of the intelligence community, Director Clapper continued, ''A diverse workforce is critical to the mission success.''

He is right. The threats America faces are complex, ranging from proliferation of nuclear weapons to terrorism, to Russian plans and intentions. We need people who understand all cultures and backgrounds and who can use their unique experience for creative solutions.

The IC has made some progress on diversity. Minority representation in the largest intelligence agencies increased to 24 percent in 2013; yet there is still work to be done.

Recently, the CIA released an unclassified report on women in leadership and found that women in the CIA who sought greater responsibility were hindered by organizational and societal challenges.

Indeed, throughout the major intelligence agencies, female hiring has remained below 40 percent for the fourth consecutive year. Women made up 51 percent of the general population in 2013, but only 39 percent of the workforce in the IC community.

In addition, the percentage of female managers was only 35.5 percent. CIA is reviewing the situation of its minority and women officers, and I commend that initiative, and I strongly urge other agencies within the IC to do the same.

This bill and the IC's efforts are good steps in the right direction. However, we have to stay in stride and look for efforts to create a more inclusive, equitable, and diverse workforce.

Going forward, I hope to look at the status of women and minority workers throughout the IC and how to increase their management ranks. Our workforce is our greatest asset and our greatest strength.

There are many parts of this bill which cannot be discussed on the floor. The United States keeps secrets for a reason. However, let me say that the intelligence professionals at each of the 16 IC agencies go to work every day to do their jobs, keep America number one, and to protect the homeland.

I want to commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their leadership on the Intel Committee. It was a committee assignment that I was not sure I wanted to accept at first, but I know how important our national security is.

I want to thank your staff, Mr. Chairman, and the ranking member's staff for helping new members come up to speed. Indeed, what we do here is so critically important. The Fiscal Year 2014 Intelligence Authorization is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentlewoman for joining us on the committee. It is sometimes long hours and thankless work, and I am fairly confident our IQ on the committee has doubled since she has arrived on the committee.

Penetrating questions, robust debate, curiosity that has no bounds, and her travel around the world has been critically important to the work we do on the committee, and the work that she has done on the committee has been exceptional in adding to the product that you see before us today.

I think that is one of the reasons it is such a good bill. I wanted to thank the gentlewoman for her work on the 2014 fiscal bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to ensure the most rigorous oversight and accountability over all U.S. intelligence agencies and all U.S. intelligence activities, I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

I also urge my colleagues to support this bill for the sake of all of us, not just in America, but around the world, who benefit from the work of our intelligence community in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, so that our dedicated intelligence professionals who work worldwide—often in harm's way—can keep us safe and our allies safe. They are truly the best in the world.

We can disagree about policy, but we should never disagree about the professionalism, bravery, and devotion to the

rule of law that are the hallmarks of our intelligence professionals.

Finally, once again, let me just thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership for these past years. I also want to sincerely thank every member of the Intelligence Committee.

I want to thank Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL for being here tonight and for being involved in this bill. You were a big part of our success.

We debate, and we argue, but we always negotiate, and we always keep in our minds what is most important: the security, privacy, and civil liberties of the American people.

Together with the Senate—and I thank Senators FEINSTEIN and CHAMBLISS again—we have produced for the House to consider today a truly strong bill, which I am proud to support. I urge all my colleagues to support it as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my ranking member, and I want to thank all the staff—Republican and Democrat staff. These bills don't come together for the fond wishes of us Members alone.

We have very dedicated and committed staff who sit down and work through the issues, just the way the Members do, and we wouldn't have this product today if it weren't for that collaboration, and I want to thank all of them for that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank DUTCH on a personal note. There is a lot to not like in this town, and there is a lot to not like in this place, but it shows you—and I think it shows Americans—that when you sit down and have mutual respect for each other, even though we disagreed on certain issues, you can come to a conclusion that is in the best interest of the United States.

Through forging that relationship, I think we forged a lasting friendship that I will always be grateful for, so I want to thank you for that.

Thank you for your work on national security, and thanks to all the staff who brought us here today. We have a lot more work to do, so we can't be too nice to them.

We are going to have to get a lot of pounds of flesh between now and the end of the year, to get a lot of work done.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask and encourage this body to support a bill that will provide national security safety for the United States for the following years.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1681.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JIM JORDAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JIM JORDAN, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, for my testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JIM JORDAN,
Member of Congress.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION INVASION

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, our current immigration policies and political rhetoric broadcast to people around the world that they can come here illegally without consequence. In fact, if they do, they will be rewarded for it. We send this message, and then we act surprised when an illegal immigration invasion into our country skyrockets.

A growing crisis at our southern border sees tens of thousands of children being abandoned at our doorstep. Their parents miscalculated. They heard someone talk about the DREAM Act and thought their children would be taken care of.

Ultimately, this crisis was brought on by Democrats and Republicans who have advocated granting legal status to those people who are here illegally, especially in terms of the so-called ''DREAMers.''

While most of those advocating such policies have good motives and good hearts, they have unintentionally created a humanitarian and bureaucratic crisis that our government is not equipped to handle.

I say we should send them home. The children and those who have come here illegally need to be sent home, whether they are adults or children.

PLAYING POLITICS FOR THE CAMERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I appreciate the opportunity to do so.

There are a number of topics that are on my mind, and generally for me, Mr. Speaker, it flows from the previous debate.

As I listened to the deliberation and the dialogue and I will say the cooperative nature that came between the chairman and the ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence here this evening, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that kind of dialogue, and I think our Founding Fathers would be very pleased if they could see that this work that is being done, a lot of it behind closed doors in the Select Committee on Intelligence, is being done in a deliberative process, sometimes in a classified setting, but often in a nonpartisan environment.

It seems as though, when the television cameras come on, the partisan nature of this United States Congress is amplified by the media's coverage of the events that take place, and when the doors get closed, we get serious about policy in a different kind of a way.

We are no longer messaging to America or simply having that kind of debate and dialogue that our Founding Fathers envisioned, and I don't know that it is particularly a phenomenon that is unique to the United States Congress.

At the time of our Founding Fathers, we didn't have instantaneous media communications that went out across the District of Columbia or into the States or across the country, for that matter, or the world.

□ 1945

As technology developed, they had the printing press. The printing press allowed for newspaper to be printed in a limited form, in a compressed and compact form. And as that message went out across the country, sometimes it took weeks for the actions here in Congress to penetrate into the public. And by then, there was another wave of action and another wave of action, an entirely different rhythm here in Congress as compared to the rhythm that we have here. I think the pace of what we do in this Congress is related to the ability to translate a message out to the American people and out to the world.

And so now going from an era when information traveled at its fastest pace, as our Founding Fathers helped shape this Nation, information traveled at its fastest pace about as fast as a horse could gallop. That was the closest thing they had to lightning speed of communications back in 1776. Today, information travels at the speed of light, and it is not only that there is a single piece of information that goes

out of here at the speed of light, but all kinds of pieces of information can go out simultaneously everywhere, not just to the District of Columbia, not to the surrounding States alone, not to the 50 States that we have and the U.S. territories across the reaches of the globe and the Pacific, for example, but everywhere in the world it can go at the speed light, which is as close to instantaneously as possible. And it can be transmitted out of an iPhone. It used to be a BlackBerry and they got a little bit too slow for us. Now, we can send video around the world in real time from a device that hangs from our belt. That has changed the posture of the politics in the United States Congress. It has changed the messaging. It has changed the civilization, and it changed the culture in different ways.

So now, we have people sitting in their living rooms all over America who for a long time now have been able to sit down from that desk and do email. That is a methodology that is now more than 20 years old, the ability to transfer instantaneously a letter that we might write on an electronic page and click the ''send'' button and it can go anywhere around the world at roughly the speed of light. But now there are millions of people sitting there who have practiced with email extensively and set up their email trees. And now a faster way to do that is on Facebook, and a more compressed way is to send it out by Twitter. There are a number of different social media that people are exercising, and there will be more that will be developed.

While that happens, the American people are projecting their opinions and their observations instantaneously to their families and to their friends, to the people who are part of their distribution list, those who are their followers on their friend list. This has changed the way we do business in this country, and it has brought about public opinions that are accelerated in a faster way; a far, far faster way than how public opinions were formed in, say, the era of our founding.

Because of this, it has been an expansion of our economy, the expansion of our efficiency. We are far more productive than we were before because we can communicate more quickly than before. But at the same time, it has opened us up for the kind of attacks that come from people who, in the era of our founding, in that era of say 235 years ago or so, they had no capability of reaching Americans, no capability of getting to our shores, and no capability of penetrating into the domestic life of Americans. We were safe enough then from the Barbary pirates. We had to go there before they would attack us.

Yet, at that era of time, 20 percent of the Federal budget that was appropriated in this city was committed to paying tribute, which was bribes, you might say ''mordida'' in today's terms, to the Barbary pirates. Now we find ourselves still fighting the same kind of ideology, of people who would use cyberspace to attack us, who would use airplanes to attack us, both of which were not envisioned by our Founding Fathers, both of which can get here far faster than a Barbary pirate corsair could be rowed across the Atlantic Ocean. That has changed the rhythm of what we do.

The Select Committee on Intelligence sees a lot of this. They see the most immediate intel that we have. They try to address this appropriately. And some of the things that we need to do is intel on our enemies.

So I am hopeful that this bill which has just been passed will contribute to making it safer for Americans, and make our enemies, whose simple design is that they would want to kill us because we are not their culture, not their religion, not their—and when I refer to them as ''civilization,'' I have to put that in quotes, Mr. Speaker. But that is the situation that is in front of us.

As the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence delivers a bill to the floor about which most of us don't have inside knowledge of, we have to keep in mind what has happened with the intelligence community and the results of the attacks that have taken place around the world. That takes me to what we saw, heard, and learned and thought we knew, to a greater degree than most Americans would agree did know, with regard to Iraq.

We went in there to liberate them in March of 2003. I was here in this Congress then. I remember the intelligence that was delivered. I remember the rhythm that was taking place, the message delivered by the President and the Vice President, the agreement on what they had for intelligence that went from U.S. intelligence, Israeli intelligence, French intelligence, everybody in the intelligence community for the world agreed essentially on the same thing, and Saddam was removed from power. American and coalition forces went in to do that, and in the ensuing aftermath of the liberation, we saw an ebb and flow of forces in Iraq.

One of them was a surprise for me to learn, as al Qaeda stepped in to places and took over in places like Fallujah and Ramadi—that we allowed that to happen on our watch. We occupied bases in Iraq. We had swept through the country and cleaned the country up. We had set up a government and turned it over to the voice of the Iraqi people. Free enterprise was starting to flow. Oil was starting to flow and was starting to go into the treasuries of Iraq. And yet, cities like Fallujah and Ramadi and others were taken over by al Qaeda. We watched that happen. That happened under the Bush administration. After it got to a certain point, President George W. Bush began to look for solutions. He was not willing to accept a capitulation in Iraq, an all-out pullout of Iraq that would have allowed for al Qaeda and our American enemies, generally Sunni-related forces, to take Iraq back over again. That was what we had under Saddam, not al Qaeda but the Sunni forces dominated Iraq. And the forces within Iraq that had been pushing back on American forces and Shia forces within Iraq, our President was not willing to accept that. President Bush was not willing to accept that.

He put together the surge, the counterinsurgency strategy that was drafted by General Petraeus. General Petraeus took some time off from his combat leadership in Iraq to sit down at Fort Leavenworth and write the counterinsurgency strategy. That strategy, before it was actually brought forward and published, was a strategy that was beginning to be developed to be implemented in Iraq.

I had the circumstance of timing to have been in Iraq before the surge was a name but when the concept was being discussed and developed by our commanders in the field and pushed by General Petraeus at the time. I saw the success of the surge as we went in and aligned ourselves with the tribal interests of the Sunnis as well as the Shias, who understood that al Qaeda was too brutal, that they could not be trusted to simply allow the Iraqi people to run their own country and run their own government, and so they aligned themselves with the people who they envisioned would be the successful ones on the other side of the violent and bloody conflict that was ensuing.

That aligned the right people on the right side, on our side of that particular battle, Mr. Speaker, that particular phase of the war in Iraq. There were many battles. It allowed for the surge of U.S. forces to step in, sweep al Qaeda out and build an alliance and an allegiance with local tribal interests say, in Anbar, and in multiple provinces and really all of Iraq to establish a peaceful foundation that would allow for a legitimate government of, by, and for the people of Iraq, and a free enterprise system to be put in place. They had then an opportunity to succeed and an opportunity to build a stable democracy in the country of Iraq.

Those were the circumstances that the Bush administration left for the Obama administration. However, I would add one piece to this that is apparently not being discussed in today's news media, Mr. Speaker, and that is this: on November 17, 2008, after Barack Obama was elected for his first term in office, President Bush, under his administration, I will say allowed or recommended or assented to our U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Ryan Crocker, who is an individual who is a wonderful public servant, one of the most knowledgeable people that we have on that whole area of the world we call the Middle East and whom has impressed me with the deep knowledge and the good judgment he has, and the careful rhythm of the work that he does, someone who has an eye on the moving of the organism in that part of

the world and how U.S. policy influences that part of the world. So I wanted to put these commercials in for Ambassador Crocker because I remain very impressed with Ambassador Ryan Crocker.

It came to be his task to sign, however, a new status of forces agreement with Iraq. The moment I read that status of forces agreement, which was signed by Ambassador Crocker on behalf of President Bush, November 17, 2008, after President Obama was elected, so under the lame duck era of President-elect Obama and in the last months of President Bush's administration—Ambassador Crocker signed the status of forces agreement, which agreed to pull all military forces out of Iraq, agreed to abandon the bases that we had established, abandon the airstrips that we had established, and the defensive positions, and the ability to project force in Iraq was not only diminished, it was essentially eliminated by that agreement.

I was alarmed that the administration would negotiate and agree to such a status of forces agreement that so weakened our ability to project power in Iraq; that with all of the blood and treasure that was invested, it sent the message that said either we don't care any longer or we have such confidence in the Maliki regime and such confidence in the new government that had been set up throughout those bloody years in Iraq that we didn't need to be there any longer.

I think of the history of the United States' involvement, Mr. Speaker, and the times we have gone into places like Germany, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, for example, around the world where America has invested blood and treasure, we have also established bases to operate from, to project power, to project force, to protect freedom throughout the reaches of the interests of the United States of America, and at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives and billions, in fact trillions of dollars, we have not in the past washed our hands and walked away as if we wanted to be finished with it, except that as I speak, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that we did have General Winfield Scott in Mexico in about 1845. We signed the Treaty of Hidalgo which essentially gave Mexico back to Mexico after the Americans had invaded and occupied the state of Mexico, including Mexico City. We could have stayed. We could have established an American presence there. We could have brought the American civilization into Mexico. Looking back on it historically, perhaps we should have done so, but that was the time when American blood and American treasure was just packaged up and brought back home again, although out of that bargain came the Gadsden Purchase and also a new line of American border between the United States and Mexico. So there was something gained from that.

In this case, we sacked up our bats and went home. We left a few marines in the embassy in Baghdad. The rest of it, we left to the Iraqis. As the intelligence came up, Mr. Speaker, and we watched what was going on, we learned that ISIS was growing and the conflict in Syria reached a questionable peak last September, last August, actually, around Labor Day in September when President Obama announced that he was planning on doing a tiny little, itsy-bitsy, teeny-weeny surgical strike into Syria, and that was when Secretary of State Kerry said it would be, and this is not an exact quote, but what I remember is that the strike would be infinitesimally small. So a tiny, little military ding on Assad's regime to send a message to him: Don't use your chemical weapons any longer on Syrians. Well, that never happened. It didn't happen partly because we needed the British cooperation. Or, apparently, the President wanted the British cooperation and David Cameron, the Prime Minister, went to the British Parliament and said, I would like to have authorization to conduct a military operation strike—I don't know if he said infinitesimally small—in Syria.

□ 2000

And the British Parliament rejected that proposal, and so David Cameron was powerless to go forward in support of a U.S. effort that might have been a military strike or two, however small they might have been, in Syria.

Then our President, President Obama, toyed with the idea of coming to Congress and asking us for the permission or the endorsement or the authority to conduct operations in Syria.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that my opinion is, constitutionally, the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. Some in this Congress would argue that the President can't issue a military strike order without first getting the consent of Congress.

I would argue instead that we are living in an era where the President of the United States must have that authority. He must have the authority to, in an instant, order a military strike if that is what the circumstances and the intelligence say is required. It is the President's decision. If the President orders our military into operations and over a period of time—and I think that an appropriate period of time today is a 30-day window—then if it is going to go beyond that, he should come back to Congress and ask for our support and ask for our endorsement of those military operations. But the initial strikes, the President has to have the authority, and has the authority under the Constitution, to order an immediate and military strike.

The President didn't do that. He followed David Cameron's request before the British Parliament, and then when the British Parliament said, no, he toyed with the idea of asking Congress. Congress sent enough messages out through the media that essentially was a whip check on the vote of Congress on whether we would authorize military force going into Syria.

When the President understood he wasn't going to get that authorization, then he decided apparently not to act in Syria, and he decided apparently to lead from behind—which is the definition of following, not leading—and he decided apparently to do the things in foreign policy that we have seen him do continually, and that is best described by the word ''dither.'' The President has been dithering on foreign policy, especially the things that require immediate response.

There is a theory in human nature and philosophy that says that if you procrastinate, then eventually the decision will be made for you, that if you dither, the decision will be made for you.

Action in Syria, or the decision, was resolved by dithering and waiting, and now it became clear that we can't identify good guys on either side of this argument. We had good guys. And I didn't advocate for this, Mr. Speaker, and so I am somewhat of a Monday morning quarterback looking back on this Syrian issue.

We had some intelligence that identified the people that were good people, those who wanted to see a free Syria. The Free Syrian Army initially led by Syrians that believed in a free Syria and Syrians that believe that Syria needed to remain a nation-state, a country unto itself, that was owned, operated, and run, a government that responded to the people of Syria, that was the initial ideology that drove the Free Syrian Army by the intel that I picked up. I have traveled into that part of world a number of times, Mr. Speaker.

One of the colonels who was a leader in the movement was essentially, I'll say, given over to the Assad regime in a military operation and was then pressed into prison, and that made him powerless. At that point, al Qaeda and the offshoots of al Qaeda and the factions of it began to assert themselves and infiltrate the Free Syrian Army to the point where we are not able any longer to identify the positive forces in Syria. You have al Qaeda and their affiliates, including ISIS, that are operating there, that have established the foundations for what they believe is to be the future caliphate of Islam.

As a result, partly the result of the U.S. not asserting itself, partly the result of perhaps not having intelligence that was good enough in that part of the world, the U.S. didn't act. The President led from behind. The U.S. didn't act. The British Parliament said ''no'' to David Cameron, and we have a mess in Syria. We have had multiple executions and beheadings taking place, Christians being persecuted and killed in Syria as well. Now the foundation of ISIS has flowed out of Syria and is flowing across Iraq.

This group, the ISIS, has asserted themselves to the point where some are

saying we need to avoid a civil war in Iraq. I will argue instead we are almost past that. We are almost past the point where the civil war has actually been engaged and it is closer to the point where it could be over, resulting in an ISIS invasion and occupation of nearly the entire nation-state of Iraq. They pushed that far into the countryside where the majority of the real estate is controlled and occupied by them.

This is an astonishing development, especially considered in light of the President's statements 3 or 4 months ago when he told America and the world that we didn't need to worry very much about ISIS because they are simply the junior varsity—the junior varsity, Mr. Speaker. How could a force, a junior varsity that doesn't have an identifiable source of military supplies and munitions—although we have some intel on where that comes from—that doesn't have a confident, identifiable source of funding to pay their people or buy their equipment munitions—although we have some fairly good sources on where that comes from—how could this junior varsity rise up in a period of 3 to 4 months from the time that the President said that they are the JV, how could they rise up and take over that much of Syria and flow into Iraq and invade and occupy Anwar province, for example, and now take the refinery at Baiji, the largest refinery in Iraq, and shut down or control the oil supply in Iraq? Now they have diverted it back to their own uses. Now we are at gas rationing in Iraq. Baghdad is threatened to be surrounded. The President has announced some days ago that he is willing to send up to 300 military personnel into Iraq presumably to prepare to evacuate Americans.

This is a calamity of colossal proportions, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, it was unforeseen by the White House and the President of the United States, the wise Commander in Chief and the people in the White House who have the maximum access to the entire intelligence community, the intelligence community that is being discussed and reauthorized here on the floor of the House tonight by the chair and the ranking member, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I would think that the question that it doesn't take much intelligence to ask is: Mr. President, how did you miss this? How did you declare ISIS the junior varsity? How could they have emerged as this powerful force that is sweeping across Iraq?

This isn't a civil war. This is a blitzkrieg by the enemy that is taking over the civilian governments and invading and occupying the towns in Iraq and executing the people who do not fit their particular religious sect. They are persecuting Christians. They are driving Christians out of that part of the world, and they are killing those that they choose to.

It isn't that alone. They bragged over a week ago that they had executed 1,700 Iraqi soldiers. Most of these soldiers will be Shi'a. And it is the Sunnis that are doing the executing and the killing. They have long been the most aggressive, the most militant, the most brutal, and the most violent force of the Islamic world, in that part of the world, in Iraq in particular.

ISIS has apparently and, according to some news accounts, are so violent and so brutal that they have even caused al Qaeda itself to step back from them and say: You are too violent and too brutal. Now, that is going a long way to think that people that would fly planes into the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, and burn to death the Americans that they did would find that the brutality of ISIS is so brutal that they would want to distance themselves from it.

I am not sure I believe that analysis. I think that that is one of those conclusions du jour that we come to; once you hear somebody say it, it gets repeated again and again, and pretty soon others pick it up, no one challenges it, and now we think that al Qaeda has been repulsed by the brutality of ISIS. I am not convinced of that.

Mr. Speaker, I can say this: I am repulsed by their brutality. I am repulsed by the beheadings that they do. I am repulsed by the videos. I am repulsed by the pictures. I am repulsed by the summary executions of hundreds, and probably thousands, of people that don't fit their religious sect that find themselves within the enforcement capability now of the black-flagged ISIS.

I am repulsed by what has come out of there. If we could see the actual reality of all the things that are going on within that part of the battle zone and in the aftermath of it as they go down through the streets and do their ethnic cleansing, I think we will find that thousands of people have been summarily executed by ISIS.

I think we will find that at least hundreds have been beheaded. I think we will find that thousands have been shot in the back of the head as they have their hands tied behind them and they are forced to kneel. I think we will find that in those numbers there will also be hundreds, and perhaps thousands, that have been forced to lay on the ground in a ditch and simply executed with AK–47 fire into the back of their heads or wherever. I think we will find that some—in fact, the videos are out there now—have been forced to kneel beside a pit in a hole in the ground that has a fire burning in it from gas poured into the hole, had gas poured onto their heads and then pushed into the hole to be burned to death in a pit.

That is the kind of brutality that we have that is taking over that part of the world. That is the kind of people that have raced across the desert, in the open desert, and faced no air power from the United States of America whatsoever. They have only faced this: the President sitting in the White House dithering, a President who has decided—he gave a speech a week ago last Friday at noon in this town, and this speech was, he came out to do his press conference and he said—I am going to give this my summary version, the STEVE KING interpretation of the President's speech that day, a week ago last Friday at noon. He essentially conveyed this message to us:

Things aren't going as well in Iraq as we had hoped. There is an enemy that has penetrated into Iraq. We are not going to have boots on the ground in Iraq. I have several options. We are going to study the options for a few days. It will take at least that long to evaluate. There will be no boots on the ground. We have options, but we are not going to deploy any options until such time as there are political solutions. If there is not a political solution, there is not going to be peace in Iraq.

So he says: I am going to require the Iraqis to produce a political solution before we will use any of the options that we have that might—he didn't say this—but that might help them, was the implication. There will be no boots on the ground. We are going to study this for a few days. Then after we study it, we are going give the Iraqis an assignment, and the assignment will be: produce a political solution and then maybe we can get around to helping you.

Huh. Well, that is the formula, Mr. Speaker, for dithering. That is the formula for dithering rather than fiddling. And while Iraq is being invaded by the black flag, radical Islamists to establish a caliphate, the President is dithering in a very similar way that Nero was fiddling while Rome was burning.

Iraq is collapsing. The soil in Iraq has been sanctified by the blood of our warriors and our heroes to the tune of billions upon billions of U.S. dollars, much of it borrowed from foreign countries to keep this budget and this economy afloat. All of that price, and we don't know how this is going to come out?

I actually don't expect that the entire nation-state of Iraq will be swamped by the black flag ISIS. I don't actually expect that, but it is a significant threat that that happens—a significant threat. As we watch the map, as the flood and the takeover of that sanctified sand in Iraq is getting greater and greater on the side of ISIS and smaller and smaller for the Shi'as, and while the confusion within what I would call the legitimized Government of Iraq causes them to retreat and back up, it looks like their last redoubt is likely to be Baghdad.

The President has dithered, and the opportunities for air strikes from the military have diminished and now the opportunities to actually bring what would otherwise be a cheap delay, at least, of that invasion, an invasion that runs at the speed that is as fast as an American military, an American armor penetrated into Iraq when we

went in to liberate in March of 2003. ISIS is penetrating into Iraq at a speed almost that fast without nearly the equipment, without nearly the planning, without nearly the communications as the Iraqis peel backwards in front of them.

□ 2015

This is something more similar to—well, I will put it this way: when Desert Storm came about and needed to be done, there was much discussion in the public airways in this country about the Republican Guard in Iraq, these crack troops that were highly trained and well equipped.

Even though their tanks were a little bit on the old side, they were supposedly well maintained and well positioned, and their armor could not be penetrated. To send U.S. forces against them in the desert was going to be a bloodbath supposedly, if you listen to some of the pundits here in this country, generally the liberal ones.

I am listening to this dialogue and have been to the locations now a number of times, and I see where they have dug their tank pits, and they take a bulldozer, dig the sand out in two directions, pull the tank down in, they set that tank in, in a fighting position, and it can fire.

It can fire from that fighting position, and any kind of horizontal fire will be blocked by the dirt that surrounds it, but from the air, they are sitting ducks.

That seemingly did not occur to the liberal people who were pontificating about how fearsome the Republican Guard was, but we know what happened when the American Air Force began to fly sorties over the Republican Guard and over their armored divisions.

A similar, in fact, a greater vulnerability existed for ISIS, as they traveled down the paths through the desert and the roads—easy, easy targets for the U.S. Air Force.

While this is going on, the President had decided: I am going to spend some days thinking about this, we have to study this, we will gather all this intel together, and then I am going to require a political solution for the Iraqis, I am going to dither.

Frustrating and infuriating, it should send a message to the Iraqis there isn't a will there. Our enemies know that, so they push on us. They push on us in Iraq, and we are watching the real estate be taken over, with black flags flying over it.

We are watching the will of the Iraqi troops to collapse in the face of the enemy. We have watched, as I said, the refinery of Baiji is now invaded and occupied, Fallujah is, and Ramadi is—multiple cities—Tal Afar, on and on, multiple cities in Iraq taken over, who now have a black flag of al Qaeda's affiliate, ISIS, flying over it.

The influence of America is diminished and pushed backwards. Iraq looks to Iran as an ally. They wonder if the U.S. is going to do anything.

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker. We are faced with a Russia that is pushing hard against the free world, a Putin who took the glory of the Olympics and the Russian hypernationalism that flowed from it and decided that he would immediately, after the Olympics in Sochi, went in and invaded and occupied Crimea.

He had a base there with a lease on it. If it was just a place to operate from, he could have done that peacefully, without violating international law and without going and invading and occupying. He could have operated freely out of his naval base there in Crimea. He chose not to do that.

I think it is ironic that Yalta was invaded and occupied by Putin. That was the location where Stalin and Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt negotiated the line across Europe that was to be the line in the aftermath of the Second World War, which became the Iron Curtain and became the dividing line between east and west.

Yalta was invaded and occupied as a component of Crimea, by Putin riding on the wave of Russian hypernationalism that came from the success of the Olympics, and now, he is pushing into Ukraine and testing them.

We know that—no, let's just say this, Mr. Speaker: we believe that, when troops show up and they are wearing Russian uniforms and they are carrying Russian weapons and they appear to be deployed as Russian troops in everything except a lacking of insignias on their uniforms and not flying a Russian flag, who do we think these people are? Do we think they are something other than Russians?

Why would we think that some force that looks, for all the world, like Russian forces—because Putin doesn't admit that they are Russian, somehow they might have come from someplace else. Who do we think they are? The Russians, the Russians in Russian uniforms, with Russian equipment, Russian supplies, Russian systems, everything except the Russian insignias.

Meanwhile, we don't hear from the President of the United States in a strong way, and meanwhile, Ukrainians wonder what is going to happen. They wonder if they have a chance of defending themselves. They wonder if any other part of the world is going to do that. Are we going to see the Iron Curtain be pushed westerly again?

When the Berlin Wall came down November 9, 1989, that was the crashing down of the Iron Curtain. For a time, freedom echoed across Europe, all the way across Europe. In fact, it echoed, at least theoretically, all the way across Asia, to the Pacific Ocean, and it has been pushed back again by the strong arm of Vladimir Putin.

Now, we are seeing a line of demarcation between east and west that is being redefined by Putin with his hypernationalism, in his effort to restore the old Soviet Union—the former Soviet Union.

The Eastern bloc countries are very nervous about what happens with a very aggressive Putin. They are very nervous because they wonder: Do they have an ally in the United States?

They wonder if they can hang on for another 2½ years until a new President is elected that is going to believe in America, in a robust America, an America that defends itself, an America that has bonded with its allies, an America that has tax and regulatory policies that allows for the growth over a free enterprise system, so that we can see an economic vigor that will drive our economy here and give us confidence in who we are again and go to the furthest outreaches of the world where Americans are doing business in country after country.

The AmCham, the American Chamber of Commerce, and nation after nation become the ambassadors of the United States. They teach the world about trade and free enterprise. They teach the world about we have an American—it is not a hypernationalism. What it is is a very active commercial style. I would give an example.

As I deal with the Australians, for example—and I have a special affection for the Aussies—they will come and make contact, and they will make friends, and they will be sociable. Then they will go away, come back again, and do that same thing.

On the third time, they are more likely to bring up the discussion about the business that they want to conduct, Mr. Speaker, but Americans are not like that. We are a little bit different.

We are more like the Donald Trumps, where we come in, we figure out what we want to do businesswise, we think we understand what the other party needs and wants in a business deal, we believe that all parties involved in a business deal need to have an opportunity to profit.

So if $1 is going to change hands with one other person, two people need to benefit from that, the buyer and the seller. If it is a three-way deal, then three entities benefit. If it is thousands or tens of thousands of people—shareholders, for example—everybody is designed to benefit from that.

We go in and we say: Here is the deal. This is our proposal. This is why it is good for you. This is why it is good for us. This is why we ought to sign here on the dotted line. We will get around to all the niceties and discussion afterwards. Maybe we will have a meal or a drink together, but let's do the business, and then we will talk about the social side.

That is the American way. We do business fast. We do business efficiently. It is a culture that has developed in this country because we have had an unfettered ability to buy, sell, trade, make, gain—here in America, without a government interference, without the belief that we had to set at the table negotiators that represented

the government, negotiators that represented the unions, to sit and talk with the negotiators that represented the capital.

In America, we do business with capital—capital because we do business for a profit and capital deserves a return on its investment. Labor gets the benefit from that profit by increasing wages and benefits to hire the best people to produce that good or service that has a marketable value.

That is what has made America's economy great, is our attitude about buy, sell, trade, make, gain, do good, produce goods and services with a marketable value here and abroad.

Let's send our Americans abroad to do business, let them take our values there, let them encourage people to come here and do business with us, and let's open up our trade wherever we can all over the world, with a free and smart trade system, that if we are going to grant access to our markets, what we ask is let us also have access to your markets.

We don't believe etiologically in trade protectionism. We believe in free and smart trade. We don't believe in stupid trade. Stupid trade would be, well, you have access to our markets, but it is okay with us if we don't have access to yours. No deal.

Americans make a lot of deals, and we make them efficient, we make them smart, we make them fast, and we make them all over the world. That has been a foundation of the burgeoning growth of the American economy and the American civilization.

It has been restrained in recent years because we have a leadership that has failed to convince me that they believe in free enterprise.

We should remember that, even on the immigration flashcards that we have, Mr. Speaker, when legal immigrants come to America and they want to study to become citizens of the United States, they will study the history of this country and the things that are necessary to be prepared to take the naturalization test.

USCIS, the Citizenship and Immigration Services, has a collection of flashcards that they can study from, so they can be prepared for the test.

These flashcards are laminated. They are about this big. They are mostly red in their base with white letters on them, and you can look at them and ask this question: Who is the Father of our Country? Flip that card around. The answer: George Washington.

Who emancipated the slaves? Other side of the card: Abraham Lincoln. What is the economic system of the United States of America? Flip the card over: free enterprise capitalism, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I wish that the White House believed in it as much we ask our legal immigrants to believe in it as they prepare for the test for the naturalization to citizenship of the United States. That is part of who we are; yet our economy is stagnant, it is flat.

There seems to be an attitude that emerges from the administration that free enterprise and that capitalism itself is somehow a dirty word. No, it is a foundation of the economy of the United States of America. It is on the test.

They believe, as I watch their reaction, that somehow the capital, the employers, are victimizing both employees and customers and that there is plenty of money there and plenty of profit there to pay for more regulation, to pay for more taxation, and to pay for more raises and wages and benefits for employees that could be dictated by the White House.

That is not the American way. It has got to be free enterprise. The relationship between the employer and the employee is up to them, not up to the government. The government can't set wages.

A government can't determine that one work is comparable to another work. Only supply and demand can do that effectively and efficiently. That is the American way, Mr. Speaker.

There are other things that are the American way. For example, we don't support lawbreakers. We don't believe that people who habitually, in a calculated way, systematically violate America's laws should be rewarded for doing so.

We understand that, when Ronald Reagan said, what you tax, you get less of; what you subsidize, you get more of; and if you subsidize lawbreakers—if you reward lawbreakers, you get more lawbreakers.

I was disappointed with Ronald Reagan. I was disappointed twice during his administration. I watched him closely. I believe that Ronald Reagan understood the founding principles of this country so confidently and so clearly that no amount of lobbying, no amount of rhetoric, no amount of misinformation was going to change his adherence to the fundamental principles that are the pillars of American exceptionalism.

So here in this Congress, in 1986, in the House and down through the rotunda and the Senate, there was an intense debate about amnesty.

The debate went something like this: There are 1 million illegal immigrants in America. They have come across the border—generally across the border from Mexico—and it is too difficult, we can't deport them all—I think I have heard that before—so we must make an accommodation to them.

We are having difficulty getting enforcement at the border because there are competing interests in those who would drag down the effort to enforce our immigration laws, especially secure the border, but we can get full cooperation on border security and full cooperation on domestic enforcement if we just give amnesty to the million people that are here illegally, and from this point forward hereafter, we will all enthusiastically join together and enforce immigration law, and INS will be in every office of every employer in America, examining your records, to make sure that you are carefully following the law and being there to be the tool to help enforce immigration law.

I listened to that, and I thought: President Reagan, you know you can't reward lawbreakers. If you do that, you are going to get more lawbreakers—just like if you subsidize any activity, you are going to get more of that activity, and if you tax it, you are going to get less of it.

Well, the penalty for violating the law is equivalent to a taxation. It is a deterrent for violating the law. The greater the penalty, the less law violators that you have.

□ 2030

The less the penalty, the greater the incentive, the more law violators you have. So, if you wanted to subsidize lawbreakers, you are going to get lots more lawbreakers.

These arguments, I thought, were so clear that I didn't need to go stand outside the White House with a sign. I could just write a letter here and there and with great confidence raise my family, run my business, and have trust that the President of the United States would veto that Amnesty Act that was to come to his desk in 1986.

It came to his desk and the people around him strongly encouraged President Reagan to sign the Amnesty Act and take all of this disagreement and all of this angst off the table that had to do with the million illegal aliens who had entered the United States illegally or were unlawfully present in America, give them a legal presence and be done with it, and INS will enforce this law at the border—Border Patrol—and internally at Immigration and Naturalization Services.

Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act. In my construction office, as an employer, I hit the high levels of frustration, at least for that stage of my life, but I began to comply with the law.

When we had applicants for jobs that came in, I made sure that I took the records that they have. I made sure that I evaluated their documents and their Social Security card, if I could get it. Most of the times, I could then. And a driver's license. At least two forms of identification.

I made sure that our job application form collected the records necessary that were required by that 1986 Amnesty Act. I made sure that I kept those records for every applicant. I was prepared for our employees and the applicants for the jobs that wanted to come in and work for King Construction, and I made sure that I had all those records up to snuff. I was meticulous in keeping those records and making sure that my executive secretary kept those records because I feared—or I was concerned—I don't know that I was afraid, because I did it right—but I expected INS, or Immigration and Naturalization Services, the forerunner to

now ICE, to show up at my office and say, We want to see your records. We want to make sure that you haven't hired anybody illegally. We want to make sure you haven't entertained hiring anybody illegally. We want to make sure that you have collected the documentation so that you are not enabling the employment of illegal aliens in America.

Well, you all know this, Mr. Speaker. Nobody ever showed up from INS, as they didn't show up in millions of employers' offices around the country. The enforcement didn't materialize domestically. It didn't really get enhanced at the border either. The promise of enforcement came unfilled, but the promise of amnesty for a million people came in triplicate.

Three times the number of people that were projected to be amnestied by the 1986 Amnesty Act were actually granted amnesty. Over 3 million of them were granted amnesty. I have met with a respectable number of them at random and happenstance over the years, and I asked them, What do you think of amnesty? They will look at me and they will say, I support amnesty. I think it was a good idea. Amnesty was good me for, amnesty was good for my family. Amnesty is a good policy.

So I say, What do you think about the rule of law and what do you think about the reward when people break the law? Should they be rewarded for it?

Well, that takes them off in a place they don't want to discuss. They just know what was good for them. I don't disagree. It was good for them, but it was bad for America. It was really bad for America, because here we are 28 years later and we are still debating the issue. The carrot of amnesty still hangs out in front of people from all over the world that says, Well, Americans have a soft heart. They are the most generous Nation in the world, welcoming immigrants to the tune of 1.2 million legal immigrants a year.

We don't even care about the quality of the standards of those who are coming into America legally—not very much, anyway—because between 7 and 11 percent of the legal immigration in America is immigration that is measured by some kind of a standard that might be an index of what they can do to contribute to our country.

Every nation in the world should have an immigration policy that is designed to enhance the economic, social, and the cultural well-being of that country.

I have long stated and continue to believe that we must have an immigration policy here that is designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States of America. We can't operate an immigration policy that seems to be designed to become the safety valve for those in poverty in the world—over 7 billion people. The poverty in the world grows at a faster rate than we have the ability to drain off even those who are the most aggrieved by poverty.

By the way, the numbers that I have seen when we were back at about 6 billion people on the planet were that there were about 4.6 billion people on the planet that had a lower standard of living than the average person from Mexico.

So if you think about alleviating poverty, there are many places to draw people from where the poverty is worse. And there are many places to draw people from where the perpetrators of violence come in significantly greater numbers.

However, even the violent death rate in the United States is only one-third of the violent death rate in Mexico. If you compare violent death rates in other countries, Mexico is one of the safer countries from Central America and on south. I think you actually have to get down to Chile before you find a country that has a violent death rate in the Western Hemisphere comparable to the lower death rate of the United States.

At one time, Colombia had a violent death rate 15.4 times that of the United States. Our rate today is 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000. Roughly 10 years ago, our violent death rates was 4.5 violent deaths per 100,000. At that time, Mexico's violent death rate was 13.2. A 4.6 violent death rate in the U.S., a 13.2 violent death rate in Mexico.

Drug wars and the massive killings that have taken place that have exceeded 50,000 people in Mexico—maybe 70,000 or more that have died in the drug wars—that is part of the statistic that has taken Mexico at a higher violent death rate now of over 18 per 100,000, and perhaps there is some index here that the U.S. violent death rate has gone in that period of time from 4.6 on up to 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000, but the ratio remains the same. Mexico is about three times more violent than the U.S., but it is significantly less violent than countries like Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

It has been stated here in this Congress that the highest murder rate, I believe, in the world, is Honduras. I have not seen those numbers, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know that that is true, but I can tell you the violent death rate in Guatemala is 74.9 violent deaths per 100,000 compared to 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000 in the United States.

It is easy enough to do the math. It is a little more than 11 times the violent death rate of the United States in Guatemala. So there is significant violence there, but some of the people that are the perpetrators of that violence are also migrants.

If we look at McAllen, Texas, and the housing that is taking place as illegal immigrants come across the border, it looks like thousands and probably tens of thousands of what I will call migrants that appear to be coming from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, they come a thousand miles through Mexico, arrive at the Rio Grande River, and stage themselves to try to come across the river into the United States.

They are brought across by coyotes who are part of the drug cartels. Sometimes they come on jet skis, sometimes in rafts, sometimes in inner tubes. They come across the river.

The staging that is there and the pushing of the people that are in here, the mix of the population that are being picked up at McAllen, Texas, is reported in the Guatemalan newspaper to be this. Of that mix of unaccompanied minors—certainly, they aren't all unaccompanied minors, but it is a special category—of that mix, 80 percent are male—that is, 8 out of 10 are boys, 2 out of 10 are girls—younger than 18. They are 17 and younger. Eighty percent boys, 20 percent girls.

Of the country of origin, two-thirds of them are from the three countries that we have defined as OTMs, or other than Mexicans—Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. That is two-thirds of them.

We see pictures of little kids. We hear stories of a 3-year-old, a 2-month-old, 4, 5, 6, and 7-year-olds. Yes, they are there. They are there in some kind of numbers. Mostly, those younger kids are in the company of, generally, a mother or a parent.

Of those unaccompanied minors, 83 percent of them—let me get my numbers right here—80 percent are boys. Eighty-three percent of them fit this age group, Mr. Speaker, and that is they are either 15, 16, or 17 years old. Eighty percent are boys and 83 percent fit those three ages—prime ages for gang recruitment.

It isn't all innocents that are coming into America through this. Yet we have a heart, we have an obligation. The first thing we have to do is stop this, and we have to send them back and we have to require the countries of origin to distribute them in the places they want them to live in their country of origin.

We have an agreement. The reason only 12 percent are from Mexico is we have an agreement forged by a bill that passed this Congress in 2008 that requires Health and Human Services to negotiate a repatriation policy. So when we pick up the unaccompanied minors, within 48 hours they are to be turned over to Mexican authorities and taken back to their homes in Mexico, to a significant degree. And not always within 48 hours. That does work, which is why we don't see a larger number of Mexicans coming in on that.

But the OTMs—the other than Mexicans—are exploiting a loophole because we don't have an agreement with those countries. We need to change the statute here in Congress and send a bill to the President that negotiates an agreement so those countries can receive those unaccompanied minors. They will be required to do so. And if we fail to reach those agreements, we should then freeze the foreign aid to those countries so that that amount cannot increase to provide them an incentive.

I would remind the people, Mr. Speaker, who are sending their children here, releasing a child and saying, Go across a thousand miles of Mexico, go with enough pesos to pay mordida to get to the United States, and present yourself to the Border Patrol and say, I am afraid that I'll be killed in my country, I remind them that in this country, if a mother or a father loses track of their child and their child wanders off down the street, they are guilty of child endangerment. They are guilty of child abandonment.

If they are guilty of that, maybe not always on the first offense, but on subsequent offenses we do this. We take those children into the custody of our Health and Human Services, whichever the State may be, and we can terminate the parental rights and we can place that child into foster care and we can transfer that child into adoption. Because we in this country do not tolerate parents who abandon their children or fail to take care of their children or endanger their children.

That is the very description of what happens if you send a child across a thousand miles of a country. That has got to stop, Mr. Speaker. I will be introducing legislation very soon that addresses that very topic.

I appreciate your attention and indulgence, and I yield back the balance of my time.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA: INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have to catch my breath after listening the last hour to an unbelievable stream of consciousness.

I want to be very specific about some things that we really need to do here in Congress.

Often, we come to the floor in the evening and we talk about the subject of making it in America, rebuilding the American economy brick by brick, road by road, job by job, and putting the manufacturing sector back on its feet.

Today, my colleagues and I want to talk about one part of that Make It in America agenda, and that is not the trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, or research, but rather the infrastructure part of that equation.

Infrastructure is the foundation upon which any economy grows. And the American infrastructure has a problem.

Here is the problem.

The American infrastructure is falling down, falling apart, overused, overworn, and in desperate need of rebuilding. We can do it. America once built the greatest infrastructure in the world. We are falling way, way behind in our own country and we are not even keeping up with other countries, such as China, which is building everything everywhere and laying in place an infrastructure that will carry them into the future.

□ 2045

Here is why we are not keeping up. Here is why we are falling down. Here is why we have potholes. Here is why cars are losing their ability to stay on the road. It is not because the drivers can't drive but because we are not spending the money that we once did. Way back in 2002, we were spending some $325 billion a year. Right now, we are down to somewhere below $250 billion on infrastructure. That is why we see bridges collapsing. That is why we have the transportation snarls and all of the problems in our transportation system.

As they say in the Middle East, just wait. It will get worse. Here in America, we are just 2 months away from this happening. We are going to fall off the transportation bridge. The funding for transportation programs, funded by the Federal Government, will run out of money sometime in August, perhaps in early September, depending on several factors that are simply unknown, but the funding for the maintenance and construction of our roads and bridges by the Federal Government will be over. There will be no more Federal funding available unless this Congress acts.

We have a roadmap. We have a plan. We have a program. President Obama and the Transportation Department, with Secretary Foxx, recently laid out a program called the GROW AMERICA Act. It is a program that would provide $302 billion over the next 4 years, which is money that is desperately needed for rail, buses, ports, the freight system—''buses'' meaning light rail, heavy rail. It is for the transit systems in our cities and the rail systems—Amtrak—bridges and highways. All of this is available. The GROW AMERICA Act is a real proposal. It is one that this Congress should take up. If there are some who have better ideas and better plans, bring them forward. For highways, it is about $199 billion. For bridges and buses, it is about $79 billion and about $10 billion for the freight systems. For the rail, it is another $10 billion to $12 billion.

All of this is possible, but we need to do this. We need to finance it, and this program by the President is fully financed. The $302 billion relies upon the existing excise tax that all of us pay for our gasoline, for our diesel fuel. The President would add another $100 billion or so to fill up the pot so that we would have the $302 billion, which is some 27 percent more than we presently are spending on the transportation system. Where does that extra money come from? It comes from corporate reforms, but that is not the only proposal on how to finance our transportation system.

In a few minutes, I will turn this over to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who will talk about that in some more detail. Also joining us tonight is my colleague from Kansas City, Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), who will be talking about his transportation system in that area.

But this is a real plan—a real proposal—all of the details that we would need on how we could develop the freight programs: where you would connect the ports to the rail systems, how you would provide those intermodal proposals, how we could repair the bridges—the funding for it—over a period of time, and the highways. It is all coordinated around fixing the things that are broken, not necessarily adding but fixing first, fixing what is broken.

For the rail systems, critically important is the intercity rail, which is the Amtrak system here on the east coast. Then this happens to be the Capitol Corridor in my own district, which runs from Roseville, all the way through San Jose and through San Francisco. It is one of the most heavily used rail corridors in the entire system.

One of the things that we also talk about here in the Make It In America is that we spend our tax money on American-made goods. If we are going to spend $302 billion of American taxpayer money, my legislation would increase the Buy American provisions, and I want to give you just one brief example of what it means:

This is the most modern locomotive in the United States, and it is, arguably, one of the most modern electric locomotives in the entire world. It is built in Sacramento. This is money that was made available in the American Recovery Act, the stimulus bill. Written into that bill was a provision that said that money—some $800 million—for Amtrak locomotives had to be spent 100 percent on American-made locomotives. Siemens, the big German manufacturing company, looked at that, and it said: $800 million and 100 percent American made? We could do that. So they took their factory in Sacramento and expanded it, and this is the first locomotive among those that will come off the lines—some 70 or 80 of them—that will be 100 percent American made. This locomotive will soon be operating here on the East Coast Corridor. Eventually, we will get those in Sacramento, but those will be diesel elective.

The final point I want to make before turning this over to my colleague Mr. BLUMENAUER is this. These were men and women in my district—Fairfield, California—in December of last year, who attended a job fair that I put on in Fairfield. I expected to find a few of my fellow citizens attending that. This job fair took place in December, and the temperature was just below 40 degrees. It was a foggy and rather cold day. More than 1,000 people lined up outside our job fair seeking a job.

Americans want to go to work. Americans want to work. They want those good, middle class jobs that come from building the infrastructure. It is just not the hard hat jobs. These are the technicians, the engineers, the accountants, the secretaries, the people who are working on the software. There are all of those jobs, and these are the men and women who want them.

So our plea today to our colleagues on the Republican side is: Let's go to work. Let's go to work here in the Congress. Let's put forward a transportation bill that avoids that transportation cliff, that allows the American public to go back to work—tens of thousands of jobs. Indeed, 3.5 million Americans will lose their jobs in the coming year if we fail to put together a transportation bill. That 3.5 million plus thousands upon thousands more will be able to go to work if we get this transportation program moving.

The President has given us a program, the GROW AMERICA Act. If there are those with better ideas, they should come forward. We should act upon that legislation, improve upon it and figure out the financing. If the President's notion of ending unnecessary corporate tax loopholes and giveaways isn't the best way, then let's put together a better way.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would yield back my share of the time and, if possible, turn it over to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), to manage the remaining portion of this session.

TRANSPORTATION—A VISION FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin, if I could, by thanking my friend from California for his ongoing leadership, advocacy, and focus on how we are going to rebuild and renew the country—making these critical investments, putting people to work, and calling upon this Congress to get in gear to be able to move the country forward. I appreciate his courtesy and his leadership.

I would like to begin, if I could, by turning to another of my colleagues from Kansas City, Missouri, Reverend EMANUEL CLEAVER, who is a gentleman who was kind enough to give me a visa to visit his district recently. I watched not just the affection that his constituents had for him but the big plans, evidenced in his community, that were dealing with how we put the pieces together for a more sustainable future—a vision for transportation. It was fascinating for me to watch, and I appreciate his allowing me to be a part of it.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas City at this time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, particularly with Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. GARAMENDI, who spoke earlier, because they have long histories—longer, in fact, than I have been in the House—of pushing for transportation issues.

I think that this is a rather sad and somewhat tragic moment in our history. The interstate highway system was developed and put in place in 1956, and who would have thought when we entered the 21st century that the Congress of the United States would fail to keep that system in top condition?

The transportation bill affects Americans in every State of this country. A robust Federal investment in transportation is an economic engine, strengthening hundreds of communities. The thing that I have said often in my district and, frankly, in hearings is that the best stimulus for the economy—the very best stimulus—is a transportation bill. The weird thing is that the infrastructure is the backbone of our economy upon which businesses, families, and communities thrive. Everyone is involved in this. Red or blue, urban or rural, we all rely on transportation and infrastructure. Ensuring economic prosperity is of paramount importance. It is not a Republican or a Democratic goal but one that we all share.

One of the things that has troubled me most since being elected to Congress 10 years ago is that we have somehow narrowed everything down to the point at which it is either red or blue—it is either Republican or Democratic. I am not sure how we can look at highway systems in terms of political tribalism. I served as the mayor of Kansas City for 8 years during the 1990s, and I can truthfully say that I had no idea on a day-to-day basis, based on what people said and did, who the Republicans were and who the Democrats were. We were all interested in trying to preserve Kansas City. When there was a pothole in one of the streets in Kansas City—and Kansas City is a huge city. It's 322 square miles. To give you an idea, you can put San Francisco inside our city limits 30 times or St. Louis three times. It is a huge city—what we all were interested in is making sure that it was fixed because there was no Republican way of fixing it, and there was no Democratic way of fixing it. We fixed the pothole. One of my great disappointments when I arrived here was that there was a Republican or a Democratic philosophy on everything, including on transportation and infrastructure.

Every dollar invested in Missouri transportation generates $4 of economic activity. The Federal Highway Administration actually estimates that, for every $1 billion spent on transportation, 34,000 direct and indirect jobs are created. Just think about that. There are 34,000 indirect and direct jobs that are generated. That is why I take every opportunity I can to talk about infrastructure and improvements to our roads and bridges and waterways in my district and in districts around the country.

Investments in transportation and infrastructure generate growth and jobs during initial design, construction, and then postconstruction. I can tell you that, at a time like this when we are still having some healing needed with our economy, this is the time to pump it up. We don't need QE4. We don't need to do another Dodd-Frank. We need to pass a transportation and infrastructure bill. That will begin to help heal this economy because it is a job creator.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers' 2013 report card—and I hope the people at home get this—3,500 bridges in Missouri alone are considered structurally deficient. There are 3,500 bridges in my State that are considered structurally deficient.

□ 2100

Over 3,300 are considered functionally obsolete. That is 14 percent of the bridges in the State of Missouri are functionally obsolete, and every day, Kansas Cityans and Missourians are driving over those bridges.

That is a tragedy because it is not only bad in Missouri, it is that way all over this country—all over the country, and this body is the only body that can address the problem.

While I agree that States should step up to raise the necessary revenues and make crucial investments themselves, it should be no surprise that interstate commerce is a duty in which this Congress is uniquely poised to fulfill.

We are a nation of red States and blue States, urban communities and rural communities. I represent both. While each State must make investments within the communities, the responsibility to ensure our Nation remains connected and globally competitive falls on this Congress.

Bridge after bridge after bridge is in danger. Highways are crumbling, and we cannot sit by and play partisan politics and argue while our infrastructure continues to deteriorate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight, hoping that these words are not falling on the floor and will not be impactful. When we come in here like this, we are hoping that these words matter and that things can change and that they will change.

It is my hope that this Congress will act and act quickly because we cannot wait until the last minute, going into August, when we will end up looking at a highway trust fund becoming insolvent, and that means it will drop below the $4 billion funding level as soon as next month, July. We must do something, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank Mr. BLUMENAUER for all the work that he has done on this issue over the years, and I hope that the American people will just saturate us with letters telling us: Pass a highway and transportation infrastructure bill.

Thank you, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you very much, Congressman CLEAVER. I appreciate your painting a very powerful picture, taking it home, as an example, and the work that you have done, both in Congress and as a local leader, a mayor, a member of the city council.

You understand this. You understand that the infrastructure in Kansas City, Missouri, used to be a point of pride. It was something that brought people together, but that is not unique to your community or mine.

Infrastructure used to be a point of pride that united Americans across this great Nation. 152 years ago, the Transcontinental Railroad under, I might say, a Republican President—President Lincoln—helped us be able to develop the United States.

It tied the country together. It helped in terms of the opening up of the west, and the United States from that point, until the end of World War II, had the finest passenger rail system in the world—not there anymore.

As was referenced, under the leadership, signed into law by President Eisenhower, there was a bipartisan initiative, a Democratically-controlled Congress, a Republican President, who initiated the interstate highway system.

The United States, over the course of a quarter century, had the largest public works project in our history to that point. It was in every State in the Union. It created more economic value than it cost, and it was a point of pride to have the finest road system in the world.

Similarly, we have made great advancements in our history dealing with water and sewage systems.

The simple fact is, as was referenced by both my colleagues already this evening, the United States is falling behind. We are no longer rated number one in the world. The last survey I saw put us at 14th and falling.

We are investing the smallest amount of percentage of our economy as we have in 20 years—less than 2 percent—and far less than our competitors in China, in Europe, Japan, India.

The United States is in trouble. Unless and until we are able to get our act together to be able to protect, maintain, and enhance our infrastructure, we are not going to be able to meet the needs of the American people, and in fact, we are going to lose our competitive position around the world.

On top of this, we are in the midst of a funding crisis for our infrastructure, and this could not come at a worse time.

As both my colleagues indicated, investing in infrastructure is one of the best ways to create family-wage jobs. The estimates are between 25,000 and over 30,000 jobs for each billion dollars that is invested.

The most recent report I saw from Standard & Poor's said, for $1.3 billion, it is 29,000 jobs.

That investment would actually lower the deficit $200 million, and it would increase overall economic activity in the United States a third more than the $1.3 billion invested. The $1.3 billion gives you, overall, $2 billion rippling through the economy.

While we are slowly falling apart, while we are struggling with a jobless recovery, and how we could desperately use these family-wage jobs that will be created in every State in the Union, there is also ongoing damage to individuals. They don't have to be on a bridge that collapsed.

AAA tells us—and that is the preeminent organization nationally that represents motorists—they have followed this very closely. Their estimate is that the average motorist incurs $323 a year of damage to their cars because of inadequately maintained roads, so it is not just that they are not getting the service.

It is not just that they are trapped in congestion. It is actually costing them money every month, in terms of damage to what, for most Americans, is their second or third most valuable asset.

Last Congress gave up on a 6-year reauthorization. They just couldn't do it. They walked around it, but they couldn't deal with the funding question, so they settled for a short-term, 27-month extension that expires in 98 days. September 30, it is over, but the money in the transportation trust fund will not last nearly that long.

My colleague mentioned that, next month or so, we are going to drop below the trust fund balance that the Department of Transportation tells us is necessary to be able to manage the hundreds and hundreds of contracts all across the country that are part of the unique Federal-State-local partnership.

They can't take the trust fund down to zero, so they are going to start cutting back this summer, and because our partners around the country in State and local government understand what is happening, they are starting to cut back now.

More than eight States are already signaling what they are going to have to forego this summer, so we have got a summer slowdown, and it is only going to get worse, and Congress, in the meantime, spins its wheels.

It is hard to be meaningful in efforts to reauthorize the surface transportation bill, which is on the verge of expiring, if you don't even know what your resources are.

We have no idea what the resources are that are available to the House Transportation Committee and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works because we haven't established how we are going to pay for it.

Now, we have heard gimmicks from our Republican friends. You know, last Congress, their solution was to take away all the guaranteed funding for transit and for transportation enhancements.

The enhancements, by the way, are the most popular program that the Department of Transportation administers. They were going to take away that guaranteed funding.

I find that somewhat ironic because that guaranteed funding came from Ronald Reagan. In the Reagan administration, they decided that they were going to have 20 percent in the transit account and 80 percent in the highway account, so you wouldn't have uncertainty. You wouldn't have people battling every year, year in and year out, about going forward on major projects.

Most important, if you are going to deal with major transit and highway projects, you need certainty; and President Reagan and his administration, in their wisdom, promoted a program that established the highway trust fund and had a separate account for transit.

Well, last Congress, the gimmick was: we will just strip away all that guaranteed funding, and we will have some theoretical money to keep the transportation program afloat.

It blew up in their face. They were able to get it through the Ways and Means Committee on a party line vote, by the way, never having a hearing on it, just moved to a work session, and it was roundly attacked.

Groups, truckers, business, environmental groups, local governments, transit, the entire infrastructure community rose up in rebellion against this goofy idea that was not going to deal with the fully funding needs, and it was going to pit people against one another.

The outrage was so strong that our Republican friends couldn't even bring their own bill to the floor, and it collapsed, and we were ending up with this 27-month gimmick.

It was funded by simply draining every dollar out of the highway trust fund, and in so doing, they thought they could maybe last for 27 months. Well, as we are finding out, they can't.

The next gimmick that we are hearing about—and I love this one—it is fascinating. Our Republican friends have required the post office, unlike any other agency—or near as I can tell, any business—to prefund the health insurance of future employees, so they are charging the post office an extra $5 billion a year for employees that aren't even on the payroll, let alone their retirement in the future.

So the post office has some challenges in terms of different patterns, in terms of this prefunding obligation, shifting use of the post office, and the refusal of some in Congress to allow the post office to operate like a business, so it has got a funding crisis.

The Republican alternative is to take a post office that has a funding crisis—it is a real one, it was artificially created, but it is a real crisis—and to eliminate Saturday mail delivery for 10 years and take these theoretical savings by eliminating Saturday home service and use these theoretical savings from an agency that they claim is going bankrupt, and they are actually trying to make go bankrupt, and use it

for another bankrupt institution—that is the highway trust fund.

Ludicrous—10 years' savings of eliminating home delivery, which are theoretical, no sense at all that they are going to materialize, but for 10 years—and it would just produce enough money to get us into the next fiscal year, and leave the post office worse off than it is now.

Luckily, I think our friends on the other side of the aisle have realized that is not a solution, and I think they have dropped that, realizing it is not going to go anywhere.

There are actual proposals that would meet this challenge. I have got legislation that has been endorsed by the AFL–CIO, by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, by both the truckers and AAA, the contractors, engineers, local government, transit, to just—straight up—deal with the fact that we haven't raised the gas tax for 21 years—pretty straightforward. It works.

□ 2115

My colleague, PETER DEFAZIO from Oregon, a senior member on the Transportation Committee, has proposed looking at a barrel tax for oil and makes a strong case that this would have significant advantages and would allow us to go forward.

You know, I don't care what solution we come up with. There are a number of good ideas. Last week, Senator MURPHY of Connecticut and Senator CORKER of Tennessee came up with a proposal in the Senate that they thought would provide those resources.

What is interesting is that the House has been AWOL on this. We have not had a single hearing in Ways and Means this year, last year, the year before that, or the year before that. It has been 42 months since the Republicans took over. We haven't had a single hearing on transportation finance. I find that shocking. I find it embarrassing as a member of the committee and as a Member of the House of Representatives. As an American, I find it shameful that we are not doing our part.

Luckily, the other body is moving. My friend and colleague, Senator RON WYDEN of Oregon, the chair of the Senate Finance Committee, is moving ahead with some alternatives that would help keep the trust fund afloat so that we can avoid the summer shutdown and we don't have to stop the programs and put these people out of work. It will give us breathing room so that the people in the House can step up and do our job.

Mr. Speaker, every single Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee requested the Republican leadership—months ago—to at least give us a hearing. You don't have to buy into any solution, but let's come together, look at the problem, and hear solutions from the Americans who are dealing with it. Let's hear from the Governors. Let's hear from the transit agencies, from the State transportation commissions, highway departments. Let's hear from the men and women who work in the maintenance and construction of our infrastructure—the bridges, the roads, the transit. Let's hear from the engineers, the truckers, the representatives of the automobiles. They have got some strong opinions. They have potential solutions. They have done research that the committee should hear about, that every Member of Congress should hear about.

Sadly, as the clock winds down, as we look at the summer shutdown and the pending bankruptcy of the highway trust fund, the House is frozen in place. Time is slipping away. We have just a few dozen legislative days before the House is scheduled to adjourn for the election, and we have not one thing on the agenda to deal with this.

I hope that my Republican colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee will join us in at least having a hearing, listening to alternatives, working together to analyze the pros and cons of the various approaches going forward. I hope that every Republican and every Democrat makes a commitment that we are not going to adjourn for the year until we provide the American people, the businesses and communities that depend on it, a robust, well-funded, stable highway transportation trust fund with dedicated funding. That was the key to President Eisenhower and the success of the interstate freeway system. That has helped us with aviation. It has made a difference in terms of transit.

The American people deserve no less than us our doing our job—robust funding, stable funding, dedicated funding that will allow American communities to have the partnership of the Federal Government that they need for the infrastructure they deserve. I strongly urge my colleagues to reflect on this, and I hope each American makes clear their desires and their expectations about how Congress meets this responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FITZPATRICK (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of travel delays.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 24 after 5 p.m., June 25 and June 26 on account of a family emergency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 316. An act to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1044. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the word that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

S. 2086. An act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 25, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6114. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Biennial Core Report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 112-81, section 2464(B)(e) (125 Stat. 1368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6115. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter notifying that the Department intends to assign women to previously closed positions in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6116. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 14 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6117. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in FY 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6118. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6119. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishing a List of Qualifying Pathogens Under the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-1037] (RIN: 0910-AG92) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6120. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Relations, Corporation for National Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6121. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6122. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6123. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's annual report for Fiscal Year 2013 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6124. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6125. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6126. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's semiannual report from the Office of the Inspector General during the 6-month period ending March 31, 2014 and the OIG's Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6127. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the 2013 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6128. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6129. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulations, Definition of Indian Tribe [NPS-WASO-NAGPRA-15507; PPWOCRADN0, PCU00RP14.R50000] (RIN: 1024-AD98) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6130. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Cemeteries, Demonstration, Special Event [NPS-WASO-REGS-14841; PX.XVPAD0517.00.1] (RIN: 1024-AE01) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6131. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Maximum Civil Money Penalty Amounts; Civil Money Penalty Complaints; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0113] received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6132. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the 2014 Annual Report: The U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) Status of Actions Addressing the Safety Issue Areas on the National Transportation Safety Board's (NTSB) Most Wanted List; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6133. A letter from the Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-5001A and R-5001B, Fort Dix; NJ [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0260; Airspace Docket No. 13-AEA-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6134. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Akutan, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0032; Airspace Docket No. 13-AAL-5] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6135. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of the Philadelphia, PA, Class B Airspace Area [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0922; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6136. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Blairsville, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0731; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-18] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6137. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bois Blanc Island, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0986; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-25] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6138. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Grand Forks, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0214; Airspace Docket No. 14-AGL-10] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6139. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Burial Benefits (RIN: 2900-A082) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6140. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Technical Corrections to Regulations [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0005] (RIN: 0960-AH55) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6141. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Obtaining Evidence Beyond the Current ''Special Arrangement Sources'' [Docket No.: SSA-2011-0099] (RIN: 0960-AH44) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6142. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties for the Fourth Quarter of 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 641. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 113–493).

Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 4944. A bill to require the submission of a report to the Congress on parasitic disease among poor Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 4945. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue Transportation Bonds to fund transportation projects in each State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, and 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 Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 4946. A bill to promote the tracing of firearms used in crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 4947. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 4948. A bill to provide for emergency supplemental appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4949. A bill to establish the National Office of New Americans to support the integration of immigrants to the United States into the economic, social, cultural, and civic life of their local communities and the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. HECK of Washington (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 4950. A bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States for 7 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BERA of California (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4951. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4952. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized remote shut down of a cellular phone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4953. A bill to grant a Federal charter to the National American Indian Veterans, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 to provide an exemption from the protections of that Act with regard to certain prospective employees whose job would include caring for or interacting with unsupervised children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 4955. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to extend the tariff preference level on imports of certain cotton and man-made fiber, fabric, apparel, and made-up goods from Bahrain under the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4956. A bill to greatly enhance America's path toward energy independence and economic and national security, to conserve energy use, to promote innovation, to achieve lower emissions, cleaner air, cleaner water, and cleaner land, to rebuild our Nation's aging roads, bridges, locks, and dams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, Space, and Technology, Oversight and Government Reform, the Budget, Rules, and 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.

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. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 4944.

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

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 4945.

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

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. . . .

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 1

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 4946.

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

US Const. Art. II, Sec. 3, Cl. 3 (''[The President] shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed[.]''); US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (''Congress shall have the power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.'') (This bill would instruct the Attorney General to give preferential treatment to police forces that meet certain criteria when distributing grant money, therefore this bill is a valid exercise of Congressional authority per the Necessary and Proper Clause provided the Attorney General's duties, as an agent of the President, to enforce federal law and punish criminal wrongdoing).

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 9, Cl. 7 (''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law[.]''); US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (''Congress shall have the 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'') (This bill would instruct the Attorney General to give preferential treatment to police forces that meet certain criteria when distributing grant money, therefore this bill is a valid exercise of Congressional authority per the Necessary and Proper Clause to instruct how the Executive Branch can spend appropriated monies).

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4947.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states and the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 4948.

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

Article I, Section 8 and Section 9

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 4949.

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

Article 1, Section 1.

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

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 4950.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to regulation of interstate commerce).

By Mr. BERA of California:

H.R. 4951.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4952.

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

Article I, §8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4953.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foriegn nations, and among the several states, and with Indian Tribes

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4954.

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

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 4955.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

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

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 4956.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 25: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 279: Mr. BARBER, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 411: Mr. NUGENT and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 517: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 543: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 594: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 688: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 713: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 787: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 812: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 831: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 920: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 942: Mr. WALZ, Mr. BARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 958: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 963: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 975: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 988: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 997: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1136: Mr. GARCIA, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1150: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1180: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1189: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1225: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1289: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1509: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1518: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1563: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1620: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1751: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2001: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2144: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2170: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 2263: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2283: Mr. MICA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CAMP, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2368: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2415: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2453: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2500: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2521: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2529: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2663: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2673: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2734: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2835: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2841: Ms. ESTY and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2959: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. YODER, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 3221: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3320: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3382: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3403: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 3482: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3489: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 3505: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3544: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3620: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3649: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3680: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARR, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3708: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 3712: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 3722: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3963: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3989: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3992: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 4012: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 4041: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4103: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4119: Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4123: Mr. COHEN and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 4148: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4166: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4190: Ms. MOORE and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4217: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 4234: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4286: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4325: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4347: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4349: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4351: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4411: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4415: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4432: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROSS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 4450: Mr. OLSON and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4474: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4475: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 4491: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 4510: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 4521: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 4558: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4577: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. MCALLISTER.
H.R. 4578: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 4612: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4640: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4646: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4653: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4664: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4698: Mr. MICA and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4704: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4707: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4723: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4727: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 4740: Mr. HANNA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4741: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4749: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4780: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4781: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4792: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4807: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4841: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4864: MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4881: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 4882: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 4899: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4904: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4927: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4930: Mr. REICHERT.
H.J. Res. 20: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 30: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 109: Mr. FORBES and Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Res. 281: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H. Res. 416: Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 456: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 503: Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Res. 529: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 587: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 601: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HIMES and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H. Res. 620: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FINCHER, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H. Res. 621: Mr. FORBES and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 630: Mr. WALZ and Ms. LOFGREN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The amendment to be offered by myself or a designee, to H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.