United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2014 No. 142

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 19, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANE BLACK 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.

WORLD TOILET DAY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today is World Toilet Day. The concept of a World Toilet Day can make children giggle, some adults blush, and others want to change the subject, but the title is designed to address this serious subject directly.

No one can afford to be squeamish, to make jokes, or change the subject about the fundamental issue of adequate sanitation because 2 and a half billion people live without it, causing about 700,000 premature deaths each year, and it is getting worse.

We have made some progress, but the number living without access has increased by 700 million people. There are now more people on Earth with a cell phone than a toilet.

The consequences of insufficient access to sanitation facilities and poor hygiene are severe. Countries where open defecation is more prevalent have found its way to the United States media recently, reporting on the horrific murder and rape of two young girls that could have been prevented in India if they didn't need to sneak out into the night to relieve themselves in an open field, leaving them vulnerable to attack.

A heartbreaking study linked the root cause of India's malnutrition crisis to a lack of adequate sanitation. It found that many of the 162 million children under the age of 5 who are malnourished in India are suffering less from a lack of food and more from poor sanitation. Those children who do survive are left with mental and physical burdens for their entire lives.

The lack of adequate sanitation is a human economic drain. The total global economic loss associated with inadequate water supply and sanitation is estimated to be over a quarter trillion dollars every year.

This crisis that leaves women vulnerable, needlessly ends lives early, and undermines economic growth does have solutions. Today, at noon, I will join my colleagues on implementation of the Water for the Poor Act we passed earlier to ensure that WASH programming helps leverage the impact of development assistance. It also ensures that our water, sanitation, and hygiene programs are targeted to help the world's poorest, that they are more effective with long-term sustainable impacts.

This bipartisan legislation, with my friend TED POE, has well over 100 cosponsors and is scheduled for a markup in the House Foreign Affairs Committee tomorrow.

This significant progress would not have even been possible without the leadership of Chairman ROYCE, and I thank him for it, along with the many advocates who have demonstrated why the United States must play a greater role to increase sustainable access to clean water and sanitation.

If passed out of committee, which I certainly hope it will, I would urge the House leadership to bring this bill to the floor for a vote immediately when we come back in session in December. That is because we cannot wait, and it is one of those rare bills we can all unite to get water, often dirty water, for their families. That is enough work hours to build 28 Empire State Buildings every day. This is time not spent working on income-generating jobs, caring for family members, or securing an education.

TED POE, a Republican, and I, a Democrat who represents Portlandia, don't often agree on a lot, but we are an example of how we can all come together because politics should stop at water.

GAS PRICES AND ENERGY PRODUCTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, according to the Energy Information Administration, today's national average price for retail gasoline is $2.97. This is the lowest price in over a 4-year period beginning in October of 2010.

Gasoline prices have decreased by roughly 21 percent in the last 6 months alone. One of the most prevalent factors determining the price of gasoline at the pump is the international average of the cost of a barrel of crude oil.

Printed on recycled paper.

Now, over the past week, the price of crude oil per barrel has hovered between $77.15 and $77.85. These are the lowest per-barrel prices since June of 2012, just over 2 years, a stark contrast to $145 per barrel in May of 2008.

The Energy Information Administration has projected that gasoline prices at the pump will continue to decline in December to somewhere around $2.80 a gallon and possibly even lower in 2015.

Additionally, U.S. natural gas prices are roughly $4.24, as production continues to flourish. This is all welcome news for consumers, businesses, and the economy, from more affordable transportation to heating our homes, from the food we consume to American manufacturing having lower costs, therefore being more competitive globally. Lower energy costs are good for our economy overall.

Now, there are many factors as to why gasoline prices fluctuate. They include international market trends and geopolitical events, as well as weather and impacts upon refining capacity due to natural disasters.

While a downed economy has decreased annual demand for gasoline as the summer travel season comes to an end, the price decreases for gasoline can largely be attributed to an increase in domestic supply.

At any other time in our history, given today's world events, our gas prices would be pushing $4 a gallon. Especially with the ongoing recession, American energy production has thankfully increased in recent years, and gas prices have decreased.

While some in Washington would like to credit the Federal Government with the increased supply, the truth is that the vast majority of this domestic production has occurred in spite of Federal actions, not because of them.

The great majority of the production has occurred on private and State-owned lands and has been the result of technological enhancements that have made shale gas and oil reserves more attainable.

Specifically, this increase in production stems from the combination of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing. Pennsylvania, for example, is currently third in State production of natural gas. The Commonwealth has produced 3.2 trillion cubic feet in 2013 alone.

Increased production has bolstered domestic energy supplies and directly led to historically low natural gas prices across the U.S. This comes on the heels of alltime high prices in 2008 of about $12. Production in Pennsylvania has provided royalty payments to landowners, while contributing significant funds to counties.

Madam Speaker, private and State-owned lands have changed the face of energy production and affordability in our country. The Federal Government would stand to gain by following suit. This starts with opening up new areas of Federal lands, both onshore and offshore, for the production of our natural resources.

These resources belong to the people. There is no reason the administration should continue to play games with energy security. Over the last 4 years, the House has made a priority of moving legislation that would increase our domestic energy production supply.

Just this past September, the House passed H.R. 2, which was a combination of 13 energy-related bills, among them is the Keystone XL pipeline, increasing the amount of permitted onshore and offshore lands for development, along with streamlining cumbersome energy permitting regulations. The bill sets timelines for agencies' permitting decisions and would provide for more pipelines and liquefied natural gas exports.

Many of these actions can be taken by the executive branch, but the administration has not acted. As we have witnessed in recent years, through the development of private lands, increasing our domestic energy supplies and encouraging American production will have a positive impact on energy prices here at home.

Increased domestic energy production of oil and natural gas has eased the financial pain at the pump. This is also welcome as temperatures drop and the home heating season has begun.

The bottom line is the government can do much more to influence energy prices for American consumers. The time for the administration to act is long overdue.

THE EXTRAORDINARY COST OF ALZHEIMER'S

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I want today to talk about an illness that affects every American family. It is an illness that is devastating. It is Alzheimer's and related dementia. It is the most expensive illness in America today, and it will become even more expensive in the future.

Today, $1 out of $5 spent by Medicare is spent treating Alzheimer's, most expensive of all our illnesses. As we look to the future, we are going to find that this disease, Alzheimer's, is going to grow over $1.5 trillion of costs by 2050, partly due to the baby boomers and their growth in the demography of this Nation, but also because of the extraordinary expense that this illness brings to us.

This is the power curve that we are looking at. If you are concerned about the deficit, you need to be concerned about Alzheimer's. If you are concerned about the American family, you need to be concerned about Alzheimer's.

Here is what we are looking at for what is the second biggest cost in the Federal budget, that is, Medicare and Medicaid. Here is the growth that we are looking over the period of the next 35 years, from some $122 billion to over $880 billion.

As you look at the Federal budget in the years ahead, as you look at Medicare, as you begin to think about the deficit that confronts this Nation, this is where you need to look because this is where the big expenditure is going to be made. It is going to be in Alzheimer's and related illnesses to it. This is it.

What can we do about this? We could sit and fuss and fume, we can take care of our seniors, or we can recognize the reality of what it means when we spend money on research, when we spend money on getting ahead of the illnesses. These are the major illnesses that confront America today.

You can take a look here. Breast cancer, there has been a decrease in mortality; prostate cancer, a decrease; heart disease, a 16 percent decrease; stroke, a 23 percent decrease; and of course, HIV/AIDS, an extraordinary 42 percent decrease in the deaths from these major illnesses.

Over here on the purple one on the right, Alzheimer's. Decrease? No. Increase? Sixty-eight percent increase from 2000 to 2010.

This is the reality of the most prevalent and most expensive and the most devastating disease that confronts Americans and really the rest of the world.

□ 1015

What can we do about it?

Let's take a look at this chart. Alzheimer's spending treatment versus research. Let's see. We are spending $150 billion on the treatment. This is Medicare and Medicaid, and research, oh, way down here, $566 million on research.

So if you want to drive the deficit to even greater depths, treat but don't do research. However, if you want to solve this problem, we know how to do it. In fact, we have done it many, many times.

If you take a look at cancer, we are spending $5.418 billion on cancer research. Cancer deaths are down. HIV, we are spending $2.978 billion on HIV/AIDS. HIV/AIDS deaths are down by 42 percent. Cardiovascular, $2 billion. Cardiovascular deaths, strokes and heart disease down. Alzheimer's, $566 million.

We know the answer. The question is whether we are willing to put our money where we can solve the most devastating, the most prevalent, and the most expensive of all illnesses.

Change this little purple, bring it back up perhaps to $2 billion a year, as we do with HIV/AIDS, cardiovascular, and cancer. Spend the research money. We are close in many, many ways across this Nation with programs that are under way.

Here is the specific ask that I make to this Congress: not $2 billion, but $200 million additional money in the appropriations that we are doing today—$200 million.

BRAIN HEALTH

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous work of the Center for Brain Health at the University of Texas at Dallas and its Brain Performance Institute. Not only do their programs and research benefit the public, they have a team that specifically focuses on serving Active Duty servicemembers, veterans, military spouses, and caregivers.

More than 2.5 million men and women have admirably worn the uniform to protect America's freedom since 9/11. Sadly, nearly 20 percent of them come back from Iraq and Afghanistan with PTSD or major depression. More than 250,000 servicemembers have sustained a traumatic brain injury in the last decade.

This ring that I wear is a sobering reminder that 22 servicemembers or veterans commit suicide each and every day. Something has to be done to help these heroes battle their inner enemies, and that is where the Brain Health team comes in.

The Brain Health team is dedicated to creating public and private partnerships to not only eliminate the stigma often associated with PTSD or TBI, but to improve treatment and access to that treatment. This team is essentially retraining brains to build their resilience, regeneration, and reverse losses in mental capacity, giving these men and women the opportunity to overcome the trauma of war and pursue a happy and healthy future.

The Center for Brain Health and Brain Performance has provided scientifically proven programs to more than 500 warriors in seven States, including my home State of Texas. The institute's service to our troops is outstanding. They are the perfect example of America's commitment to take care of our warriors and their families, and I am proud to recognize their good works.

In God we trust.

THE 43 MURDERED MEXICAN STUDENTS

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

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise to bring attention to the massacre of 43 students in Mexico.

Edmund Burke said:

> All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.

On September 26, students from a teacher training college visited Iguala, Mexico, to participate in a protest. According to media reports, the students were arrested by police forces and handed over to a criminal gang. Their burned bodies have reportedly been found discarded in a river.

As The Washington Post reported yesterday:

> The demand to find the students and punish those responsible for their disappearance has broadened into a more diverse fury about corrupt politicians and their drug-trafficking cronies.

Mexican prosecutors have formally charged former Iguala Mayor Jose Luis Abarca in the disappearance of the students. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated incident. In the last several months, three constituent families of mine have been touched by murder in northern Mexico.

I again call on the United States State Department to ensure that the Mexican Government thoroughly investigates these atrocities and that those responsible be brought to justice and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

The crises of human smuggling, drug smuggling, and illegal migration do not begin or end at the border. Resolving these matters requires that we address issues of economic development and cartel violence in Mexico and that we address the demand for narcotics in the United States, along with eliminating the presence of cartels in an estimated 1,000 U.S. cities.

The leaders of the State Department in Washington, D.C., need to understand that this is one of the most pressing foreign policy issues confronting our Nation. Otherwise, evil will indeed triumph.

INCREASE OF VIOLENT ATTACKS IN ISRAEL

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, a strong Israel means a strong United States, and a strong United States means a strong Israel. That is why I want to offer my condolences to the families of the Israelis murdered by Palestinian terrorists in Jerusalem yesterday.

The increase in these attacks is a grim reminder of the need for the United States—now, more than ever—to stand side by side in support of Israel and its right to defend itself and her citizens. I condemn these terror attacks, and I call on President Obama and leaders of other responsible nations to do the same and to hold Abu Mazen and the Palestinian leadership accountable for these actions.

We must recognize the importance of U.S.-Israel cooperation across a wide spectrum of areas, but particularly our cooperation on security and defense issues.

In the past year, I have had the opportunity to not only see firsthand what our joint efforts have produced with the Iron Dome antimissile defense system, but also why this is such an important venture. Last August, I led a congressional delegation trip to Israel to discuss our bilateral relationship with Prime Minister Netanyahu and other top-ranking Israeli officials. The one thing that we heard repeatedly in almost every meeting was how thankful the Israelis were for the United States Congress' continued support for the Iron Dome and other defense missile systems and our belief in Israel's need to maintain its qualitative military edge over its enemies.

Iron Dome has become known for its accuracy after its remarkable performance in 2012, especially in November of that year during Operation Pillar of Defense, when Hamas terrorists fired thousands of rockets indiscriminately into Israeli civilian populations. The sheer numbers were astounding, and the rate of success is a testament to the U.S.-Israeli cooperation.

So when we arrived in Israel in August of 2013, less than a year after Pillar of Defense, one of the first things that Prime Minister Netanyahu said to us was:

> Thank you for Iron Dome. It truly saved countless innocent Israeli lives.

We visited a deployed Iron Dome battery in northern Israel to see this remarkable piece of technology. We also met the incredible young men and women of the Israeli Defense Forces who operate the Iron Dome batteries. It was impressive and inspiring to see how well these young people handled the weight of such an incredible burden, but that is a testament to the Jewish people and to Israel.

The next time I witnessed firsthand the importance of Iron Dome was just this past summer, Madam Speaker. We were in Israel and in Jordan to get a better understanding of the situation in the Middle East. We had arrived in the region about 2 weeks after the news that Hamas had kidnapped three Israeli teens, Eyal, Naftali, and Gilad. We were in Israel the day that the heart-wrenching news came out that the bodies of these three young boys had been found riddled with bullets in the territories. It was an incredible moment of sadness, of loss, of despair for the entire nation, and we grieved with them when we attended the funeral of the three teenagers.

But Israel had no time to grieve over its loss of these three because Hamas had been engaged in rocket attacks against Israel that began when the three boys were abducted and murdered. Their intensity increased as the search began; and once Israel found the bodies, Hamas began firing rockets, hundreds of rockets into innocent Israeli civilian populations.

Amid the constant barrage of rockets and the continual blares of warning sirens, Iron Dome once again proved its worth and importance. It successfully shot down rocket after rocket aimed at the Israeli people over the course of the latest operation called Protective Edge.

The performance of Iron Dome, Madam Speaker, shows how great both Israeli and American technology and expertise are, and why it is vitally important that our two countries continue to work together on projects

such as Iron Dome, David's Sling, Arrow, and many others.

Congress recognizes this fact, and that is why we continue to fund these major projects in a bipartisan manner, because we understand the threats that Israel faces and we understand the importance of Israel's right to defend herself to ensure her continued existence.

I authored and the House passed the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act, which bestows upon Israel a unique status as a major strategic ally of the United States, and I hope that one day soon we will be able to pass this bill again in the new Congress and send it to the President for his signature.

HONORING THE CONGRESSIONAL STAFF OF GEORGIA'S 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I don't know if this will be the last time I address this House, but I can think of no more appropriate subject for such an occasion than to honor those who have worked with me over the last 10 years serving the people of Georgia's 12th Congressional District.

Representing Georgia in the House of Representatives has been the honor of my life. I have met thousands of people, both in Georgia and Washington, I will count as friends and colleagues for the rest of my life.

But any Member of Congress can tell you that the key to a successful congressional office is to gather the best and brightest people to serve the people we represent. I am honored to have served with a staff who are known on Capitol Hill as among the hardest working and most effective.

My staff has worked under some very difficult circumstances, facing what many called insurmountable odds, and put in long hours to make sure the people of Georgia's 12th District had representation like they had never seen before. Thanks from this Congressman will never be enough, but my success in this position is because of their dedication to this office.

I would like to recognize the staff, some of whom have left, but many of whom are here until the end, who have made all this possible.

My chief of staff, Ashley Jones, has been the foundation of this operation. Ashley has been my most trusted adviser and assembled a team that has delivered such outstanding results over the last 10 years. Her loyalty, counsel, and friendship have meant the world to me, and she has been an invaluable asset to the 12th District.

Lynthia Ross Owens has served as my district director. Lynthia has been the most respected member of my staff in the district. For years, she has been my eyes and ears in Georgia when the congressional schedule has taken me away from the district.

Hill Thomas is by far the most knowledgeable legislative director on Capitol Hill. He has counseled me through numerous legislative wins and milestones in our time together, and folks in the 12th District know Hill as a tireless advocate on their behalf, and his service to them will never be forgotten.

These three are the foundation of one of the best staffs on Capitol Hill, but the rest of the 12th District staff deserves recognition, too.

My communications director for the last 3 years, Richard Carbo; Jonathan Arogeti, my senior legislative assistant; Jessie Andrews, our senior legislative correspondent and scheduler; Vanna Cure, who has served in the district and in Washington on a number of initiatives in our office; Asa Porter, our legislative correspondent; Francesca Amodeo, our staff assistant and intern; Demetrius McCoy, a dedicated advocate in the district on behalf of our veterans; Beverly Kay Herrington, who is dedicated to helping folks in the district get the benefits they are owed from the Federal Government; Troy Windham, who helped introduce us to many folks in the newest portions of the district and helped deal with the VA during a difficult time; Matthew Kleinsorge, a veteran himself and a loyal staffer to this district who has been my eyes and ears on all issues for veterans.

I would also like to thank those former staffers who have served over the years. They may have left the Barrow team, but they never went very far: Roman Levit, Brandon Webb, Peyton Bell, Jane Brodsky, Kristin Fulford, Luke Moses, Wes Devetger, Lauren Perry, Harper Lawson, Will Rooks, Aaron Schmidt, Mike Goodman, Chris Schepis, Chris Cashman, Doug Moore, Bennett Golder, Meredith Wise, Anne Scheer, Tharon Johnson, Vernisha Davis, Brandi Hebron, Kristie Gregory, Najhee Jackson, Kathryn Hyler, Anne Watson, Reggie Castleberry, Mike Little, Charles Renwick, David Bell, Adam Toledano, and Yvonne Davis.

Madam Speaker, it has been the honor of my life to have served alongside this team, and for all their hard work and dedication to me and to the people of Georgia's 12th District, I say thank you.

□ 1030

SURVIVORS VICTORY DAY

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

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, last month, in October, I had a young lady, Jessica Huber, and her father come to my Round Rock office and tell me a great story of survival.

I am introducing legislation on behalf of this 13-year-old, Jessica Huber of Leander, Texas, and all who have shown the real meaning of survival, and we have great examples every day in our armed services—who are serving in harm's way on our behalf—of their strong heart of survival.

In Jessica's case, on November 19, 2002, Jessica was nearly killed after her mother, while under the influence of prescription drugs and illegal drugs, ran a red light and crashed. Jessica's father experienced a parent's worst nightmare when doctors had given up hope that she would survive.

But those doctors didn't know Jessica.

Like all Texans, she didn't just give up. She underwent multiple blood transfusions and surgeries, and she endured painful rehab. There were many dark days for this brave young woman.

Despite the extraordinary odds against her—and all said the odds were against her—I am glad to report that Jessica is living a happy, healthy, and productive life in my district. Jessica's journey reminds us all of the indomitable nature of the human spirit and of our basic desires to persevere in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds and challenges.

My legislation recognizes November 19 as Survivors Victory Day and encourages all to honor the thousands who have been victims and, more importantly, survivors of traumatic crimes, illnesses, and misfortunes. I call on my colleagues to celebrate this survival and to support this important bill.

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 33 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:

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

As we meditate on all the blessings of life, we especially pray for the blessing of peace in our lives and in our world. Our fervent prayer, O God, is that people will learn to live together in reconciliation and respect so that the terrors of war and of dictatorial abuse will be no more.

Bless all the peacemakers of our world. May Your eternal spirit be with them and with us always.

May Your special blessings be upon the Members of this assembly in the important, sometimes difficult work they are given to do. Give them wisdom and charity that they might work together for the common good.

May all that is done this day in 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 gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HONDA 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.

NATIONAL RURAL HEALTH DAY

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize November 20 as National Rural Health Day.

I was born and raised in a small town in Kansas. I understand firsthand that folks in rural communities deserve access to quality health care options. A growing challenge facing folks in many rural communities across the country is access to health care. For many rural communities, the presence of a critical access hospital could be the deciding factor in whether or not the next generation decides to raise their family in their hometown.

These communities are the backbone of America. Congress' commitment to ensuring rural communities have access to care has been strong over the years, but it must continue. I take to the floor today to reaffirm my personal, unwavering support.

HONORING TERRY ALLEN

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of an important and respected member of the Chicago community. Last week, we lost an advocate for the middle class, Terry Allen, when he lost his battle with cancer.

Serving for decades as a dedicated leader, he represented thousands of Chicagoland workers with great distinction. Terry embodied the heart of our city and strived to improve the lives of workers, even when his own health was failing. His contributions to the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, IBEW Local 134, and middle class workers changed countless lives and will continue to do so in his memory.

Terry Allen was an inspiration to all who knew him. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring his legacy, celebrating his life, and remembering his illustrious contributions to the city of Chicago.

NO SOCIAL SECURITY FOR NAZIS ACT

(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, as chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security, the committee of jurisdiction over who receives Social Security benefits, I am introducing, along with Ranking Member BECERRA and now 35 original cosponsors, the No Social Security for Nazis Act.

The world must never forget the 6 million Jews and other innocents murdered by the Holocaust. America has worked to prevent Nazis from entering the country and reaping the benefits of U.S. citizenship, including Social Security. However, due to a loophole, some Nazis who came to America continue to receive Social Security benefits. That is just plain wrong.

Our bipartisan bill would stop benefits from going to denaturalized Nazis. It also stops benefits from going to Nazis who renounce their citizenship as part of a settlement.

I thank Ranking Member BECERRA for working with me on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to act quickly and pass the No Social Security for Nazis Act.

AMERICA'S PRIORITIES

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks, I have had the opportunity to meet with my constituents in senior centers, farmers' markets, small businesses, and on factory floors to hear directly from them about their priorities.

They are worried about the enormous challenges facing our country, such as ISIS and the spread of Ebola, but most of all, they are worried about the future and the future of their families.

They spoke about the need to raise the minimum wage, invest in public safety, enact comprehensive immigration reform, strengthen public education, make college more affordable, and, most importantly, getting them back to work.

Now that the elections are over, we shouldn't waste a single day without getting to work on their priorities. Like me, I am sure many of my colleagues heard the same message about creating jobs, growing the economy, and rebuilding the middle class.

The American people want a Congress that gets things done and works for them instead of a Congress looking to score political points. While our economy has recovered, too many Americans feel left out of that recovery. So as we bring this Congress to an end and begin to prepare for the next Congress, we should all renew our commitment to the American people and remember whom we were sent here to serve.

HONORING HAROLD COKER

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend the Third District of Tennessee lost a beloved member of its community, Mr. Harold Coker.

As the first in his family to graduate from college, Harold displayed his unique ambition at a young age. In his late twenties, he started his own business, Coker Tire Company, in Athens, Tennessee. Thanks to Harold's hard work and dedication, Coker Tire expanded into Chattanooga and soon became the largest supplier of collector tires in the world.

Harold's involvement and leadership in his community was admired throughout the Nation. In fact, when the first of my colleagues, SAM GRAVES, the chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, visited the Third District, I took him directly to Coker Tire to show him one of Chattanooga's most prized businesses.

I am grateful for the opportunity to have worked with Harold and will miss his lively, ambitious spirit. My thoughts and prayers are with his beloved wife, Lil, and their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. Harold's legacy in the automotive industry and Tennessee community will forever be remembered.

SMALL BUSINESS SATURDAY

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, across the country, many people will begin their holiday shopping just after Thanksgiving on Black Friday and Cyber Monday. But Small Business Saturday, November 29, gives us an opportunity to celebrate and support the locally owned shops in our communities.

Small businesses make our neighborhood great. They give our communities character and drive our local economy. I am proud to support our small businesses as a shopper and as a member of the Committee on Small Business here in Congress.

When we shop at a small business, almost half the money we spend stays in our community and supports local jobs.

So this holiday season, remember to shop small. It does big things for our community.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mrs. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate rejected legislation to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. Meanwhile, the House has passed legislation to authorize building the pipeline nine times.

There is no good reason to continue to delay this project, which will create tens of thousands of jobs and has strong bipartisan support.

Keystone XL is the most studied pipeline in our Nation's history. Thousands of pages prove its worth to our economy and national interest and further document its safety. It will spur job creation, help us on our way to energy independence, and increase access to affordable North American oil.

For more than 6 years, supporters of the Keystone XL pipeline have been fighting to secure the necessary approval that would allow the U.S. to take advantage of vital oil production in Canada and the northern United States. It appears supporters will have to wait a little longer before the Senate finally acts in America's economic and energy interests.

HONORING BARNETT GRIER

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Barnett Grier, who lived to be 99 years old and passed away last week.

The son of a slave, Mr. Grier grew up in Charlotte, North Carolina. He was a physicist, a businessman, a teacher, and an author. But it was perhaps the title of civil rights activist for which he was best known.

In 1951, Mr. Grier published his autobiography, entitled, ''Trek to Equality,'' which detailed his family's struggles in Riverside, California. When his family was transferred to our community to form the west coast division of the Naval Weapons Research Center, the African American families, including Mr. Grier's, did not receive assistance in their move.

He continued to work in Riverside and later founded the Habitat for Humanity, created a scholarship for local students, and established an advisory committee on African American students.

Barnett Grier affected the lives of countless residents in the Inland Empire. Because of his passion and his dedication to our community, his memory will undoubtedly live on.

A QUESTION OF FAIRNESS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, President Obama is expected to sign executive orders soon regarding illegal immigration. In July 2011, he said, ''I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own, but that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions.''

A year ago, President Obama said, ''If, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing laws in Congress, then I would do so. But we are also a nation of laws. That's part of our tradition. And what I'm proposing,'' he said then, ''is the harder path, which is to use our democratic processes to achieve the same goal.''

President Obama should reflect on his own words. He should follow the democratic process, as reflected in the recent election. A bedrock principle of our Nation is the rule of law. That principle promotes stability and fairness.

Will the President's actions promote stability or even more chaos? Will it be fair to American workers and immigrants who have done things the legal way?

Any immigration reform, Mr. Speaker, must be fair and must respect the rule of law.

TIME FOR A ROBUST DEBATE ON THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this Chamber to do its constitutional duty and debate a new authorization for use of military force.

Eight weeks ago, the House rushed through an amendment to the continuing resolution to authorize arming and training vetted Syrian rebels. But this is not something we should go into blindly. It is time that this Chamber has an informed, robust discussion and debate about the U.S. role in combating and dealing with ISIL and other extremists in Syria and Iraq.

Those 8 weeks that we went through, we have conducted nearly 800 airstrikes in Iraq and Syria and killed nearly 1,000 soldiers, terrorists, and civilians. We are quickly sliding back into combat in the Middle East. It may be necessary to send soldiers to the region to help repel the very real threats posed by ISIL and extremists.

But this is not something we should do and go into blindly. It is time for a robust debate.

□ 1215

IRANIAN TALKS THREATEN NATIONAL SECURITY

(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, I appreciate the forceful warnings of South Carolina senior Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM about the President's negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program.

Senator GRAHAM has stated that the administration ''needs to understand that this Iranian regime cares more about trying to weaken America and push us out of the Middle East than cooperating with us. Until we recognize that reality and formulate a regional strategy to counter the Iranian regime's malign influence, we will continue to harm U.S. national security interests.''

The Iranians have not earned the right to be trusted. Despite years of their misleading nuclear inspectors and ignoring international calls to suspend enrichment while developing ballistic missiles, incredibly, the administration continues to acquiesce to a dangerous deal.

Senator GRAHAM has been a Paul Revere—warning of regional threats, holding the President accountable for his national security mistakes. He promotes congressional approval on any deal reached with Iran. Together, sanctions should be promoted which will stop further nuclear blackmail and promote the safety of Israel and our regional allies.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President should take action to never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CARBON MONOXIDE AWARENESS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the importance of carbon monoxide awareness.

Each year, 400 people in the United States die from carbon monoxide poisoning, making it the leading cause of accidental poisoning deaths in the country. The real tragedy is that these deaths could be prevented through the installation of carbon monoxide detectors in the home.

In January 2009, western New York teenager Amanda Hansen tragically passed away from carbon monoxide poisoning as a result of a defective boiler.

After Amanda's tragic death, her family created the Amanda Hansen Foundation, which aims to educate and promote the awareness of carbon monoxide poisoning and to help those who cannot afford it to obtain and install CO detectors. I join them in encouraging all Americans to prevent carbon monoxide-related tragedies by installing detectors in their homes.

It is for Amanda and for others who have unnecessarily died that I am a cosponsor of H.R. 4864, the Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act. This legislation would help States and local governments implement education programs, develop training materials, and

buy and install CO alarms in schools and homes.

MEDIA OPPOSE IMMIGRATION EXECUTIVE ORDERS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the editorial boards of several national publications have supported amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants.

It is a credit to their intellectual honesty that the media now admit that President Obama's threats to use executive orders to undercut immigration laws are wrong and contrary to his constitutional responsibilities.

For example, a Washington Post editorial commented:

''In Mr. Obama's own words, acting alone is 'not how our democracy functions.' ''

The Wall Street Journal editorial board said:

''We support more liberal immigration but not Mr. Obama's means of doing it on his own whim because he's tired of working with Congress.''

Even The New York Times admits ''the President cannot rewrite immigration law.''

But the media isn't alone. Public opinion polls show a strong majority of Americans disapprove of the President's issuing executive orders to grant amnesty. The President should listen to the American people, not to those who want him to violate his oath of office to uphold the Nation's laws.

HAWAII COUNTY LEADERS

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have an active volcano with lava flowing directly toward a small town called Pahoa, in my district, so I want to take this opportunity to highlight two courageous leaders who have been at the heart of a very strong, resilient community which faces an uncertain future as the Kilauea lava flow continues slowly and steadily towards their homes, their businesses, and their community.

Hawaii County Mayor Billy Kenoi and Hawaii County Civil Defense Administrator Darryl Oliveira have shown incredible leadership, not only in response to this but also in response to Hurricane Iselle and Tropical Storm Ana and, now, to the nearly 5 months of managing the slowly creeping lava flow threatening Pahoa. All three of these natural disasters have been punishing for this community of Puna, whose residents continue to unite and show optimism even with this uncertain future.

Billy and Darryl's tireless work and strong leadership have kept people safe, informed, and prepared even as Mother Nature, through Madame Pele, runs her course.

Mahalo to Mayor Kenoi and Chief Oliveira. We stand ready as your partners to support the community we all serve, and we are grateful for your unwavering commitment to them.

IN MEMORY AND HONOR OF PLACER COUNTY SHERIFF'S DETECTIVE MICHAEL DAVIS, JR.

(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, today, I rise in memory and honor of Placer County Sheriff's Detective Michael Davis, Jr., a peace officer, brother, husband, father, son, and hero.

A resident of Roseville and a graduate of my alma mater, Butte College, Michael dedicated his life to public safety.

Having first come to the Placer County Sheriff's Office as a reserve deputy in 1996, Michael was hired as a police officer with the Auburn Police Department, and in 1999, he began working for the department in many capacities, including as an impact weapons instructor, an emergency driving instructor, an adviser to the youth Explorer Program, and as a homicide detective for the past 10 years.

Recently, on October 24 of this year, during a horrific crime spree, Michael Davis, Jr., was one of two northern California sheriff's deputies, including Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff Danny Oliver, who lost their lives in the line of duty. As a detective, he may not have normally been on this type of call, but he answered the call during this crime spree when a twice-deported criminal was running and gunning all up through two different counties.

Michael died while protecting his community, and, indeed, he helped stop this crime spree. It is a tragic loss felt deeply by many in the community, including by myself, with the sadness that it brings for all. He was protecting the people of Placer County in that line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in recognition and honor of Detective Michael Davis for all of his service to our community, and I stand beside his family, including his wife, Jessica, and their four children in their time of sorrow and profound personal loss.

God give them strength, healing, and peace.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress comes to a close and as the 114th begins, I am hopeful that we can come together at some time to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Unfortunately, time and time again, House leadership has consistently denied a vote on the bipartisan, Senate-passed reform legislation while not even presenting an alternative measure of its own. The Senate-passed plan provides a legal, stable workforce for agriculture and critical protections for those who work to put safe, healthy foods on our Nation's dinner tables. Each day that our immigration system remains broken jobs are lost and our economy struggles.

It is unacceptable to put political interests above our national interests. The time to address immigration reform is now. The President's action, mind you, is because this House—its leadership—has chosen not to act.

NATIONAL RURAL HEALTH DAY

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge National Rural Health Day, which is tomorrow, November 20.

The Third District of Nebraska contains over 50 Critical Access Hospitals. Rural hospitals are vital to rural areas. These facilities provide crucial care to some of our most elderly and vulnerable populations.

Recent reports have stated these facilities are facing a disproportionate rate in closures. This year alone, 43 rural hospitals have closed nationwide. Because of ObamaCare, we are seeing the beginning of deep cuts to Medicare beneficiaries, which is a major patient population for these rural facilities.

Rural hospitals are also having to deal with arbitrary regulations, such as physician supervision and a 96-hour pre-certification rule. These facilities simply do not have the power to abide by these regulations while continuing to provide affordable and efficient health care.

I will continue to fight to ensure our rural communities maintain access to quality care, and I appreciate the opportunity to recognize National Rural Health Day.

HONORING UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT 81

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Union School District 81—a single school district in Joliet, Illinois—for winning an Award of Merit from the Illinois State Board of Education for outstanding improvement and effort.

This district has undergone a transformation that would have seemed impossible 2 years ago. Since then, in addition to a renewed focus on academics, the school has built its first playground, provided computers for all students in the third through eighth grades, and added 18 days of school for

students, all while improving its financial rating. The teachers, administrators, staff, parents, and students of Union School District 81 deserve this commendation for their hard work and for their dedication.

I would also like to recognize the efforts of Superintendent Tim Baldermann for his dedication to providing a top-quality education for all of his students. I congratulate them on their important achievement.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge President Obama to take executive action on immigration.

I would have loved to have been here today to celebrate the passage of comprehensive immigration reform in this House, but this House has refused to hold a single vote.

Fifteen months ago, the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill in a bipartisan manner. This bill would have addressed many of the practices with our immigration policies that are simply unsustainable and contrary to our values.

By the end of today, about 1,000 people will have been removed from this country and from their families. Because of this, I call on President Obama to take bold and meaningful action on immigration. This action will inevitably provide a boost to our national and local economies while helping to promote strong communities and family unity.

The President can act within his legal authority—just like President Ronald Reagan did exactly on this issue—to ensure that thousands of mothers and fathers are no longer separated from their children. The President must act and act boldly now.

NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, every November, we celebrate National Adoption Month and National Adoption Day to help build awareness of the many children in foster care who are waiting to find permanent, loving families.

Sadly, more than 100,000 children are currently waiting for permanent families and have waited for years in foster care. Every year, dozens age out of the system without ever finding a permanent home. As an adoption attorney for 25 years, I know firsthand how important it is to adopt and provide a stable environment for children. Every child deserves loving parents, and adoption is a great way to unite a child who needs a home with a loving family.

Yesterday, I was proud that the New Hampshire bureau of Community and Family Support Services celebrated National Adoption Day with families and community leaders to share positive adoption stories and to draw attention to children in New Hampshire who are waiting to find permanent, loving homes.

The families that we are celebrating on National Adoption Day and in National Adoption Month are true heroes. They are opening their hearts and are embarking on the ultimate journey of love and commitment. As a member of both the bipartisan Congressional Coalition on Adoption and Congressional Caucus on Foster Youth, I will continue to work with my colleagues to help create a better foundation for these precious children to thrive, grow, and flourish into independent and successful adults.

□ 1230

NO SOCIAL SECURITY FOR NAZIS ACT

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, today, 160 million Americans pay into Social Security every day that they work, and as a result, they know that they and their families will be protected if they die, become disabled, or retire.

For most of the 58 million Americans who currently receive Social Security, a Social Security benefit check is their most important source of income. We recently learned that some Nazi war criminals and collaborators slipped through a loophole in our law and are in fact receiving these very same Social Security benefits.

I am pleased to join with my dear friend and colleague from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, to introduce the No Social Security for Nazis Act, which tightly closes this very loophole.

As the chairman and the ranking member of the Social Security Subcommittee, Mr. JOHNSON and I have the responsibility to safeguard Social Security, and I believe this bill is the right way to do that.

Like past Congresses, we believe that there is no place for the Holocaust perpetrators in the United States of America, and if there is no place for them in our country, then there is certainly no place for them in our crown jewel, Social Security.

I hope we can move quickly to enact this legislation before Social Security is required to pay another dime to a Nazi war criminal.

I thank Chairman JOHNSON for his tireless work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to join Chairman JOHNSON and me in sponsoring the No Social Security for Nazis Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). 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.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5448) to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5448

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 ''John F. Kennedy Center Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 13 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76r) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND SECURITY.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board to carry out section 4(a)(1)(H)—

''(1) $22,200,000 for fiscal year 2015;

''(2) $23,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(3) $24,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

''(4) $26,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

''(5) $27,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.

''(b) CAPITAL PROJECTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board to carry out subparagraphs (F) and (G) of section 4(a)(1)—

''(1) $12,200,000 for fiscal year 2015;

''(2) $16,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

''(3) $13,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

''(4) $13,000,000 for fiscal year 2018; and

''(5) $14,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5448.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I bring up a bill which is a simple reauthorization bill, and I am very pleased to be here actually on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), and we wish him well. He has had some medical issues. He chairs the Subcommittee on Transportation.

He actually has a cosponsorship with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON), who you will be hearing from in a

minute, but this is a bill to reauthorize the capital repair and maintenance programs at the Kennedy Center.

In 2012, I helped introduce and Congress passed the last reauthorization for the Kennedy Center, and I want to thank again the current leader of the Transportation Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), for his leadership on this issue and for also moving this legislation forward, and as I said, Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. CARSON from Indiana have also taken the lead on this measure.

The building, of course, is a national monument. It is our national cultural center. In fact, it is owned and maintained by the Federal Government, and it is a memorial to the late John F. Kennedy.

Now, I want to cite in the RECORD, to let folks know this because most people don't know this, that the idea that came forth for the Kennedy Center was not so much by President Kennedy, but it was the foresight and vision of President Eisenhower. President Eisenhower actually proposed a national cultural center when he was President.

When they renovated the Eisenhower Theater several years ago, some of the Eisenhower family was there, and they actually showed clips of President Eisenhower proposing a national cultural center, so it was his idea and his vision.

It was named for our slain and great President Kennedy, but the vision for the national cultural center again came from Dwight David Eisenhower, our President. I actually saw an old film of him describing his vision for what we have.

The other thing I wanted to say is, since we built the Kennedy Center—and this is a reauthorization. Some several years ago, I had the opportunity to introduce legislation for the first real expansion, which I understand is now underway, the plans and some of the preliminary design.

When they built the Kennedy Center, it was a performing arts center, but it never had an educational component. It never had the space that they need. So of all the legislation I have participated in, I couldn't be more proud than helping to author the first expansion since we constructed that building.

This measure, however, is a reauthorization for some of their operations and their capital repairs which is part of our responsibility as the Federal Government, so capital programs are critical.

I might say that in the expansion there is no Federal public money, that it is all money that is raised privately. It is also important that we pass this legislation because it provides effective and efficient building operations for the next 5 years.

The amounts authorized in the legislation will help address building inefficiencies that we currently have. It will assure that the building can continue to operate cost-effectively and will also reduce costs for the taxpayers, so those are some of the points that I would like to make.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very esteemed colleague from Florida, Chairman MICA.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 5448, which reauthorizes the Kennedy Center through fiscal year 2019 for operations, repairs, and capital projects. The authorization levels in this bill are derived from the Kennedy Center's 2014 comprehensive building plan and are supported by the Kennedy Center.

The Kennedy Center is, first and foremost, a Presidential memorial. We have a responsibility to fund its maintenance, consistent with the dignity of a memorial to the 35th President of the United States of America.

Now, I strongly believe, Mr. Speaker, that allocating funding for proactive maintenance and repairs is in the best interest of our taxpayers. The Kennedy Center is one of the Nation's busiest arts facilities. It presents more than 2,000 performances annually and hosts thousands of theatergoers, visitors, and tourists.

To Chairman MICA's point, the Kennedy Center also provides educational programs for teachers and students from prekindergarten through college across the U.S. This includes a variety of events and activities across the great Hoosier State of Indiana.

These programs are supported by performance fees and donations and include professional development for arts, teachers, specially-designed concerts, phenomenal training programs for talented young musicians, and other outreach projects.

The Kennedy Center is providing tremendous value to taxpayers through educational opportunities and performances, promoting their mission of being a national cultural center.

President Kennedy once said, ''After the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we will be remembered not for our victories or defeats in battle or in politics, but for our contributions to the human spirit.''

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the John F. Kennedy Reauthorization Act of 2014, so we can continue this phenomenal work.

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

Mr. MICA. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues to join us in the approval of a bipartisan piece of legislation that again authorizes the capital repair costs and maintenance for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5448.

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.

STELA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5728) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5728

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 ''STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. No additional appropriations authorized.

TITLE I—COMMUNICATIONS PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Extension of authority.
Sec. 102. Modification of television markets to further consumer access to relevant television programming.
Sec. 103. Consumer protections in retransmission consent.
Sec. 104. Delayed application of JSA attribution rule.
Sec. 105. Deletion or repositioning of stations during certain periods.
Sec. 106. Repeal of integration ban.
Sec. 107. Report on communications implications of statutory licensing modifications.
Sec. 108. Local network channel broadcast reports.
Sec. 109. Report on designated market areas.
Sec. 110. Update to cable rates report.
Sec. 111. Administrative reforms to effective competition petitions.
Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—COPYRIGHT PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Reauthorization.
Sec. 202. Termination of license.
Sec. 203. Local service area of a primary transmitter.
Sec. 204. Market determinations.

TITLE III—SEVERABILITY

Sec. 301. Severability.

SEC. 2. NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out this Act, or the amendments made by this Act. This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

TITLE I—COMMUNICATIONS PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2019''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking ''January 1, 2015'' each place it appears and inserting ''January 1, 2020''.

SEC. 102. MODIFICATION OF TELEVISION MARKETS TO FURTHER CONSUMER ACCESS TO RELEVANT TELEVISION PROGRAMMING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 338 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 338) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) MARKET DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Following a written request, the Commission may, with respect to a particular commercial television broadcast station, include additional communities within its local market or exclude communities from such station's local market to better effectuate the purposes of this section.

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In considering requests filed under paragraph (1), the Commission—

''(A) may determine that particular communities are part of more than one local market; and

''(B) shall afford particular attention to the value of localism by taking into account such factors as—

''(i) whether the station, or other stations located in the same area—

''(I) have been historically carried on the cable system or systems within such community; or

''(II) have been historically carried on the satellite carrier or carriers serving such community;

''(ii) whether the television station provides coverage or other local service to such community;

''(iii) whether modifying the local market of the television station would promote consumers' access to television broadcast station signals that originate in their State of residence;

''(iv) whether any other television station that is eligible to be carried by a satellite carrier in such community in fulfillment of the requirements of this section provides news coverage of issues of concern to such community or provides carriage or coverage of sporting and other events of interest to the community; and

''(v) evidence of viewing patterns in households that subscribe and do not subscribe to the services offered by multichannel video programming distributors within the areas served by such multichannel video programming distributors in such community.

''(3) CARRIAGE OF SIGNALS.—

''(A) CARRIAGE OBLIGATION.—A market determination under this subsection shall not create additional carriage obligations for a satellite carrier if it is not technically and economically feasible for such carrier to accomplish such carriage by means of its satellites in operation at the time of the determination.

''(B) DELETION OF SIGNALS.—A satellite carrier shall not delete from carriage the signal of a commercial television broadcast station during the pendency of any proceeding under this subsection.

''(4) DETERMINATIONS.—Not later than 120 days after the date that a written request is filed under paragraph (1), the Commission shall grant or deny the request.

''(5) NO EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE DISTANT SIGNALS.—No modification of a commercial television broadcast station's local market pursuant to this subsection shall have any effect on the eligibility of households in the community affected by such modification to receive distant signals pursuant to section 339, notwithstanding subsection (h)(1) of this section.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 614(h)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 534(h)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''community'' and inserting ''community or on the satellite carrier or carriers serving such community'';

(B) by redesignating subclauses (III) and (IV) as subclauses (IV) and (V), respectively;

(C) by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

''(III) whether modifying the market of the television station would promote consumers' access to television broadcast station signals that originate in their State of residence;''; and

(D) by amending subclause (V), as redesignated, to read as follows:

''(V) evidence of viewing patterns in households that subscribe and do not subscribe to the services offered by multichannel video programming distributors within the areas served by such multichannel video programming distributors in such community.''; and

(2) by moving the margin of clause (iv) 2 ems to the left.

(c) MARKET MODIFICATION PROCESS.—The Commission shall make information available to consumers on its website that explains the market modification process, including—

(1) who may petition to include additional communities within, or exclude communities from, a—

(A) local market (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code); or

(B) television market (as determined under section 614(h)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 534(h)(1)(C))); and

(2) the factors that the Commission takes into account when responding to a petition described in paragraph (1).

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to implement this section and the amendments made by this section.

(2) MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION.—As part of the rulemaking required by paragraph (1), the Commission shall ensure that procedures for the filing and consideration of a written request under sections 338(l) and 614(h)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 338(l); 534(h)(1)(C)) fully effectuate the purposes of the amendments made by this section, and update what it considers to be a community for purposes of a modification of a market under section 338(l) or 614(h)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934.

SEC. 103. CONSUMER PROTECTIONS IN RETRANSMISSION CONSENT.

(a) JOINT RETRANSMISSION CONSENT NEGOTIATIONS.—Section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) prohibit a television broadcast station from coordinating negotiations or negotiating on a joint basis with another television broadcast station in the same local market (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code) to grant retransmission consent under this section to a multichannel video programming distributor, unless such stations are directly or indirectly under common de jure control permitted under the regulations of the Commission; and''.

(b) PROTECTIONS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY VIEWED AND OTHER TELEVISION SIGNALS.—Section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(v) prohibit a television broadcast station from limiting the ability of a multichannel video programming distributor to carry into the local market (as defined in section 122(j) of title 17, United States Code) of such station a television signal that has been deemed significantly viewed, within the meaning of section 76.54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, or any other television broadcast signal such distributor is authorized to carry under section 338, 339, 340, or 614 of this Act, unless such stations are directly or indirectly under common de jure control permitted by the Commission.''.

(c) GOOD FAITH.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence a rulemaking to review its totality of the circumstances test for good faith negotiations under clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 325(b)(3)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(3)(C)).

(d) MARGIN CORRECTIONS.—Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(C), by moving the margin of clause (iii) 4 ems to the left; and

(2) by moving the margin of paragraph (7) 2 ems to the left.

(e) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to implement the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 104. DELAYED APPLICATION OF JSA ATTRIBUTION RULE.

A party to a joint sales agreement (as defined in Note 2(k) to section 73.3555 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) that is in effect on the effective date of the amendment to Note 2(k)(2) to such section made by the Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Report and Order adopted by the Commission on March 31, 2014 (FCC 14–28), shall not be considered to be in violation of the ownership limitations of such section by reason of the application of the rule in such Note 2(k)(2) (as so amended) to such agreement before the date that is 6 months after the end of the period specified by the Commission in such Report and Order for such a party to come into compliance with such ownership limitations.

SEC. 105. DELETION OR REPOSITIONING OF STATIONS DURING CERTAIN PERIODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 614(b)(9) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 534(b)(9)) is amended by striking the second sentence.

(b) REVISION OF RULES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall revise section 76.1601 of its rules (47 C.F.R. 76.1601) and any note to such section by removing the prohibition against deletion or repositioning of a local commercial television station during a period in which major television ratings services measure the size of audiences of local television stations.

SEC. 106. REPEAL OF INTEGRATION BAN.

(a) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The second sentence of section 76.1204(a)(1) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, terminates effective on the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REMOVAL FROM RULES.—Not later than 545 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall complete all actions necessary to remove the sentence described in subsection (a) from its rules.

(c) PRESERVATION OF WAIVERS.—Any waiver of section 76.1204(a)(1) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act or granted after such date shall be extended through December 31, 2015.

(d) WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Commission shall establish a working group of technical experts representing a wide range of stakeholders, to identify, report, and recommend performance objectives, technical capabilities, and technical standards of a not unduly burdensome, uniform, and technology- and platform-neutral software-based downloadable security system designed to promote the competitive availability of navigation devices in furtherance of section 629 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 549).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the working group shall file a report with the Commission on its work under paragraph (1).

(3) COMMISSION ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Commission may appoint a member of the Commission's staff—

(A) to moderate and direct the work of the working group under this subsection; and

(B) to provide technical assistance to members of the working group, as appropriate.

(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The initial meeting of the working group shall take place not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS IMPLICATIONS OF STATUTORY LICENSING MODIFICATIONS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study that analyzes and evaluates the changes to the carriage requirements currently imposed on multichannel video programming distributors under the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) and the regulations promulgated by the Commission that would be required or beneficial to consumers, and such other matters as the Comptroller General considers appropriate, if Congress implemented a phase-out of the current statutory licensing requirements set forth under sections 111, 119, and 122 of title 17, United States Code. Among other things, the study shall consider the impact such a phase-out and related changes to carriage requirements would have on consumer prices and access to programming.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations for legislative or administrative actions. Such report shall also include a discussion of any differences between such results and the results of the study conducted under section 303 of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 1255).

SEC. 108. LOCAL NETWORK CHANNEL BROADCAST REPORTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the 270th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and on each succeeding anniversary of such 270th day, each satellite carrier shall submit an annual report to the Commission setting forth—

(A) each local market in which it—

(i) retransmits signals of 1 or more television broadcast stations with a community of license in that market;

(ii) has commenced providing such signals in the preceding 1-year period; and

(iii) has ceased to provide such signals in the preceding 1-year period; and

(B) detailed information regarding the use and potential use of satellite capacity for the retransmission of local signals in each local market.

(2) TERMINATION.—The requirement under paragraph (1) shall cease after each satellite carrier has submitted 5 reports under such paragraph.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms ''local market'' and ''satellite carrier'' have the meaning given such terms in section 339(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 339(d)); and

(2) the term ''television broadcast station'' has the meaning given such term in section 325(b)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)(7)).

SEC. 109. REPORT ON DESIGNATED MARKET AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains—

(1) an analysis of—

(A) the extent to which consumers in each local market have access to broadcast programming from television broadcast stations located outside their local market, including through carriage by cable operators and satellite carriers of signals that are significantly viewed (within the meaning of section 340 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 340)); and

(B) whether there are technologically and economically feasible alternatives to the use of designated market areas to define markets that would provide consumers with more programming options and the potential impact such alternatives could have on localism and on broadcast television locally, regionally, and nationally; and

(2) recommendations on how to foster increased localism in counties served by out-of-State designated market areas.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS FOR FOSTERING INCREASED LOCALISM.—In making recommendations under subsection (a)(2), the Commission shall consider—

(1) the impact that designated market areas that cross State lines have on access to local programming;

(2) the impact that designated market areas have on local programming in rural areas; and

(3) the state of local programming in States served exclusively by out-of-State designated market areas.

SEC. 110. UPDATE TO CABLE RATES REPORT.

Section 623(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543(k)) is amended to read as follows:

''(k) REPORTS ON AVERAGE PRICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall annually publish statistical reports on the average rates for basic cable service and other cable programming, and for converter boxes, remote control units, and other equipment of cable systems that the Commission has found are subject to effective competition under subsection (a)(2) compared with cable systems that the Commission has found are not subject to such effective competition.

''(2) INCLUSION IN ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall include in its report under paragraph (1) the aggregate average total amount paid by cable systems in compensation under section 325.

''(B) FORM.—The Commission shall publish information under this paragraph in a manner substantially similar to the way other comparable information is published in such report.''.

SEC. 111. ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS TO EFFECTIVE COMPETITION PETITIONS.

Section 623 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 543) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) STREAMLINED PETITION PROCESS FOR SMALL CABLE OPERATORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall complete a rulemaking to establish a streamlined process for filing of an effective competition petition pursuant to this section for small cable operators, particularly those who serve primarily rural areas.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to have any effect on the duty of a small cable operator to prove the existence of effective competition under this section.

''(3) DEFINITION OF SMALL CABLE OPERATOR.—In this subsection, the term 'small cable operator' has the meaning given the term in subsection (m)(2).''.

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(2) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission.

TITLE II—COPYRIGHT PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. REAUTHORIZATION.

Chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 111(d)(3)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''clause'' and inserting ''paragraph''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''clause'' and inserting ''paragraph''; and

(2) in section 119—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(E), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

SEC. 202. TERMINATION OF LICENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 119 of title 17, United States Code, as amended in section 201, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) TERMINATION OF LICENSE.—This section shall cease to be effective on December 31, 2019.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 107(a) of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (17 U.S.C. 119 note) is repealed.

SEC. 203. LOCAL SERVICE AREA OF A PRIMARY TRANSMITTER.

Section 111(f)(4) of title 17, United States Code, is amended, in the second sentence—

(1) by inserting ''as defined by the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission,'' after ''television station,'';

(2) by striking ''comprises the area within 35 miles of the transmitter site, except that'' and inserting ''comprises the designated market area, as defined in section 122(j)(2)(C), that encompasses the community of license of such station and any community that is located outside such designated market area that is either wholly or partially within 35 miles of the transmitter site or,''; and

(3) by striking ''the number of miles shall be 20 miles'' and inserting ''wholly or partially within 20 miles of such transmitter site''.

SEC. 204. MARKET DETERMINATIONS.

Section 122(j)(2) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by moving the margins of subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) 2 ems to the left; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) MARKET DETERMINATIONS.—The local market of a commercial television broadcast station may be modified by the Federal Communications Commission in accordance with

section 338(l) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 338).''.

TITLE III—SEVERABILITY

SEC. 301. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. 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 on the bill into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer yet another outstanding example of bipartisanship and thoughtful policymaking from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The STELA Reauthorization Act is an important piece of legislation that ensures that millions of satellite TV subscribers continue to receive broadcast TV programming from their chosen satellite provider.

We have reached across party lines and across the two houses of Congress to craft a compromise for this must-pass legislation that will improve the video marketplace for TV viewers across the country.

In addition to reauthorizing the distant signals offered by satellite providers, we were able to include targeted reforms that in fact will enhance the video marketplace and allow consumers to access the programming that they want when they want it.

These reforms are prime examples of the kinds of deregulatory changes that we are looking at as we work to replace the 80-year-old Communications Act. They are going to spur investment in communications networks, promote competition, and, yes, create needed American jobs.

For example, the bill eliminates the costly CableCARD integration ban that has increased the cost of cable-leased set-top boxes and makes them less energy efficient. Ultimately, this is a double whammy for consumers because, after being forced to pay for an unnecessary and antiquated technology, consumers then have to pay a penalty in the form of higher electric bills.

Although we eliminated the whole mandate in our original bill that we passed through our committee, we worked with our Senate colleagues and agreed to sunset the provision in 1 year.

This will provide time for the FCC to hold a working group on successor solutions to CableCARD without unduly delaying the benefits to consumers who choose to lease equipment from their cable provider.

The bill also evens the playing field for all video providers. It seeks regulatory parity for cable and satellite providers when it comes to protecting broadcast signals during Nielsen sweeps. It also provides satellite operators and broadcasters with the opportunity to modify local markets, like cable operators already have the ability to do.

□ 1245

We hope that in our updated Communications Act that we can find additional ways to eliminate regulatory differences that no longer serve a meaningful, technical purpose or that distort business and consumer incentives.

The bill provides other positive, bipartisan reforms, and it is our intent that as we update the Communications Act in the coming Congress that it continue along that very same path. That being said, the matter before us is the reauthorization of these provisions for the millions of satellite viewer subscribers that depend on them. The clock is ticking, and the bill will ensure when folks flip on their TVs, yes, their favorite show will be available when they want to watch it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for the bill as this Congress is quickly drawing to a close.

I particularly want to thank Subcommittee on Communications and Technology Chair GREG WALDEN, Ranking Members HENRY WAXMAN and ANNA ESHOO, and Judiciary Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, as well as our respective staffs for their bipartisan and hard work on this very important legislation. I also want to thank our Senate colleagues JAY ROCKEFELLER and JOHN THUNE for their willingness to work with us to find common ground.

I am proud of our committee's record of bipartisan results. As we work toward the Communications Act update next year to modernize our Nation's communication laws for the innovation era, continued cooperation will be critical to that success. Without this bill, without this reauthorization being moved forward, satellite viewers—millions of Americans—will have those sets turned off. It is important that we reauthorize this bill, and I am pleased to do so in a very bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, 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. 5728, the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act Reauthorization. This is the continuation of our bipartisan efforts this year to ensure that 1.5 million satellite subscribers don't lose access to broadcast programming when the current satellite television law expires at the end of this year and to make some targeted reforms to the video marketplace. The bill before us today represents a compromise with our colleagues from the Senate, and I look forward to working with them to quickly see it passed into law.

In July, the House passed H.R. 4572, to reauthorize the expiring communications and copyright law that allows households across America, but especially those in rural areas, access to broadcast content. In addition, the Energy and Commerce Committee on which I serve was able to come to agreement on several key reforms to our video laws to benefit the TV-watching public.

H.R. 5728 maintains these bipartisan provisions from the bill we adopted in July, in particular addressing the abuses in the retransmission consent process. The bill prevents two non-commonly owned broadcasters from colluding to jointly negotiate for retransmission consent.

The Energy and Commerce Committee heard extensive testimony about how this practice drives up prices for consumers and potentially threatens access to local broadcast content. I also want to emphasize that this language does not permit broadcast stations that are deemed ''commonly owned'' as a result of the joint sales agreement to negotiate jointly for retransmission consent.

Our colleagues on the Senate Commerce Committee proposed additional pro-consumer reforms, and I am pleased that we were able to include those in H.R. 5728. Mr. Speaker, these provisions include an FCC rulemaking to assess the standard for determining whether parties are negotiating in good faith for retransmission consent, a prohibition on broadcasters preventing significantly viewed signals from being carried in local markets, and greater transparency for consumers by including retransmission consent payments in the FCC's report on cable rates.

H.R. 5728 also makes further changes to the provisions that were heavily debated in the House during consideration of H.R. 4572. The bill now extends by 6 months the deadline for broadcasters to unwind certain joint sales agreements, a rule which the FCC tightened earlier this year to address concerns that broadcaster coordination in local markets were undermining localism, competition, and diversity.

Finally, H.R. 5728 reflects further compromise on the FCC's cable set-top box rules. The FCC's integration ban—the rule written to promote competition in the cable set-top box market—will sunset in 1 year. This well-intentioned rule has not resulted in the kind of competition Congress envisioned and has actually caused significant energy inefficiencies in cable set-top boxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are including an idea from our Senate colleagues to create a working group that is charged with identifying a successor solution. I support further efforts to promote competition in the set-top box market and look forward to engaging with the working group and the FCC on this issue.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN, and on the Senate side, Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Ranking Member THUNE, also our ranking members on our side of the aisle, Ranking Members WAXMAN and ESHOO, and other Democrats on our committee.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the distinguished chairman of the Telecommunications Subcommittee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, last July the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4572, the STELA Reauthorization Act, by unanimous vote. Today, after extensive consultation with our colleagues in the Senate, we are offering a second version of STELA's reauthorization, which will extend the copyright and retransmission consent provisions for distant signals retransmitted by commercial satellite providers for 5 years. Now, if we don't act to extend these provisions by the end of this Congress, there will be 1.5 million subscribers to satellite television, including many in my home State of Oregon, that just won't have access to broadcast network programming come New Year's Day.

This bill represents the best of how Congress can work together and get things done. Today's version of STELAR is a compromise bill that incorporates the previously passed provisions—these were passed unanimously by the House earlier this year—with the provisions that passed by voice vote out of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Now, by coming together to produce legislation with strong, bipartisan, bicameral support, we have demonstrated our clear commitment to the continued availability of broadcast programming to millions of subscribers and to some targeted and, in some cases, much-needed reforms to our communications laws.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, this bill sets a date for the sunset of the FCC's integration ban on cable-leased set-top boxes. That clears the way for innovation and new investment by lifting an unnecessary regulatory burden that has cost the cable industry and its consumers $1 billion. One billion dollars, Mr. Speaker, since 2007 it has cost.

I especially want to thank Vice Chairman BOB LATTA, who is right here, and my Democratic colleague from Texas, GENE GREEN, whom you have just heard from, for their thoughtful, bipartisan work on lifting the integration ban.

Now, the bill offers a glide path for those companies that currently rely on CableCARD and urges the consumer electronics manufacturers and MVPDs to work together to find a next-generation solution for a competitive set-top box market.

Our bill also opens up the ability for satellite operators and broadcasters to modify local markets so that consumers can receive programming that is relevant to their communities. Broadcasters have long had the ability to reach such agreements with cable systems, and this bill creates parity, allowing broadcasters to ensure their programming is reaching the right communities via satellite, regardless of DMA boundaries. Our bill also provides parity by removing a government restriction on cable's ability to drop broadcast signals during the Nielsen sweeps. Additionally, the bill ensures that consumers will be able to access locally relevant broadcasts from outside their local markets without interference from local broadcasters.

Mr. Speaker, we have also sought to stabilize the retransmission consent regime. This bill prohibits broadcast stations in single markets from negotiating jointly with cable and satellite operators. The bill also seeks to allow policymakers to gather more information on retransmission consent by requiring cable operators to report annually on their payments for broadcast programming. This bill also asks the FCC to reexamine the meaning of ''good faith'' in retransmission consent negotiations, but, importantly, it does not predetermine any outcomes for that rulemaking.

The STELA Reauthorization Act is yet another example of true bipartisanship with support from all sectors of the communications industry. This type of collaboration has long been the hallmark of our committee, and I am pleased to see the legislative result before us today. As this Congress is drawing to a close quickly, I urge my colleagues to join me in getting this important legislation onto the President's desk and signed into law before the authorization ends at the end of the year.

Now, it takes many hands to make light work, and this bill is no different. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the staff from the House Commerce Committee's staff, David Redl, Ray Baum, Grace Koh, Shawn Chang, Margaret McCarthy, and David Grossman; as well as Senate Commerce staff Ellen Doneski, John Branscome, Shawn Bone, David Quinalty, and Hap Rigby. They spent many hours working to find common ground on this bill, Mr. Speaker, and their effort has paid off for consumers.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip and a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman UPTON for yielding and for his leadership, as well as Chairman WALDEN of the subcommittee and the ranking members, for bringing a good bipartisan bill to the floor that addresses some real problems and starts to lay some groundwork for important future discussions about the video marketplace.

Let me first say, Mr. Speaker, that the STELA Reauthorization Act will give certainty and ensure that 1.5 million satellite consumers across the country don't have to fear losing their signal at the end of this year, which will happen without passage of this legislation. So it is very important that immediately we get this resolved so that we don't create that uncertainty across the country.

Also, Mr. Speaker, why this bill is important is it finally starts to implement some important and much-needed reforms to our video marketplace laws. I have been saying this a long time: If you look at the laws that we have on the books, we have a 21st century marketplace, we have a dynamic industry that has evolved and grown, and the technology has advanced in a dramatic way over the last few decades, but, unfortunately, the laws have not changed to reflect the current marketplace. We have started that conversation with a few of the provisions in this bill, and I was happy to work with the chairman, the ranking member, and others on some of those provisions; and we also talked about the need to have a deeper conversation about a Communications Act update next year in the new Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on that as well. But in the meantime, it is important that we pass this bill and that we urge the Senate to move quickly as well to create that certainty for those customers all across the country that are counting on us to get this done.

Again, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member for working in a bipartisan way to bring this bill to the House floor and pass it along.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the vice chair of the subcommittee.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the full committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5728, the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014. I am pleased to see the

bipartisan and bicameral effort that took place to bring forth this must-pass legislation.

Through the leadership of Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN and with the bipartisan support of Ranking Member WAXMAN and Subcommittee Ranking Member ESHOO, this legislation underscores a commitment to ensuring that our communication laws maximize the potential for investment, innovation, and consumer choice.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased this bill incorporates a bipartisan and pro-consumer provision to eliminate the current set-top box integration ban, similar to the one that I, along with Congressman GENE GREEN, sponsored in the House. Repealing this outdated technological mandate will foster greater investment and innovation in the set-top box market. It is clear that the integration ban is simply unnecessary and does not reflect the technological advancements or consumer demands of today, which have been agreed upon and supported on a bipartisan level, even by the Progressive Policy Institute.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' and support this bipartisan legislation. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

□ 1300

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the House will consider joint Judiciary and Energy and Commerce Committee legislation, H.R. 5728, the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014, to ensure that all of our constituents continue to have access to network channels on America's two satellite carriers.

Title II of the legislation extends the expiring section 119 copyright license for another 5 years, as this committee has done on previous occasions, most recently in 2010. This license ensures that when our constituents do not have access to a full complement of local network television stations, they can have access through satellite television carriers to distant network television stations. This helps ensure that consumers in rural areas, like mine in Pennsylvania's 10th Congressional District, have the same access to news and entertainment options that consumers in urban areas enjoy.

Without enactment of this legislation, many of our constituents would potentially lose access to certain networks altogether on December 31, when the current license expires.

I would like to point out that although numerous stakeholders interested in video issues have contacted the committee on a variety of issues, they all agree that this license should not expire at the end of this year. Other issues of interest in this area will be the subject of further discussion as my committee continues its ongoing review of our Nation's copyright laws.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan, pro-consumer legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of science-based policies. Throughout my career, I have always welcomed expert scientific advice and relied upon facts and scientific evidence to legislate. But the bill we are considering today is not a sound science bill; it is actually an anti-science bill. It would take away the ability of decision-makers to rely on published, peer-reviewed studies to protect our health and our planet.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am opposed to the next bill that we will consider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas continue to yield time on this legislation, H.R. 5728?

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want Members to know I am going to put a statement in the RECORD supporting this legislation and urging all of our colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5728, the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act Reauthorization. The House passed H.R. 4572 in July, a bill that extends the expiring satellite television law and makes targeted reforms to the video marketplace. Since that time, we have engaged in bicameral, bipartisan negotiations that produced the compromise bill before us today.

First and foremost, H.R. 5728 ensures that 1.5 million satellite subscribers across the country will not lose access to broadcast content when current law expires at the end of the year.

H.R. 5728 maintains the key provisions designed to address abuses in the video marketplace that received bipartisan support in the Energy and Commerce Committee. In particular, it prohibits the collusive practice of joint retransmission consent negotiations by two or more broadcasters in the same market.

I want to note that the language is carefully crafted to ensure it does not become a loophole for broadcasters who are deemed ''commonly owned'' under the Joint Sales Agreement attribution rules to continue to jointly negotiate retransmission consent deals with distributors.

Further, we adopt additional reforms proposed by our colleagues in the Senate Commerce Committee.

For example, the FCC must re-examine its standard for determining whether parties are negotiating in ''good faith'' for retransmission consent and provide greater transparency for consumers by including retransmission consent payments in the agency's report on cable rates.

Finally, H.R. 5728 reflects further compromise on two provisions that were the subject of extensive negotiations here in the House earlier this year.

The bill alters a provision we included to address concerns about implementation of new FCC limits on broadcaster coordination through Joint Sales Agreements. We now provide a simple six month extension for broadcasters required to unwind those agreements under the new FCC rule.

Second, the bill delays by one year the sunset of the FCC's ''integration ban,'' which is a rule intended to stimulate competition in the cable set top box market.

We also added another good idea from the Senate bill by creating a working group tasked with identifying a successor solution. The well-intentioned integration ban has had the perverse effect of hindering energy efficiency in set top boxes.

Removing the integration ban from the FCC's rule books does not eliminate the separable security requirement that ensures competitive access to cable companies' own decryption technology for set top boxes. But it does allow for innovation in the delivery of cable TV in ways that will increase energy efficiency.

I support further efforts to promote competition in this area and know that my colleagues will be actively engaged with the working group next year.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting H.R. 5728.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5728, the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Nearly four months ago, the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010 (STELA). The language before the House today reflects a compromise reached with the leadership of the Senate Commerce Committee and paves the way for an extension of STELA prior to the expiration of the statute on December 31, 2014.

Like the bill passed by voice vote in July, H.R. 5728 reauthorizes STELA for a period of five years, ensuring that approximately 1.5 million satellite subscribers can continue accessing broadcast television signals. Reflecting my belief that our video laws are outdated and in some cases are even being abused, H.R. 5728 requires the FCC to re-examine its 'good faith' rules to ensure retransmission consent negotiations are conducted fairly and in a timely manner.

To better understand how retransmission consent fees impact a consumer's monthly bill, H.R. 5728 requires the FCC to include aggregate data as part of its annual report on cable rates. This provision will bring about much needed transparency because retransmission consent fees are estimated to rise from $4.3 billion this year to an estimated whopping $5.1 billion in 2015.

H.R. 5728 also includes a provision I strongly supported during committee debate to ensure broadcasters cannot team up against pay-TV providers for leverage during retransmission consent negotiations. This is an important step toward rebalancing the playing field and ultimately protecting consumers from unacceptable blackouts and increased rates.

Finally, H.R. 5728 improves on language included in the bill adopted in July by delaying repeal of the cable set-top box 'integration ban' by one year and establishing a stakeholder working group tasked with developing a successor solution. Importantly, this provision does not negate a cable operator's obligation to promote the competitive availability of set-top boxes under Section 629 of the Communications Act. While I continue to believe repeal of the ban should be conditioned on an industry-wide adoption of a successor to the CableCARD, this is a compromise I support. With an eye to the future, we can fulfill a goal I set out to achieve nearly 20 years ago and that is to give consumers an alternative to having to rent a set-top box from their local cable company every month.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5728.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5728.

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.

SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4012.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 756 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. 4012.

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

□ 1310

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. 4012) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee 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 Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me this time.

H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act, is a short, commonsense bill. It requires the Environmental Protection Agency to base its regulations on public information. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, for introducing this bill.

Costly environmental regulations should only be based upon data that is available to independent scientists and the public. However, the EPA does not adhere to this practice. In fact, nearly every major air-quality regulation from this administration has been justified by data that it has kept secret. This means the Agency's claims about the benefits of its rules cannot be verified by independent scientists.

This includes the recent plan to regulate our entire electric system. This proposal will kill thousands of jobs and increase electricity costs, all for no discernible effect on global temperatures.

This also includes upcoming ozone regulations, which even the administration admits will be the most expensive in history. Unachievable standards will result in economic hardship, stalled new road projects, and burdened local governments.

Unfortunately, EPA clearly sees transparency and accountability as a threat. Speaking before the National Academy of Sciences, EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy said that her agency needed to keep the science ''from those not qualified to analyze it.'' But the public deserves better, and this administration promised more. In 2012, the President's science adviser testified:

> Absolutely, the data on which regulatory decisions are based should be public.

The chair of EPA's own Science Advisory Board testified that EPA's advisers recommend ''that literature and data used by EPA be peer reviewed and made available to the public.''

Americans agree. A recent poll from the Institute for Energy Research found that 90 percent of Americans believe that studies and data used to make Federal Government decisions should in fact be made public.

Reforms to the EPA's regulatory process are consistent with the data access requirements of major scientific journals, the White House scientific integrity policy, and the recommendations of independent groups like the Administrative Conference of the U.S. and the Bipartisan Policy Center. Deans of major universities, former EPA scientists, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and dozens of experts and organizations all support this bill.

A letter from more than 80 scientists and academics stated that:

> Complying with H.R. 4012 can be accomplished without imposing unnecessary burdens, discouraging research, or raising confidentiality concerns.

The signatories include professors, two former chairs of EPA science committees, medical doctors, statisticians, deans of major universities, and environmental scientists.

The Secret Science Reform Act prohibits the disclosure of confidential or proprietary information protected by the law. Instead, it stops EPA's use of unverifiable science.

□ 1315

For those who are concerned about the regulations already on the books, the act is not retroactive. It applies only to new future regulations issued by the Agency.

The act requires the EPA to base its decisions on information to which all scientists will have access. This will allow the EPA to focus its limited resources on quality science that all researchers can examine. This will promote sound science and confidence in the EPA decisionmaking process.

This bill ensures the transparency and accountability that the American people want and deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, this bill does not permit me to mince words. This bill is an insidious attack on EPA's ability to use the best science to protect public health, and its consideration on the House floor today is the culmination of one of the most anti-science and anti-health campaigns I have witnessed in my 22 years as a Member of Congress.

The genesis of this legislation is the Republicans' longstanding obsession with two seminal scientific studies conducted by Harvard University and the American Cancer Society.

These studies link air pollution with increased illnesses and death; moreover, those results were confirmed by multiple independent researchers and organizations including the National Research Council and the Health Effects Institute.

The Republican majority has harassed EPA for more than 2 years in an attempt to get access to the raw data used in those studies, presumably in an attempt to cast doubt on the conclusion that air pollution is bad for the health of Americans and to prevent EPA from trying to keep the air we breath clean.

The EPA told my Republican colleagues that since the studies involved the personal health information of

hundreds of thousands of volunteers, the raw data was stringently protected from public disclosure; therefore, even if they were the legal custodian of this data, they could not lawfully hand over such sensitive information.

Instead, in compliance with the law, EPA provided the Science Committee with all of the ''de-identified'' data within its possession, which ran to hundreds of pages of data rolled in like a grocery cart. This was not enough for my colleagues, and so they have decided to pursue this pernicious piece of legislation.

Rather than explain the problems with this legislation myself, I will simply quote from a letter we received from the American Lung Association and the American Thoracic Society, two leading and trusted public health organizations. They state:

> The legislation will compel the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to either ignore the best science by prohibiting the Agency from considering peer-reviewed research that is based on confidential patient information or force EPA to publicly release confidential patient information, which would violate Federal law.
>
> This is an untenable outcome that would completely undermine the ability of the EPA to perform its responsibilities under the Clean Air Act and myriad other Federal laws. The legislation will not improve EPA's actions; rather, it will stifle public health protections.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will wrongly claim that this legislation is consistent with the requirements of major scientific journals, the White House's policy to promote public access to federally-funded research, and recommendations from independent groups like the Administrative Conference of the United States. This is simply not true.

All of those entities recognize the balance between making data public and protecting confidentiality and personal privacy. They do not paint scientists or the EPA into a corner and tell them that the only way their research can be used or considered is if all of that data is available in a form—let me quote from the bill—''that is sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction.''

That phrase is critical to understanding the implications of H.R. 4012. According to a letter from the American Cancer Society to EPA, they ''are not aware of any way to create a de-identified version of the Cancer Prevention Study II data set sufficient to protect confidentiality of the participants while at the same time allowing a true replica of the studies.''

Because legitimate researchers like the American Cancer Society must publish their peer-reviewed results in a de-identified form, if this bill becomes law, the EPA will not be able to rely on those important studies to protect public health and the environment.

I would like to quote Dr. Ellen Silbergeld from Johns Hopkins University, a witness at a hearing the Science Committee held on this bill. She states:

> If the EPA is unable to access the peer-reviewed literature because raw data are not available as proposed in the ''Secret Science'' bill, then we move to the dysfunctional situation where the EPA will be unable to sustain its decisions because these will be based on inadequate or incomplete science.

This is not a position that I can support. Let me be clear: this bill is an attempt to constrain the EPA under the guise of promoting transparency.

A diverse set of voices from the scientific, public health, legal, and environmental communities agree with me and have criticized this legislation. I have received letters from more than 50 organizations expressing their concern with H.R. 4012, including the American Lung Association, the American Thoracic Society, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, the Association of American Universities, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Environmental Defense Fund.

Whatever views my fellow Members may have about specific EPA rules and regulations, I would hope that they will see this bill for what it is, a malicious assault on EPA's ability to protect public health. Limiting or prohibiting what science EPA uses as part of its rulemaking would be a consequence of this bill. The American people deserve better.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, at the end of my opening remarks, I will enter into the RECORD an exchange of letters between the chairmen of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

I continue to be stunned at some of the hyperbolic language that seems to be moving around this piece of legislation.

Transparency, it is an incredibly powerful concept and a fairly simple one in this aspect: if you are going to make public policy, do it by public data and public data for the concept of refinement and creation of public policy.

Is there anyone in this body when we all ran for office that did not commit to transparency? Well, H.R. 4012 is part of that commitment. If you have faith in our higher learning institutions, if you have faith in the American people, this data belongs to them.

Partially, one side belief I have is, as the crowd has the opportunity to analyze and collect and look at data, whether they be from the right, the left, or just academic, we will end up with finer-crafted solutions.

How would any of us know if the EPA has set optimal rule sets? Well, one of the ways you discover this is by having lots of voices in the mix. This bill keeps that commitment, and I have no idea why my brothers and sisters on the left seem to be trying to shut down that commitment to transparency.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, August 22, 2014.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I write concerning H.R. 4012, the ''Secret Science Reform Act of 2014.'' As you are aware, the bill was referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, but the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a jurisdictional interest in the bill and has requested a sequential referral.

Given the implications of H.R. 4012 for agencies within its jurisdiction, the Committee on Energy and Commerce remains committed to working on scientific transparency. However, because of our mutual interest in having this important legislation considered by the House before the end of the 113th Congress, I will not insist on a sequential referral of H.R. 4012. I do so with the understanding that, by foregoing such a referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive any jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters, and the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4012 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, August 27, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: Thank you for agreeing to withdraw your request for a sequential referral of H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014.

I agree that forgoing further action on this bill does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will insert copies of this exchange into the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4012 on the House floor. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Science Committee, so I wasn't part of the deliberations, but when a bill is presented as being about transparency and openness and relying on science, I ask myself:

''Well, of course, why would there be any partisan difference on something like that?''

Then you start looking at different things that make you wonder if that is what this is really about. This is a bill that came out of the Science Committee, and I looked at the list of the supporters. There is not a Democrat on the list. As I understand it, the vote was on a party-line basis. Would that mean that Democrats don't believe in these things? Or is something else going on?

I submit that Republicans don't have a lot of credibility when they talk about wanting more science because I have seen so many areas where Republicans have tried to ignore the science, deny the science.

The best example of this irony is that when Republicans are claiming they are for sound science, they have had so many anti-science proposals on the House floor. I think even the Flat Earth Society recognizes that there is some overwhelming consensus on some things like climate change or that man is causing climate change and that it is a serious threat to our planet. Republicans undercut their statement of support for science when they have voted repeatedly to deny that climate change exists.

Well, we have a Republican majority here. It is even a larger majority for the next year. They may be able to write our Nation's laws, but they can't rewrite the laws of nature.

The list of anti-science votes in this body that this body has cast is embarrassing. House Republicans voted to defund the U.S. contribution to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the leading international body assessing the science of climate change.

They voted to bar U.S. funding for the Global Climate Change Initiative which funds U.S. efforts to understand climate change. They voted to eliminate funding for EPA's greenhouse gas reporting rules so scientists would not be able to track emissions.

House-passed budgets have repeatedly slashed funding for our Nation's leading science-based agencies like NIH; the National Science Foundation; and ARPA–E, which invests in cutting-edge energy research. The Energy and Commerce Committee, despite requests that were repeatedly made to the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee, they wouldn't even allow a hearing where scientists could come in and talk about the issue of climate change.

Now, we have a bill where the Republicans are saying they want science, they want more transparency, they want more openness.

I looked into this, and this is a fight about something quite controversial that happened some years ago at EPA, when those who were against EPA action claimed that EPA shouldn't rely on the science unless all the information were put out, including confidential information that served as the basis for some of the scientific conclusions, but the scientific conclusions were not refuted. In fact, they were reaffirmed in other studies. They are not scientifically invalid.

If this bill passed, the conclusions based on the evidence which cannot be made public because it interferes with people's confidential information would not be available.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

□ 1330

Mr. WAXMAN. So what we are seeing is something that sounds good from a party that has no credibility to say that they are for more science information. What they would do is limit what EPA would be able to use to determine, based on the science, what the regulations and their other pronouncements could be. They would keep information away from EPA and keep EPA from acting.

I want to urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I underscore that this is not pro-science policy. It seems to me it is anti-science and making it difficult for government to act to stop pollution, which can hurt people's health and destroy the atmosphere on our planet.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4012, and I thank the gentleman from Arizona and the chairman of the Science Committee for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

H.R. 4012 is a critical step in restoring the public trust necessary for EPA to accomplish its core mission. Transparency was a major campaign promise the current President made to the American people, and here is a way we can help the President finally follow through on one of his goals. This should be a strong bipartisan effort for anyone that believes their government has a duty to be accountable to the American public we serve.

H.R. 4012 follows a basic tenet that nearly all Americans agree on: public policy should be dictated by public science. Unfortunately, transparency, along with oversight by the American people's duly-elected representation, has been something EPA scoffs at. This must change.

The President continues to use his regulatory agencies to bypass the will of the legislature in a number of cases, and policy from EPA has been one of the worst offenders. Everyone here believes in clean air, clean water, and necessary regulations, but what we have now is a regulatory agency attempting to put in place legislation which this Congress previously rejected in prior sessions. This is not a government that is working for you.

Americans also believe in clear laws and a fair judicial system where both sides can state their case and an adequate resolution can be found. This is why this closed-door regulatory approach is so frightening.

When someone accuses you of a crime in a court of law, they must stand before that court and make that claim. Your deposition is given to both sides, and you cannot hide behind secret testimony which is only given to the prosecutor. This is what we have now happening at EPA.

EPA legislates through regulations, and the defendant has no chance to see where EPA's claims are coming from. It is time for the American people to see behind the curtain, and it is unjust to continue using claims from the Agency that cannot be contested only because they cannot be seen.

I would also like to correct unfounded claims made by opponents of this legislation. Nothing disallows EPA from using the most up-to-date scientific information to make public health decisions. It would certainly be my hope that the research institutions would make this available, but it would ultimately be their decision whether or not EPA could use their data. If I dedicated my life to studying these complex issues, I would want to make sure it could be used.

The other claim is that this bill will make public personal health care information, which would be against the law. This legislation makes clear that nothing in this bill requires the ''public dissemination of information, the disclosure of which is prohibited by law.'' The data sets must only be made available in a manner that is ''sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research results.''

Numerous congressional hearings and testimony from experts have made it clear that this information can easily be made anonymous. This is how data sets are presented to the peer-review community and published for journals already.

This is the transparency the American people deserve. They should no longer be held guilty from data they can't see or black box economic analyses deemed proprietary. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the second most senior member of the full committee on the Democratic side.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill. I really believe that the so-called Secret Science Act is in fact a direct attack on American science.

I am a very strong supporter of transparency in government, as well as in science, and in Silicon Valley, where I am from, we believe more data in more hands benefits everybody, but I think this bill is not in fact an open data bill. It will be a data reduction bill.

It doesn't give the EPA greater authority to provide the raw data it uses.

It actually reduces the kinds of data that can be used by prohibiting the EPA from using any data that can't currently be publicly released.

That sounds reasonable except that in fact there is some data that you can't actually release under current law—medical records, confidential business data, trade secrets—all of which, if made publicly available, would run afoul of various provisions of law.

I believe that we could work together on a bipartisan basis to figure out how to fix the barriers to release of data while maintaining necessary confidentiality for some data. I think we should all agree on that.

I want to point out another way that the bill is a problem, and that is the additional cost that is going to be incurred per study. The estimate, according to CBO, is that there will be an additional $10,000 to $30,000 added per study. That means that if this bill were to become law, it would cost an additional $500 million to $1.5 billion a year to do science studies.

I would love to be disappointed, but I don't believe that the Republicans intend to add additional funding to the EPA to cover the cost of the science studies that this bill would create. In fact, this bill does not address that issue.

What this would do would be to actually cut the number of science studies that the EPA is able to do. I think that that is a result that would be very unfortunate for the country. What we need is more science, not less.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, our constituents have a right to know whether EPA's regulations are based on sound science and do these regulations actually benefit the American public.

The Secret Science Reform Act, which I have cosponsored, is a simple and straightforward message to government bureaucrats that they cannot propose costly new regulations without the transparency that the American people deserve.

It makes you kind of wonder if the opponents of this legislation believe, like Mr. Gruber, that the American people are too stupid to understand the cost of the EPA overreaching regulations. Trust me when I say Americans are not stupid, and they deserve and demand the truth from the start.

When given a bad prognosis from their doctor, I wonder how many of the proponents of the bill would say they don't really care about the details or the data. That is interesting.

EPA's regulatory agenda should not be based on secret science and 30-year-old data in order to sell it to the American people. It is long past time that Congress increases the transparency of the EPA. This legislation will do exactly that by prohibiting the EPA from proposing or finalizing regulations based upon a science that is neither transparent nor available for review.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH and Congressman SCHWEIKERT for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my next speaker, I would like to enter in the RECORD a series of letters from outside groups opposed to this legislation, including the American Lung Association, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, League of Conservation Voters, and many others.

In addition, I would also like to place a Statement of Administration Policy threatening a veto of this bill into the RECORD.

AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION,
AMERICAN THORACIC SOCIETY,
November 17, 2014.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 4012 the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014. The American Lung Association is the oldest voluntary health organization in the United States. The Lung Association mission is to save lives by improving lung health and preventing lung disease. We achieve our mission through research, advocacy and education. The American Thoracic Society is a medical professional society dedicated to the prevention, detection, treatment and cure of pulmonary disease, critical care illness and sleep disordered breathing through research, education and advocacy.

Science is the bedrock of sound regulatory decision making. The best science underscores everything our organizations do to improve health. We strongly believe in a transparent and open regulatory process. A vital element of research is patient confidentiality. Physicians and researchers have earned by trust of their patients by steadfastly maintaining patient confidentiality. Patient confidentiality is a clear legal obligation and a sacred vow.

The legislation before the Congress will compel the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to either ignore the best science by prohibiting the agency from considering peer-reviewed research that is based on confidential patient information or force EPA to publicly release confidential patient information, which would violate federal law. This is an untenable outcome that would completely undermine ability the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to perform its responsibilities under the Clean Air Act and myriad other federal laws. The legislation will not improve EPA's actions, rather it will stifle public health protections.

We note that the kind of information disclosure envisioned in this legislation exceeds that required by peer reviewed journals. We believe much of the intent of this legislation is already achieved through the current peer review process required by all academic journals. The vast majority of peer reviewed journals require manuscript authors to register any trial using human subjects with clinicaltrials.gov. This public registry collects key information on the study population, research goals and methods that allow outside reviewers and scientists to either challenge or attempt to reproduce study results. Additionally, the peer review process and publication of results invites the broader scientific community to debate study findings. Trial registry and manuscript publications are only part of the process by which scientific endeavors operate in a transparent environment.

Private organizations, public charities, research universities, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, corporations and many other entities conduct medical research. Many of these organizations compile large longitudinal data sets that track patients of a period of time. These data serve as the basis of many studies that permit epidemiologists to track disease and risk factor information for large patient populations.

The published peer-reviewed information from such data often may inform regulatory decision making at the EPA and other federal agencies and inform future research. Not only do these data inform regulatory action, they help inform efforts to educate the public about the magnitude of a disease, risk factors and steps individuals can take to improve their health. In order for EPA to set the most appropriate standards it must be informed by the best information.

Understanding the impact of air pollution on human health and the magnitude of harm caused by pollution at specific levels helps the agency meet its obligations under the Clean Air Act. Absent these data, it is unclear upon what basis the agency could make sound decisions.

We urge the House of Representatives to reject H.R. 4012.

Sincerely,

HAROLD WIMMER,
National President & CEO, American Lung Association.

STEPHEN C. CRANE, PhD, MPH,
Executive Director, American Thoracic Society.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2014.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Majority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTHY: As leading U.S. science, engineering, and academic institutions, we are writing to express our concerns regarding the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014 (H.R. 4012). As the new House Majority Leader we encourage you and your colleagues to take additional time to evaluate the unintended consequences of this bill before considering it on the House floor.

The research community is concerned about how some of the key terms in the bill could be interpreted or misinterpreted, especially terms such as ''materials,'' ''data,'' and ''reproducible.'' Would the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) be excluded from utilizing research that involved physical specimens or biological materials that are not easily accessible? How would the agency address research that combines both public and private data?

With respect to reproducibility of research, some scientific research, especially in areas of public health, involves longitudinal studies that are so large and of great duration that they could not realistically be reproduced. Rather these studies are replicated, utilizing statistical modeling. The same may be true for scientific data from a one-time event (e.g., Deepwater Horizon Gulf oil spill) where the data are being gathered in real time. We could foresee a situation whereby the EPA would be constrained from making a proposal or even disseminating public information in a timely fashion.

Finally, the legislation could impose additional uncompensated burdens of cost and effort on those recipients of federal research grants where the research results are expected to be ''relied on to support a covered action.'' The bill is not clear on whether it is the EPA's or the research institution's responsibility to cover the costs associated with sharing and archiving this information.

The America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 required that the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) work with federal agencies to establish access to data policies that relate ''to the dissemination and long-term stewardship of the results of unclassified research, including digital data and peer-reviewed scholarly publications.'' Agencies are expected to finalize their data access policies by the end of the year, and given the complexities associated with access to research data as outlined above we suggest that the Congress wait to review the agency policies before imposing new statutory requirements via H.R. 4012.

American Anthropological Association; American Association for the Advancement of Science; American Geophysical Union; American Geosciences Institute; American Meteorological Society; American Physical Society (APS Physics); American Political Science Association; American Society for Microbiology (ASM); American Society of Agronomy; American Society of Civil Engineers; Association for the Sciences of Limnology and Oceanography; Association of American Geographers; Association of American Universities; Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU); Bard Center for Environmental Policy; Biophysical Society; Brown University; Consortium for Ocean Leadership; Consortium of Social Science Associations; Cornell University; Crop Science Society of America.

Duke University; Ecological Society of America; Entomological Society of America; Harvard University; Indiana University; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; National Council for Science and the Environment; Society for Conservation Biology; Soil Science Society of America; Stanford University; Stony Brook University; The Ohio State University; The University of Texas at Austin; University of California System; University of California, Davis; University of California, Irvine; University of California, Riverside; University of California, Santa Barbara; University of Maryland; University of Michigan; University of Oregon; University of Pennsylvania.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,
Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

Re Oppose H.R 1422, H.R. 4012, and H.R. 4795: An Attack on Scientific Integrity and Public Health

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on HR. 1422, H.R. 4012, and H.R. 4795.

H.R. 1422, the so-called EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would undermine the ability of the Science Advisory Board to provide independent scientific advice to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This bill would allow industry participation on the Scientific Advisory Board, while preventing subject experts from being included. Additionally, new burdens imposed on the Board would needlessly delay necessary public health and environmental protections.

H.R. 4012, the so-called Secret Science Reform Act of 2014 would endanger public health by preventing the EPA from using the best available science. The bill contains favorable exemptions for industry and would severely restrict the health studies that the EPA is able to use by prohibiting the use of peer-reviewed studies with confidential health information. These types of studies are the basis for the best research on pollution's effects on people. This legislation cripples the EPA's ability to develop effective public health safeguards.

H.R. 4795, the so-called Promoting New Manufacturing Act is an attack on clean air protections. This bill would create unclear procedural requirements and loopholes that could allow newly permitted industrial facilities to be exempted from the most recent national air quality standards set by the EPA. This legislation effectively creates amnesty for new facilities while delaying the permitting process and threatening public health.

We urge you to REJECT H.R. 1422 H.R. 4012, and H.R. 4795, a collective attack on scientific integrity and public health. We will strongly consider including votes on these bills in the 2014 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call Tiernan Sittenfeld, Sara Chieffo or Alex Taurel in my office at (202) 785–8683.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE; CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY; CENTER FOR EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT; CLEAN WATER ACTION; COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA; DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE; EARTHJUSTICE; ENVIRONMENT AMERICA; ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND; INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW); LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS; NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL; PUBLIC CITIZEN; SIERRA CLUB; SOUTHERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER (SELC); SOUTHERN OREGON CLIMATE ACTION NOW; UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA (UWUA); WE ACT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters we strongly urge you to oppose the trio of anti-EPA bills hitting the floor this week: the ''Secret Science Reform Act of 2014'' (HR 4012), the ''EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013'' (HR 1422), and the ''Promoting New Manufacturing Act'' (HR 4795). Collectively, these misleadingly named bills would radically diminish EPA's ability to protect public health. Under these bills, EPA would be required to ignore significant science; the Scientific Advisory Board would be required to ignore conflicts of interest; and enforcement officials would be required to ignore pollution emitted in violation of the law. These bills are broadly written and would have damaging impacts far in excess of what their sponsors will admit.

The ''Secret Science Reform Act,'' HR 4012, is based on a faulty premise. Its notion of ''secret science,'' based on claims about studies of fine soot pollution conducted almost two decades ago, is unfounded despite lengthy congressional inquiries. The bill would deny EPA the ability to rely upon peer-reviewed medical studies that involve commitments to patient confidentiality, when the agency carries out its statutory responsibilities to safeguard public health and the environment. Further, this bill would effectively amend numerous environmental statutes by forbidding EPA to use certain kinds of studies in setting health standards. It would also make it impossible for EPA to use many kinds of economic models it routinely relies on because those models are proprietary. This marks a radical departure from longstanding practices. Its end result would be to make it much more difficult to protect the public by forcing EPA to ignore key scientific studies.

HR 1422 would attack EPA's scientific process in a different way. This bill would significantly weaken the content and credibility of the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) reviews—a textbook example of making a government program function poorly to the benefit of polluting industries and at the expense of public health and independent science. The bill will add unnecessary new burdens on the SAB, distorting its mission and altering its process with no benefit to EPA or the public. The worst provision would mandate allowing the participation of scientists with financial conflicts of interest, as long as those conflicts are disclosed. This is inconsistent with a set of nearly universally accepted scientific principles to eliminate or limit financial conflicts. The bill also significantly broadens the scope of the SAB and creates a comment process that will add needless delay to the Board's work. The result would be further stalling and undermining of important public health, safety, and environmental protections.

Lastly, HR 4795 is a substantive attack on our nation's right to clean air protections. It would grant amnesty from national clean air health standards, create red tape and cause unintended burdens to local businesses. The bill would exacerbate air pollution nationwide, causing harm to public health and making the jobs of state and local officials harder to perform. Newly permitted industrial facilities would be allowed to operate in violation of national health standards, while other local businesses and local communities would have to ''pick up the slack'' and be penalized for the new facility's amnesty and pollution. In so doing, the bill repeals a health safeguard in place for nearly 40 years under the Clean Air Act, making it more difficult for states to permit new facilities while also keeping their air clean.

This legislation will obstruct the implementation and enforcement of critical environmental statutes, undermine the EPA's ability to consider and use science, and jeopardize public health. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose these bills.

Sincerely,

BlueGreen Alliance; Center for Biological Diversity; Center for Effective Government; Clean Water Action; Communications Workers of America; Defenders of Wildlife; Earthjustice; Environment America; Environmental Defense Fund; International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW); League of Conservation Voters; Natural Resources Defense Council; Public Citizen; Sierra Club; Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC); Southern Oregon Climate Action Now; Utility Workers Union of America (UWUA); WE ACT for Environmental Justice.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 4012—SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2014

(Rep. Schweikert, R–AZ, and 53 cosponsors, Nov. 17, 2014)

The Administration strongly supports regulatory transparency, but strongly opposes H.R. 4012. The bill would impose arbitrary, unnecessary, and expensive requirements that would seriously impede the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) ability to use science to protect public health and the environment, as required under an array of environmental laws, while increasing uncertainty for businesses and States.

H.R. 4012 could be used to prevent EPA from finalizing regulations until legal challenges about the legitimate withholding of certain scientific and technical information are resolved. The bill also could prevent EPA from making crucial decisions, including those concerning the cleanup of contaminated sites, if the data supporting those decisions cannot, for legitimate reasons, be made publicly available. For example, some scientifically-important data is not made broadly available in order to protect the privacy of test subjects or Confidential Business Information, and H.R. 4012 could prevent EPA from taking actions based on protected data. In short, the bill would undermine EPA's ability to protect the health of Americans, would impose expensive new mandates on EPA, and could impose substantial litigation costs on the Federal government. It also could impede EPA's reliance on the best available science.

Instead of an overly broad bill that would tie EPA's hands, the Administration urges Congress to support the Administration's efforts to make scientific and technical information more accessible and regulations more transparent. A bill consistent with the principles expressed in the Administration's Executive Order 13563 ''Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review'' and the December 2010 Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) Memorandum on Scientific Integrity, as well as implementation of the Administration's recent open data and public access initiatives (e.g., OSTP's February 2013 policy memorandum on Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research) would greatly benefit the American people. EPA also has embarked on several initiatives that enhance access to and transparency of data and science used to inform policy and regulatory decisions.

If the President were presented with H.R. 4012, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a dangerous attack on the power of knowledge.

Supposedly, this bill prevents the Environmental Protection Agency from using secret science to issue regulations. Supposedly, by requiring the EPA to only consider publicly available data when drafting regulations, this bill will make the EPA more transparent.

Mr. Chairman, nothing could be further from the truth. Science has shown over and over that air pollution causes health problems, such as asthma. This is not a disputable fact.

Scientists have spent years comparing data on air pollution with data on health problems. Those results are very clear. They have been replicated, they have been peer-reviewed, and the EPA has issued regulations accordingly.

But the data in these studies cannot be made public without risking the violation of the privacy of Americans who voluntarily participated in them by releasing their personal health information. Rather than argue with the indisputable facts on air pollution—a losing bet—this bill attempts to discredit the science as ''secret,'' when in fact there is nothing secret about it.

The only secret here is the true intent of this bill, a dangerous attack on science itself. For this reason, I have cosponsored an amendment proposed by Mr. KENNEDY. The amendment clarifies that nothing in this bill will prevent the EPA from using sound peer-reviewed science to issue regulations. One cannot oppose that without opposing science itself.

Science has brought us to the Moon, it has brought us the electric lightbulb, and yes, it demonstrates a link between air pollution and asthma. The American people rely on us to make decisions based on facts, not to legislate away facts that are politically inconvenient.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire on the time remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 19½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Texas has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

It is interesting to listen to this debate. You hear one hyperbolic statement after the other from our friends on the other side. Two Members have used the claim that this is anti-science. One Member just said this is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Mr. Chairman, it makes you wonder, doesn't it, why the defensiveness about transparency, why the defensiveness about the truth, why the defensiveness about more participation as it relates to science, and here is the answer: they have got to defend something, Mr. Chairman, and they have got to defend something that is indefensible.

What they have to defend is the orthodoxy that allowed the other side to create ObamaCare. The architect of ObamaCare, Jonathan Gruber, said this is a tortured way to make sure CBO scores it this way and so forth and so on, and they basically had to trick and manipulate and so forth.

The irony is that the very folks who are claiming to shroud themselves in the truth are actually doing the exact opposite.

Here is the point: I represent manufacturers. I represent all kinds of people who are in business and science, Mr. Chairman. What they want is to be able to participate in this process. They want to know that the regulations that are being foisted upon them from Washington, D.C., at least are based on good science and are not based on bumper stickers and other nonsense. They want to make sure that the decisionmaking is transparent and that it makes sense.

This is a great bill. We should all vote for it.

□ 1345

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the one scientist we have with a Ph.D. in physics in our body who is retiring and, as of next year, will become the CEO of AAAS.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady, my good friend from Texas, and I rise in opposition to this legislation.

The bill concerns me, not only about the interference with protection of public health, but also the harm it would do to science and the science process. In sum, H.R. 4012 would prohibit the EPA from using any scientific studies that are not publicly available and cannot be independently reproduced.

Now, while this sounds virtuous and laudable, it is, at best, a blatant misunderstanding of how scientists operate, of the peer review process, and a violation of health privacy laws and an affront to science.

Now, I see the other side saying, oh, no, it is not a violation of health privacy laws because anything that violates the health privacy laws won't be used. Well, that is the point.

Mr. Chairman, I will enter into the RECORD a letter from the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, dated November 4, which says, ''the proposed legislation is so broad that it could be used to prevent the implementation of nearly any regulation by the Environmental Protection Agency.''

These are not partisans who are talking about this. These are people who want the science used so that we have good regulations. They are not trying to interfere with EPA's work.

Consider epidemiology. This is the science that investigates the patterns in disease and health, like trying to understand the spread of diseases like Ebola, or in understanding why smoking causes cancer. Now, not surprisingly, collecting these epidemiological data requires getting information that is legally prohibited from disclosure under the health privacy legislation, data about illness and treatment and family history and so forth.

So when H.R. 4012 says EPA must use studies where the information is public, it is saying EPA may not use many, perhaps most, epidemiological studies because the researchers are prohibited legally from making their data publicly available. There is no question that H.R. 4012 strips EPA of

the ability to use the best available science.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOLT. Were it to become law, studies that might be used on regulations to keep drinking water safe or to prevent exposure to dangerous pesticides or other chemicals would be null and void.

Let's be honest. The not-so-hidden motivations behind this are to restrict the availability of academic independent science and to strengthen the hand of biased industry input. It is entitled the ''Secret Science Act,'' which is a direct aspersion on science and the peer review process. It suggests that scientists are conspirators in lab coats trying to pull one over and bring in unnecessary regulations.

Everyone wants transparency, reproducibility, accountability. The science community, the publications, the universities, the funding agencies are working on this all the time. They don't need this help, so to speak, from Congress.

Science is a system of progress toward knowing what is right. It is better than the private marketplace or industrial manipulation. Let's let science work.

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SOCIETIES FOR EXPERIMENTAL BIOLOGY,
Bethesda, MD, November 4, 2014.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB) would like to express its opposition to H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014. As a federation of 27 scientific and engineering societies, representing more than 120,000 biomedical researchers, we clearly understand and support the principle that federal regulations must be based on sound science. We are, however, concerned that the language of the proposed legislation is so broad that it could be used to prevent the implementation of nearly any regulation by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and, by precedent, lead to similar restrictions on other agencies. We agree that federal agencies should base regulations on sound science. However, we are concerned that this legislation will not increase transparency, and is, in fact, duplicative of existing policies.

According to a March 9, 2009 Memorandum from the White House on the subject of Scientific Integrity, ''when scientific or technological information is considered in policy decisions, the information should be subject to well-established scientific processes.'' Additionally, under Section (d), unless information is prevented from being disclosed by statute or other regulation, ''an agency should make available to the public the scientific or technological findings or conclusions considered or relied on in policy decisions.'' In accordance with this Memorandum, the EPA has its own Scientific Integrity Policy. As the policy notes, the EPA is in compliance with the 2002 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Information Quality Guidelines, the 2005 OMB Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review, the EPA's Quality Policy for assuring the collection and use of sound scientific data, and the EPA's Information Quality Guidelines for establishing the transparency, integrity, and utility of information used and published by the agency. This extensive and comprehensive set of regulations more than ensures that the science upon which EPA bases regulations is of the highest technical merit, transparent, and reproducible.

Steps to enhance and put back transparency across all disciplines of science are already underway at several other federal agencies. For instance, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is developing a training module for graduate students to enhance experimental design to increase the reproducibility and transparency of research findings. Funding agencies, including NIH and the National Science Foundation, require inclusion of data management plans as part of the grant application. These efforts enhance work already being done by the agencies to ensure the transparency, availability, and reproducibility of data produced by federally-funded research.

As working scientists, we are dedicated to the open circulation of our work, much of which is funded by federal agencies that require dissemination, including the EPA, NIH, the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy. We are equally committed to seeing that our research results contribute to the good of the Nation, including the quality of its environment and the health of its people. Establishing unreasonably broad and burdensome requirements for the implementation of already well-supported regulations, as H.R. 4012 appears to do, could weaken the scientific foundations of government policy, contrary to the stated goals of the bill.

For these reasons, FASEB opposes the Secret Science Reform Act in its present form.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. HAYWOOD, PhD,
FASEB President.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my buddy who actually went to MIT and knows something on the subject.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act.

Before I came to Washington, I spent 6 years studying science, math, and engineering at MIT. We were taught there and we learned very well that transparency and reproducibility are the basic tenets of science. In fact, one of my favorite things that I learned—and this comes from engineering, where you apply science—is, without facts, all you have is an opinion.

That is what the other side needs to learn today. They are hiding behind this false narrative, unfortunately, that the EPA will be unable to use certain data because they would have to release confidential or private information. This is patently untrue.

Look, the FDA, the CFPB, the Census Bureau, which one of those organizations does not collect data that has sensitive and private information in it? Yet they still use the data. They can still disclose the data, and it is transparent, and we can look at it.

This is a solvable problem. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences, in 2005, said nothing in the past suggests that increasing access to research data without damage to privacy and confidentiality rights is beyond scientific reach.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I will introduce into the RECORD a memorandum from the President's own OMB to the executive heads of departments and agencies that encourages more transparency. This is a May 9, 2013, memorandum.

Clearly, we have the same goals with the administration, so I don't understand why the other side is against this. In fact, this memorandum from the President's own OMB says, ''Making information resources accessible, discoverable, and usable by the public can help fuel entrepreneurship, innovation, and scientific discovery—all of which improve Americans' lives and contribute significantly to job creation.''

But are they worried? Are they worried that you can't release data, that you will violate somebody's privacy or confidentiality?

No, they are not. In fact, the President's own OMB Director references the standards that we have. This is what science is about. It is about standards. It is about units of measure. It is about numbers. And we have standards for this. The NIST has standards for guidelines and definitions for releasing data while maintaining confidentiality, integrity, and availability. So they are clearly hiding behind a false narrative.

The EPA Administrator, Ms. McCarthy, said in a March 7, 2014, letter to Congress that the Agency's efforts ultimately resulted in the CDC reaching the conclusion that all of the research data could be provided without the need for de-identification.

So there is really a false narrative here. I don't know how the other side, who purports to be for science—and I am for science, with my background. I don't know how the other side can make these arguments with a straight face.

I would just say the American people would be better served with access to this data. I support the bill.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2013.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Subject: Open Data Policy—Managing Information as an Asset

From: Sylvia M. Burwell, Director; Steven VanRoekel, Federal Chief Information Officer; Todd Park, U.S. Chief Technology Officer; Dominic J. Mancini, Acting Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

Information is a valuable national resource and a strategic asset to the Federal Government, its partners, and the public. In order to ensure that the Federal Government is taking full advantage of its information resources, executive departments and agencies (hereafter referred to as ''agencies'') must manage information as an asset throughout its life cycle to promote openness and interoperability, and properly safeguard systems

and information. Managing government information as an asset will increase operational efficiencies, reduce costs, improve services, support mission needs, safeguard personal information, and increase public access to valuable government information.

Making information resources accessible, discoverable, and usable by the public can help fuel entrepreneurship, innovation, and scientific discovery—all of which improve Americans' lives and contribute significantly to job creation. For example, decades ago, the Federal Government made both weather data and the Global Positioning System (GPS) freely available to anyone. Since then, American entrepreneurs and innovators have used these resources to create navigation systems, weather newscasts and warning systems, location-based applications, precision farming tools, and much more.

Pursuant to Executive Order of May 9, 2013, Making Open and Machine Readable the New Default for Government Information, this Memorandum establishes a framework to help institutionalize the principles of effective information management at each stage of the information's life cycle to promote interoperability and openness. Whether or not particular information can be made public, agencies can apply this framework to all information resources to promote efficiency and produce value.

Specifically, this Memorandum requires agencies to collect or create information in a way that supports downstream information processing and dissemination activities. This includes using machine-readable and open formats, data standards, and common core and extensible metadata for all new information creation and collection efforts. It also includes agencies ensuring information stewardship through the use of open licenses and review of information for privacy, confidentiality, security, or other restrictions to release. Additionally, it involves agencies building or modernizing information systems in a way that maximizes interoperability and information accessibility, maintains internal and external data asset inventories, enhances information safeguards, and clarifies information management responsibilities.

The Federal Government has already made significant progress in improving its management of information resources to increase interoperability and openness. The President's Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government instructed agencies to take specific actions to implement the principles of transparency, participation, and collaboration, and the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Open Government Directive required agencies to expand access to information by making it available online in open formats. OMB has also developed policies to help agencies incorporate sound information practices, including OMB Circular A–130 and OMB Memorandum M–06–02. In addition, the Federal Government launched Data.gov, an online platform designed to increase access to Federal data assets. The publication of thousands of data assets through Data.gov has enabled the development of numerous products and services that benefit the public.

To help build on these efforts, the President issued a Memorandum on May 23, 2012 entitled Building a 21st Century Digital Government that charged the Federal Chief Information Officer (CIO) with developing and implementing a comprehensive government-wide strategy to deliver better digital services to the American people. The resulting Digital Government Strategy outlined an information-centric approach to transform how the Federal Government builds and delivers digital services, and required OMB to develop guidance to increase the interoperability and openness of government information.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), who is ranking member on the Environmental Subcommittee.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014, a short bill with a long list of problems.

Now, I applaud the sponsor of the bill, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, for his goal on transparency. Transparency is something our constituents care about and deserve. But transparency is something we should accomplish through collaboration with and input from the scientific community. This bill, unfortunately, passed out of the Science Committee on a party-line vote and is opposed, for good reason, by research institutions and scientists from across the country.

As the cornerstone of its regulatory process, the EPA relies on peer-reviewed science conducted by the brightest minds at our Nation's universities and other research organizations. The EPA already publicly discloses the studies that support regulatory action.

Large cohort studies like the American Cancer Society and Harvard Six Cities studies, which made an association between air pollution and mortality, are vital to the Agency as it pursues its mission of protecting public health. These studies that were peer reviewed have, since they were conducted, been subject to reanalysis with their findings confirmed.

This Secret Science Reform Act, which looks simple on its face, will actually encumber, if not eradicate, the EPA's ability to perform its most fundamental duty: protecting Americans from significant risks to human health and the environment. The EPA would only, under this bill, be able to rely on publicly available data and studies that are reproducible, making it virtually impossible to use many reports and other sources of scientific data.

I want to add that this act also perpetuates the incorrect notion that the science relied on by the EPA is somehow hidden. It is not. This misconception is based on conflating the meanings of ''secret'' and ''confidential.'' One thing should be made clear in this debate. None of the information used by the EPA is secret. Some information may be confidential if it includes, for example, the personal health information of millions of Americans who participated in a study about air quality.

Finally, another concern about this act is that it attempts to block access to good science, in part, because the Science Committee majority has not been able to obtain data it requested through a subpoena, data containing the personal health information of millions of Americans that was part of the Harvard Six and American Cancer studies. The EPA responded to that subpoena with all of the information in its possession that it was legally authorized to provide—boxes and boxes and stacks and stacks of data and information—and apparently that was not enough. Now the Secret Science Reform Act is going further, with chilling consequences for the EPA and for every American who deserves to enjoy clean air and clean water.

Let's bring back common sense. Using the personal health information of Americans as a bargaining chip is unacceptable. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this legislation.

Let's go back to the drawing board, work collaboratively to make this a better bill, and let the EPA go back to protecting the public health of Americans.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire into the time remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 15 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014.

This much-needed legislation will finally start to shed light for the American people on the underlying science that the EPA uses to justify their new rules and regulations. Not only would the EPA have to share the evidence they are using or the science they are using on the rules, but they would have to specify the need for the rule. But most importantly, the results of the EPA's analysis would have to provide enough information so that the public can independently reproduce the results so that we can check the EPA's work.

As I travel up and down my district visiting small, medium, and large manufacturing companies, I hear a common theme over and over again. At almost every stop these companies are telling me they are dealing with new or proposed rules coming out of the EPA. Whether it is a mom-and-pop brick manufacturing company, an international steel manufacturing company, or a coal-fired power plant, they are all dealing with new and very costly new EPA rules. If the EPA and environmentalists get their way, some of these companies will simply go out of business because the rules are unattainable and they apparently don't really move the needle toward improvements in public health.

I say ''apparently'' because we don't have all the facts and data that the EPA is using to justify these new rules, and we can't validate and verify what they are telling the public.

Thousands of direct jobs and tens of thousands of indirect jobs are at risk because of these proposed and pending rules. We owe it to these hardworking

men and women to share the science with the public so we can verify what the EPA is saying before they lose their jobs over unverified studies.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank Chairman SCHWEIKERT for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and the sponsor have done a good job of describing what the bill is and what it does and why it is necessary. I want to talk a little bit about what is at stake.

I think the first thing that we have to consider that is at stake is the unilateral disarmament of the American economy by virtue of destroying, really, our global competitiveness. It is an interesting time to talk about it.

Our President just came back from making a deal in China, a climate deal in China, where the Chinese are allowed to continue to pollute for 16 years, create more jobs of their own and take some of ours, while we put standards and requirements, emissions requirements on our industries that won't be able to keep up and put our jobs at risk.

In my home State of North Dakota, there are 4,000 megawatts of low-cost electricity—the jobs that producing that electricity creates and the competitiveness that that electricity provides for our economy—that is at stake, all based on EPA rules that are based on some 1970s, decades-old data and studies that are only available to the bureaucrats.

□ 1400

We have, for example, in western North Dakota a brick plant in Hebron, Hebron Brick, that is subject to the MACT rule, which is a rule based on studies that are tightly held, again, and only visible to the bureaucrats. We have countless acres of private farmland and ranch land in our State and in the States around us that have been owned privately for generations. It is up for grabs if this Waters of the U.S. rule continues to go forward, a rule that really took forceful inquiry by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to find, to get, to reveal the secret maps that the EPA was creating as part of this massive land grab.

It really comes down to this, Mr. Chairman: we are at a time in our country when there is very, very low confidence by the public in our government. I am just saying let's restore America's confidence in America's government, and let's provide the one great safeguard to corruption that we can provide, and that is transparency.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Have you ever had a moment at which you are approaching the microphone—and you have got to accept that we are all passionate about our views—and you have heard some things that, shall we say, start to get your blood pressure moving a bit, but let me see if I can do this without being hyperbolic and then walk through some of the realities of the information that is laid out in front of me right here.

First, I do want to respond to something that Ranking Member JOHNSON said. I want to first caveat that she has always been very kind to me, but we have the confirmation from the EPA, itself—and we will put the documents into the RECORD—that they are perfectly capable of blinding anything that is confidential, anything that is personal. I mean, we have the comments from Administrator McCarthy on March 7 walking us through that they can do this, and they didn't see it as a real problem.

Let me walk through something else that I am finding sort of absurd, and I am having a little trouble finding the best way to articulate this. We spent about an hour in our office sort of just searching the Internet on this subject. If you go back about a decade ago, a number of our friends on the left were demanding something almost identical to this. So what is different? It wouldn't happen to be a different philosophy, a different President, a different party in the White House, would it?

Let me back up and say: Why do I embrace this Secret Science bill, H.R. 4012?

I genuinely, in every fiber of my being, believe that we will get better policy, better design, more creative ideas because, whether you are on the left, the right, or are just an active addition, you do not know whether the EPA rule sets are optimal. You may believe they are, but we are doing it on faith. Peer review is wonderful except for the fact that the peer reviewers don't see the underlying data. The beauty of this piece of legislation is that neither you nor I right now knows, in the absolute collective analysis, whether the EPA is even going far enough or whether it is going too far or whether there is another approach that would be dramatically more efficient.

What happens when that researcher gets his hands on a linear data set and matches it up with something else that no one had thought of putting in there and, all of a sudden, discovers the noise in the data that there are opportunities to do it better, faster, more efficiently, to save lives, or to maybe even do it cheaper?

You will not know that until the cabal that right now has the franchise on the information, on the brokerage of the data, is broken up. What is so stunningly disheartening here is that much of this concept, if you go back and look at the speeches from the President in 2007 and 2008, and at memos from the President 18 months ago, from OMB, demanding this, saying this was the wave of the future if you embrace science—but not the science of an elite few. The fact of the matter is our Nation—our country—and our world is made up of really smart people who have the right and the ability to give us input to do this better.

I beg of my fellow Members here to stop being afraid of true transparency. Stop defending the incumbent class that thinks it has the only legitimate scientists who have the right to put forward what our future looks like.

I may be behind this microphone in a couple of years from now if this bill passes, saying: I never knew we weren't going far enough. You may be behind that microphone over there, saying: The crowd analysis of the data says there was a dramatically better way. But we need to pass this bill to have that opportunity.

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

THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2014.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of February 14, 2014, regarding the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) response to a subpoena duces tecum (subpoena) from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (Committee).

As you note in your letter, during and immediately after my November 14, 2013, appearance before your Committee, we agreed to additional dialogue regarding the EPA's response to the subpoena. I understand that our staffs have had several discussions since that date, and made significant progress toward a common understanding of this matter. I want to thank you and your staff for your willingness to engage in these discussions, as I believe they have been both productive and constructive.

Your subpoena sought data from the American Cancer Society and Harvard Six Cities cohorts, as well as analyses and re-analyses of that data. In particular, the subpoena sought data from studies that utilized data from the American Cancer Society and Harvard Six Cities cohorts. Once the EPA received the subpoena, we conducted a diligent search for data, as well as analyses and re-analyses of that data that were already in our possession, custody, or control that would be responsive to the subpoena. In addition, we considered what data, as well as analyses and re-analyses of that data, were not in our possession, custody, or control on the date we received the subpoena, but that may still be within the scope of the Committee's subpoena. For data, as well as analyses and re-analyses of that data, that were not in the EPA's possession, custody, or control but that could still be considered within the scope of the subpoena, the EPA sought to identify a legal authority for the agency to obtain that information so that it could be provided to the Committee. In this case, the Shelby Amendment (Public Law 105–277) provides the EPA with the authority to obtain certain research data that was not in the agency's possession, custody, or control on the date we received the subpoena, and the EPA utilized that authority to obtain that data.

The actions taken in response to the subpoena are detailed in an enclosure (Enclosure 1) to this letter, and included multiple

interactions with the third party owners of the research data in an effort to obtain that data. Once the agency successfully obtained the research data, we undertook a review of this data to determine whether the release of the data would raise privacy concerns. The agency sought the assistance of the Centers for Disease Control in this inquiry as well, in an effort to ensure the privacy of the subjects of the data was not compromised.

Through its efforts, the EPA located within its possession, custody, or control, or obtained through its authority, the data for five studies listed in the subpoena. Any other data, as well as analyses and re-analyses of that data, that may be within the scope of the subpoena, whether specifically listed in the subpoena or not, are not (and were not) in the possession, custody, or control of the EPA, nor are they within the authority to obtain data that the agency identified. However, the issuance of the subpoena does not provide the agency with any additional authority to obtain data, as well as analyses and re-analyses of that data, that we otherwise do not have the authority to obtain.

All responsive data, as well as analyses and re-analyses of that data, located or obtained during our efforts to respond to the subpoena have been provided to the Committee. The EPA provided that data to the Committee through letters sent prior to our receipt of the subpoena, and then our letters responding to the subpoena of August 19, 2013, September 16, 2013, and September 30, 2013. The EPA provided the Committee with the data for these five studies in exactly the same format the data were provided to us. Importantly, the agency was able to work through the various privacy concerns so that we would not need to de-identify any of the data. As of the EPA's letter of September 30, 2013, the agency has provided the Committee with all of the data covered by the subpoena that the agency has obtained or has the authority to obtain under the Shelby Amendment. Additionally, the EPA has not withheld any data in our possession that is responsive to the subpoena. Thus, the EPA has completed its response to the subpoena. The EPA acknowledges, however, that the data provided are not sufficient in themselves to replicate the analyses in the epidemiological studies, nor would they allow for the one to one mapping of each pollutant and ecological variable to each subject. For the reasons explained in our previous letters on this topic, these acknowledgements do not call into question the EPA's reliance on these studies for regulatory actions.

Your February 14, 2014, letter also requests the grant agreements related to the studies covered by the subpoena, and those documents are being provided with this letter. These EPA grant agreements span from 1998 to 2006 and contain a variety of data access provisions. Despite that variation, the EPA has reviewed each of the agreements and determined that each grant agreement contained data access provisions that are consistent with the EPA grant regulations at the time of the award. The EPA's current practice is to incorporate into our grant agreements a reference to the agency's regulations regarding access to research data funded by the grant.

Thank you again for the opportunity to explain the actions the EPA took in responding to your subpoena.

Sincerely,

GINA MCCARTHY.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chair, I hope we can all agree that it is in the nation's best interest to allow EPA to use the best available science to protect our health and well-being. This means the science that EPA uses should be held to the same standards as any other science. I support transparency in scientific research, but it is important to recognize that the data from many of the studies that EPA depends on cannot be made publicly available without violating the privacy of individuals.

As a member of the Science Committee, I have supported increased public access to scientific data in science journals. However, there are exceptions to the types of data that can be shared publicly. EPA studies often rely on personal health records or proprietary computer models to characterize the harmful effects of pollutants. We must not mistake EPA's legally-mandated shielding of personally identifiable information as dubious "secret science."

These studies undergo a rigorous review process including peer review and sometimes replication. If the goal is more replication, Congress should provide funds to conduct additional studies, not throw out studies that depend on sensitive information. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that up to 50 percent of the studies that EPA uses rely on such sensitive materials. Through these studies, we gain a deeper understanding of our natural environment that is invaluable to informing public health policy. This bill would eliminate these insightful scientific studies from being used to protect our clean air and drinking water.

This bill could also dangerously impact participation in future public health studies if privacy of study participants cannot be ensured. It is unclear how EPA would make data "publicly available in a manner that is sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research results," without divulging identities. With the large amount of personal information available on the internet and in public archives, it can be relatively easy to identify an individual based on limited information.

Our businesses, our environment, and our families depend on EPA to work with the best available science to protect the air we breathe and the water we drink. I cannot support a piece of legislation that impedes their ability to do so.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I submit the following letters.

AMERICAN STATISTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, September 5, 2014.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, As president-elect of the American Statistical Association, with 19,000 members, I write regarding H.R. 4012, the "Secret Science Reform Act." We generally applaud the idea that researchers and federal agencies strive to make data available to others—under strict pledges to maintain confidentiality of data provided by individuals and establishments where necessary—and to encourage reproducible research. Access to data and reproducibility of research are crucially important for science to advance.

While H.R. 4012's intent is to make data more widely available, we have several concerns and urge the bill to be revised significantly before further consideration. Our concerns include those voiced by others (especially the American Association for the Advancement of Science) that the bill's statements do not account for the complexities common to the scientific process on research that involves biological materials or physical specimens not easily accessible, combinations of public and private data, longitudinal data collected over many years that are difficult to reproduce, and data from one-time events that cannot be replicated. The bill as written could have far-reaching consequences that would ultimately hamper or undermine the scientific process generally and EPA's work specifically. We also agree with the point that it would be prudent to see the EPA's data access policy—in accordance with the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010—expected by year's end before further action on H.R. 4012.

Our nation should be striving for transparency in government and, as noted above, data accessibility, but these goals also must be balanced with the necessity to protect individuals' and businesses' privacy. The bill's language of "publicly available" except when "prohibited by law" acknowledges this balance, but that language is vague and may be insufficient to protect individuals and businesses. In particular, some data sets may not fall under "prohibited by law," yet the data are still collected under a pledge to protect the identifiability and confidentiality of the reported values. For example, the government, as well as private and nonprofit sectors, routinely collects data—including private business information and private health information—under strict pledges to protect confidentiality. In some studies, this is backed up with penalties for violating those pledges. Such data should not be publicly available to every person who might ask for them. Rather, data subjects' confidentiality should be protected, for example by policies and procedures that provide data access to trusted users (i.e., approved users committed to appropriate protections of the confidentiality of study participants) while discouraging breaches of confidentiality and/or by data redaction techniques developed in the statistical and computer science communities. Under the current wording, a choice may have to be made between maintaining data confidentiality and issuing needed regulations.

To emphasize the challenges and importance of confidentiality protection, we note that simple but necessary de-identification methods—like stripping names and other personally identifiable information (PII)—often do not suffice to protect confidentiality. Statisticians and computer scientists have repeatedly shown it can be possible to link individuals to publicly available sources, even with PII removed. Thus, allowing unrestricted public access without appropriate controls could result in unintended disclosures. These could cause significant harm to the advancement of science and the federal government—especially the federal statistical system—as people may be less willing to provide their data if highly publicized breaches occur.

In short, any requirements for making data available should carefully consider the complexities, challenges, and potential ramifications. We hope you will address these concerns, which would require major modifications to the bill. We would be happy to be of any assistance.

Sincerely,

DAVID MORGANSTEIN,
President-Elect,
American Statistical Association.

NOVEMBER 17, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned individuals and organizations working on public health and science-informed regulation strongly oppose HR 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act, and HR 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, up for a House vote as early as November 18.

Both bills would severely undermine the ability of the Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA) to use the best available scientific evidence when making decisions regarding the protection of public health and safety and the environment.

HR 4012, the erroneously named Secret Science Reform Act, would tie the EPA's hands by restricting the information it can use to develop protective regulations. The EPA could only regulate based on publicly available scientific data. This restriction would block the agency's use of many different types of public health data, such as those for which public release would violate privacy protections, or data from corporations that are designated as confidential business information.

It also would restrict the use of scientific data that is not ''reproducible.'' This provision seems to adopt a very narrow view of scientific information solely based on laboratory experiments. As major scientific societies including the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) have noted, such a restriction would eliminate the use of most epidemiological and public health data, such as those regarding the public health impacts of air pollution, because these data are collected in long-term studies following individuals longitudinally.

Not only do privacy concerns arise, but such studies are not inherently reproduced in the way a laboratory experiment or a clinical trial may be. It would be unethical to deliberately expose adults or children to air pollution merely to determine whether the increased rates of asthma and heart attacks caused by such exposures can be duplicated, or to encourage teenagers to smoke to re-assess the toxic effects of tobacco.

HR 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would greatly weaken the EPA's advisory process, ensuring that recommendations from its independent Science Advisory Board (SAB) will be dominated by corporate special interests. While the bill has been improved by several amendments offered by minority members of the House Science Committee, it still remains unacceptable.

This bill opens the door to increased corporate influence on the Board, both by encouraging the EPA to accept more SAB panelists with corporate ties, and disqualifying some of the nation's leading experts.

The bill's overly broad restriction that a member of the SAB cannot participate in a discussion that cites the member's own work is counterproductive, and goes far beyond the common-sense limits imposed by the National Academies. Of course, a scientist with expertise on topics the SAB addresses likely will have done peer-reviewed studies and other work on that topic. That makes the scientist's evaluation more valuable, not less.

Even worse, the bill requires the SAB to remain in an endless loop soliciting public comment about the ''state of the science'' touching on every major advisory activity it undertakes and responding to nearly every comment before moving forward, without being limited by any time constraints. At best, the SAB will be reduced to busy work. At worst, the SAB's assessments will address the concerns of corporations, not the desires of citizens for science-informed regulation that protects public health.

These bills together will greatly impede the ability of EPA, and potentially other agencies, to utilize the best available science, independently reviewed, to inform regulations crucial to public health and the environment.

We strongly urge you to vote No on HR 4012 and HR 1422.

Sincerely,

Center for Science and Democracy at the Union of Concerned Scientists; Annie Appleseed Project; Breast Cancer Action; Center for Medical Consumers; Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies; National Center for Health Research; National Physicians Alliance; Our Bodies, Ourselves; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Public Citizen; The TMJ Association; Woodymatters; Susan F. Wood, PhD, Associate Professor, Director, Jacobs Institute of Women's Health, The George Washington University, Milken Institute School of Public Health; John H. Powers, MD, Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine, The George Washington University School of Medicine.

UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS,
Cambridge, MA, November 17, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing in strong opposition to H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014, up for a vote in the House as early as Nov. 18. The legislation represents a solution in search of a problem, and would greatly impede the agency's mission to protect public health and the environment.

The EPA already makes the data, methodology, and peer-reviewed research it relies on in its rule-making processes as transparent as possible. Moreover, the additional restrictions imposed by this proposed bill would make it almost impossible to base public protections on the best available scientific information. In particular, if enacted, the language appears to indicate that the agency would be inhibited by the following challenges:

The EPA wouldn't be able to use most health studies. The agency would likely be prevented from using any study that uses personal health data. The confidentiality of such data is usually protected by institutional review boards (IRB); thus, the data could not be made publicly available as demanded. Since many EPA rules are health-based standards, this rule would severely restrict the ability of the agency to base rules on science.

The EPA wouldn't be able to draw from industry data sources. The agency would be prevented from using data provided by industry to the agency. Since information from industry sources is often not publicly available, a law requiring as such would prevent the agency from utilizing industry data, a source of information that often provides otherwise unknown data to inform EPA rulemaking.

The EPA wouldn't be able to use new and innovative science. New scientific methods and data may be restricted by intellectual property protections or industry trade secret exemptions. This proposed bill would limit EPA's ability to rely on the best available science including novel approaches that may not yet be publicly available.

Long-term and meta- analyses would be unavailable. Many of EPA's health-based standards rely on long-term exposure studies that assess the link between chronic diseases/mortality and pollutants; or on meta-analyses that include many different studies and locations to provide a more robust look at the science. In HR 4012, the provision that studies be conducted ''in a manner that is sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research'' may prevent use of these vital studies by the EPA, as it is unclear whether such spatially and temporally comprehensive studies would be considered ''sufficient for substantial reproduction.''

I strongly urge you to oppose the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014. The proposed bill would inhibit the EPA's ability to carry out its science-based mission to protect human health and the environment

Sincerely,

ANDREW A. ROSENBERG, Ph.D.,
Director, Center for Science and Democracy, Union of Concerned Scientists.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–57. 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. 4012

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 ''Secret Science Reform Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. DATA TRANSPARENCY.

Section 6(b) of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4363 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1) The Administrator shall not propose, finalize, or disseminate a covered action unless all scientific and technical information relied on to support such covered action is—

''(A) specifically identified; and

''(B) publicly available in a manner that is sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research results.

''(2) Nothing in the subsection shall be construed as requiring the public dissemination of information the disclosure of which is prohibited by law.

''(3) In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'covered action' means a risk, exposure, or hazard assessment, criteria document, standard, limitation, regulation, regulatory impact analysis, or guidance; and

''(B) the term 'scientific and technical information' includes—

''(i) materials, data, and associated protocols necessary to understand, assess, and extend conclusions;

''(ii) computer codes and models involved in the creation and analysis of such information;

''(iii) recorded factual materials; and

''(iv) detailed descriptions of how to access and use such information.''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113–626. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–626.

Mr. GOSAR. 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 13, insert ''online'' after ''publicly available''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 756, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense, one-word amendment to H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act.

My simple amendment adds the word ''online'' to the disclosure requirements found in this legislation.

The Congressional Budget Office has determined that my amendment would not score and would not affect direct spending or revenues. My amendment is supported by the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, LAMAR SMITH. My amendment also has the support of the sponsor, Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I would like to thank both the chairman, Mr. SMITH, and Congressman SCHWEIKERT for their efforts on this legislation and for their support of my amendment.

As a result of my simple, good governance amendment, the EPA will be required to make all scientific and technical information relied upon for rulemaking available online before proposing or finalizing new regulations.

I strongly support H.R. 4012, and I am proud to cosponsor this commonsense bill offered by my good friend and fellow Arizonan, DAVID SCHWEIKERT. The underlying bill would require the Environmental Protection Agency to utilize actual science when formulating regulations, and it requires that the science be made available for peer review and reproduction.

A recent poll from the Institute for Energy Research found that approximately 90 percent of all Americans support making studies and data utilized by the Federal Government available to the general public. By the way, the general public is not stupid. The intent of the bill is transparency, and I believe the best way to accomplish that goal is to require this information to be posted online.

For far too long, the EPA has used secret studies and so-called ''peer reviews'' from biased sources to justify regulations that fit their job-killing agenda. Not only does this practice result in a lack of transparency, it also leads to hundreds of thousands of jobs being destroyed across the country by unreasonable and unnecessary regulations.

A requirement similar to my amendment was adopted by this body when the House passed H.R. 4315 this past July. A provision found in H.R. 4315 required that data used by Federal agencies for Endangered Species Act listing decisions be made publicly available and accessible through the Internet.

Finally, H.R. 4012 protects personal and confidential information and has a provision that makes clear such information will not be disclosed as a result of this act. My amendment would not conflict with such policy.

Again, all my simple, one-word amendment does is require that the scientific and technical information requirements in the underlying bill be posted online. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my commonsense amendment, and I urge the passage of the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Mr. GOSAR's amendment. At least it clarifies the underlying intent of this bill in that this information relied on by the EPA should be thrown up on the Web site.

The peer-reviewed science relied on by the EPA often involves personal health information and other confidential data that is legally protected from disclosure. No legitimate researcher would violate the law and leak confidential information—for example, to make a trade secret or information protected by HIPAA accessible to anyone who has an Internet connection.

This amendment only makes the underlying problems with the bill that much more obvious, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to thank the ranking member for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, we frequently hear my colleagues across the aisle say, ''I am not a scientist,'' in response to a stance they may be taking on a matter which has a strong technical or scientific aspect to it. Well, I am a scientist, and that is why I am standing today in strong opposition to the Secret Science Reform Act.

Even my colleagues in the House who are not scientists, when they have a question of law, they will consult a lawyer, but that doesn't seem to be the case where science is concerned. I think that it would be good if in this House we spent a little while listening to the scientists who are concerned with these issues.

Today, a letter was introduced into the RECORD from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, signed by 42 organizations representing scientific organizations and research universities. In the letter, they state that the research community is concerned about how some of the key terms in this bill could be interpreted or misinterpreted, especially terms such as ''materials,'' ''data,'' and ''reproducible.''

Would the Environmental Protection Agency, for example, be excluded from utilizing research that involved physical specimens or biological materials that are not easily accessible? How would the Agency address research that combines both public and necessarily private data?

These are all important questions which this legislation and, sadly, this debate have not addressed, so I stand alongside thousands of my colleagues in science in opposition to the Secret Science Reform Act and in support of what has been referred to in this debate as ''so-called peer review.'' Let us scientists set the scientific standards and not Washington politicians.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I am a scientist and I am a dentist, so I understand both science and HIPAA.

Provision 2 of section 2 of H.R. 4012 protects personal and confidential information and has a provision that makes clear such information will not be disclosed as a result of this act. My amendment would not conflict with such policy.

□ 1415

So you are telling me that President Obama and members of the Democratic Party can yell and scream for the last couple of weeks about the need to make all information available for free at the same speed to everyone on the Internet, the net neutrality issue, but you all have a problem with making the science about which the APA justifies the regulations available online for peer review and reproduction?

Wow, we are really the party of secret science. Can we all say ''Jonathan Gruber''? And do videos count? This is an absurd objection from an administration that claims that they were going to be the most transparent administration in the history of this country.

I yield to my friend from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for having two Members from Arizona up here.

I am prepared to accept the amendment as the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. GOSAR. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–626.

Mr. KENNEDY. 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:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. ENSURING THE USE OF THE BEST SCIENCE.

Nothing in this Act shall prevent the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from considering or relying upon any peer-reviewed scientific publication even if such publication is based on data that is prohibited from public disclosure.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 756, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo the comments of my colleagues, particularly the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), about the importance of transparency. An open government with transparent rules and regulations is at the core of our democracy, but I also believe in the unassailable value of science.

When this country's greatest minds come together to tackle our greatest problems, we are a stronger Nation. Whether we are talking about advancements and achievements in cancer treatment or clean water, science makes us healthier, stronger, and richer.

Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today takes science off the table for the EPA, the very Agency entrusted with keeping our air clean, our water safe, and our homes clear from toxic substances. The bill before us leaves the EPA with unworkable standards, prohibiting it from using certain studies simply because they contain information that, by law, cannot be made public. My amendment would fix this oversight.

The Kennedy-McGovern-Clark amendment clarifies that the EPA can and should use the best scientific information available, so long as that data complies with the highest academic peer-review protocols.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates the EPA relies on roughly 50,000 scientific studies every year. As written, H.R. 4012 would drastically shrink this number. The bill before us could even prohibit the EPA from using other government-funded research, like NIH studies linking toxic substances to premature births or CDC research on mitigating the impact of natural disasters and human health.

Imagine if we took this approach across the whole of government. The results could be catastrophic. You don't just have to take my word for it. I have got here, Mr. Chair, a letter from the Conference of Boston Teaching Hospitals who write:

> Research conducted at our hospitals, while not originally undertaken for environmental protection purposes, is sometimes relied upon by the EPA and other Federal agencies to develop scientifically-based policies. Much of this research uses personal health data which is protected by both Federal law and our institutional review board guidelines.

Why would we want to lose research by the best and brightest minds in medicine that could protect the American people?

I am proud to say that the Conference supports my amendment, stating:

> By allowing the EPA to consider peer-reviewed scientific publications in its work, this amendment would ensure that the best available science is the foundation for the EPA's important work.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to submit that letter for the RECORD.

CONFERENCE OF BOSTON TEACHING HOSPITALS,
Boston, MA, November 18, 2014.

Representative JOSEPH KENNEDY,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KENNEDY: On behalf of the Conference of Boston Teaching Hospitals, I would like to thank you for your introduction of the amendment to H.R. 4012 and offer our full support for the amendment.

As currently drafted, H.R. 4012, The Secret Science Reform Act of 2014, would greatly impede the EPA's mission to protect public health and the environment by making it nearly impossible to develop policies founded on the best available scientific information.

Research conducted at our hospitals, while not originally undertaken for environmental protection purposes, is sometimes relied upon by the EPA and other federal agencies to develop scientifically based policies. Much of this research uses personal health data which is protected by both federal law and our institutional review board guidelines. Under the proposed law, this valuable research would not be able to be used when developing EPA policies. By allowing the EPA to consider peer-reviewed scientific publications in its work, this amendment would ensure that the best available science is the foundation of the EPA's important work.

Thank you again for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

JOHN ERWIN,
Executive Director.

Mr. KENNEDY. Furthermore, CBO, in its analysis of the bill, made some troubling conclusions. For each scientific study used, the EPA could incur additional costs of up to $30,000.

If the EPA continues to operate as it does today, this bill could cost taxpayers an additional $1.5 billion every year, so this bill ensures that the EPA would have to spend more money, use fewer studies, all without being able to use the best science available.

There are several protections in place already to ensure that the science that the EPA uses is the best science available and that it is credible.

First, any and all studies go through a significant peer-review process that includes an independent analysis.

Second, the Office of Science and Technology Policy is already working to ensure that all publicly-funded research is available online.

Third, public comment periods allow for anyone, an individual or organization, to submit evidence supporting or opposing a proposed regulation. However, this bill puts limits on the public comment period. It would prohibit the EPA from taking into consideration valuable studies that come to light along the way during that open comment period if they provide private information.

Mr. Chairman, this makes no sense. I urge the House to accept my amendment to clarify that the EPA may use the best science that is peer reviewed and published, while upholding the necessary protections for confidential information.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself an additional 20 seconds.

I would also like to thank my colleagues from Massachusetts, Congressman JIM MCGOVERN and Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK, for supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, as I approach the mike here, I want to make it clear that my friend on the other side, who is speaking for this amendment, has been very kind to me and my office, but the amendment ultimately doesn't do what we just heard.

Let's walk through the sentence. ''Any peer-reviewed.'' It doesn't say ''highest and best.''

Okay. Let's walk through the next portion of this. Peer review, if you actually look at the methodology and the mechanics, is the study plausible, credible? They don't get the underlying data set.

Do we all remember our Statistics 101 class? The multiple parts of an equation that the sample sets are where so many of the difficulties actually are; yet we are going to rely on peer review, for peer reviewers that never see the underlying data.

The fact of the matter is if any of you have Web access right now, there is Web site after Web site after Web site right now talking about the retraction of peer-reviewed articles.

You are willing to hand hundreds of billions of dollars of potential costs and regulations, you are willing to hand the health of Americans over and not be willing to trust transparency where there is an egalitarian nature, where my university, your university, a researcher here, a researcher maybe on the other side of the world, someone that just happens to be darn good at math, and has some other data sets out there and matches it, but they are excluded because they don't meet the definition of the official science, official reviewers, and even the official reviewers never see the underlying data.

This amendment does not say the finest and the best and the most highest standard of review. It says, ''any peer-reviewed.''

With that, Mr. Chairman, I request my brothers and sisters here in this building to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for the time.

Mr. Chairman, there used to be a time when our Republican friends respected science. There used to be a

time when people like Vern Ehlers, a physicist from Michigan, was welcomed in the Republican Conference. Sadly, those times are long gone. If we can't agree on basic scientific principles, then there isn't much hope for us to agree on much else.

I will remind my colleagues, for the record, up is up, down is down, gravity exists, the Earth orbits the Sun, and climate change is real. It doesn't matter whether the data is private or public. What matters is whether the findings are peer reviewed and can withstand scientific scrutiny.

Scientists understand that the real litmus test for supporting a finding is independent confirmation, using a completely independent method.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 230, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

AYES—194

Adams
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
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, 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, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
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—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
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
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
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
Hanna
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)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Cassidy
Duckworth
Hall
Johnson (GA)
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Smith (WA)
Velázquez

□ 1451

Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mrs. WAGNER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas, HUFFMAN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, 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. 4012) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible, and, pursuant to House Resolution 756, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I am in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4012 to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the proposed subsection (b) the following:

''(4) This subsection shall not apply to any covered action that is in response to an emergency with the potential to harm the health and safety of a community, including—

''(A) a disease outbreak such as Ebola or the pandemic flu;

''(B) a release of toxic chemicals into public drinking water supplies; and

''(C) a nuclear, biological, or terrorist attack.''.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to the committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

I have already spoken at some length about the problems with the underlying bill. The bill would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from using the best science in its mission to protect public health.

However, this motion to recommit highlights a specific and very troubling aspect of this bill. As written, the bill would prevent EPA from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating risk, exposure, or hazard assessments or guidance based on nonpublic information.

I and my Democratic colleagues are concerned about how this language would impede the EPA's ability to respond to emergencies and disasters.

I will give you an example. In my hometown of Dallas, we had a well-publicized case of a man named Thomas Duncan tragically dying after being infected with the Ebola virus. This gentleman was originally sent home from the Texas Health Presbyterian Hospital when his symptoms were not initially identified as Ebola.

After Ebola was identified, great efforts were made to disinfect areas the gentleman had contact with while he was infected with Ebola.

I have a picture displayed here.

Here in my hand is EPA's list of disinfectants for use against Ebola virus. The EPA disseminates this critically important information on its Web site.

□ 1500

However, under this bill, the EPA could be prevented from disseminating this type of information because EPA-registered disinfectants are frequently supported by legally protected information or confidential business information.

In my hometown, not my district, two nurses who work at the Texas Health Presbyterian Hospital contracted Ebola. As a former nurse who worked in Dallas, I think it would be appalling to put our frontline health care workers, as well as the general public, at risk of the deadly Ebola virus or any other infectious disease all so we can take a political shot at EPA.

As another example of how this bill could affect emergency response, EPA could be prevented from providing guidance during toxic chemical spills like the one that occurred earlier this year in West Virginia. If that guidance to local emergency responders were based on confidential business information, which is oftentimes the case when dealing with registered chemicals, then the EPA would be prohibited from disseminating vital information to the local authorities. What is remarkable is that the Natural Resources Defense Council warned the committee of this exact issue in a letter back in February, but the majority chose to ignore those warnings. That is plain irresponsible.

My amendment would fix this problem by exempting any response to an emergency that could harm the health and safety of a community. The amendment won't fix all of the problems with this bill, but it will prevent one of the more morally objectionable outcomes of this legislation.

I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

On this particular occasion, on this motion to recommit, this MTR, it does win a point on creativity. But if we actually just heard part of it, you are telling me that the EPA, when they respond to a spill, they are showing up embracing secret information on how they are responding. It is absurd.

Maybe even the motion may be well-meaning, but when you start using definitions of ''emergency,'' ''community,'' ''including'' with a long dash, we all know where that leads, and it leads both to chaos, inefficiency, and actually doesn't make a lot of drafting sense. So let's actually move on to what we are really here about: the underlying bill.

I have been shocked at sort of the crazy hyperbole that we have heard today about the secret science bill. This bill is actually very simple. All it does is provide transparency substantially as President Obama campaigned on.

Walk through the mechanics. We were having a little debate in our office whether I should hold these up. This here is a stack of letters, memos, demands from folks on the left. It just happened to be there was a Republican President, and even some of these when they were in the majority here, demanding disclosure of the underlying data from the EPA. There is even part of here where the former then-chairman was demanding the data and saying if he didn't get it he was going after contempt.

So what has changed? Seriously, what has changed here with the left on transparency? Is it just the fact that we now have a Democrat in the White House?

So let's actually walk through what we have all campaigned on in here. Is there a Member here that, when you got in front of your constituents, did not promise more transparency in government? That is what this is about. If you are going to create rule sets that affect every American's life, their health, their economic future, don't they have the right to see the underlying data?

And think of the arrogance that is going on right here. If you believe that the EPA is the sole keeper of all great knowledge, that their cabal is the only one qualified to be creative, to understand is there a better way, a more efficient way, a healthier way, then vote against the bill. But if you believe in the American people, if you believe in our institution, if you believe there is amazing knowledge all over this country and all over this world, this is the transparency that makes us healthier, that makes us more efficient, that makes decisionmaking coming out of the EPA much more rational. This is what we all campaigned on. This is what we promised. Let's go vote for it.

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. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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 passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 230, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—196

Adams	Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny
Barber	Cartwright	DeFazio
Barrow (GA)	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Bass	Castro (TX)	Delaney
Beatty	Chu	DeLauro
Becerra	Cicilline	DelBene
Bera (CA)	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Doyle
Bonamici	Clyburn	Edwards
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Ellison
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Engel
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Enyart
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Eshoo
Bustos	Costa	Esty
Butterfield	Courtney	Farr
Capps	Crowley	Fattah
Capuano	Cuellar	Foster
Cárdenas	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Carney	Davis (CA)	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.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
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
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
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
Fitzpatrick
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
Hanna
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)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Cassidy
Duckworth
Hall
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Smith (WA)
Walz

□ 1513

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). 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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 190, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

AYES—237

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
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
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
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
Hanna
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)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—190

Adams
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
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
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
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Schiff	Slaughter	Veasey
Schneider	Speier	Vela
Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez
Schwartz	Takano	Visclosky
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman Schultz
Serrano	Tierney	Waters
Sewell (AL)	Titus	Waxman
Shea-Porter	Tonko	Welch
Sherman	Tsongas	Wilson (FL)
Sinema	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Sires	Vargas	

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell	Hall	Smith (WA)
Cassidy	McCarthy (NY)	
Duckworth	Negrete McLeod	

□ 1521

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:

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yes" on H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014. I would like to express that I intended to vote "no" on H.R. 4012.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

ATOMIC ENERGY COOPERATION AGREEMENT AMENDMENT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5681) to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5681

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

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION ON THE USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the provisions for congressional consideration of a proposed agreement for cooperation in subsection d. of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), the amendments to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes, done at Washington, July 22, 2014, and transmitted to Congress on July 24, 2014, including all portions thereof (hereinafter in this section referred to as the ''Amendment''), may be brought into effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act as if all the requirements in such section 123 for consideration of the Amendment had been satisfied, subject to subsection (b) of this section.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954 AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Upon coming into effect, the Amendment shall be subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) and any other applicable United States law as if the Amendment had come into effect in accordance with the requirements of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I will share with the Members here that I rise in strong support of this legislation to extend for another 10 years the United States-United Kingdom Mutual Defense Agreement. This agreement has governed our nuclear cooperation with the United Kingdom for 50 years.

As always, I appreciate the cooperation of our ranking member, Mr. ENGEL of New York, for bringing this legislation to the floor. By acting today, we will ensure that this vital cooperation with Great Britain continues uninterrupted.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has no closer ally than the United Kingdom. We all know that. Our societies are founded on a shared belief in freedom and universal human rights. As a result, our close consultation on major foreign policy issues has long been routine; and coordinated action, frankly, is the norm between us and the U.K. We share an unprecedented defense relationship. The advantage of that is it has helped us secure our shared interests and values since the World Wars of the last century. We have fought side by side in conflicts from World War I to Afghanistan. Today, we have joined forces, along with other partners, to battle ISIL. Our intelligence cooperation is unique.

We are both founding members of NATO. We have shouldered a disproportionate share of the burden in NATO. We do that because we understand that the world remains a very dangerous place, but also because we know if we do not do so and we do not lead, no one else will.

Our cooperation on defense includes a unique partnership on nuclear security. This Mutual Defense Agreement is the framework through which this partnership takes place. It enables the exchange of nuclear materials, technology, and information that has been renewed many times. Actually, this goes back to 1958. The bill that we will renew here will take it for another decade to ensure that our full cooperation on defense can continue uninterrupted.

So I urge my colleagues to support the bill to demonstrate our unwavering commitment to the United Kingdom: a friend, a partner and enduring ally.

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

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5681. This legislation approves an amendment, as the chairman said, to the United States-United Kingdom Mutual Defense Agreement.

I want to begin by thanking Chairman ED ROYCE for his bipartisan leadership on this legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor.

□ 1530

Since 1958, the U.S.-U.K. Mutual Defense Agreement has underpinned cooperation between our two countries on defense-related nuclear technology. The U.K. is the only country with which we share this sensitive nuclear technology. It reflects the special relationship that binds our countries together.

Every 10 years, this agreement has been extended to stay up to date with new technologies and build new areas of cooperation. Now, normally, these extensions go into effect automatically 60 legislative days after the updated agreement is submitted to Congress. However, this agreement will lapse on December 31, before we reach that 60-day mark. If that were to happen, the revised agreement would have to be resubmitted in the next Congress, the 60-day clock would reset, and, most importantly, there would be no legal authority to continue defense-related nuclear work with the U.K. for some period of time.

What would that mean?

First, the regular scheduled transfer of nuclear material between the U.S. and the U.K. would grind to a halt.

Secondly, ongoing work on submarine propulsion would be interrupted, which would affect the deployment of our ally's nuclear deterrent.

Thirdly, exchange of sensitive information that benefits both of our nations would be delayed, including information related to threats from other countries.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this agreement to lapse. Passing this bill will protect these critically important defense programs with one of our closest allies.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. I just want to reiterate the importance of passing this bipartisan, noncontroversial legislation to ensure that there is no lapse in the U.S.-U.K. Mutual Defense Agreement.

I thank the chairman, as always, for his cooperation.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ENGEL.

I think, by moving quickly here, we can send this bill to the President's desk.

I am proud to note, I will add, that we recognize this special relationship in the House with the British American Parliamentary Group, which was formed shortly after World War II, and each year Members of Congress and Members of Parliament convene to discuss our partnership.

Last year, Congress dedicated a bust of Winston Churchill that is prominently displayed in this Capitol. We just had an unveiling today of the bust for Vaclav Havel, and it will stand next to that of Winston Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, the United Kingdom remains our closest ally and most important security partner, and the Mutual Defense Agreement is a key element of our unmatched special relationship, as Churchill used to call it.

By renewing this agreement, Congress will ensure the uninterrupted continuation of our close nuclear cooperation with the U.K. and reinforce our joint ability to provide strategic security. So I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

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 California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5681.

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.

GIRLS COUNT ACT OF 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3398) to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3398

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 ''Girls Count Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to the United States Census Bureau's 2013 international figures, 1 person in 12—or close to 900,000,000 people—is a girl or young woman age 10 through 24.

(2) The data also asserts that young people are the fastest growing segment of the population in developing countries.

(3) Even though most countries do have birth registration laws, nearly one-third of all children under the age of 5 worldwide have never had their births registered. Moreover, an estimated 45 percent of children under the age of 5 worldwide (about 290 million children) do not possess a birth certificate.

(4) A nationally recognized proof of birth is the key to determining a child's citizenship, nationality, place of birth, parentage and age, without which a passport, drivers license, or national identification card are impossible to obtain. Those who lack such documentation are often prevented from officially participating in and benefitting from the formal economic, legal, and political sectors in their countries.

(5) The lack of birth registration among girls worldwide is particularly concerning as it exacerbates their disproportionate vulnerability to trafficking, child marriage, and lack of access to health and education services.

(6) A lack of birth registration among women and girls can also aggravate what in many places amounts to an already reduced ability to seek employment, participate in civil society or purchase or inherit land and other assets.

(7) Girls undertake much of the domestic labor needed for poor families to survive: carrying water, harvesting crops, tending livestock, caring for younger children, and doing chores.

(8) Accurate assessments of access to education, poverty levels, and overall census activities are hampered by the lack of official information on women and girls. Without this rudimentary information, assessments of foreign assistance and domestic social welfare programs cannot be accurately gauged.

(9) To ensure that women and girls are fully integrated into United States foreign assistance policies and programs, that the specific needs of girls are, to the maximum extent possible, addressed in the design, implementation, and evaluation of development assistance programs, and that women and girls have the power to affect the decisions that affect their lives, all girls should be counted and have access to birth certificates and other official documentation.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) encourage countries to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and enact laws that ensure girls and boys of all ages are full participants in society, including requiring birth certifications and some type of national identity card to ensure that all citizens, including girls, are counted;

(2) enhance training and capacity-building to developing countries, local nongovernmental organizations, and other civil society organizations to effectively address the needs of birth registries in countries where girls are undercounted;

(3) include organizations representing children and families in the design, implementation, and monitoring of programs under this Act; and

(4) mainstream into the design, implementation, and evaluation of policies and programs at all levels an understanding of the distinctive impact that such policies and programs may have on girls.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT COUNTING OF GIRLS IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to—

(1) support programs that will contribute to improved and sustainable Civil Registration and Vital Statistics Systems (CRVS) with a focus on birth registration as the first and most important life event to be registered;

(2) promote programs that build the capacity of developing countries' national and local legal and policy frameworks to prevent discrimination against girls;

(3) support programs to help increase property rights, social security, and home ownership, land tenure security, and inheritance rights for women; and

(4) assist key ministries in the governments of developing countries, including health, interior, youth, and education ministries, to ensure that girls from poor households obtain equitable access to social programs.

(b) COORDINATION WITH MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the World Bank, relevant United Nations agencies and programs, and other relevant organizations to urge and work with countries to enact, implement, and enforce laws that specifically collect data on girls and establish registration and identification laws to ensure girls are active participants in the social, economic, legal and political sectors of society in their countries.

(c) COORDINATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary and the Administrator should work with United States, international, and local private sector and civil society organizations to advocate for the registration and documentation of all girls and boys in developing countries to prevent exploitation, violence, and other abuses.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

The Secretary and the Administrator shall include in relevant evaluations and reports to Congress the following information:

(1) To the extent practicable, United States foreign assistance and development assistance beneficiaries by age, gender, marital status, location, and school enrollment status.

(2) A description of how United States foreign assistance and development assistance benefits girls.

(3) Specific information on programs that address the particular needs of girls.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

(2) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.—The term ''foreign assistance'' has the meaning given the term in section 634(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394(b)).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of State.

SEC. 7. SUNSET.

This Act shall expire on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and also to include any extraneous material for the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this measure. It is called the Girls Count Act, and I do want to thank Mr. CHABOT of Ohio for his work on this important piece of legislation.

Now, what this does is it aims to increase birth registration rates in developing countries. And usually the births which are not being registered are infant females.

Nearly one-third of all children around the world have never had their births registered by their country's civil registries. Almost hard for us to recognize here—one-third.

A child whose birth is not recorded has no birth certificate to prove her age or his age or parentage or citizenship, making these children especially vulnerable to violations of their basic rights.

The lack of a birth certificate usually prevents individuals from acquiring essential pieces of identification that you are going to need in life—like a driver's license, like a passport—and can also impede any financial transaction you are going to make—taking out a loan, taking out a mortgage. Basically, these girls, tragically, don't count.

For girls in particular, this lack of documentation can undercut existing legal protections against girls being trafficked or made child brides. And as they grow up, girls without an official identity face high barriers to work, high barriers to education or political participation, and all of this in places where we need women and girls to be actively shaping their country's future, to improve prospects for development, to oppose extremism in their communities.

That is why I am pleased that the House is acting on H.R. 3398, because this bill supports efforts to increase birth registration by encouraging the State Department and USAID to work with countries on improving their civil registries.

The bill promotes the development of laws and policies to prevent discrimination against girls and improve property and inheritance rights for women. And lastly, the legislation requires the State Department and USAID to provide more relevant breakdowns of foreign assistance whenever possible so that we can be sure women and girls are from benefiting from our efforts.

So this bill complements other work that the House has done this Congress, particularly our efforts to combat child trafficking and to promote safe international adoptions. Ensuring that every boy and girl is counted can prevent children from being trafficked or prevent them from being exploited or denied a loving home.

I am proud of the House's work thus far to address this critical issue. I believe that this bill in particular is another step in advancing this agenda, and that is why I would just like to recognize Mr. CHABOT for all of the work he put into it and, as well, of course, to recognize Mr. ENGEL's contribution.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 3398, the Girls Count Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank Representative CHABOT and Representative MCCOLLUM for authoring this important legislation. It is very good legislation, it is very important legislation, and I am proud to be a part of it.

Around the world, nearly 230 million children under the age of 5 have never had their birth registered or been issued a birth certificate. Most of these unregistered children are girls, and all of them face serious vulnerabilities.

The lack of birth registration makes it much harder to get official documentation and, as a result, these children often become targets for child labor, abuse, human and sex trafficking, child marriage, recruitment into militant groups, and other forms of exploitation.

Unregistered children are often prevented from access to health care, including necessary child immunizations, and from enrolling in school. Down the line, many of these children will be unable to inherit land or money, start a business, or even open a bank account.

This sort of marginalization often hits women the hardest. Unregistered women are more likely to be confined to their homes and invisible to the outside world. Lack of registration limits their choices and opportunities and impedes the long-term development of their communities.

H.R. 3398 will enhance efforts to get more children registered. It reaffirms our strong support for programs aimed at addressing the undercounting of girls in the developing world. It encourages countries to support programs that expand the rights of women, especially property ownership and Social Security rights.

The legislation authorizes the Secretary of State and the Administrator of USAID to support important civil registration and vital statistics programs focusing on birth registration, and allows them to work with local government ministries to ensure equal access to these programs. This complements the work of organizations around the world that are engaged in the important work of protecting vulnerable children and puts pressure on other governments to act.

While improving birth registration systems helps the most vulnerable populations, it has positive ripple effects across a whole society. Governments with better records can provide better services, tailor more effective policies, and bring more people into full participation in their economies. This basic practice can help make entire countries stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. I, once again, thank Chairman ROYCE for his cooperation and bipartisanship.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and the author of this particular bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on this important issue, and I also want to thank my friends and colleagues, Mr. ENGEL and Ms. MCCOLLUM, for their leadership and their support as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that we are living in challenging times. The international community is having to confront new evils it seems like every day. It is critical that we confront these evils with determination and resolve and intelligence. This bill, the one before us today, really actually does this.

With this bill, Congress has the opportunity to address an injustice that is holding girls back from fully participating in society but, worse, exposing them to the particularly horrific evils of human trafficking.

There are 230 million children around the globe under the age of 5 who have never been recognized as being born. Their births were simply never recorded.

In eastern and southern Africa, for example, only 38 percent of children are registered by their fifth birthday. So think of that; nearly two-thirds of the children born in those regions in Africa are not registered. There is no recording of their birth. They, in essence, don't exist to the government.

These children, a majority of whom are girls, become invisible members of society and miss a critical first step in securing their fundamental human rights. Being recognized by your government is necessary, for example, for determining identity and citizenship and age and obtaining access to education and health care and many other things.

When a girl is not counted at birth, it is difficult, if not impossible, for her to own land or start her own business or vote, and she is at risk of being confined to home and, oftentimes, left unpaid.

Lack of a birth certificate keeps girls from fully participating in society. It increases the risk of child marriage, forced labor, recruitment into militant groups, human trafficking, and sexual exploitation.

The Girls Count Act would help put an end to these horrors. The bill directs the Department of State and USAID to work with our international partners to support the issuance of birth certificates in developing countries. The bill will ensure that the most important step in a new citizen's life, the registration and recognition of their very birth by their government, actually occurs.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of a birth certificate denies children their fundamental human rights that we as Americans oftentimes take for granted. This bill would make it U.S. policy to encourage the registration of all children worldwide and make sure that girls do truly count.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I want to once again thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for their support and leadership in this.

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

I want to again thank the chairman and thank Mr. CHABOT.

Getting children registered at birth helps to get them off to a good start. This bill encourages governments to enact laws and policies that give all children, including girls, a chance to be full participants in society. So I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

□ 1545

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would like to also mention the contributions of Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM and Congressman CHRIS SMITH.

CHRIS SMITH is the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations. He is also an original cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank the distinguished chairman for yielding and for his leadership in helping to bring this legislation to the floor, and especially Chairman CHABOT for his Girls Count Act of 2013. I am happy and thankful to be an original cosponsor and to urge the House to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, in many parts of the world, girls are discriminated against simply for being female. Indeed, this blatant disregard for the value of the girl child often begins in the womb, especially in countries such as China and India, where we see the horrific practice of sex-selection abortion. This cruel practice, in turn, has led to a gender imbalance that has fed other crimes against women, especially sex trafficking, which has risen exponentially in the People's Republic of China because of the missing daughters, because of this discrimination against the girl child in utero.

Let me point out that, in her book, ''Unnatural Selection: Choosing Boys over Girls, and the Consequences of a World Full of Men,'' Mara Hvistendahl traces the history of sex selection to population control. Again, we don't count the girl as being of meaning. Of course, this is talking about a physical count, so we have a record of these young ladies, of these young girls, but there are consequences, again, that continue throughout the life or the lack of because she is destroyed early on.

Hvistendahl writes—and I will only mention this briefly—that there are over 160 million missing girls in Asia—in China, mostly, and in India. It is a direct result of sex-selection abortion, and that discrimination of the girl child has profound implications for the region and for the world and, of course, for all of those girls who have lost their lives.

Again, I want to thank Mr. CHABOT for this important legislation and BETTY MCCOLLUM. This is a very important step forward in making sure we know where the girls are after being counted so they can fully participate in society.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I will close now, and I will urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

I thank the chairman, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

This is a bipartisan, important piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The point I would make in closing is that, in the wake of the horrors we have seen perpetrated by ISIS against women and Boko Haram against schoolgirls—kidnapping and enslaving them and robbing them of their freedom—we had one of these girls testify before our committee. She had narrowly escaped Boko Haram but lost her mother and her father.

I know so many of us are deeply concerned about the plight of women and girls around the world, and this bill recognizes the suffering and aims to empower those who have been cast into the shadows of their society. Birth registration is one of the first steps in the fight to preserve an individual's basic rights under the law. It is also a critical means to ensuring the full participation of women and of girls in communities and schools. Let's help girls count. That is what this does.

Again, I want to thank Mr. CHABOT and BETTY MCCOLLUM and Mr. CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, as well, for their leadership on this measure, which I encourage all Members to support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3398, 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.

CONDEMNING IRAN FOR HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 754) condemning the Government of Iran for its gross human rights violations.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 754

Whereas Iran is a member of the United Nations and a signatory to both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, among other international human rights treaties, without reservation;

Whereas in violation of these and other international obligations, officials of the Government of Iran continue to perpetrate gross violations of the fundamental human rights of the Iranian people;

Whereas Iranian women are increasingly subject to heinous acid attacks, either condoned by, or sponsored by, the Government of Iran, through the Basij and other vigilante groups;

Whereas the Parliament of Iran recently enacted a law providing legal protection to private citizens to enforce a strict Islamic dress code and other behavior prescribed under Sharia law, emboldening the Basij and other vigilante groups;

Whereas the Government of Iran ''manipulates the electoral process'', according to the United States Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013, ''severely limit[ing] citizens' right to change their government peacefully through free and fair elections'';

Whereas following voting irregularities that resulted in the election of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the Government of Iran brutally suppressed peaceful political dissent from wide segments of civil society during the Green Revolution in 2009 in a cynical attempt to retain its undemocratic grip on power;

Whereas the Government of Iran has kept the principal leaders of the Green Revolution, Mir Hussein Moussavi and Mehdi Karroubi, under house arrest since February 2011;

Whereas the United States Department of State consistently finds that Iranian authorities have ''limited freedom of association through threats, intimidation, the imposition of arbitrary requirements on organizations, and the arrests of group leaders and members'';

Whereas the United States Department of State's Virtual Embassy Tehran website highlights human rights violations and abuses in Iran on a weekly basis;

Whereas the Government of Iran continues to restrict freedom of speech and peaceful assembly, particularly for journalists and human rights activists;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran found in its August 2014 report that the laws and policies of the Government of Iran ''continue to place overly broad restrictions on the rights to freedom of expression and access to information'', including ''severe content restrictions, intimidation and prosecution of Internet users and limitations on Internet access through throttling and filtering'';

Whereas the ability of religious freedom and human rights activists to freely express themselves, and mobilize civil society, is actively thwarted by the Government of Iran;

Whereas the Special Rapporteur found that the Government of Iran continues to apply capital punishment to offenders convicted of crimes below the international human rights law threshold of ''most serious crimes''; political prisoners; and juvenile offenders, including 8 individuals in 2014 believed to be

less than 18 years of age at the time of their alleged crimes;

Whereas Iranian women continue to face legal and societal discrimination, as well as rampant domestic violence, which is not specifically prohibited under domestic law;

Whereas, on October 25, 2014, Iranian authorities executed Reyhaneh Jabbari, an Iranian woman convicted of killing a man she said she stabbed in self-defense during a sexual assault, an execution preceded by the lack of due process, including a reported forced confession;

Whereas the United States Department of State issued a statement condemning Jabbari's execution and calling on Iran to ''respect the fair trial guarantees afforded to its people under Iran's own laws and its international obligations'';

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom found in its 2014 Annual Report that the Government of Iran ''continues to engage in systematic, ongoing, and egregious violations of religious freedom, including prolonged detention, torture, and executions based primarily or entirely upon the religion of the accused'';

Whereas the Government of Iran persecutes such religious minority groups as the Baha'is, Christians, Sufi, Sunni, and dissenting Shi'a Muslims (such as imprisoned Ayatollah Hossein Kazemeyni Boroujerdi) through harassment, arrests, and imprisonment, during which detainees have routinely been beaten, tortured, and killed;

Whereas since 1999, the United States Department of State has repeatedly designated Iran as a ''country of particular concern'' for severe violations of religious freedom pursuant to the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–292), most recently on July 28, 2014;

Whereas the Government of Iran has long persecuted with particular intensity the Baha'i community, the largest non-Muslim religious minority in Iran, who number at least 300,000, and are viewed as ''heretics'', and therefore are subjected to repression on the grounds of apostasy;

Whereas according to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, since 1979, Iranian authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha'i leaders;

Whereas ordinary Iranian citizens who belong to the Baha'i faith are disproportionately targeted, interrogated, and detained under the pretext of national security;

Whereas senior governmental, military, and public security officials in Iran are responsible for ordering, controlling, and committing gross human rights violations that, in many cases, represent national policies of the Iranian regime;

Whereas the United States Department of the Treasury, pursuant to section 413 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8753), issued a General License in September 2013 to permit the exportation of services and the transfer of funds for activities related to human rights and democracy building projects in Iran, which facilitate United States nongovernmental organizations' activities that increase Iranian access to information and freedom of expression;

Whereas since 2010, the United States Department of the Treasury, in consultation with the United States Department of State, has sanctioned 19 Iranian officials and 18 Iranian entities for their involvement or complicity in serious human rights abuses or in restricting the freedom of expression or assembly of the Iranian people;

Whereas the most recent designation was for Morteza Tamaddom, former Governor-General of Tehran Province, designated May 23, 2014, under Executive Order 13628 for his involvement in censorship and other activities that limit the freedom of expression and freedom of assembly of Iran's citizens;

Whereas the United States led the effort in the United Nations Human Rights Council to renew the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on Iran in order to further expose Iranian human rights abuses; and

Whereas it is important that the President of the United States consistently and rigorously exercise the statutory authorities granted by the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 and the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for human rights abuses, engaging in censorship, or engaging in the diversion of goods intended for the people of Iran: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls on the Government of Iran to abide by all of its international and domestic obligations with respect to human rights and civil liberties, including freedoms of assembly, speech, and press;

(2) deplores the dramatic rise in executions of Iranian citizens by authorities since the election of President Hassan Rouhani in June 2013;

(3) condemns, in particular, the recent cruel execution of Reyhaneh Jabbari, an Iranian woman convicted of killing a man she said she stabbed in self-defense during a sexual assault;

(4) deplores the Government of Iran's mistreatment of its religious minorities, including through the deprivation of life, liberty, and property;

(5) condemns, in particular, the Government of Iran for its relentless persecution of its Baha'i minority;

(6) calls on the Government of Iran to release all political prisoners and prisoners of conscience;

(7) notes that the Administration has designated only one Iranian person for the commission of serious human rights abuses under the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act, as amended, since May 30, 2013;

(8) urges the President to increase the utilization of all available authorities, including the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including by freezing those individuals' assets and barring their entry into the United States;

(9) urges the United States Government to adopt and implement the following recommendations of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom with respect to Iran—

(A) continue to seek that violations of freedom of religion or belief and related human rights are part of multilateral or bilateral discussions with the Government or Iran whenever possible, and continue to work closely with European and other allies to apply pressure through a combination of advocacy, diplomacy, and targeted sanctions;

(B) continue to speak out publicly and frequently at the highest levels about the severe religious freedom abuses in Iran, press for and work to secure the release of all prisoners of conscience, and highlight the need for the international community to hold authorities accountable in specific cases; and

(C) continue to call on Iran to cooperate fully with the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights Situation in Iran, including allowing the Special Rapporteur, as well as the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, to visit and continue to support an annual United Nations General Assembly resolution condemning severe violations of human rights, including freedom of religion or belief in Iran and calling for officials responsible for such violations to be held accountable;

(10) condemns the undemocratic elections process that denies Iranians the ability to freely choose their own government; and

(11) stands with the people of Iran who seek the opportunity to freely elect a government of their choosing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of this resolution, which condemns the Government of Iran for its gross human rights violations.

This bipartisan resolution, which I have introduced together with my good friend from New York—the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ELIOT ENGEL—comes at a very important moment. The administration, together with the world's powers, is seeking a diplomatic solution to Iran's nuclear program. We all want this outcome, though, at this point, it is unclear how an agreement that is in the long-term national security interests of the United States can be reached.

One thing is clear: we can have no illusions about the true nature of the Iranian regime. The history of rogue regimes teaches us that the manner in which these governments treat their own people is a pretty good indicator of how they will treat their neighbors and of whether they will abide by international agreements. This is a regime that has systematically violated the fundamental human rights of large segments of Iranian society since embarking upon the Revolution that brought it to power in 1979. It is a regime that rules by force, preventing the people of Iran from choosing their own government.

The world saw the undemocratic nature of this regime back in 2009 when millions of Iranians took to the streets to peacefully protest a stolen election. Not many are going to forget the images of the young girl bleeding to death in the capital city there, and today, the leaders of the Green Revolution opposition movement are confined to

their homes, they are under house arrest, and, of course, at the time, thousands were imprisoned, many disappeared, and hundreds were tortured. It is a regime that has brutally suppressed the voice of human rights activists and journalists and religious minorities. But what I want to focus on today is the plight of women, who, in particular, face heinous treatment.

Recently, the parliament in Iran enacted a law. What they were responding to were acid attacks that had occurred because young men in this Basij militia had taken it on their own responsibility to go up to women who were uncovered and throw acid in their faces. The reason for the enactment of the law—which followed the harassment and arrest of a human rights activist, a woman who protested the fact that young men were themselves taking on this responsibility of enacting shari'a law, and doing it sometimes by motorcycle, driving by and throwing the acid, sometimes by walking up to the women—was that they were doing this with impunity. The state, the government, was not coming in. The argument that these young men were making was, it is shari'a law that they do this, so this is our enforcement mechanism.

What strikes me is the brutality of the law passed by parliament that would enact a law providing legal protection to citizens to enforce a strict Islamic dress code and other behavior prescribed under shari'a law. In other words, it is cover for these young men. It says if you are going to go out there and if you are going to enforce the Islamic revolution, and you are going to do it by throwing acid, you now have protection under the courts to do it.

This law will embolden these Basij. It will embolden them and other vigilante groups, who in recent months have prowled the streets of Iran's cities, conducting these cruel acid attacks on innocent women. I was going to hold up one of these pictures today, but I thought better of it. I think what we should do is appeal to reason here and make an appeal to the parliament in Iran and say, Reverse this law. Reverse this act. You are only going to encourage more acid attacks.

Let me underscore this point: today, Iranian women face the terror of knowing that state-sanctioned vigilantes may attack them by dousing them with corrosive acid, disfiguring them and blinding them. This is an unspeakable reality there. In 2014, the women of Iran, frankly, are under siege, not by an external force but by their own theocratic government. This is not the history of Cyrus the Great. Iran was the home of the first human rights document thousands of years ago. That was Persian culture. What is this?

We who live in freedom have a moral responsibility to condemn this brutal regime and insist that it treat its people with the dignity and respect that they deserve. This resolution stands for the principle that U.S. foreign policy can and must pursue strategic objectives like the dismantling of Iran's nuclear program while promoting the importance of democracy and human rights. Ultimately, the best chance for a peaceful Iran is a democratic Iran. These two go hand in hand.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 754, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its gross human rights violations.

When President Hassan Rouhani was elected in June 2013, he came to office with a reputation as a so-called ''moderate.'' Some hoped that the human rights situation inside Iran would improve. A year later, we know that was a false hope. In fact, on so many fronts, things have gotten worse.

It is interesting when people say Rouhani is a moderate. No moderates were allowed to run for President in the Iranian election. There were six hard-liners at the end who were allowed to run. Rouhani may be the most moderate of those six hard-liners, but he is still a hard-liner, and I think we are seeing it time and time and time again. In fact, we don't even really know that he has the power to make decisions. Supreme Leader Khamenei is the one who really makes all of those decisions. So, while we can hope for certain things, I think we have to deal with things, unfortunately, as they are and not as we wish they were.

For example, Iranian authorities have dramatically escalated the number of executions of Iranian citizens. This is from the so-called ''moderate'' Rouhani regime. According to the U.N., there were 852 executions between July 2013 and June 2014.

Last month, Iran executed Reyhaneh Jabbari. She was convicted of killing a man whom she apparently stabbed in self-defense while she was being sexually assaulted. That evidence wasn't allowed to be a part of her trial. While she was in prison, awaiting execution, she was tortured.

We all remember the massive protests, as the chairman mentioned, after the fraudulent 2009 Iranian elections. We all remember the images of tens of thousands of Iranians—brave Iranian citizens—taking to the streets, and we all remember how the Iranian government responded—sending the Basij militia to brutally beat peaceful protesters. The leaders of that Green Revolution remain under house arrest to this very day.

Religious minorities also face constant danger in Iran. This is especially true for members of the Baha'i faith. The Baha'i people are frequently detained and interrogated by Iranian security forces. Since 1979, hundreds of Baha'i leaders have been executed.

The United States has helped to shine a light on Iran's human rights violations. We have pushed the U.N. Human Rights Council to continue the work of the Special Rapporteur on Iran. Now, I have been one of the strongest critics of the Human Rights Council and its outrageous bias against Israel, but this Rapporteur has done important work to reveal the scale of human rights abuses in Iran.

Since 2010, the administration has sanctioned 19 Iranian officials and 18 Iranian entities. We have gone after them for their involvement or complicity in serious human rights abuses or in restricting the basic freedoms of the Iranian people. I am proud of the role that Congress has provided in putting forth these sanctions.

The most recent designation was for Morteza Tamaddon. He was the governor-general of Tehran Province. On May 23 of this year, we singled him out for his involvement in censorship and other activities that limit the freedom of expression and the freedom of assembly of Iran's citizens. This designation occurred even while the P5+1 is negotiating with Iran on its illicit nuclear program. Even as those negotiations continue, we cannot and must not turn a blind eye to the horrific abuses taking place in Iran every single day.

□ 1600

The resolution we are now considering urges the administration to use every tool at its disposal to target, expose, and punish those who violate the human rights of the Iranian people because, at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, despite the sharp differences between our governments, we have no ill will toward the people of Iran, to the citizens of Iran.

They are, unfortunately, oppressed by a government that calls itself their government, but it is really a brutal oppressor of the Iranian people.

On the contrary, I believe the people of our two nations should be natural friends. Iran would be the natural U.S. ally in the region, but because of the Iranian regime, this of course cannot happen and will not happen as long as they are in power.

I hope that this resolution will demonstrate to the people of Iran, who are our friends—not the government, but the people of Iran—that we join them in seeking a future for their country based on respect for democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I thank the chairman, as always, for his cooperation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 754, condemning the government of Iran for its gross human rights violations, authored by my good friend and colleague, Chairman ED ROYCE of California.

I want to thank him, especially on the eve of the November 24 deadline for the Iranian-U.S. talks on nuclear, as it is very important to have this discussion on the floor of the House, so your timing as well as the substance is deeply appreciated by all, especially the victims of Iran.

Ironically, Iran wants the world to lift sanctions and trust them with nuclear capabilities, despite ongoing reckless and violent disregard for even the most basic of human rights of its own citizens, as well as U.S. citizens.

U.N. special rapporteur for human rights in Iran, Dr. Ahmed Shaheed, noted in a March 2014 statement that hundreds of individuals remain in some form of confinement for exercising their basic rights, including 179 Baha'i, 97 Sunni Muslims, 49 Christians, and 14 Dervish Muslims.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been nearly 2½ years since American pastor Saeed Abedini has seen or hugged his children, Rebecca and Jacob, or his wife, Naghmeh; and she has been a tireless advocate on his behalf. She was back here yesterday on Capitol Hill, pleading for her husband.

Members will recall that Pastor Abedini was arrested in Iran in September of 2012. He was in Iran to help orphans. Orphans. He was arrested while he was there, and he was there with the full knowledge and consent of the Iranian Government.

I have chaired two congressional hearings on Saeed Abedini. His wife testified at both, and to hear this noble, brave, and loving wife present her husband's case brings tears to your eyes.

She testified at a hearing that FRANK WOLF had chaired previous to the two that I had, and you could heard a pin drop when she told her story and told about the agony that both she and her family—especially her two young children—experience, knowing that their father has now been given an 8-year sentence and has been subjected to torture of many, many kinds.

We are also concerned about Robert Levinson, a retired agent of the FBI. His daughter lives in my district. That family is in utter agony. He got 7 years.

Amir Hekmati, a 31-year-old retired U.S. Marine, disappeared while visiting his grandmother in Iran in 2011. He got 10 years.

Now, recently, Jason Rezaian, a Washington Post reporter, has disappeared.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution sends a clear message to the Iranians and to the world that we care about human rights, but I would also ask that the President of the United States invite to the White House the family members of these Americans unjustly held captive in Iran and to ask, petition, push for, and link to our negotiations the release of these Americans and for a fuller expression of human rights in Iran.

I thank Chairman ROYCE for yielding the time.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a member of the Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and Transportation Committees.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ROYCE for this legislation, and I offer my strongest support because, if nothing else, it reminds us of what the Iranian regime really is at its foundational core, what its essence is.

With much of today's focus on the prospects of a nuclear deal with Iran and the potential military cooperation of our Nation with theirs against ISIS, we absolutely cannot and must not forget the unacceptable and appalling human rights abuses the Iranian regime commits on a daily basis.

Just today, a U.N. resolution condemned Iran's numerous human rights abuses, which include an ''alarmingly high frequency'' of the use of the death penalty, the persecution and imprisonment of religious and ethnic minorities, and the suppression of multiple individual freedoms, and the list just goes on.

Firsthand reports continue to emerge, describing how, of the over 800 documented executions over the past year, 80 percent were for drug offenses, and legal due process was almost never given to defendants. We don't even know if the defendants committed any offenses whatsoever.

Also, disturbingly, in 2014 alone, at least eight people under the age of 18 at the time they allegedly committed their crimes were executed.

Mr. Speaker, President Hassan Rouhani promised to improve the Iranian regime's human rights record. Really? Does anybody take that seriously at all? Realistically, the Iranian regime has only ramped up the oppression of its citizens.

We absolutely must remain clear-eyed when dealing with this extremist regime in all accounts, whether it is a nuclear deal, whether it is in cooperation against ISIS, and certainly when it comes to their human rights violations.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am here in support of H. Res. 754, and I wholeheartedly support this resolution, and I commend Chairman ROYCE for his important work and leadership on this issue.

Any successful negotiation must be based on mutual trust and respect. Trusting and respecting the Iranian regime as an equal member of the world's community of nuclear power producers would be a tragic mistake, in my view. Iran has not earned our trust or Israel's trust or the world's trust. For 35 years, Iran has done anything but earn our trust.

It is time for Iran to free Christian pastor Saeed Abedini. Iran's horrific human rights violations, their state sponsorship of terrorism, their public condemnations of our own country, and their repeated denials of Israel's right to exist spell potential disaster here, I am afraid. Let's not trust the untrustworthy.

This dilemma reminds me of a scorpion and the frog fable that my friend from Arkansas, TOM COTTON, recently used. A frog is about to cross a river when he is asked for a ride by a scorpion. Now, the frog knew that scorpions are poisonous and untrustworthy. He knew that, if the scorpion stung him on the way across the river, they would both drown.

When the frog asked for assurance from the scorpion, the scorpion replied, ''Of course, I won't sting you. If I do, we will both drown.'' Halfway across the river, of course, the scorpion struck, and as they were both headed for their demise, the frog asked, ''Why did you sting me?'' The scorpion responded, ''Because it is my nature.''

Even though the frog knew that the safe way to go was to say ''no'' to the scorpion, he caved in, dismissed better judgment, and the result was tragic.

Let us not repeat the mistake of the frog. We cannot give Iran a free ride across the Rubicon to nuclear weapons. We must not hand the keys of nuclear proliferation to a scorpionlike regime that cannot be trusted.

So what do we do? We can't do a bad deal. We can't walk away, but we also can't trust Iran. What must Iran do to gain our trust? Treat its people right. Treat its neighbors right. Treat Israel right, with dignity and respect. I think we have many rivers to cross before we get to that state.

As we work on this Iranian nuclear dilemma, which will take years, we need to see concrete progress toward the civil liberties that have been mentioned today. They must stop the crimes against humanity exposed in Chairman ROYCE's resolution.

To gain our trust, Iran must acknowledge the right of Israel to exist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1930s, the world trusted a scorpion, thinking that we had achieved peace in our time, and millions paid the price for that mistake with their lives. Let's not stand here someday and admit that we messed up because we trusted an Iranian scorpion.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman from New York for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have said time and time again that the Iranian Government must improve the status of

human rights in their country. Let's not pretend though that this resolution is taking place at this time outside of any context. There is a context, and the context is that we are closer than we have ever been to reaching a peaceful agreement with Iran on nuclear weapons.

I don't know what is going to happen on November 24, and I suspect the people who do know aren't telling the public just yet, but I do know that we have made substantial progress and that we are close.

The context is important that we should stand with the people of Iran and stand for their human rights. I absolutely believe that that is the right thing to do; therefore, I ask for a ''yes'' vote on this.

I have to ask the question: Is this the most well-timed time for this resolution? I do worry that we could undermine the negotiations, but the four corners of this resolution are right, so I am a ''yes'' vote.

I think today's resolution, which highlights the human rights abuses in Iran, also could be improved if it included words and language about the best way to bring those abuses to an end.

I believe improving human rights in Iran is much more likely if we secure a nuclear agreement. The best way to empower human rights leaders within Iran is to engage, not isolate.

Increased sanctions and the threat of war hurts human rights activists because it allows the hard-liners in Iran to claim that they are under imminent threat and, therefore, there is no time or space or room for human rights. I believe that a nuclear agreement will actually increase the likelihood for human rights advocacy.

I don't want to see us go back to the days when we talked in terms of the ''axis of evil.'' It didn't improve the set freedom and security of Americans or anyone. I liked the fact that we have embarked on the path of diplomacy.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. President Rouhani has prioritized diplomacy, and I think this is an important opportunity that we should pursue.

In the final analysis, human rights are what the United States should always stand for, and we in this Congress should never not stand for human rights. I am proud that we are clear on human rights in this resolution.

I simply want to admonish and warn us that taking action that could undermine very delicate negotiations may not be the best timing that we have ever pursued and that for the last 30 years—and I hope for the next 30 years—we will always raise the banner of human rights whenever and wherever, but I think we should be sensitive of the reality of the moment that we are in.

Let me just say thank you to the brave souls who stand up for human rights under very difficult conditions in Iran.

□ 1615

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond.

One of the reasons the timing on this is important is because this is the timing that the Iranian regime has chosen to pass legislation that would protect those young men in the Basij who carry out these acid attacks against women. One of the reasons I am bringing this bill to the floor is because I am concerned about what it tells us about a regime that, rather than come to the defense of these women who admittedly were in violation of the dress code in terms of their facial, in terms of their mode of dress, to allow individuals in a theocratic country to make the decisions that they are the arbitrator of what is shari'a law and then to exonerate them by saying it is the right of the individual to step in against another and enforce shari'a law rather than have the state do it, this is a theocratic state that is taking a principle against the individual, against individual freedom, and especially against rights of women to an extra step that is so injurious to human liberty, but also the fact that they would do this now and that they would be so unconcerned that we might not even respond to this or that the international community would have a reaction to this, I think it demands a reaction. Because if we do not, in the court of international opinion, hold them to account for these kinds of acts in their Parliament, what is the message that is given to those who are encouraged to further violate women's rights and minority rights in Iran? That is why I am pushing this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I had a conversation a little over a week ago with a group of Iranian American women about their experiences in Iran and their reaction to this parliamentary act and their reaction to the acid attacks which are increasing in number to a truly alarming percentage. There have been over a dozen of these now. So that is why the timing of the legislation. It is in response to this. In the process, it catalogs the other abuses that the regime recently has undertaken under President Rouhani at a time when we thought they might put a different foot forward to the international community.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to send a message of support to the Iranian people that they build a better future for themselves and their children. Today this House exposes the gross violations of human rights by the Iranian regime. The Iranian people deserve better. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, there were observers that were tempted to believe that Iran's President Rouhani would usher in a more tolerant attitude at home. I think many of us suspected that might be the case because he did occasionally offer less antagonistic rhetoric than his predecessor, even if he had had the history he did have in the security services. But it turns out that was wrong. That assumption was wrong.

In a new report, the U.N. Special Rapporteur has documented an alarming increase in the number of executions, including political prisoners, juveniles, and religious minorities, such as the peaceful Baha'i, since President Rouhani took office in August of 2013. The motif of this regime is becoming a religious dissident swinging by the neck from a crane, if you watch the news coming out of Iran.

I won't again articulate my concerns about these acid attacks that are going on, but this comes, I think, at a time when millions of Iranians yearn for basic freedoms—basic freedoms—that we in the West take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent upon all of us, as the House is doing today, to stand with the people of Iran who suffer under this theocracy and to speak out.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 754.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MALALA YOUSAFZAI SCHOLARSHIP ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3583) to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3583

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 ''Malala Yousafzai Scholarship Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On October 9, 2012, Malala Yousafzai was shot in the head by Pakistani Taliban on her way home from school.

(2) In late 2008, Malala began writing a blog for BBC Urdu under a pseudonym pressing the case for access to education for women and girls despite objections from the Pakistani Taliban.

(3) Malala's advocacy for the education of women and girls made her a target of the Taliban.

(4) The Taliban called Malala's efforts to highlight the need for education for women and girls an ''obscenity''.

(5) On July 12, 2013, Malala celebrated her 16th birthday by delivering a speech before the United Nations General Assembly in which she said, ''So let us wage a glorious struggle against illiteracy, poverty, and terrorism. Let us pick up our books and our pens. They are the most powerful weapons. One child, one teacher, one book, and one pen can change the world. Education is the only solution.''.

(6) According to the United Nation's 2012 Education for All Global Monitoring Report, ''Pakistan has the second largest number of children out of school [in the world]'' and ''nearly half of rural females have never been to school.''.

(7) According to the World Bank, ''The benefits of women's education go beyond higher productivity for 50 percent of the population. More educated women also tend to be healthier, participate more in the formal labor market, earn more income, have fewer children, and provide better health care and education to their children, all of which eventually improve the well-being of all individuals and lift households out of poverty. These benefits also transmit across generations, as well as to their communities at large.''.

(8) According to United Nation's 2012 Education For All Global Monitoring Report, ''education can make a big difference to women's earnings. In Pakistan, women with a high level of literacy earned 95 percent more than women with no literacy skills.''.

(9) In January 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton stated, ''We will open the doors of education to all citizens, but especially to girls and women . . . We are doing all of these things because we have seen that when women and girls have the tools to stay healthy and the opportunity to contribute to their families'' well-being, they flourish and so do the people around them.

(10) The United States provides critical foreign assistance to Pakistan's education sector to improve access to and the quality of basic and higher education.

(11) The Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program administered by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) awards scholarships to academically talented, financially needy Pakistani students from all regions, including remote areas of the country, to pursue bachelor's or master's degrees at participating Pakistani universities.

(12) Fifty percent of the 974 Merit and Needs-Based Scholarships awarded during fiscal year 2013 were awarded to Pakistani women. Historically, only 25 percent of such scholarships have been awarded to women. Starting in the fall of 2013, USAID has committed to provide 50 percent of all scholarships to women.

(13) The United Nations declared July 12, 2013, as ''Malala Day''—a global day of support for and recognition of Malala's bravery and courage in promoting women's education.

(14) On October 10, 2014, Malala Yousafzai became the co-recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize for her ''struggle against the suppression of children and young people and for the right of all children to education''.

(15) On December 10, 2012, the United Nations and the Government of Pakistan launched the ''Malala Fund for Girls' Education''' to improve girls' access to education worldwide, with Pakistan donating the first $10,000,000 to the Fund.

(16) More than 1,000,000 people around the world have signed the United Nations Special Envoy for Global Education petition calling on the Government of Pakistan to enroll every boy and girl in primary school.

(17) Pakistani civil society organizations collected almost 2,000,000 signatures from Pakistanis on a petition dedicated to Malala's cause of education for all.

(18) Engagement with Pakistani diaspora communities in the United States, who have unique perspectives, access, and opportunities to contribute to stability and economic growth in Pakistan, will be a critical element of a successful United States program to promote greater access to education for women and girls.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) every individual should have the opportunity to pursue an education;

(2) every individual, regardless of gender, should have the opportunity to pursue an education without fear of discrimination;

(3) educational exchanges promote institutional linkages between the United States and Pakistan; and

(4) recipients of scholarships referred to in section 4 should commit to improving their local communities.

(b) CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVES IN PAKISTAN.—Congress encourages the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to continue their support for initiatives led by the Government of Pakistan and Pakistani civil society that promote education in Pakistan, especially education for women.

SEC. 4. MERIT AND NEEDS-BASED SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this Act as the ''USAID Administrator'') shall award at least 50 percent of the number of scholarships under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program (referred to in this Act as the ''Program'') to women for each of the calendar years 2014 through 2016.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) CRITERIA.—The scholarships available under subsection (a) may only be awarded in accordance with other scholarship eligibility criteria already established by USAID.

(2) ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES.—Scholarships authorized under subsection (a) shall be awarded for a range of disciplines to improve the employability of graduates and to meet the needs of the scholarship recipients.

(3) OTHER SCHOLARSHIPS.—The USAID Administrator shall make every effort to award 50 percent of the scholarships available under the Program to Pakistani women.

(c) LEVERAGING INVESTMENT.—The USAID Administrator shall, to the greatest extent practicable, consult with and leverage investments by the Pakistani private sector and Pakistani diaspora communities in the United States as part of USAID's greater effort to improve the quality of, expand access to, and ensure sustainability of education programs in Pakistan.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The USAID Administrator shall designate appropriate USAID officials to brief the appropriate congressional committees, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the next 3 years, on the implementation of section 4.

(b) CONTENTS.—The briefing described in subsection (a) shall include, among other relevant information, for the most recently concluded fiscal year—

(1) the total number of scholarships that were awarded through the Program, including a breakdown by gender;

(2) the disciplines of study chosen by the scholarship recipients;

(3) the percentage of the scholarships that were awarded to students seeking a bachelor's degree or a master's degree, respectively;

(4) the percentage of scholarship recipients who voluntarily dropped out of school or were involuntarily pushed out of the program for failure to meet program requirements; and

(5) the percentage of scholarship recipients who dropped out of school due to retaliation for seeking an education, to the extent that such information is available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Malala Yousafzai Scholarship Act. I really want to thank the chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. She authored this bill along with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) and our colleague from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Earlier this year, the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing on women's education which underscored the point at the heart of the bill: a modest investment in educating women and girls in the developing world, particularly in areas beset by poverty and radicalism, can pay long-term dividends that help stabilize societies, promote market-based economic growth, and advance U.S. national security objectives.

I have for years expressed concern about the appalling state of education in places like Afghanistan and Pakistan and the subsequent rise of madrasas, those that prey upon the disenfranchised and breed radicalism. And what I am speaking of now are the Deobandi schools, not the other madrasa, but the Deobandi ones in particular.

The situation for women in areas where access to education is actively suppressed is particularly grim. In Pakistan's northwest frontier province and in Balochistan, for example, literacy among women is between 3 and 8 percent—under 8 percent. I visited all-girl schools in Pakistan up in the northwest frontier only to learn later, when I came back for another visit, that they had been destroyed and it was no longer possible to visit that site.

It is therefore fitting that this bill was named after Malala Yousafzai, who at the age of 15 dared to defy the Taliban and survived a brutal assassination attempt, and ultimately inspired a generation of women and girls to demand their fundamental right to be educated. She is known today for

leading that effort. Just last month, Malala became the corecipient of this year's Nobel Peace Prize for her struggle, in her words, for the right of all children to education.

This legislation requires that USAID award at least half of the scholarships made available through its existing Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program in Pakistan to women. It adds no new money to the program, but it provides support and policy guidance to make sure that these scholarships are now going half to women.

The bill also emphasizes the importance of working with the Pakistani diaspora, those communities in the United States who already are doing so much back in Pakistan relating to education and to the medical colleges and universities. Tapping into this vast pool of expertise and resources will prove invaluable to our long-term commitment to promote educational opportunity for girls in Pakistan and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleague from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her leadership on this issue, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3583, the Malala Yousafzai Scholarship Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my good friend, the chairman of the Middle East Subcommittee, Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for her commitment to girls' education and for authoring this bill. ILEANA works hard at everything she does, and I am very proud of her, as usual, for her good work in this bill.

I also want to thank Mrs. LOWEY for the hard work she has put into this through the years. She has always been a good force on the Appropriations Committee with earmarks pushing for these very, very important things that we are putting forward here in this resolution.

I want to also thank my fellow New Yorkers, GRACE MENG and JERROLD NADLER, who are cosponsors of this bill, as well as NITA LOWEY, as well.

Mr. Speaker, some of the most effective programs we funded in Pakistan in the years since 9/11 are those that support education, and particularly education for girls. The legislation before us today ensures that at least 50 percent of the scholarships that USAID provides in Pakistan are made available to girls and women. As the President has said, if a country is ''educating its girls, if women have equal rights, that country is going to move forward. But if women are oppressed and abused and illiterate, then they are going to fall behind.''

The World Bank's top economist has said that financing women's education yields the highest rate of return of any investment in the developing world. But there is another compelling reason for the U.S. to support female education in Pakistan and in other countries around the world. Educated women and girls are proving to be some of the most powerful weapons in the fight against radicalism.

Take the example of Malala, the courageous young woman. We all know about her. She was recently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. As a teenager, Malala became a vocal advocate for all girls to have the right to an education at a time when the Taliban in Afghanistan prohibited access to education for girls. When she wouldn't follow their orders, the Taliban shot her in the head for defying them. After recovering—thankfully—from the violent attack on her life, Malala's passionate calls for universal education inspired millions—I know she inspired me—and spurred action around the world.

In the speech she gave at the U.N. in July of 2013, Malala said of the Taliban:

> They thought that the bullets would silence us. But they failed. And then, out of that silence came thousands of voices.

Mr. Speaker, the positive impact of these voices will only continue to grow in Pakistan and around the world as more and more girls are given the opportunity to get an education. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I thank Chairman ROYCE once again for working with us and for being a vocal voice in all these important resolutions, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, the author of this measure, but also, herself, a former educator who understands only too well the importance of this bill.

□ 1630

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL not only for helping bring this bill, H.R. 3583, to the floor today, but for working in such a smooth, bipartisan manner throughout their time over 2 years—and beyond, to infinity—and helping bring all of our Members together on incredibly vexing issues. Whether it is Iraq or Iran or ISIS or you name it, our committee works in a very smooth way. And it is thanks to the leadership at the top.

I also want to thank Congresswoman GRANGER, KAY GRANGER, and Ranking Member NITA LOWEY of the State Foreign Operations Subcommittee. They joined me in introducing this bill. This bill is as much theirs as it is mine. Also, Senator BOXER, on the Senate side, for her leadership on this issue.

As Chairman ROYCE so nicely put it, I am a former Florida certified teacher. That is what I used to do in my real life. And I am a lifelong student and one of the most senior women in Congress today. I have been around a long time. So I hold the issue of education very near and dear to my heart.

We know that access to education is a game changer for any society, Mr. Speaker. It could transform developing countries. It improves the lives of so many, especially in the vulnerable populations.

Greater access to education for women and for young girls, it leads to an increased respect for human rights, it leads to a rise in prosperity and well-being, and a more peaceful and stable society.

Everyone wins. A society in which women have unfettered access to the education system expands the horizons not just for the girls and women involved, but for everyone in their community and their nation. These countries that limit access to education for young girls and women are missing out. They are missing out on the untapped potential of nearly half of their population.

Imagine how much more productive and how much better off some of these nations would be if they promoted a more inclusive society.

What are they afraid of? It is no coincidence that the countries that are most susceptible to human trafficking and exploitation or the trappings of extremism and terrorism are also those countries that restrict a woman's access to education.

Education is the most important factor in empowering young girls and women to become successful members of our society, protecting them from the ignorance that enables abuse, radicalization, and exploitation.

And that is precisely the case in Pakistan, a country which has one of the highest number of children out of school already. They are not going to school. Two-thirds of all children out of school are girls.

The numbers are troubling. Barely half of all girls in Pakistan are enrolled in primary schools. And that figure drops to 30 percent for secondary schools. These numbers are even lower in rural areas where poverty is ever increasing and girls have even less access to schools.

A lot of this has to do with the Taliban, Mr. Speaker, that radical terror group that seeks to impose Shari'a law and forbids women, forbids girls from access to education.

That is why this bill is so important. We need to help ensure that we can counter the Taliban's efforts to deny fundamental rights to women and limit their contributions to Pakistani society.

The United States provides Merit and Needs-Based Scholarships to Pakistani children. But this bill will ensure that at least half of those scholarships go to women. There is still much more to be done to ensure access to education for all women in Pakistan and indeed throughout the world.

Doing so would mean a safer society, a healthier society, a more stable and secure world, and so it would be in our national security interest to make it so.

This is but a small step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I thank again my chairman, Chairman ROYCE of California,

and Mr. ENGEL of New York for guiding our committee in such a wonderful bipartisan way.

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

I want to first of all, again, thank Chairman ROYCE for working closely with us on all these pieces of legislation, and thank ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her hard work and her collegiality as well.

The legislation that we are passing now and the three pieces of legislation that we passed beforehand makes me very, very proud to be the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think we do good work on the committee. I think we do good bipartisan work on the committee. It is on issues like this that it is really very crucial and very important for the powers that be all over the world to see that foreign policy in America is bipartisan, that we are strongest when we work together, that we are strongest in tackling foreign policy issues when we do it in a bipartisan nature—and we have done it in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. So I want to tell the chairman how proud I am to work with him.

Mr. Speaker, humanity will never reach its full potential until all children, especially girls, are given the opportunity to get an education. Educated women and girls make critical economic contributions, stabilize whole communities, and serve as bulwarks against extremism. This important legislation would ensure girls and women be given at least 50 percent of the scholarships we provide in Pakistan, a nation that continues to face enormous challenges, including the threat of terrorism.

Again, I want to thank everybody. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL did something especially impactful. He quoted from the speech before the United Nations last year of Malala, in her own words. I thought I would just close by making her closing argument, which was:

The extremists are afraid of books and pens. The power of education frightens them. They are afraid of women. The power of the voice of women frightens them. That is why they are blasting schools every day. Because they were and they are afraid of change, afraid of the equality that we will bring into our society.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the co-sponsors and Co-Chair of both the Children's Caucus and the Pakistan Caucus, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3583, the Malala Yousafzai Scholarship Act.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 3583 would provide numerous educational opportunities to Pakistani women in situations similar to Malala Yousafzai.

According to the United Nation's Education for All Global Monitoring Report, Pakistan has the second-largest number of children not attending school, and nearly half of rural girls have never been to school.

The Pakistan-based Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program awards scholarships to academically talented, financially needy Pakistani students from all regions to pursue bachelor's or master's degrees at participating Pakistani universities.

The Malala Yousafzai Scholarship Act would require the U.S. Agency for International Development to award 50 percent of its Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program scholarships to Pakistani women each year through 2016.

Mr. Speaker, Malala Yousafzai is the heroic Pakistani girl who rose to prominence as she stood against the oppressive policies imposed on the citizens of Pakistan by the Taliban.

She is the youngest Nobel Peace Prize winner, and was awarded the honor for her struggle against the suppression of children and young people and for the right of all children to education.

Malala's devoted service to education, justice, and equality in Pakistan is deserving of recognition, which is why I introduced H.R. 60 to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Malala Yousafzai.

The Congressional Gold Medal is one of the highest civilian awards in the United States, and Malala's legacy of inspiring young women around the world is truly commendable and worthy of this honor.

It is fitting that this act, the Malala Yousafzai Scholarship Act, is named in Malala's honor, as she is a symbol of hope in a country long beset by violence, and her actions demonstrate the impact one person can have on the entire world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3583 to help change the lives of Pakistani women, like Malala Yousafzai, by opening doors to education, justice, and equality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3583, 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.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

GETTYSBURG ADDRESS ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today is an important anniversary. On November 19, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln delivered the Gettysburg Address. Prior to this famous address, Lincoln arrived at the Gettysburg train station. Earlier this year, the House passed my bill to permanently preserve this historic landmark without utilizing any federal funds.

Currently, this bill awaits consideration by the full Senate.

The Battle of Gettysburg marks a turning point in American history. By preserving the Lincoln train station, I hope to inspire my fellow citizens to learn and appreciate the significance of the Gettysburg Campaign, the Gettysburg Address, the Civil War, and the bravery of the soldiers who, in President Lincoln's powerful words, gave the last full measure of devotion.

HONORING OHIO CITIZENS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the season of Thanksgiving, a time to celebrate the precious gifts of family, friends, community, and country, please allow me to pay special tribute of gratitude to some outstanding northwest Ohio citizens whose lives made a significant contribution to building a better community and America.

We honor them for who they were and what they contributed to the betterment of our lives together in what some have called our beloved community.

In particular, let me recognize business leader Barry Greenblatt, his magnificent, ebullient personality as founder of Barry Bagels and a work ethic like no other.

Mrs. Jean Overton was a pioneering woman who gladly assumed the role of mother for our community.

The former Mayor of Waterville, Ohio, three terms, Chuck Peyton, who lived as a man for others, a Navy veteran who logged four decades of public service.

Sheryl Shipman, who dedicated her career to ensuring recreational opportunities for children, older adults, and people with special needs. Oh, she was a leader, and how people trusted her in Toledo.

Finally, Sam Szor, ''Mr. Music.'' Born in Toledo's Birmingham neighborhood, for more than 60 years under his baton delighting hundreds of thousands of people in his incredible music that floated over our community in free concerts for decade after decade after decade.

What magnificent Americans these individuals were.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to lay their life stories in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, as we come to this Season of Thanksgiving, a time to celebrate the precious gifts of family, friends, community, and country, please allow me to pay special tribute of gratitude to some outstanding Northwest Ohio citizens whose lives made a significant contribution to building a better community and America. We honor them for who they were and what they contributed to the betterment of our lives together in what some have called our beloved community.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, please let me recognize for outstanding character and achievement:

Business leader Barry Greenblatt, founder of Barry Bagels. Without a doubt, Barry's ebullient personality, creativity, and work ethic produced a business, founded in 1972, that anchored Toledo and Southeast Michigan in their very hearts. Without question, Barry Bagels are the best in America. His deli counter became part of the Toledo and Ann Arbor scenes, appreciated and always dependable. Barry's generosity extended far beyond the walls of his business. His charity was as boundless as his broad smile. He was always collecting for some needy cause—sick children, peace in the Middle East, local ball clubs and youth groups. He worked in his business, hands on, year after year. He was indefatigable. He made an effort to employ local youth and touched the lives of thousands of our fellow citizens with his good humor and community-minded. What a likable human being was he. Customers could often find Barry behind the counter, his happy banter infectious.

Quick to lend a hand, participate in an event, lead an effort or help a friend, Barry Greenblatt was held in high esteem by all who were lucky to know him. He was the perfect example of a compassionate businessman whose focus was on his family, his employees and his community. We shall always remember Barry's smiling face and golden heart. May his wife, children and grandchildren draw strength from his legacy achievements. We join our spirits with theirs and shall deeply miss him.

Mrs. T. Jean Overton was a pioneering woman who gladly assumed the role of Mother for our Community. Jean never stopped giving—to her family, her church, her neighborhood, her community, and to every person whose path she crossed. A talent and broadcast pioneer and graduate of the University of Toledo, in 1952 Jean was the first African American woman to broadcast on Toledo area airwaves. She went on to work for many more years in broadcasting and public relations, but also moved into public service.

Following the Civil Rights movement of the 1960's, Jean assumed leadership roles in Model Cities and other programs to revitalize Toledo's neighborhoods, with a particular dedication to North Toledo. Jean was a leader. Always with grace, she attended community meetings, founded organizations, counseled youth, testified at public forums, fought the abuses of poverty and discrimination, and ministered to forgotten people and places. Her spirituality, perseverance, and genuine concern were evident and made a difference. Appointed to the Ohio Public Health Council in 1971, Jean led an effort to organize an association for people with sickle cell anemia. Jean was also a neighborhood activist throughout her life. As her son succinctly described Jean, "She would want to be remembered as a mother, first and foremost. And someone who would rather give than receive, to be honest. She was a mother to Toledo." Toledo is a better place because Jean Overton made her life here with us. May God grant her a peaceful rest and bring comfort to her dear family and all those who loved her.

Chuck Peyton truly was a man for others. As a Navy veteran, councilman, municipal administrator and then three term mayor of Waterville, Ohio, Chuck logged four decades of public service. With an easy smile and ability to listen, he happily devoted his years to building a stronger community and country. He was a storyteller, enjoyable company to young and old. His travels as a deep sea diver equipped him with harrowing and adventuresome tales.

Committed to public transit, and understanding the needs of the disabled as he bore lifetime mobility challenges from an accident, he served 18 years as a trustee for the Toledo Area Regional Transit Authority for eighteen years. His public service also included various county positions and administration in the Ohio Department of Transportation's Northwest Ohio district office.

Chuck Peyton knew how to achieve progress. He was always thinking forward, whether it was modernizing regional public transit or visioning the new U.S. 24 route between Ohio and Indiana to relieve dangerous conditions on the old Route 24. Our community is better because Chuck Peyton lived among us, and cared about us. May his lovely wife Diane, family, and friends draw comfort from their memories of his living legacy of love and devotion to duty.

Robert O'Connell was "an icon of local tennis." He was a history teacher and renowned tennis coach at Ottawa Hills High School, retiring in 1988. A master of the game, he coached many young people to outstanding high school and college careers, imbuing them with a love of the game. A testament to his character and his coaching is the high regard with which his athletes still hold him. In 2006, the Ottawa Hills tennis courts were named in Robert O'Connell's honor. Even with all of the local and statewide accolades, Robert O'Connell's greatest legacy is his family. We shall not forget this champion.

Sheryl Shipman dedicated her career to ensuring recreational opportunities for children, older adults and people with special needs. She served as a supervisor and manager in Toledo's Recreation Department until illness overcame her. Through several city administrations and many budget challenges, Sherrie fought for the initiatives she developed for people to play in Toledo's pools, parks, ice rinks, baseball diamonds and community centers. One of her colleagues explained, "She felt all the children of Toledo were her children. That's what allowed her to be a force to be reckoned with." Sherrie Shipman's tireless efforts on behalf of others earned her respect and admiration and will not soon be forgotten. Her son summed it up by saying, "She was a leader, and people trusted her."

Finally, Samuel Szor, "Mr. Music." Born in Toledo's Birmingham neighborhood, Sam's musical talents were soon recognized. A high school standout, Sam performed as part of the University of Michigan Marching Band while earning two degrees. He came home to teach, inspiring students and community alike. Sam began Toledo's famed outdoor summer concert series, "Music Under the Stars" in the Toledo Zoo's amphitheater. For more than sixty years under his baton, Sam delighted and dazzled summer concertgoers with this brilliance. An accomplished musician in this own right, Sam performed with the Toledo Symphony Orchestra, eventually leading it himself in the Casual Concerts program of popular and classical music. He also conducted the Perrysburg Symphony Orchestra for twenty years. He directed the First Congregational Church motet choir for 37 years. For 53 years Sam led the Toledo Choral Society in its annual December presentation of Handel's "Messiah." A true visionary, Sam Szor enjoyed iconic status in his lifetime. His imprimatur in our community is everywhere as his career was writ large. The gifts he gave us are truly priceless and we will long remember our very own "Mr. Music."

THE NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT

(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, this week the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service announced that the agency is reopening the comment period for an additional 30 days for the public comment period on their proposal to list the northern long-eared bat as endangered.

This species can be found in 38 States, and if listed under the Endangered Species Act, the consequences could have significant impacts on farmers, foresters, landowners, and the States themselves.

The underlying issue is that neither habitat loss nor human activities have played a role in the losses. The northern long-eared bat is suffering from a fungal disease known as White-nose Syndrome, which wakes subterranean cave-roosting bats out of hibernation in winter. Once awake, these bats leave the cave in search of food and, unfortunately, starve or die during the colder months.

Rather than placing a limitation on land use that has nothing to do with the spread of a disease, I would encourage the Fish and Wildlife Service to focus on research into countering the White-nose Syndrome.

The American people deserve as much.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(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, tomorrow at 1 p.m. Congressman TED DEUTCH and I will convene a hearing on the threats that an Iran nuclear deal will have for global security.

We are just 5 days away from the deadline, and this is what is airing right now on Iranian State-run television: "Iran will not even go back one step from the research and development and the enrichment of uranium."

This leading ayatollah also threatens U.S. military bases and Israel saying that Iranian ballistic missiles can "hit and raze to the ground anyplace in Israel as well as any American base in the region." State-run television.

Iran continues to make these overt threats to us and to our ally, the democratic Jewish state of Israel, yet President Obama engages this evil regime as if the nuclear program exists in a vacuum.

Mr. Speaker, this is an obtuse and dangerous way to approach the greatest threat to global security, and Congress must not allow any deal with Iran to leave in place the possibility that the regime can obtain a nuclear weapon.

AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the American people keep asking: Where have all the good jobs gone? And I truly appreciate my colleagues, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York and Congressman PAUL TONKO of New York, for joining me tonight.

We are talking about jobs that can create a middle-class way of life for the people who occupy them as well as local businesses, jobs that produce living wages, that produce good health benefits and pensions and 401(k)s you can depend upon.

□ 1645

Now, since the 1980s, unlike any period following World War II, because the United States is importing more than we are exporting, we actually have lost millions and millions of jobs.

People complain about a budget deficit. The reason we have a budget deficit is because we have a trade deficit. In fact, since the mid-1970s, every single trade agreement the United States has signed of any consequence has resulted in more and more and more red ink.

Go to any store in this country. I don't care if you are trying to buy a suit or an automobile or curtains, I really don't care what it is, if you can find something made in America, that is a discovery.

What does that mean? It means that rather than exporting more than we import, we have been driving down the living standard of most Americans decade after decade. Jobs here disappear while capital moves abroad and exploits penny wage workers who have no hope for a better life because they live in places that have no Democratic values.

It is a shocking number to put on the record, but since the mid-1990s, this country has amassed over $4.3 trillion in trade deficit—and that is a conservative estimate—amounting to a job loss of over 8.5 million good jobs. That is what this red ink is all about. It is a shocking figure. The American people, they sort of know it innately, but when you really put it up there they go, ''Yeah.'' That is what happened.

If you look here, this shows that, with more imports, you get fewer jobs. When the trade deficit keeps getting worse, if you are out of a job yet, keep buying foreign. I am not against trade, I am for balanced trade, but I am not for trade that puts our country in this kind of an economic hole.

This is just one example—and we will go back to it a little bit later—this is the most recent agreement that the United States signed called the Korea Free Trade Agreement. We were supposed to be able to sell 50,000 cars in Korea.

Guess what. We have been able to ship—here is our piddly little shipment over there—750,000 cars. Guess how many they have sent over here. Look at this arrow compared to that little tiddlywink there. Imported vehicles from Korea, over 561,000 compared to 7,450.

So when you start wondering where your job has gone, think about what has happened to these trade agreements and how they have put us deeper and deeper in the trade hole and then in the budget deficit hole.

When I ask individual Americans how their life is going under the corporate globalization model that has been accelerated by the so-called free trade agreements, if they answer honestly and if they are not a multimillionaire investor, consistently, the response is one of great disappointment and too frequently one of great distress. The middle class in America is in trouble.

It is safe to say that this is a direct result of the long list of free trade deals that have benefited only the wealthiest in the global environment in which we live, wealthy investors who can survive anywhere. In fact, they have a lot of houses—Paris, Geneva, you name it—but each of us has a house that is our most important asset.

We come from little communities across this country, and we have a right to a good life. Our people have a right to a good life because they work so hard. Trade policy is the major reason, in my opinion, that America cannot employ all Americans seeking work.

I wanted to allow my colleagues to also speak this evening. Let me just give you a couple examples, practical examples—actually, the list could go all across this floor if I were to roll it out. Fort Smith, Arkansas, ask the 1,860 workers who lost jobs at Whirlpool when production was shifted to Mexico.

How about the 300 people who worked at the Vise-Grip plant in DeWitt, Nebraska, a town of only 572 residents, who all lost their jobs, and some would say their town identity, when the company moved to China to keep the name competitive.

How about Maytag from Newton, Iowa—one of America's iconic products—shut down, moved to Monterrey, Mexico. If you look at the census statistics from the time that happened over a decade and a half ago until today, poverty in Newton has risen up to a level of 25 percent.

This is happening across this country.

How about the 535 workers who made hearing aids in Eden Prairie, Minnesota, who were laid off when the Starkey Laboratories factory moved to Mexico and China.

Every American listening knows a company or more that has done exactly the same thing. If you go down to those countries and you see how the people live, you couldn't stomach it; you simply couldn't. I have gone down to the maquiladoras in Mexico.

I have asked the workers in those factories, ''Take me to where you live,'' and they do. It is truly sad to see a tiny little crate barrel house powered by a lightbulb connected to a battery, and this is what development brings them. Come now. Come now. The world can do better than that.

13,000 citizens of our congressional district in Ohio had jobs shifted overseas, outsourced to someplace else. Oh, they know this tale all too well.

I would ask my dear colleague from New York—New York has been battered, just like Ohio has been battered—Congressman PAUL TONKO, one of the greatest leaders on economic growth for our country, who has taken time tonight during a very busy week to join us here, thank you so very much for coming to the floor tonight.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much, Representative KAPTUR. Thank you for leading us in this discussion. We are going to be joined in a minute with our representative from Rochester, New York, Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER, and she and I, we can suggest, live along the Erie Canal Corridor, she at the western end of upstate New York, I at the eastern end.

That corridor became the birthplace of a necklace of communities dubbed ''mill towns'' with the development of the Erie Canal. Product activity, product discovery, product development was the theme ongoing in that region. People tethered their American dream in these mill towns. They came, they worked their fingers to the bone, they came up with product ideas, and that was the pulse of our community. Manufacturing was alive and well.

Then we saw this onslaught of what was called a trade negotiations process, where we would get into this concept of providing for negotiations, but those negotiations have grown a far distance from trade barriers and negotiations on tariffs. It became a way to encourage public policy in a very veiled kind of concept, so that you were addressing far beyond the tariff measures and the trade burdens.

What we have today, as you indicated, is trillions of dollars in trade deficit where these manufacturing jobs have left our home communities in upstate New York and are now, in many situations, in underdeveloped nations or newly developing nations.

When we look at the Trans-Pacific Partnership that is looming as one of the largest, if not the largest, most complex trade negotiation ever, you are going to look at situations where you have a minimum wage of 25 cents, for instance, in Vietnam, or an average hourly salary of 75 cents.

This is not what we want to bring as a condition for our American workers. We can't compete with that, nor should we. We are holding down the workers' rights, the human rights, of these people in developing nations by agreeing to these sorts of agreements.

I think that we can do better. We must do better. I stand for fair trade. This free trade concept where we sacrifice American workers, we find the rusting of manufacturing towns as a result, is not what the doctor ordered for the American economy.

We need to be fair to the middle class. This is the great many of us who have found our American prosperity developed in manufacturing centers where we were able to raise a family and grow a community and develop a neighborhood simply by a just salary, sound benefits, and the security of knowing that your job was your grounding in that community.

Free trade has taken away that American Dream for far too many, and we need to do better. We cannot continue to endure these trade deficits that are of the trillions of dollars and watch the many, many millions of jobs lost in the ensuing efforts because it is an unsustainable outcome.

I have watched as so many manufacturing centers left our area. I represent the Mohawk Valley Capital District region of New York. We witnessed a huge exodus of jobs. I have people telling me today, as they are closing down factories, they cannot compete with situations in China, for instance, where there are many conditions that favor those businesses because of these sound partnerships that they have with their government, where they will buy the factory and, perhaps, pay the utility bill and then further manipulate the currency.

There is a lot of work to be done on these issues. We need to make certain we go forward and have a sound overview by Congress, so that there is an investment by Congress and we are not circumventing our responsibilities and going forth with sound policy that will strengthen the great many of us called the ''middle class of America,'' provide for the American dream to be tethered in these mill towns, where we have manufacturing opportunities that are paying sound salaries, providing great benefits, and not destroying workers' rights.

I thank you for leading us in this discussion and look forward to exchanging many thoughts here in the ensuing hour.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman TONKO, thank you so much for coming to the floor this evening.

I grew up in a family where the work ethic was really respected, and we believed in it because you could get somewhere. You worked long hours. Sometimes, you worked 7 days a week, but you could save a little bit of money.

Now, you try to save money and the banks pay you .07 percent interest or something like that, so if you are a saver, if you have a good work ethic, if you have a good savings ethic, what does the market yield you really?

What I worry about is the work ethic itself because I talk to many employers now and they say, ''MARCY, do you know what, if we have to hire 40 people,'' let's say, for part-time jobs in a retail store, they say, ''you can't believe how many people we have to go through until we find people who really want to work.''

Well, one of the things that is happening across this country is large numbers of people don't believe working counts because they have seen what has happened in their own families. We stand to lose the work ethic itself among major segments of this population. That is very worrisome to me, and we see related social problems and rising poverty.

I mentioned in the Maytag situation in Newton, Iowa—and I am not just picking on Newton, Iowa—but there was a community that absolutely lived for that company. It was invented there.

Fred Maytag is buried right there, looking over his town and parks he endowed and all the people whose lives he helped to elevate. To see poverty increase 25 percent of the total community tells you where we are headed. That is just one place, but it is all across our country.

Before I call on Congresswoman SLAUGHTER to add her eloquent words this evening, I wanted to mention Norma McFadden, who worked in my district, one of 150 employees who made crayons for a company called Dixon Ticonderoga, one of Ohio's oldest manufacturers dating back to 1835, before the factory was closed and offshored to Mexico in 2002.

Norma, along with many of her colleagues, took advantage of what was then called ''trade adjustment assistance,'' which since has been eliminated, and she got an alternative degree as a phlebotomist.

Many of the jobs of her fellow coworkers—there were no jobs for them to go to. That poor factory in Sandusky, Ohio, just shuttered. The property hasn't been reused. These were people who made a good product, they worked for years, they were proud of their community, they were proud of their company, and all of a sudden, it was all jerked away. I can guarantee you that the people who are working those jobs outside of Mexico City do not earn a living wage.

What are we doing? What are we doing to this country and what hope do we provide to the people of other countries that their work matters? I say what we are yielding is social instability, instability.

If you look at the murders around this country and what is happening with the drug epidemic in this country, don't think there isn't a connection between hopelessness and what is happening, not to some of the wealthy people that prowl around the Capitol who have the ability to pay to get here or who have lobbying firms here or somehow want to reach a Member of Congress on some very arcane amendment that they wanted.

I am talking about the average person who will never come to Washington, who has a belief in this country, but it is starting to erode at the edges because their economic future is so uncertain.

□ 1700

I want to call on a real fighter for the American people, who has been a stalwart protagonist of enormous dimension here for jobs in America and for the fair treatment of workers everywhere, Congresswoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER, the ranking member of the Rules Committee. She is such a gifted member.

Thank you for being here tonight.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you so much for putting this together. It is so important. I hope that people listening to us will understand that some of us here have been trying for years to try to save American jobs from bad trade policy.

Every time the Congress debates a trade agreement, they make these grand promises. I remember NAFTA. They said 250,000 brand-new jobs were going to be coming to Rochester, New York. None of it ever happened. We were promised this great, bright future that didn't show up.

Frankly, over my career here, which has been nice and prosperous and creative, I have never yet seen a trade policy that came out of this Congress of the United States that benefited in any way the American manufacturer or the American worker.

I come from a district that was devastated by NAFTA, and I want to tell you a story about Eastman Kodak. Kodak, one of the great commercial institutions and innovators of the 20th century, once had over 60,000 jobs in the Rochester area. Now, there are only a few thousand left, and this is the trend all across the country.

Eastman Kodak is a name that everybody knows, with Kodachrome and everything that they have done for motion pictures. A study was done once that showed that the word ''Kodak,'' stated to people that heard it, that it was solid, it was good and dependable—Eastman Kodak, the backbone, basically, of Rochester, New York.

They were great patrons of the art, education, everything that they did. Actually, George Eastman made sure that every soldier that went away to the first World War got a camera. It was in a day that you had to send the camera back to the factory to be opened and developed. All these soldiers sent them back and forth while they were overseas fighting—or even in the country. They had this Eastman Kodak camera going back and forth every month.

It would take me all night here to talk about how this is the company

that built the Norden bombsight that won the Second World War and engineers that have come from this company, which is now devastated. Now, they have started up some smaller companies, for which we have great hope.

In fact, the laser beam that took down the three Somali pilots that were holding Captain Phillips—if you remember, they shot simultaneously off a major rocking boat, a big one. Captain Phillips and the pirates were in a smaller one.

They shot simultaneously and killed the three pirates with a laser beam from Rochester. The night vision goggles that everybody is so concerned about and the Navy SEALs used to take down Obama bin Laden are component parts from Rochester. We have all that ability there, but we took the jobs right out from under them.

This debate comes down to a thing called Fast Track, which isn't going to mean much to anybody, but in the seventies, we were the largest manufacturers in the world, and we were pretty darn sure we would be forever.

We saw no end to that great prosperity because people were innovators, and we saw the wonderful things we were able to do. Generations of families would work at these major companies in all of our districts, and it was solid as a rock, and you knew it was always going to be there, until it wasn't.

Fast Track came up in the seventies when we were the largest manufacturer, and the idea was that since we were so good and we wanted to help rebuild the economies of other countries and that we would allow the President and whoever negotiated the trade to simply bring the agreement, once they were finished with it, to the Congress of the United States, with no committee action whatever. We are not even told what is in those trade agreements. I personally have tried, on behalf of Hickey Freeman, to find that out about textiles and could not.

The idea was we would simply vote up or down, no amendment, no nothing—just a quick vote and go—taking away the whole reason for our existence here to represent the people who sent us here and to do what we could to keep the United States prosperous and forward looking.

When I was chair of the Rules Committee briefly—because it came under the purview of the Rules Committee—we were able to get rid of it. Unfortunately, the Korea Free Trade Agreement was filed before we were able to get rid of it, so Korea was done under Fast Track, and I appreciate so much what you have shown us with that. It was very troubling to me about Korea.

South Korea, as we pointed out, shows 7,450 cars. There are 26 dealers in South Korea that will sell American cars, but during the same period that we sold 78,000, they sold 561,626 here. We obviously wanted South Korea to prosper. We lost so many lives there. We fought very hard for their freedom.

But we also signed a treaty that if anybody attacks South Korea, the United States is obligated to go and fight. Would you think that maybe with all of that—we rebuilt their economy, we saved their country—that they might sell American cars?

What we have seen and what we tried to say on this floor, the three of us all talking about it, is you are buying a pig in a poke here. This is not going to work because the simple reason is we never had enforcement on a single one of our trade bills. We simply reduce our tariff. Everything comes flooding in here.

It is not tariffs that keeps our goods from selling in other countries. It is the unseen trade barriers. They don't like the bumper. The steering wheel is wrong. The window doesn't fit. Or they simply let it sit at ports, on docks, rotting and rusting and whatever, but they don't sell, and we have not a single thing to do about it.

I have a bill that I am going to reintroduce in January—I am hoping we can get a lot more attention on it—which is a bipartisan bill with a lot of outside support that simply says that trade agreements being negotiated by the United States of America would also be accompanied by an enforcement part, which would be a person in the Labor Department who would do it, not the people who wrote those bills.

The people who write those bills have such pride of authorship. I don't know of a single time—maybe once or twice with the WTO—where we have tried to do something about unfair labor practices, but we don't really worry about that. We just take it—or our people take it—those who have lost all the jobs.

The bill we have says we can also do what we call ''snap back,'' that Congress can stop that until they do away with the unfair barriers that prevent our goods from being sold in their countries, as the agreement stated they would be.

We are about to do another one, if you can believe it. This one is a humdinger. This one goes over 11 countries. Again, we have no idea what is in it, as I told you. They are trying to get it through Fast Track. We have a good start, I think, on stopping that.

I am trying to get the number here. We have, I think, 30 Republicans that have signed on not to do Fast Track. We have about a total of 150 Members of the House who will not and, certainly, the Senate. We have let the President of the United States as well as the trade negotiator know that Fast Track won't work here.

Food safety is a real crucial issue. One of my colleagues, ROSA DELAURO, said that when you read about delta shrimp, you are probably reading about the Mekong Delta shrimp. The food safety issue is so bad, as we understand it in this trade bill, that if we cause them to lose any money when they bring in bad fish—which, in the first place, frankly, is not tested nearly enough when it comes in—or anything else that causes them to have any economic cost, they can sue us.

Think about this for a minute. They can sue us because we enforced our own clean air standards and our clean water standards and our food safety standards. I will tell you it boggles the mind just simply to think about it.

What we are asking—and we have let the President know and the whole world that we are trying to get to understand—is that this Congress of the United States will not stand by for Fast Track, and to have a bill come up here that will decimate, again, parts of this country in the United States, threaten our food safety laws, and not have the ability to read the thing, have committee action on it, and to amend it, all that would be gone under Fast Track, and we would only be able to vote up or down.

I will tell you we have had such devastating losses from playing the game that way that it would boggle the mind that we would stand by and watch that happen yet again in cases where it would be even worse.

I am so pleased to be here tonight and join with my friends who try to fight the good fight. This is a magnificent country, and all of us certainly have benefitted from it. Just to be able to be a Representative in the Congress of the United States is remarkable, but with that goes a heck of a responsibility.

That responsibility is to leave this place better than we found it. We can't do that with this trade bill, so I urge all my colleagues, everybody listening, to pay attention to what is going on here and help us to get people that represent you to join us in the fight to stop this trade agreement in its tracks.

As everybody else has said—and I think it goes without saying—I have no problems with free trade—well, free trade I have got a lot of troubles with. Let me back that up.

I have no trouble with international trade. It is the wave of the future. We are doing it. Free trade has always meant that people come in here free and eat our lunch. Fair trade is a whole other issue. Let's have a little fair trade for a change. It would do us a world of good.

Thank you very much, Marcy, for letting me be here.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank the gentlelady, as busy as you are, for joining us this evening and fighting for jobs for America's workers from coast to coast. Thank you so very, very much.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. It is a pleasure.

Ms. KAPTUR. We appreciate your contributions this evening.

Following on what Congresswoman SLAUGHTER has stated, I can guarantee you that, according to polls done by the Pew Research Center, which is a national polling organization, over half of Americans say that free trade has been about U.S. job losses. They have experienced it. They know that whether it is NAFTA, whether it is the China

deal, whether it is CAFTA—in Latin America or Korea, CAFTA has operated the reverse.

Enough people have now, sadly, suffered. They have internalized what is going on, and they are wondering what has happened to this country. Not only have they lost their jobs, but because the economy hasn't grown as fast, we are seeing that there is a downward pressure on wages in this country.

I see people being hired in plants in my district now in the auto industry, which is doing better because we refinanced it a couple of years ago, but before, people used to be able to go in there and earn $20, $30 an hour.

Now, they are starting them at a little above minimum wage. They are working them 7 days a week, 10 hours a day. They are working two and three times as hard because there is this downward pressure on wages.

I mentioned Norma McFadden having worked at Dixon Ticonderoga in Ohio. I can tell you two out of every five of the displaced manufacturing workers who were actually able to be rehired had wage reductions of more than 20 percent.

Congressman TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. I was just going to add to that statement, Representative, that there was a GAO study, a report that was called for by Representative GEORGE MILLER and Representative SANDY LEVIN. That report clearly indicated that the provisions of these trade agreements have not been carefully and well-enough monitored and enforced. Also, violations that were discovered which require investigations were not done expeditiously. There are huge delays.

That ought to raise some concern to Members of Congress who might just casually dismiss this authority that we should have to review these agreements. These agreements, again, are far beyond tariffs and trade barriers.

They include public policy components that would range from worker protection to environmental concerns to food safety to consumer protection. These are all given dynamics that should not first and foremost be part of these agreements, but because they are, can have devastating consequences.

Again, I think this effort here is about greed. It is about providing for those that can control and manipulate that economy at the expense of diminishing the worker. We have seen what has happened here as we have lost American jobs in our manufacturing base.

The people who have been displaced from the manufacturing centers are now working in jobs that are providing for far less dollars—remuneration—for the hard work that they invest into that new job.

We are also watching the developing nations and their workers getting paid with a minimum wage of 25 cents or an average hourly rate of 75 cents. That is really destroying the workers not only this in country, but around the world.

To this Nation and her needs, it is about growing our middle class, growing our economy, protecting our middle class, and when we are sending off jobs in this casual, dismissive type of agreement concept called free trade, it is not a fair outcome, and fair trade is where it ought to be.

We need to go forward. I agree with the comments made by Representative SLAUGHTER. We need to make certain there is not a Fast Track opportunity where we circumvent the responsibilities of Congress, where we should have debate, where we should allow for amendments, and not just move to a single up-or-down vote.

□ 1715

That is dangerous, that is far reducing the involvement of Congress. It is relinquishing Congress of its responsibilities and its duties and the empowerment that it can bring to the American worker.

So there is much work that needs to be done here. And as one who represents many manufacturing towns that in their heyday provided for great jobs and great opportunity and for the tethering of the American Dream, we need to move forward with progressive responses rather than this attack on working families in this country and around the world.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman TONKO, thank you so very, very much for your comments. And obviously, New York has been battered, as so many other places in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Youngstown, Ohio (Mr. RYAN). He fights every minute of every day for the people of our country, and certainly for the people of his district in northeastern Ohio, a leader here, a rising leader nationally, and we thank him so much for joining us tonight.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you.

All these fights are side by side with my friends from Toledo and upstate New York. And you look, upstate New York with Ms. SLAUGHTER, the Great Lakes States, I think we are the ones who have seen over the course of the last two or three decades really what has happened to our manufacturing base. I think both of you have hit the nail on the head.

And you look at the politics and the elections, from 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, in my estimation, these are all about economics. These are about average people not feeling like they have opportunity to latch on to the American Dream.

I think when we talk about these trade agreements, the issue inevitably comes down to manufacturing. How can we reinvigorate manufacturing in the United States again?

And it is not just the trade agreements, but it is what other progressive policies do we have with the Tax Code, with investments and infrastructure, research and development, renewable energy.

You talk about windmills. You have got to make everything that is in that windmill. The tons of steel, all of the component parts need to be manufactured. So why wouldn't we focus on getting that done here in the United States so we can put our folks back to work in manufacturing jobs that pay more, more secure pensions, more secure and higher benefits? That is, I think, ultimately the ladder up.

I will give you an example where we got this right. We had an opportunity in Youngstown, Ohio, and Girard, Ohio, for an expansion of a new steel mill, up to a billion dollars. And we needed to do some site preparation work, and we were able to get $20 million from the stimulus package. Then the company said, You need to level the playing field with China.

And so the President put tariffs on the steel tubing coming in from China. And in Youngstown, Ohio, we have a billion dollar steel mill that put our building trades to work for a year and a half to 2 years, over 1,000, 1,500-plus workers to build the facility, 350 new jobs, investments back in the community.

That is when we get it right, when we level the playing field, when we put the tariffs on their dumped products coming into the United States. That, to me, is what this is all about.

You go down the Ohio River, north on the turnpike over to Toledo and Chicago and into the Great Lakes. You go east on 90, and you go through Pennsylvania and into New York. These are the regions of the country that, if we want America to not feel so insecure economically, we have got to get these reinvestments back into these communities.

We can't just give a blank check and ignore what needs to be negotiated. Our opportunity here, our job here, I think, is to lift all of these other countries up and not exploit and then have the bad food come back to the United States or the cheap products come back to the United States, whether we are talking about drywall or baby food or whatever the story is from the last couple of years.

I think we have an opportunity to right the ship. We have got to have a coalition here in Congress that is willing to do that, and we do have an opportunity. Just think about this.

I know my friend from Minnesota wants to speak a little bit as well.

If we had a national manufacturing policy in the United States, if we said we are going to rebuild the United States, how many Members of this Congress, if we said, how much is your combined sewer that you are going to have to invest in the next 10 years? A billion? Some big cities are a billion dollars; hundreds of millions in small- to mid-sized towns like the ones I represent, getting close to actually billions of dollars.

If we put people back to work and made the investment and our building trades all went back to work, union workers, good contracts, good wages,

good benefits, we incentivized manufacturing with the Tax Code and research and all the rest, we invested in the renewable energies so that we can make the solar panels, make the windmills and we move in this direction, we could light up the United States again with a few key changes. But I think having a trade policy that Congress has input on, that levels the playing field, does not sacrifice our clean air, our clean water, our food, is the way to go about it.

So I just wanted to stop in, thank my friends, thank the dean of our delegation in Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, for this leadership. We have got to keep pushing back. So I want to thank you for the opportunity to be here with you and look forward to hopefully beating this thing back.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman RYAN, thank you so very much for your time this evening, for your leadership, for the great voice that you give to America's economic future and to all of those who work to make it possible. Thank you for the respect you show them and for the amount of time that you devote to Make It In America and toward manufacturing in America. Thank you so very, very much.

Mr. Speaker, we have marvelous leaders who have joined us tonight from across the country, obviously, from our sister State of Minnesota, a Great Lakes State that has received its fair share of battering over the years, and a great, great Member, KEITH ELLISON, the leader in our Progressive Caucus, as well as, obviously, a leader in the Minnesota delegation.

Thank you so very much for being with us this evening.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I certainly appreciate it. And I want to thank her for taking up this important issue of trade agreements, trade generally and trade promotion authority.

I just want to say that Minnesota has had its experience with trade agreements. According to policy experts, if you look at the North American Free Trade Agreement, which lifted tariffs and other trade barriers between North American countries, it has led to the outsourcing of over 30,000 Minnesota jobs. It also did bring in some jobs; but the net outcome, after you take the lost jobs and the gained jobs together, is a loss of 13,700 jobs.

So the thing is that some people say, well, trade will help. It will help some people. But when you look at everybody, it has not been a job gainer for us, as it was promised to be. And I think that is very important.

I am glad that Congressman RYAN and you and others have been speaking in a local framework. I am glad to hear about New York and Ohio.

I can just tell you from my own State of Minnesota, we are not afraid of trade. We believe we have got the best workers in the world and we can compete with anybody, but only on the basis of a fair trade. We believe we can compete, we can make great products, but when other countries are dumping, when they are manipulating their currency, when all types of crazy things are happening like that, then we are not talking about fair trade. We are talking about free trade, and free trade is free-for-all trade, and free-for-all is not going to be good.

I can assure you that when the trade deal comes that really does support labor standards and environmental standards in the right way, I won't be standing against it. But until then, I have to stand against it.

I just also want to say that there has been a lot of talk recently because of this Trans-Pacific Partnership, this deal that has been negotiated over the last several months, and there is a lot of concern about it. But before people get really worried about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is the new trade deal, the new NAFTA, I think they ought to worry about something called Fast Track or Trade Promotion Authority, because here is the thing.

Whether you like these trade deals or you don't like them, I doubt that you believe that they are perfect as they come out of the hands of the U.S. Trade Representative and all these other countries. I doubt you believe that they couldn't benefit from any negotiation or any amendment, because around here, we have never seen a perfect piece of legislation. Even the best can be improved. Yet, if we grant Trade Promotion Authority, we will only have an up-or-down vote. We will literally abandon our national sovereignty to other countries who will be able to sue American companies for lost profits.

I don't mind dealing in an American court, but I do have a problem being in an international court just because we want to ban smoking, just because we want better environmental regulation, just because we want to take care of our people. We may then be sued for lost profits by some foreign company.

Of course, one of the problems is that we don't know what the Trans-Pacific Partnership really is. People have seen pieces of it here and there, but we don't know because it has been negotiated in secret. And my constituents say, Well, KEITH, you send me—Congressman, you send me a copy of that Trans-Pacific Partnership. I want to know what it says.

And I say, Mr. Constituent, I can't send it to you because I don't have it. They haven't let me see it, not in its entirety. They send you pieces of it. You can look at this chapter or that chapter, but you can't look at the whole thing.

So they are going to basically, after they get their Trade Promotion Authority, they are going to give us a few weeks to basically look it over, and then we can only vote it up or down.

Ms. KAPTUR. I say to the gentleman, these agreements are so powerful they actually should be treated as treaties because they involve so much more than just goods. When you get into the legal right to sue and you look at what has happened to our country under these trade agreements—I don't know about Minnesota, but in our part of the country, we have something called the emerald ash borer that has eaten through all of our ash trees. It is a multibillion dollar problem. Cities like Toledo and Cleveland are losing 10 percent of their tree cover—10 percent—and those all have to be replanted. And that critter got in here in packing material. But who gets taken to court from the other country for sending in dirty soil here? There is no legal recourse.

If you look at the U.S. Department of Agriculture budget, in the invasive species account, you will find it skyrocketing as American taxpayers are being charged to try to clean up some of this mess that is happening across our country.

It isn't just the emerald ash borer. It is critters like the Asian beetle, which came in on Chinese packing crate material and is eating hardwoods all across our country. The damage is enormous, and there is no court. There is no place where we can go to hold the importer and the exporter responsible within the laws of our country.

What kind of a crazy system is this where we tie the hands of the American people?

Under NAFTA, we were told that we would have 200,000 more jobs in our country. But when NAFTA was passed, we fell into trade deficit with Mexico; and actually, we lost nearly 700,000 jobs just to Mexico because of NAFTA. So these trade agreements, they say they are one thing, but they actually come back and turn negative numbers, negative numbers.

I look at this Korean account. We were supposed to have 50,000 cars here, and all we have gotten is a handful—7,000. The Koreans have managed to sell over a half a million here.

If you go to those countries and you look at how they keep our vehicles out and how they promote their exports of parts here—the automotive repair dealers were in here a few weeks ago. I ran into them in the hallway. Why were they here? Because when they try to repair a car and the part comes in from a foreign country—let's say you are putting the hood on. The car was in an accident and you have to replace the hood. The fit isn't as good. The metal is more thin. It isn't as good a quality metal, and they can't make it fit the repair. So then the customer in our country gets mad.

These replacement parts are coming in from all over the world. It is an inferior product. It makes our repair dealers look like they are not doing a good job. It is not their fault, for heaven's sake. They are caught in this system that doesn't work for them, and it doesn't work for us. We have got to figure out a better way.

I think Congressman TONKO wanted to add a remark. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1730

Mr. TONKO. As we continue to banter on this importance of trade—of free trade versus fair trade—I can't help but be reminded of the pioneer spirit that has taken this Nation to moments of greatness, where that greatness was written by the American worker, oftentimes by the immigrant who came to this country to pursue the American Dream.

What we need to do here is have history instruct us. Let us understand what the greatness of this Nation is about. Our best days lie ahead of us if we do that, if we are willing to take lessons from American history, where our sons and daughters who, as our ancestors—many of them immigrants—came to these shores. It was their creative genius. It was their integrity. It was their ingenuity. It was their work ethic. It was their passion as they tethered that American Dream that grew these opportunities of manufacturing in our mill towns. They were undeniably the impetus.

Today, we need to be instructed by that pioneer spirit. We need to understand that, if given a fair shot, we can continue to grow upon that greatness, but if we suffocate that American Dream, if we suffocate the American worker, if we deny just remuneration for their sweat equity as they pour themselves into that job, if they are denied that job because of these trade deals, these negotiated outcomes that are denying again the worker across the world, then we all lose. It is important for us to understand that we need to invest in the manufacturing base. This is a walking away from history.

This is allowing greed to take over the equation of job creation. This is about providing for greed for a very few. Look at the relationship between the worker and the owner, the manager of these situations. We have reduced the worker. We see what the average income is looking like. We see what the household income is looking like. We have destroyed this. We have put people into lower-paying jobs as they have lost those manufacturing sector jobs. We have not allowed for the job growth.

We look at the chart that Representative KAPTUR has displayed for us here this evening. It is overwhelmingly convincing. When you look at the activity in one direction versus the activity in the opposite direction, it is absolutely, blatantly, obvious that we need to do better, and we don't do that. We don't begin by relinquishing the role of Congress in this process. A Fast Track, as it has been talked about here this evening, denies the opportunity for fair debate. It denies the opportunity for amendments. It requires a simple up-or-down vote. We don't need to put public policy in for worker protection, environmental standards, child labor issues, consumer protection, public safety. All of these items are tossed into these agreements where there isn't the appropriate discussion and where the worker is held down—25 cents for the minimum wage in Vietnam, 75 cents for the average hourly wage, and then tossing people out of the American Dream here that they wanted to tether.

That pioneer spirit needs to be fed. That pioneer spirit needs to be nurtured. That pioneer spirit needs to be respected. That pioneer spirit needs to be revered. When we do that with sound trade opportunities, we will prosper because we have the intellectual capacity as a nation—we have the work ethic as a nation; we have the creative genius as a nation—to prosper. Give us the fair opportunities to grow our economy and allow for trade policy to initiate a new era of greatness for this country. That is when we are going to respond in justice and in fairness—in social and economic justice—that will allow us again to write these new annals of history that will show yet another era of greatness for the American worker.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman TONKO, thank you for your passion, for the voice that you give to millions and millions of people across this country on the floor of Congress. We know we have our finger on the heart of where the American people are. It is just this city that is out of sync with where the public is, and we have to get them aligned once and for all.

You would think that a place that has been amassing mammoth trade deficits because of trade policies over the last 25 years would not be brain dead, but, apparently, some people are brain dead over on the executive side, and they have allowed America's communities to sink further and further into debt—into trade debt—and job loss. They are completely connected.

If you go to these other countries—and I had this chart up here about Korea, but Japan is the same. If you look at the number of vehicles coming here versus our vehicles going there, we are dealing with closed markets. It is not like these other places like our stuff. They figure out thousands of ways to block our products from going in. Oh, gosh. Twenty or 30 years ago, I went to Japan to figure out: Why weren't they buying U.S. cars and U.S. auto parts? I brought free spark plugs, and I said to the head of Toyota and to the head of Honda and to all of these companies, Please, we will give you free spark plugs. These were the best plugs we made in our country. Just try them out. In those days, the Japanese would only accept about 2 percent of automobiles in their market from anyplace else in the world, okay? When our market was open, over half the vehicles on our streets were from every place else in the world—made there rather than here, okay? Today, 30 years later, it is the same in Japan. They may be 3 percent of their market. They didn't even take Yugos, for heaven's sake, when those things were on the market.

You are facing closed markets abroad. You are facing mammoth trade imbalances. The most important things those brilliant people over at the National Security Council economic division should do is pay attention to the United States of America for a change and ask themselves: Why isn't this formula working?

Do you know what? Your decisions are hurting the American people, who are funding your operation over there on the executive side. Somebody had better pay attention to these mammoth, mammoth hemorrhages because I will tell you what—this recent election I don't view as an ideological one. The American people are trying to find a way to start getting a little traction in their economic way of life. They are having trouble, and this city isn't listening. The structures that are there to help the American people are completely out of kilter, and they have been out of kilter for a long time. It is not fair to the American people. It is simply not fair.

We have to raise our voices here. I know there are living rooms out there that are listening to us tonight, and they are cheering what we are saying because they have lived it. They have lived the job loss. They have scratched and tried to get two and three jobs to try to hold their families and their households together. We have seen families split up because of the lack of income, and it isn't their fault. They are trying. They are trying to get a foothold.

I remember one President. I didn't like what he said, but he said, Walk with your feet. If you have got a problem, move somewhere else.

Do you know what? Where we live, our communities, our homes, our families, our neighbors—the communities we have built together—really mean something. It is us. We have invested our lives there—our parents, our grandparents. It isn't so easily cast away. I hope that is not an old-fashioned American idea, but people have labored for years to build our libraries, to build our museums, to build our zoos, our marinas, all of our parks. You just don't so easily walk away. Our homes mean something to us. It isn't fair to the people who have contributed so much to the betterment of this country to have it so rough, and it isn't their fault.

For all of the people I meet who are homeless, for all of the people who have fallen on tough times, they want to work. These are workers. Why should workers have to go on food stamps, for heaven's sake, in the United States of America? What an embarrassment that is for this country. Then we have certain people here in the Congress who say, Oh, just cut them off. What are they supposed to do? Where are they supposed to go when their jobs have been royally outsourced elsewhere? This is not a few jobs but millions and millions.

I have had the gift in my lifetime of being able to travel, to go follow the job. Go see what happened when Trico moved out of Buffalo. Go see what happened when Mr. Coffee moved out of Cleveland. When you start following these places, then, all of a sudden, it becomes clear: oh, somebody is making a whole lot of money off of the outsourcing of jobs. Do you know what? It wasn't the people in my community. It wasn't the workers. It wasn't even the small business people. It is the capitalists who take the money—those people who are rich enough to own these companies—and who then figure out they can outsource it so they can make more money, not work with the people in these communities who have given their lives, their sweat for these places. It is so disrespectful. It is un-American. It is un-American what they are doing.

Mr. TONKO. The gentlewoman talks about the ownership—the pride of developing community and neighborhood, the investment that the worker made in growing a family, developing a household, building a neighborhood in a strong and powerful and meaningful way. Those are the mill town memories. Those memories guide my heart and soul.

I am from a mill town. I still live in that mill town and represent that mill town here in the House of Representatives, and it was the clamor of that assembly line that resonated to people of all ages in that mill town. It was the activity. It was the hustle and bustle of manufacturing that resonated, that became the pulse of manufacturing, and that became the heart of a mill town. You knew which day the mill was shut—there was silence—but now the silence is deafening, and we need to bring back that resurgence, that opportunity which meant the American Dream, meant an opportunity to earn a paycheck—the dignity to earn that paycheck—and to be able to raise a family and develop and maintain a household. That is what it is all about. It is about economic and social justice.

So we have work to do, and I believe that Washington needs to listen to small-town mill town across this country, to the middle-income community that reminds us it is about the dignity of work; that they want to invest their skill set, that they want to invest their professionalism, they want to invest their work ethic in building a product, allowing us to taste that greatness of manufacturing.

We look at the data that are assembled that should guide us here, and we see CEO salaries and productivity rising steeply upward. Meanwhile, flattened, if not dipping south, is the average worker's salary. Something is fundamentally unjust about that outcome. Something is fundamentally unsustainable about that outcome. If we are going to enjoy prosperity, every strata of the income ladder is affected if we are not dealing with worker fairness. Then and only then, if we address worker fairness, can we rightfully hope to have a better tomorrow. Isn't that what we are about—providing hope, instilling hope into the hearts and minds and souls of individuals and families, of workers—of the mill towns of the American economy?

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman TONKO, your service gives us hope, and I know it gives the people of your district hope. Thank you for joining us this evening.

I am going to yield to Congressman KEITH ELLISON of Minnesota, who has spent the evening here with us.

Thank you so much for working overtime on behalf of your constituents and all of America.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentlewoman.

Again, I just want to point out that President Obama correctly said that income inequality is the defining issue of our time. I think he was right when he said that.

When you look at why do we have the flat and declining wages that the Congressman from New York, PAUL TONKO, just mentioned and that you have mentioned—why? What are the components of this?—I can tell you that it is clear that we have not invested in public infrastructure, which would put people to work and improve productivity. It is clear that we have cut the taxes of the wealthiest and the most privileged people in our society, and, literally, we have added them onto people in the middle, and we have failed to educate people properly. Yet one of the components that we can never forget is this trade policy. You cannot intelligently claim that you want to do something about income inequality and pass these trade deals which ship jobs overseas and put downward pressure on wages here.

This is a key part of how we get the American middle and working classes back to getting raises again.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman so much for that excellent point.

I take it, by the signal, our time has expired. We thank all of those for listening who are present.

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

□ 1745

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN BILL FRENZEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I rise with several of my colleagues to honor the work and memory of Congressman Bill Frenzel, who passed away on Monday. Congressman Frenzel represented Minnesota's Third Congressional District for 20 years, first elected in 1970 and retiring in 1990.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, many of us tonight had already planned to speak today to express our love and appreciation to Bill from this floor, even before we learned of his death.

Now, it just feels too late, in a way, but one of the benefits of extolling the virtues of people greater than ourselves is that we become better still, so we are keeping with that plan tonight.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, that as I stand here in this Chamber, where Bill did some of his best work, my heart is more full of emotions than my head is full of ideas, and there are many facts that I could recite about the service of Bill Frenzel; instead, I am going to try to capture the man that I knew, the man that we all knew, and the man that we all truly loved and respected.

When I received the news that Bill passed away on Monday, there was a scrap of paper hanging on my wall in my Washington office and also a scrap of paper hanging on my Minnesota wall that became my prized possessions. They are two vintage Frenzel doodles.

There are hundreds of them out there—whimsical, fantastically detailed little drawings that Bill Frenzel did while he was on the phone, while he was in committee meetings, listening to testimony, or during debates. Such was the hyperactivity of this brilliant mind, that when he was required to sit still, his drawing hand had to be moving.

I say that to convey the idea that Bill Frenzel was just more alive than most people that you meet. He was always thinking. He was always creating. He was always pushing positive ideas, and in the interactions that I had with him, it was like he was always leaning forward at you at an angle, like a person walking boldly into a stiff wind.

Bill Frenzel was a serious legislator, often pouring over line by line of the Federal budget. In fact, that practice continued after he left Congress. Every year, he would make a phone call to my office, requesting his copy of the annual Federal budget.

It is amazing to me that anyone would even want this massive document sitting on their bookshelf, but what is truly amazing is that Bill would actually go through this budget line by line for decades after he left this institution.

Bill believed in and dedicated his life to doing the greatest good for the greatest number of people, and for Bill, the way that he did the greatest good for the greatest number of people was by promoting and advancing international trade.

I suppose it began by looking at the great good being done around the world

by many outstanding companies that operate out of the district that we represent in Minnesota, companies that feed and restore health to millions and billions all across the borders of the world.

Bill believed—and he was absolutely right—that there is no force in the modern world that has done more to raise people out of poverty, to foster the spread of human rights, or to expand democracy than international trade.

Within Bill's own lifetime, the United States and Germany and Japan were mortal enemies, doing terrible violence to each other's lands and peoples, but through the experience of being trading partners, they have become our best friends and our best allies.

For three decades, there was no stronger advocate for international trade that was more persuasive than Congressman Bill Frenzel. He was the indispensable man, in many ways, in the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement, which has benefited all of the people of our continent immeasurably and has been the model of our agreements now for all over the world.

Just last month, in October, Bill received the Mexican Order of the Aztec Eagle—that is the highest honor of the nation of Mexico that can be given to a noncitizen—in appreciation of his work on the North American Free Trade Agreement.

In 2000, he also received the Order of the Rising Sun, Gold and Silver Star, from the Emperor of Japan for his efforts to advance trade and the U.S. relationship with Japan.

He deserves America's highest honors as well. He worked across the aisle as a consensus seeker because he understood that relationships matter, that relationships make a difference, especially on the big issues like Social Security reform, budget reform, tax reform, welfare reform, and, of course, trade agreements.

After retiring from Congress in 1991, he became a guest scholar in economic studies at The Brookings Institution, and he remained very active in public policy, being appointed to governmental panels by Presidents on both sides of the aisle.

Just 2 months ago—in fact, in September, President Obama reappointed him to the White House Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations. That is a position that he was first appointed to by President George W. Bush in the year 2002.

He also cochaired the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, a bipartisan organization dedicated to educating the public about the impact of fiscal policies.

I will just tell you, personally, Mr. Speaker and Members, that I will miss my conversations with Bill Frenzel. I got together with him every 3 or 4 months over coffee, where he would share his years of wisdom, his experiences, and his insights that he gained during that tenure in public service.

There is no doubt that he was a good friend and a mentor in many respects; however, there is no temptation for any of us to try to do a Bill Frenzel imitation because there will never be another like him.

For me, Bill absolutely inspires me to be the best that I can be and search for ways that I can do the greatest good to help the greatest numbers of people.

I offer my condolences tonight, Mr. Speaker, to the Frenzel family; to his wife, Ruthy, who was always by his side; and to his three daughters, Debbie, Pam, and Mitty.

I also want to give thanks to Minnesota's Third Congressional District voters for electing him in the first place and for giving me an amazing set of shoulders to try to stand upon, as well as my thanks to God for the life and service and the example of Congressman Bill Frenzel.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Minnesota, Mr. RICK NOLAN. Congressman NOLAN has a very unique perspective on his friendship with Bill Frenzel, serving with him both in Congress, as well as in the State legislature in Minnesota.

I will just say that, as two public servants of Minnesota for a number of years, both in and out of office, their paths crossed many times, and their friendship exemplifies, I think, Bill's friendly nature and willingness to work with people on both sides of the aisle to get things done for the country and our State.

Mr. NOLAN. Thank you, Representative PAULSEN, and thank you for helping to organize this tribute to a truly great native son of Minnesota, who made us all so proud in so many ways that, as you said, Erik, it is hard to enumerate all of them.

When it came to public service, when it came to governance, when it came to bipartisanship, when it came to doodling, when it came to baseball—I mean, the list just goes on and on. He truly made us proud in so many ways.

I too want to recognize other friends of the Frenzel family who are here. As you said, Bill and Ruthy were inseparable. They were clearly a team, and that can be so valuable and so important to the success of a legislator, a great public servant, and Bill was so proud of his family and the girls, Debbie and Pam and Mitty. He talked about them often.

I want to thank the family for being there for Bill and for helping to give him the strength to carry on and do all the great things that he did.

As Erik mentioned, we served together in the State House of Representatives. Bill had been there before me. I followed him to the Congress. Again, obviously, he had been there before me, but he was always such a good friend, offering all kinds of guidance and help negotiating the ways of the State House and the State and the ways of the U.S. House and the ways of the government here.

He was just a wonderfully good friend and a good mentor. I shall always be forever grateful for his mentoring and his guidance, and that was something he did for anyone who had the good judgment to take advantage of it because he was always open. He was always available. He was always there for you, and he was always so incredibly well-prepared.

The thing I liked most about Bill was that he was so respectful of everyone else and their ideas, and you knew if you had an idea—whether it was a good one or a bad one—you were going to get a hearing with Bill Frenzel, and if it was a bad idea, of course, he would be the first to tell you and tell you why.

Quite frankly, more often than not, he was right, and that was just such an important lesson that he gave to all of us and inspired us all. When it came to things like—Erik mentioned the budget. Most Members will maybe read the summary. Bill Frenzel, he read that thing in its entirety.

He knew where every nickel and every dime was going, and he understood the consequences of it. When it came to trade policy, the same thing. He knew of all of its implications. He understood international trade.

In fact, in many ways, he was an inspiration to me outside of politics as well, in no small measure to the benefits that he articulated to trade because when I left this Congress—what, some 34 years ago—I went into export trading because I had heard Bill Frenzel talk about the incredible opportunity that we had with our technology, our ability to produce food, our ability to produce good consumer goods, our ability to produce things that improve the lives of people all over the world and why not get out there and aggressively export those goods and those services, which is what I ended up doing for 32 years before I had the weak moment and came back to this institution—no, I am just kidding. I am delighted and thrilled to be back here.

For Bill Frenzel, I feel so much better prepared than I was, quite frankly, when I served years ago, thanks in no small part to Bill Frenzel.

When it came to the rules of the House, Bill understood the importance of the integrity of this institution better than anyone, and I suspect Bill would be on the floor here today, from time to time, calling for the reestablishment of regular order because Bill was never afraid of anyone else's ideas. In fact, he welcomed them.

Bill and I and others, we served in a time when, if anyone had a good idea, they could offer it to the rest of the Chamber in the form of an amendment, and we could debate it, and we could argue it, and we did it in committee, in full committee. We did it in conference committee.

Bill Frenzel understood that that was the foundation of bipartisanship, that was the foundation of a Congress that was effectively governing and getting things done, and that was perhaps his greatest contribution to all of us because only through that process do we get to know one another and build respect for one another and learn where those areas for common agreement and fixing things and getting things done comes from, and we have Bill Frenzel to thank for that.

I would be remiss if I didn't talk about his doodling. You know, it was amazing. You would be in a committee or you would be in a hearing, and Bill would be busy doodling away. You would think he wasn't paying any attention at all.

Suddenly, he would rise, and he would have a question, and it was like the best question that anybody asked. He obviously had a two-track brain. One hand was doodling, but, boy, he never missed a thing. He never missed a thing, and that was Bill Frenzel.

Speaking of those doodles—and, boy, they are treasured. To have a Bill Frenzel doodle that has been autographed, I mean, in this town, that is like having a Picasso. These were great doodles, as you have seen, the intricacy and the geometry and the creativity of them. It is just amazing, and how he could do that was amazing as well.

Of course, he was a great Minnesota sports fan, the Vikings, the Twins, the North Stars, you name it. He was one of the stars on the Republican baseball team. He always showed up in those games with his Minnesota Twins jersey on. They used to win a lot of games back in the day.

Then Marty Sabo came along and started managing the Democrats, and things turned on them, but Bill was a great ballplayer. He loved Minnesota. He loved Minnesota sports, and he was just a wonderfully good friend.

As I said in the beginning, whether it was governing, whether it was baseball, whether it was doodling, whether it was family, whether it was bipartisanship, advising Presidents, welcoming new Members, advising and helping others, there was just no greater mentor, no greater public servant that Minnesota ever had in the wonderful Bill Frenzel.

His life will continue to be an inspiration for all of us going forward. Truly, our State, our Nation is a better place for Bill Frenzel.

□ 1800

His inspiration will enable all of us to continue that great tradition forward and continue to make this great Nation of ours a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my fellow Members for the opportunity to stand here and pay homage to a great Minnesotan and a great public servant for our State and our Nation.

Mr. PAULSEN. Well, I thank the gentleman for sharing his perspective, his stories, and some fond memories. I appreciate that very much, and I know the family does as well.

Next I will yield to the gentleman from Maryland, STENY HOYER, the minority whip who served for a decade, Mr. Speaker, with Bill Frenzel until Bill retired in 1991. And that relationship continued after Bill's retirement as both had a passion for working on the Federal budget and bridging the gap between Republicans and Democrats when it comes to our country's spending and tax policies.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman HOYER I think often pointed out Bill's willingness to put all things on the table when it comes to the budget to find common ground with his counterparts on the other side of the aisle. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Congressman PAULSEN, who represents the district that Bill Frenzel represented.

I came here, Mr. Speaker, in 1981. Bill Frenzel was a Member of Congress at that point in time, and as Congressman PAULSEN pointed out, we served together for the following 10 years. But as he also pointed out, we continued to work thereafter because of joint interests that we had.

I think Congressman NOLAN caught the essence of Bill Frenzel very well, and I would associate myself with his remarks. But I would also add that the American people want us to work together. What I have said since the election is, look, all 435 of us share two things in common: one, we are all Americans; two, our people all sent us here to make America better. Those two things we share in common. And we share the expectations of the American people that we will do that which we can agree on together and not allow that on which we do not agree to undermine our ability to work on that on which we do agree. Bill Frenzel got that message. Bill Frenzel lived that kind of life. Bill Frenzel was that kind of Member of Congress.

Bill Frenzel could be pretty sharp. I don't mean bright, I mean sharp-tongued, if he thought if you were you were going off, as Congressman NOLAN said, in the wrong direction. I am happy to say that I was never the object of that, but Bill Frenzel wanted you to be candid, be straightforward, be intellectually honest and not play games. He was prepared and, in fact, did the same.

Bill Frenzel in his private life working with Brookings continued his public life's commitment to rational, responsible government. As Congressman PAULSEN pointed out, I am a very big advocate of fixing our debt, fixing it in many ways through the kind of policies that Bill Frenzel recommended, policies which say to both sides, look, we both have interests; we have got to accommodate those interests, but we have got to accommodate a bottom line. Be real, in other words.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Frenzel was a Republican, I am a Democrat, but we were first Americans. I felt it a great honor to learn from Bill Frenzel, to respect his intellect and his insights, and to respect the quality of his service and his willingness to work with others to do what the American people expect all of us to do: make their country better.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with Mr. PAULSEN to honor an American who served his country well, an American of whom we can all be proud, of which his family clearly is proud, and rightfully so. But his colleagues were proud of him on both sides of the aisle.

I want to say to his wife, Ruth, we send our sympathies, but we share with you that pride in Bill Frenzel's contribution to his country, to this institution, and to each of us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a friend and former member of the House who passed away on Monday.

Bill Frenzel served the people of Minnesota's Third District for twenty years.

Bill was a Republican.

I am a Democrat.

That difference did not stand in the way of the respect I had for him or our friendship as colleagues in this House.

Though we did not agree on every issue, Bill and I found common ground on our shared concern for fiscal sustainability and the necessity of compromise to achieve bipartisan progress.

As a Korean War veteran, a businessman, and a legislator, Bill exemplified the highest American values of service to community and country.

In the years following his retirement from the House, where he had served as ranking member on the Budget Committee, he continued his service by remaining a powerful voice for bipartisan budget solutions and a more sustainable fiscal future at the Brookings Institution.

He also served as a co-chair of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

We need more people in Washington like Bill who believe strongly in the importance of bipartisan compromise when it comes to our budget and making the tough choices necessary to afford the investments we need to make in a more competitive economic future and greater opportunities for our people.

I join in offering condolences to his wife Ruth and their three daughters—Deborah, Pamela, and Melissa—their grandchildren, and the entire extended Frenzel family.

May Bill's memory inspire greater bipartisan cooperation in this House in the months and years ahead.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for offering his perspective, as well, in those unique stories and reflections from a bipartisan basis on a truly great American, as Mr. HOYER had mentioned.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas, KEVIN BRADY, my colleague and a good friend who is a very distinguished member of the House Ways and Means Committee. He is also the former chairman and a member of the Subcommittee on Trade. Congressman BRADY is another Member of Congress that benefited greatly from the wealth of wisdom that Bill Frenzel imparted on important

issues like trade and the Federal budget. I know I can speak for many members of the Ways and Means Committee when I say that the work that Bill did at The Brookings Institution, as well as the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, has been beneficial to all of us.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Congressman PAULSEN, thank you for allowing me to join you tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor our late colleague and friend, Bill Frenzel, who faithfully and with great distinction served his constituents in Minnesota for 20 years and, I would say, served his country for a lifetime.

As you can tell from my accent, I am not from Minnesota. I am from Texas. I had a chance to meet Bill when I started on the Ways and Means Committee where I now serve with Mr. PAULSEN, who is one of our, frankly, most respected members, and his predecessor, Jim Ramstad, as well, all following in the Bill Frenzel mold.

When I started on Ways and Means, I just came quickly to appreciate his willingness to share his vast wealth of knowledge on trade issues, big and small. Even though he was no longer an elected official, I was always struck by Bill's just endless willingness to give of himself, of finding ways to advance the cause of free trade and economic freedom throughout the world.

I think it is important to note that historically in Congress, trade has always been a bipartisan issue, Republicans and Democrats working together; and throughout his career, Bill's constructive work across the aisle exemplified the best of this ideal. Everyone knew he was open to new ideas, was a straight shooter, respected others, and worked hard to get people to come and arrive at a consensus.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, Bill was elected to do a job, and he just wanted to get things done. And, boy, did he get things done in the trade world. From working on GATT, the Uruguay Round, normal trading relations with China, NAFTA, and helping set the foundation for the World Trade Organization, Bill was at the center of the trade world as a respected Member of Congress and as a thought leader on international trade when he retired from public life.

The truth is Bill Frenzel believed in economic freedom. He believed in our right to buy, sell, and compete around the world with as little government interference as possible. He believed families should have choices, but no government anywhere should decide what is on that grocery shelf and what price you paid for it. That was your choice. That was your economic freedom.

He knew that while America was free, we would see so many ''America need not apply'' signs around the world; and he knew if we tore them down and gave our American businesses and workers—our Minnesota businesses and workers—a chance to compete, in fact, we would not just grow customers around the world, we would grow jobs here at home. So his leadership on trade, his fingerprints on all things trade can be found not only here in the United States but in foreign capitals around the world where his counsel was sought by many and he was respected by all.

Mr. Speaker, Bill's contributions to our Nation and to this body will always be remembered, and he leaves a towering trade legacy on which we can all build economic prosperity for generations to come. I hope his family understands how special he is that so many of us who you may not have known before, we all consider ourselves Bill's fans and friends.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman. As he mentioned, the members of the Ways and Means Committee absolutely do look at Bill Frenzel as an important role model and inspiration as we look to tackle continued problems and opportunities down the road.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), another Member, like Bill, who is committed to serving the people of Minnesota in the Fifth Congressional District, his constituents.

Bill Frenzel, as was mentioned, was always someone that was willing to work across the aisle to get things done and accomplished here in Washington. I think all of us in the Minnesota delegation are thankful for the example set by Bill for working together, and we see that example still today. I know I have worked with Congressman ELLISON on similar issues for our constituents back home, and I think that we can thank Bill Frenzel for setting that spirit of cooperation that preceded us both.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Congressman PAULSEN, I appreciate your holding down this Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely true that all of us owe a debt of gratitude to people who walked before us even if we never had the pleasure of knowing them and meeting them.

I am one who believes I owe Bill Frenzel even though I never had the opportunity to get to know him. But it doesn't matter, because Bill Frenzel served the people of the State of Minnesota. He got up every day, and he did his best by them. He has a reputation for reading the bills, understanding the issues, and arguing with passion for values that he held in the best interests of the people whom he represented. For that, I always have to take my hat off to a man such as Bill Frenzel.

Bill Frenzel made a good reputation for Members of Congress who would come to Minnesota before I ever got here. Before I ever got here, people like Bill Frenzel made it so that our colleagues would greet us and expect us to be thoughtful and hardworking like he was, because he laid down that path before we ever got here. So I have had the pleasure of reading about Bill Frenzel since he left us for his reward, and I knew well of him before that.

But I will simply say that there are many people in this world whom we owe a great debt of gratitude to, who paved the way and carved a path for us, whom we never had a chance to thank personally. As a man who believes in reality beyond this one, I just hope that Bill Frenzel knows that I am grateful to him, and I thank him for his great service while here.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman because those words he mentioned about being hardworking and thoughtful certainly reflect Bill Frenzel's spirit which we need to continue to embody on this House floor.

Mr. Speaker, next I will yield to the Congresswoman from Minnesota, MICHELE BACHMANN, my colleague and good friend. She is the Representative from Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District and somebody who, like me, has served after Bill Frenzel's congressional career came to a conclusion but has benefited also, I think, from Bill's service. As we know, she will also be leaving our delegation and retiring from Congress, and we are thankful for her service to Minnesota. I know that she will look to the example that was also set by Bill Frenzel and stay very active and involved in public policy issues that face our country even after her House tenure comes to an end soon.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to say thank you to my wonderful colleague, ERIK PAULSEN, who has exemplified the spirit of Bill Frenzel in the Third Congressional District seat; and it really is because our former colleague, Bill Frenzel, set a standard.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to think in Minnesota that we are a trendsetter, and we have often called ourselves the Brainpower State. Well, could the Brainpower State have ever been better exemplified than by a man like Bill Frenzel? He really was a thinking man's person. He also was an individual who was completely willing to open himself to new ideas from other Members. I think it is very evident from the Members that we heard from this evening on both sides of the aisle that this was a complete, unfettered outpouring of not just admiration, but love—love and appreciation for what this man did.

As Representative PAULSEN had just said, I will, too, soon be leaving this House floor. This will be one of the last speeches that I ever give from this privileged well. There is no greater bastion of a few square yards of freedom than this area. We are allowed to do this. I am allowed to speak here tonight because I was privileged to be given an election certificate just like Bill Frenzel. He earned the trust, he earned the admiration, and Bill earned the respect of the people in the Third District. One thing I can tell you, Bill

Frenzel never disappointed. He kept faith with those who gave him that election certificate.

Mr. Speaker, I know when I first ran for Congress, it was in 2006. I began the journey a little bit before then. And as I was in Minnesota, usually all of us made our way over to the Third Congressional District, because in the Third Congressional District resided a lot of the people who paid for the campaigns in the State of Minnesota. And everyone knew Bill Frenzel.

So I would meet and have lunch, breakfast, and dinner, and lunch, breakfast, and dinner, and coffees and coffees with people in the Third Congressional District. When it came to finding those who wanted to get behind efforts in Minnesota in running for campaigns on either side of the aisle, it was usually out of the Third Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I want the family, who this evening—for those who are watching across the Nation on C–SPAN, it is important to know that Bill was so highly loved. His family is here this evening. They are joined here in the gallery, and they are able to hear what every family needs to hear.

□ 1815

Yes, there is sorrow at the passing of a loved one, but there is also great joy. Joy that is made in reliving memories, memories of those we admired, those we served with, those that we loved. It is good to remember them forever. It helps to deepen in our memory book the importance of what this life meant; Bill's meant something. Bill contributed, Bill was a positive force for good, not just for the Third District, not just for Minnesota, but for the Nation. It was his character, first of all. That is what I want the family to know.

When I sat down in coffee after coffee, breakfast after breakfast, inevitably, Bill's name came up. I am sure that ERIK PAULSEN would agree. Bill's name came up. Why? Because people would say to me, ''MICHELLE, you know Bill Frenzel, don't you? Bill is a friend of mine.'' I heard that over and over and over: ''Bill is a friend of mine.'' He was a respected colleague, yes; a thinker, yes. But he was people's friend.

So people would always speak with Bill in the terms of raising the bar and setting a standard.

I hope that I was able live up to that standard of a Bill Frenzel for my brief 8 years in Congress. I give Bill a lot of credit. He served for 8 years in the Minnesota House of Representatives. He served for 20 here in the United States Congress. Think of that: 28 years of public service. That is amazing. I was able to put in 8 here. Think of 20 years here, pouring out his life on behalf of this Nation. It really is an accomplishment.

To think that during all of those years it wasn't that Bill just had 1 good year or 2 good years, Bill had 20 great, fabulous years that not only can the family be proud of but that our Nation, and, as a fellow Minnesotan and successor colleague, I am proud of.

I also just briefly want to mention one thing that Bill also did for his Nation, and that is he was willing to lay down his life when he served our country in the Navy. He was a veteran. I am thankful for what he did.

The Holy Scriptures say: ''Greater love hath no man than this, but that he would lay down his life for his friend.''

Bill Frenzel willingly put himself on the line so that he could do that. Thank goodness, his life wasn't required and he came back to serve in this distinguished body. As a distinguished man, he singularly served this body.

And so with great humility I want to say again to Ruthy, to the three girls, to the grandchildren: Be so proud of the legendary Bill Frenzel. His name will not be forgotten in this institution. His work won't be forgotten in this institution.

As one who is about to depart, I can tell you, you think about that: What I did here, did it matter? The speeches I gave, the work I did, the late nights, the early mornings, the weekends—the sacrifices that he made and the sacrifices that you as a family made.

Bill would be the first one to say, I couldn't have done this without Ruthy, I wouldn't have done this without the girls, I couldn't have done it without those who loved me. He would be the one to say that.

So I thank the family, Mr. Speaker, who are in the gallery, for what you did to support this legendary man because he made a distinct contribution, and he couldn't have done it without you making that sacrifice.

So I am very grateful for what they did. I thank God our country is a better place because of Bill Frenzel.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank my colleague. As you mentioned, he was a veteran, a public servant, a thinker, opening himself to new ideas and certainly offering ideas himself.

There is sadness, but, as you mentioned, great joy as we reflect on the opportunities to be a role model to help others. So I thank the gentlelady for her comments tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to note that several Members were unable to attend and be with us on the floor tonight, but they will be submitting statements for the RECORD. These Members include Congressman PAUL RYAN from Wisconsin. He is the next chairman to the Committee on Ways and Means. Although their time in Congress did not overlap, I know that Congressman RYAN valued his friendship with Bill Frenzel and often sought his counsel on trade and other matters while he was still learning his ropes on the Committee on Ways and Means. In fact, when we had our coffees together, he would often reflect and ask questions about Congressman RYAN and his future.

Congressman DAVE CAMP, the current chair of the Committee on Ways and Means, as well may offer some comments. We had a conversation earlier today and also reflected on the contributions that our former colleague Bill Frenzel had made to the institution at the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, we lost a true leader, a true role model who represented the absolute and very best in public service. Bill Frenzel was a statesman who continues to be an inspiration in many ways to the folks in this body and on this House floor and all of those who continue to be focused on issues like tax reform, welfare reform, budget reform, and advancing a trade agenda and economic freedom throughout the world.

And so tonight, as we close, we close noting that we are honoring an American that contributed greatly to giving the greatest good to the greatest number of people. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this past week, we lost one of our former colleagues, Bill Frenzel. Bill served in the House for 20 years, during which he gained a vast amount of knowledge and an even greater amount of respect. He was a leading voice for fiscal responsibility, serving as the ranking member of the House Budget Committee. He also served on the House Ways and Means Committee, specifically the Subcommittee on Trade. He took on the work with relish, serving as a congressional representative to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in Geneva for 15 years. He was so knowledgeable on the topic that he was indispensable—so much so that after he left Congress, three successive presidents sought his counsel.

Bill's hard work won him respect in the House and around the world. After he retired from the House, he kept active on fiscal issues, serving as co-chair of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. In 2000, the emperor of Japan awarded him the Order of the Rising Sun, Gold and Silver Star. And just this year, Bill received the Mexican Order of the Aztec Eagle. I think other countries saw in Bill the same thing we did—a man who loved his country and wanted it to be a force for good in the world. He understood that trade wasn't a form of competition so much as a form of collaboration—of countries working together to build a better life. He understood that the free world was stronger when we banded together, and he wanted to strengthen those bonds.

We'll remember his know-how. We'll remember his wit. (He once called gridlock the best thing since indoor plumbing.) But most of all, we'll remember his character. He served his country in both war and peace. He spent his life in public service. He was a Midwesterner, a man of the House, a voice for fiscal responsibility—an American through and through.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of Minnesota's true dedicated public servants: former Congressman Bill Frenzel.

For twenty years, Bill represented the Third District of Minnesota in the U.S. House of Representatives with distinction. During his time in this chamber, he established himself as an expert in fiscal responsibility and trade

issues setting himself apart from his colleagues as a leader on the Budget and Ways and Means Committees.

His service to our country did not end after his time in the House. He was instrumental in the passage of NAFTA as a special adviser to President Clinton and worked with President George W. Bush on the Social Security Commission and Advisory Committee.

As we honor his career and service, it is easy to see that Bill truly worked to represent all he served by crossing the aisle, time and again, to produce solutions for Minnesotans and all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in sending prayers to Bill's wife, Ruthy; his daughters Debby, Pam, and Mitty; and the entire Frenzel family.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Bill Frenzel, U.S. Representative of the 3rd District of Minnesota from the 92nd through the 101st Congress, who sadly passed away on Monday, November 17th at the age of 86. Bill retired from Congress right as I was elected to office to serve Minnesota, but I was lucky enough to have gotten to know him during my tenure in the Minnesota Senate and later serving as the Representative from the 7th District on Minnesota. He left a great legacy and was an honorable public servant.

Born in St. Paul in 1928, Bill attended Dartmouth College where he received both his Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Following graduation, Bill served as a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve during the Korean War from 1951 to 1954. Prior to his election to the U.S. Congress, Bill served for 8 years in the Minnesota House of Representatives, amongst other boards and executive committees. Bill had a successful career representing Minnesotans during his tenure in Congress. Rising to Ranking Member on the House Budget Committee, and a long tenure on the House Ways and Means Committee, he became known around Washington as an expert in budget and fiscal policy. He served as a Congressional Representative to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) for 15 years. After serving 10 terms, Bill decided to retire, telling the Star Tribune, "You ought to go out when you're hitting .300, rather than deteriorating."

Following his retirement from Congress, Bill did not slow down. He served as Chairman of the Ripon Society until 2004, and has been a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution since his retirement, serving as a director of the Brookings Governmental Affairs Institute. In 1993, President Bill Clinton appointed Bill as a special adviser to help work with the Republican party to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement. Subsequently, President George W. Bush appointed Bill to the Social Security Commission, and to the Advisory Committee on Trade Policy and Negotiations. Up until his death, Bill continued to chair numerous boards and commissions, furthering his legacy as a devoted public servant and policy maker.

Not only a brilliant mind, Bill had a knack for lighting up a room around him. He had an engrained sense of integrity that he embodied throughout his life and career. Known around Washington for his "doodles," Bill was able to maintain a sense of lightness and humor, while navigating difficult policy negotiations. Bill Frenzel leaves behind a monumental legacy in Washington and Minnesota, but his crowning achievement was that of his family: his wife Ruthy and his three daughters, Debby, Pam and Mitty, and two grandchildren. My prayers go out to them during this time of grief and loss.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Bill's life and legacy, as he was truly a giant in Washington and the U.S. Congress. It is in that sense that I invite my colleagues to join me in remembering his service, and that we may all serve to honor his work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that the rules do not permit references to those in the gallery.

IRAN AND DEVELOPMENTS FOLLOWING THE JOINT PLAN OF ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight because I know that in a short period of time it appears that the President of the United States will issue an executive order related to immigration that could very well be outside the constitutional limits of his authority.

And I believe that is going to create a great reaction in this country, Mr. Speaker. As important as it may be, it is also going to coincide with the date of November 24, when the interim agreement that this President signed with the nation of Iran will essentially expire. Then it will either be renewed or some type of agreement will be reached—or the effort will be abandoned.

I am deeply concerned that the importance of this event could be obscured by the media frenzy that potentially will follow this President's executive order on immigration.

So I come to the floor tonight to speak to that issue, Mr. Speaker, because the pursuit of nuclear weapons by the nation of Iran is an issue of the most profound significance to the national security of this country and to the peace and security of the entire world.

It seems very important to me that we do not let that issue be obscured by others, as important as they may be.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in this body are all too familiar with the endless parade of terror groups that have seemingly come onto the world stage in recent years.

But if we are startled by the rapid rise of ISIS and its subsequent march across the Middle East, during which it has beheaded, raped, crucified, and sold into sex slavery scores of men, women, and children alike; if we are concerned about the crushing video of the innocent woman whose hands and feet were tied to two cars that subsequently drove in opposite directions and ripped her in half, or the Christians who were beheaded and whose decapitated heads were used as soccer balls;

If we are outraged at the activities of Boko Haram and its brutal displays of violence against any group that doesn't stand alongside its inhuman ideology, including its raids and its bombings across Nigeria, its systematic abduction of young schoolgirls, as young as 12, who are said to be raped every day in their months of captivity;

If we are shocked at the activities of al Shabaab, whose attacks have killed hundreds upon hundreds of civilians, including teenage girls lined up before firing squads as well as the numerous suicide bombings and other such horrific methods;

If we recoil at the thought of groups such as the Taliban, whose atrocious violations of basic human rights, roadside bombings, and suicide attacks marked so much of the United States' early struggle in Afghanistan;

If we recall, as so many of us do, precisely where we were when we learned of al Qaeda's attack on September 11 that claimed thousands of innocent American lives, just one of those senseless attacks by that group;

Mr. Speaker, if we are stunned and outraged at this rise of militant Islam in the world, then, sir, how will we feel if we allow President Barack Obama to stand idly by and watch the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, this deranged Islamist regime in Iran, lay hold upon nuclear weapons?

Mr. Speaker, shortly before the midterm elections earlier this month, President Obama penned a so-called letter of collaboration to Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

This is the same Ayatollah Ali Khamenei who just a couple of days ago released his detailed, nine-step plan on how to wipe Israel off of the map.

Mr. Obama's incredibly naive attempt at collaboration is with a man whose sermons have included such edifying lines as "The Zionist cancer is gnawing into the lives of Islamic nations."

This is just one of the recent very telling glimpses at just how out of touch with reality this President truly is as Iran continues its sprint toward a nuclear weapons capability.

The Obama State Department was recently confronted by the somehow shocking revelation that Iran was now defying the interim agreement by feeding uranium into the IR5, the most technologically advanced centrifuge currently available in the world.

Inexplicably, Mr. Speaker, the administration responded with the sort of naivete that has become so characteristic of Obama foreign policy, stating: "We raised that issue with Iran as soon as the International Atomic Energy Agency reported it. The Iranians have confirmed that they will not continue that activity as cited in the IAEA report, so it's been resolved."

To rephrase that, upon learning that the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism had defied an agreement on

which the safety of the free world ostensibly rests and that indeed Iran was still conducting activities that could help it obtain nuclear weapons with which to carry out its threats to destroy the United States, the Obama Administration, so sophisticated is their ''understanding'' of what is presumably a tragically misunderstood Iranian regime, was assured by a pinky promise that the Iranians won't do it again.

Mr. Speaker, such naivete would be heartwarming on an elementary school playground, but on the world stage, when this President seems poised to personally usher in an age of nuclear terrorism, it becomes a very grave thing indeed.

Mr. Speaker, this administration's attempted punitive measures have been so halfhearted and demonstrably ineffective that they have at times actually benefited the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism.

For instance, last week, the organization United Against Nuclear Iran released its updated analysis of the joint plan of action. That is the plan agreed upon by this administration and the Iranian regime. The Iranian government reported a 4.6 percent increase in their gross domestic product for the first quarter of the current Iranian calendar year compared to that same period last year.

According to the Central Bank of Iran, this is the first time the Iranian economy has experienced positive growth in more than 2 years.

□ 1830

Meanwhile, Iran's inflation is down 24 percent since July 2013, from an estimated 45 percent to 21.1 percent at the end of September. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the entire Iranian Stock Exchange has seen a 57 percent increase since roughly this time last year.

Mr. Speaker, how bitterly ironic that this President has done more to benefit the Tehran Stock Exchange than he has done to benefit the New York Stock Exchange.

These statistics directly controvert assertions made by administration officials that, despite the sanctions relief provided under the joint plan of action, Iran would still find itself even deeper in the economic hole. That is what they told us, Mr. Speaker.

Let us not forget that Iran's economic bounce, which is occurring in the midst of what are supposedly sanctions designed to punish its economy, follows an agreement, the meaning of which neither party can even agree upon.

The Iranian regime has publicly stated its belief that the agreement—which specifically references an ''inalienable right'' to use nuclear energy—guarantees Iran's right to continue enriching uranium. That is contrary to all of the U.N. Council resolutions saying that they had to dismantle such capability. The White House, meanwhile, has stated that it doesn't understand the agreement to mean that.

From Iran's perspective, Mr. Speaker, they have signed on to an agreement that gives them a guaranteed right to ongoing uranium enrichment, giving them a breakout capability that—for a nuclear weapons capability not within years but rather within months, and then, as a reward for signing that agreement, which gives them nearly everything they have ever wanted, the Obama administration has also agreed to lift sanctions, providing a further boon to the Iranian economy.

Mr. Speaker, what part of this approach is supposed to convince the jihadist Iranian leadership that they should reconsider their current course? Is it our concession to their nuclear rights? Is it our help in facilitating an economic windfall for them?

Just last week, a Wall Street Journal op-ed revealed that an upcoming London forum will bring together Iranian firms with a range of international counterparts—ranging from law offices, telecom operations, business consultancies, and even art auction houses—to explore how capital might be moved into Iran as the country transitions into a ''post-sanctions'' environment.

This is hardly the face of an Iran that fears the effect Mr. Obama's sanctions will have on what looks to be a very lucrative future.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could see some method to this madness if, for example, the President had managed to secure other concessions from the Iranian Government, a commitment perhaps to address its atrocious human rights record; instead, the election of Hassan Rouhani—again, a man heralded by many on the left as a harbinger of a more reasonable era in Iran—what has transpired has been described by some as an ''execution binge,'' with nearly two executions occurring every day, often performed as a public spectacle as a punishment for such times as refusing to convert to Islam.

In fact, since Rouhani's election last year, over 900 such executions have taken place. Meanwhile, Mr. Rouhani's promise to ease Internet restrictions remains unfulfilled. An American pastor and a citizen of the United States of America remains in prison in Iran, where he has been tortured for his Christian faith.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how one may try to give this President the benefit of the doubt, there is simply no way to make the Obama approach make any reasonable sense.

If the goal has been to keep Iran from being able to obtain a nuclear weapon, then Mr. Obama has failed. If the goal has been to punish the Iranian economy for the regime's radical pursuit of nuclear weapons, then Mr. Obama has failed.

If the goal has been to have an impact on Iran's human rights record, then Mr. Obama has failed. If the goal was to reduce the chances of the world's children stepping into the shadow of nuclear terrorism, then Mr. Obama has failed.

This President's only conceivable victory lies in his hope that, like a would-be modern Richard Nixon opening the doors to China, history will somehow consider Mr. Obama a hero for blazing new trails into Iran and for his mindless refusal to take the Iranian regime at its word, no matter how many times they have expressed that their real goal is the destruction of America and Israel.

Mr. Speaker, very simply, the Obama foreign policy is a gutless political correctness on the global stage. It is the cynical pursuit of legacy without regard for the cause of human freedom. It is the belief that tepid appeals to some hollow concept of tolerance are all that are necessary to tame the most savage of beasts.

The entire Obama legacy, Mr. Speaker, rests on the desperate hope that history will hand out an award for blind trust in the promises of jihadists.

Mr. Speaker, former Ambassador to the United Nations John Bolton once said:

> Diplomacy is not an end in itself if it does not advance U.S. interests.

This President's take on that principle seems to be:

> U.S. interests be damned, so long as everyone considers me diplomatic.

It is for all of the above reasons that I am pleased to join my colleague in the Senate, Senator TED CRUZ, in introducing H.R. 5709, the Sanction Iran, Safeguard America Act of 2014.

The bill would eliminate many of Mr. Obama's waiver authorities over sanctions and would oppose severe sanctions on Iran once again. Included in the legislation are sanctions on Iranian crude oil, oil transportation, financial institutions, petroleum—including sanctions on the purchase, acquisition, sale, transport, and marketing of petroleum products—and the Iranian automotive sector, among others.

The bill also includes a prohibition on funding for any additional negotiations with Iran until a joint resolution of approval by Congress is passed, certifying that all Iranian-held American prisoners of conscience are released; the IAEA has determined Iran has dismantled its nuclear program, ceased enrichment activities, and released all stockpiles of enriched uranium; the Central Bank of Iran is no longer considered a primary money laundering concern under the PATRIOT Act; and Iran has renounced their state sponsorship of terrorism designation by admitting to participation in terrorist acts.

Mr. Speaker, I would adjure this body that we must legislatively fill, insofar as it is possible, this vacuum of leadership left by a President who is asleep at the wheel while radical terrorists move toward placing their fingers on the nuclear trigger under his paralyzed stare.

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

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we got word earlier this afternoon that President Obama intends to issue an oral decree followed by a written decree—as any good monarch would—indicating that he has decided to change the law regarding immigration.

An article here from The Washington Post has a quote from Secretary Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of Homeland Security, which he says:

> ''Legislative action is always preferable,'' Johnson said, ''but we have waited for Congress to act, and the Congress has not acted. The President has waited.''

That is what leaders in places like Venezuela—many places historically where that statement has been made, we have waited for parliament or the legislature or Congress to change the law. They didn't do as we dictated to Congress they had to do, and therefore, we have decided to change the law.

This President is creating a constitutional crisis, and it happens when a President is allowed to continue pushing the envelope and pushing the envelope and exceeding the envelope, and you have an incorrigible opinion written—as the majority for the Supreme Court did on ObamaCare—that is the height of hypocrisy.

How the Supreme Court majority could say, on page 14 and 15, that the mandated penalty in ObamaCare was not a tax—the Supreme Court said if it were a tax, of course, under the anti-injunction statute many decades old, we would not have jurisdiction—plaintiffs wouldn't have standing.

But since clearly the penalty is just that—it is a penalty—then it is not a tax because, if it were a tax, we wouldn't have jurisdiction, plaintiffs wouldn't have standing, and we would all be out of luck, and we wouldn't be able to issue an opinion, but since it is not a tax, it is a penalty, then we will go forward and be able to issue an opinion.

Then you get over about 40 pages, and the opinion says, since it is a tax after all—even though 40 pages or so ago it wasn't—now, we found that it is, therefore, it is constitutional.

So we have had all three branches help create a constitutional crisis. The President on one hand, by continuing to overstep the boundaries of the Constitution as he usurps more and more power; the Supreme Court by issuing decisions that are nonsensical; and Congress, if we continue not to use the powers of the purse to stop the lawlessness by this administration.

The Supreme Court has had opportunities to stop it—they have stopped it on many occasions—set a record for numbers of Supreme Court opinions ruling against an administration unanimously, so the President does have that part of his legacy going, but apparently, the legacy continues to be stretched to the bounds of absurdity.

The Washington Post said—this was from today:

> President Obama will announce Thursday that he will use his executive authority to expand temporary protections to millions of undocumented immigrants, according to several individuals who have been briefed on the decision. Obama will travel to Las Vegas on the heels of that announcement to rally support for his initiative on Friday.

It shouldn't be a surprise. While the President slept and four heros—including one ambassador—in Benghazi were killed, he got up and headed for Las Vegas.

□ 1845

Now, he is going to announce this constitutional crisis he is creating by deciding to legislate and then take off for Las Vegas again, gambling with the jobs of Americans as he goes.

Getting back to the article again, it says:

> Congress will receive official details on the move Thursday, according to a senior Democratic Party official.
>
> Even before final confirmation of the President's plans, outside advocates began readying events to promote the administration's immigration policy.
>
> ''We hear there will be a primetime Thursday evening announcement, to preview, and full unveiling in Vegas on Friday,'' immigration advocate Dawn Le wrote in an email to other activists, which was later inadvertently sent to a group of reporters Wednesday morning. ''Can folks begin to work and plan watch parties for Thursday and/or Friday? Unclear whether Thursday night content will be what is 'celebratory,' but Friday will be where we need a lot of energy guaranteed.''

That is, of course, while the President is in Las Vegas, gambling away American jobs.

The article goes on:

> Obama launched his push for immigration reform in January 2013 in Las Vegas, outlining a plan that would allow many of the Nation's 11 million undocumented immigrants to earn citizenship.

Now, it is important to note the article goes on to say:

> Johnson said the administration has concluded it has ''wide latitude'' to take action. ''It can't be that we are not allowed to lift a finger to fix our broken immigration system,'' he said. ''And we will.''

That is what creates the constitutional crisis, Mr. Speaker. Jefferson once recommended that we shouldn't bring up a bill for a vote until it has had a year on file for people to review. That would eliminate all these legislating-by-crises situations, but we have seen crises generated.

We know the former Chief of Staff for the President of the United States once quipped that you never want to let a good emergency go to waste; obviously, there is a feeling that this would be the time to usurp congressional authority.

Now, the sad thing is the crisis is not as bad right now as it has been in the past. Any time the President talked about amnesty or legal status, Border Patrolmen—some on the record, some in articles—have pointed out any time the President—or anybody in Washington, but especially the President—talks about amnesty or legal status, the numbers of people coming in illegally, the number of people dying trying to get in, increases.

The number of people wishing to get lost in the masses from Central America and Mexico coming in from countries where radical Islamic activities abound are coming in, in greater numbers.

Interestingly, the White House has shown it has the ability to foment a crisis unilaterally, and then by fomenting the crisis unilaterally, justify the crisis they created to usurp congressional authority granted to Congress and no one else in the Constitution.

There is an article from my dear friend, Senator TED CRUZ. ''The Constitution designs a system of checks and balances for our Nation, and executive amnesty for illegal immigrants unilaterally decreed by the White House would seriously undermine the rule of law.

''Our Founders repeatedly warned about the dangers of unlimited power within the executive branch. Congress should heed those words as the President threatens to grant amnesty to millions of people who have come to our country illegally.

''To be clear, the dispute over executive amnesty is not between President Obama and Republicans in Congress; it is a dispute between President Obama and the American people. The Democrats suffered historic losses in the midterm elections largely over the prospects of the President's executive amnesty. President Obama was correct: his policies were on the ballot across the Nation in 2014. The elections were a referendum on amnesty, and the voters soundly rejected it. There was no ambiguity.

''Undeterred, President Obama appears to be going forward. It is lawless. It is unconstitutional. He is defiant and angry at the American people. If he acts by executive diktat, President Obama will not be acting as a President, he will be acting as a monarch.

''Thankfully, the Framers of our Constitution, wary of the dangers of monarchy, gave the Congress tools to rein in abuses of power. They believed if the President wants to change the law, he cannot act alone; he must work with Congress.

''He may not get everything he wants, but the Constitution requires compromise between the branches.

''A monarch, however, does not compromise. As Alexander Hamilton explains in Federalist 69, a monarch decrees, dictates, and rules through fiat power, which''—as TED CRUZ points out—''is what President Obama is attempting. When the President embraces the tactics of a monarch, it becomes incumbent on Congress to wield the constitutional power it has to stop it.''

He goes on to make good points.

It is important that someone speak for the tens of millions of American citizens who had a dream, who hoped to have work, who hoped to provide for their families, who hoped to have enough to pay back student loans, who hoped to buy their children bicycles for Christmas, but they are out of work. They lost work.

Oh, I know the books have gotten cooked, and we are told that the unemployment rate is dramatically better, but a big reason that the American voters did not indicate that at the polls is they don't feel it, and the reason they don't feel that the employment numbers are better is because they personally know they are not. They are not better.

In fact, this article is from September 5 from CNS News:

> A record 92,269 million Americans 16 and older did not participate in the labor force in August, as the labor force participation rate matched a 36-year low of 62.8 percent, according to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics.

The labor force participation rate has been as low as 62.8 percent in 6 of the last 12 months, but prior to last October had not fallen that low since 1978, which, hypothetically or parenthetically, was during the august—I say sarcastically for those on the left that don't know sarcasm—days of the American economy during President Carter's glorious years as President.

This article goes on:

> BLS employment statistics are based on the civilian noninstitutional population, which consists of all people 16 or older who are not in the military or an institution such as a prison, mental hospital, or nursing home.
>
> In August, the civilian noninstitutional population was 248,229 million, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Of that 248 million, 155,959 million, or 62.8 percent, participate in the labor force, meaning they either had a job or had actively sought one in the past 4 weeks.
>
> The 92,269 million who did not participate in the labor force are those in the civilian noninstitutional population who did not have a job and did not actively seek one in the last 4 weeks. Because they did not seek a job, then the administration did not count them as unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, as the President intends to announce tomorrow—and party in Las Vegas—going into more detail about how many Americans are going to be displaced from their jobs by people the President is going to provide amnesty to, somebody needs to be speaking up for that union member that would love to pay union dues if he just had a job, or for the single moms that have approached me in tears, saying they got forced into part-time work because of ObamaCare and the change in the law that was entailed in the ObamaCare bill.

There are people hurting across America that are American citizens that once had a dream. Maybe we should label the President's unconstitutional actions as the American citizen dream killer, instead of any type of DREAMer act.

We have seen statistics that indicate that possibly less than 10 percent of people who have come into this country illegally are actually working, so the President provides amnesty for millions of people who are illegally here.

I hope that he will also provide an apology to the Hispanics and people from different places around the world that my office is trying to help achieve visas, achieve citizenship legally, some taking years.

I am sure the President is not going to feel like apologizing. Apparently, the indication is he wants to celebrate the unconstitutional actions he is going to announce in Las Vegas, but somebody with the government needs to apologize to the American people that 92 million-plus Americans are not even looking for a job any more when they are eligible for jobs, they could have jobs, most of them would like to have jobs, but they have given up. They have lost their dreams under this administration.

As the President announces making millions of more people who have come illegally eligible to take American citizens' jobs in the next 2 days, I hope that our Congress on both sides of the aisle will do what is right and say, ''Wait a minute. Secure the border, Mr. President. That is what is exclusively within your control.''

The Supreme Court has said States and local authorities can't secure the border. It is up to the administration, and the mere fact is that this administration has turned their back on protecting Americans from the illegal aliens that have come in and killed Americans, raped Americans. Thank God most of them don't do those things.

□ 1900

But for the millions of people who have been the victims of crimes by people who have come in illegally, those crimes would never have occurred if we had had an administration that secured the border so people who came across with criminal records in their past in the countries they came from would not be allowed in here, and those crimes they committed in America would not have been committed.

Those that have been deported and come back in after they committed crimes here and commit more crimes, as I personally saw as a judge happen in Smith County, Texas, those wouldn't be happening if we had an administration that would properly secure the border.

The Clinton administration didn't do it. The Bush administration didn't do it. And now, this administration has set records for how poorly they have prevented people from coming in illegally, the damage that has been done to American citizens, crushing dreams, taking dreams.

I hope and pray the President will remember his oath, that this precursor that was released today about the damage the President wants to do to American citizens who are trying to find jobs, that he will have second thoughts and not do it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people who spoke very loudly and clearly when they came out to vote will let the President know, in person, through email, through phone calls, that American citizens still need jobs.

Why don't you help the economy get going stronger so that we need more people to come in and have those jobs?

Our oath is to the American people, and when you have nearly a third of the United States, or getting close to half of people eligible to work that have even completely given up on looking for jobs, the economy is not good. Americans are suffering.

Now the President wants to bring in, just provide amnesty to people who will then be able to compete and put American citizens out of work. It really is heartbreaking.

Now, if you stay aboard, say, an Air Force One and you only go to rallies or golf courses where everybody is doing great, wealthy, you only talk to high-tech industry people that are just knocking down billions of dollars, it is easy to start feeling like things are going great. But if you go to Sabine County, Texas; San Augustine, Texas; Shelby County, Texas; Angelina County; Nacogdoches County; Rusk County; Panola County; Harrison County; Gregg County; Smith County; Wood County; Upshur County—those are counties all within my district. And in some of those counties, people are really getting desperate. They don't need to compete with 5 million more people for jobs. They would just like a job themselves.

If the Obama administration will take the foot off of the throat of this economy, will help us roll back and repeal ObamaCare.

I got notice again of another hospital in my district this week, there in Gilmer where my nephew was born. Gilmer hospital, where my nephew was born, is now going to be closed. They are not going to be able to handle the continued cuts that ObamaCare has created. There are numerous reasons, but that is a death knell.

Hospitals are closing. People are hurting. So for the 92, between 92 and 93 million people that have given up hope, how sad, because the Obama administration will not secure our borders.

I want immigrants coming in. I love the fact that we allow more legal immigrants in than anybody. I love that. That is wonderful. But when you don't have secure borders and millions come in, millions upon millions, then you are moving toward a day when nobody is going to want to come in because you didn't have a logical immigration process. They overwhelmed the system. They broke the system, and now that shining light on a hill has gone out.

We are moving in that direction: the military becoming too small to adequately protect us, people around the

world in hostile environments deciding that America can be pushed around, radical Islamists deciding this is the time to move, Iran figuring out that they have an administration that can be duped over and over again until they have the atomic weapons and the ability to carry them, which they have already got. They can do it with ships, enough to take out the Great Satan, which is the United States, according to them, and the Little Satan, Israel.

And this President is going to have a good time out in Las Vegas. Las Vegas can be fun, but not when the President says he is going to sign a law—wouldn't it be ironic if he decided to sign it at Caesars Palace, because the real Caesar's palace used to see that kind of thing on a regular basis, you know, a dictator, or Caesar just signing a law as he saw fit.

But in this case, you would think a Caesar would not sign a law that would provide the ability to displace millions of Americans who have jobs and force them into the eventuality where 92 million Americans are. They have given up hope. They have given up on their dreams.

If you believe the Bible, as I do, it makes clear that the government is here to protect people, to protect against evil, to encourage good conduct. That means following the law. You provide a protected environment in which people can be peacemakers and be meek and loving and kind and turn the other cheek.

But that is not for the government. The government's role is to enforce the law as it is. And may God plant the seeds of wisdom in the right people in this administration so they will quit harming Americans who just want a job.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 885. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the ''Thaddeus Stevens Post Office''.

S. 1093. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 130 Caldwell Drive in Hazlehurst, Mississippi, as the ''First Lieutenant Alvin Chester Cockrell, Jr. Post Office Building''.

S. 1499. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 278 Main Street in Chadron, Nebraska, as the ''Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office''.

S. 1512. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the ''Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office''.

S. 2141. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2539. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research.

S. 2583. An Act to promote the non-exclusive use of electronic labeling devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 20, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7753. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Fresh Unshu Oranges From Japan Into the United States [Docket No.: APHIS–2013–0059] (RIN: 0579–AD85) received October 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7754. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Electronic Import Inspection Application and Certification of Imported Products and Foreign Establishments; Amendments to Facilitate the Public Health Information System (PHIS) and Other Changes to Import Inspection Regulations [Docket No.: FSIS–2009–0022] (RIN: 0583–AD39) received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7755. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the report on the payment of a Foreign Language Skill Proficiency Bonus to members of precommissioning programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7756. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel Brian P. Cummings, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7757. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Gilmary M. Hostage III, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7758. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General David S. Fadok, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7759. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Major General John W. Nicholson, Jr., United States Army, to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7760. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General James F. Amos, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7761. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation: Ocean Transportation by U.S.-Flag Vessels (DFARS Case 2014–D012) (RIN: 0750–AI38) received October 15, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7762. A letter from the Director, Naval Reactors, transmitting executive summaries of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program's latest report on environmental monitoring and radioactive waste disposal, radiation exposure, and occupational safety and health; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7763. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to China Eastern Airlines of Shanghai, China pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7764. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2013 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7765. A letter from the Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress: Preservation of Minority National Banks and Federal Savings Associations; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7766. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program [Docket ID: ED–2014–OPE–0082] (RIN: 1840–AD17) received October 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7767. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Program Integrity: Gainful Employment [Docket ID: ED–2014–OPE–0039] (RIN: 1840–AD15) received November 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7768. A letter from the Director, Division of Regulations, Legislation, and Interpretation, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Establishing a Minimum Wage for Contractors (RIN: 1235–AA10) received November 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7769. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Green Building Certification Systems for Federal Buildings [Docket No.: EE-RM/STD–02–112] (RIN: 1904–AC13) received October 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7770. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled ''Update on the Adoption of Health Information Technology and Related Efforts to Facilitate the Electronic Use and Exchange of Health Information''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7771. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—AAAPD and AAASD; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP–2014–0467; FRL–9917–03] received October 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7772. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio;

Ohio PM2.5 NSR [EPA-R05–OAR–2014–0385; FRL–9917–92–Region 5] received October 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7773. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Arkansas: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06–RCRA–2014–0366; FRL–9918–56–Region 6] received October 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7774. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Identification of Nonattainment Classification and Deadlines for Submission of State Implementation Plan (SIP) Provisions for the 1997 Fine Particle (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS; Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR–2013–0694; FRL–9917–96–Region 2] received October 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7775. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Arkansas [EPA-R06–OAR–2012–0765; FRL–9918–61–Region 6] received October 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Paraquat Dichloride; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP–2013–0729; FRL–9917–15] received October 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7777. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Prallethrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP–2013–0659; FRL–9917–30] received October 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7778. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Kentucky: New Source Review for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R04–OAR–2013–0486; FRL–9918–68–Region 4] received October 28, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Amendments to Gasoline Volatility Standards and Motor Vehicle Refinishing Requirements for Illinois [EPA-R05–OAR–2013–0273; FRL–9914–97–Region 5] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Revision to the Chicago 8–Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan [EPA-R05–OAR–2014–0274; FRL–9917–33–Region 5] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7781. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Lead and 2010 NO2 NAAQS [EPA-R05–OAR–2011–0888; EPA-R05–OAR–2012–0991; FRL–9917–32–Region 5] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7782. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Revisions to PSD and NNSR Programs [EPA-R05–OAR–2014–0242; FRL–9915–94–Region 5] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7783. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pseudomonas fluorescens strain D7; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP–2013–0569; FRL–9916–13] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7784. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09–OAR–2014–0592; FRL–9917–02–Region 9] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7785. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Lake County Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09–OAR–2014–0412; FRL–9912–71–Region 9] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7786. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09–OAR–2014–0615; FRL–9916–95–Region 9] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7787. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances; Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPPT–2012–0727; FRL–9917–25] received October 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7788. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a certification of export to China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7789. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Homeland Defense and Global Security, Department of Defense, transmitting a Report on Proposed Obligations for Cooperative Threat Reduction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7790. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 11–14 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Agreement with the Republic of Singapore; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7791. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7792. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7793. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; (GSAR); Qualifications of Offerors [(Change 59); GSAR Case 2013–G501; Docket No.: 2014–0010; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 3090–AJ46) received October 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7794. A letter from the Archivist, National Archives, transmitting Archives' FY 2014 Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory, as required by the FAIR Act and OMB Circular A–76; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7795. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report entitled ''Statistical Programs of the United States Government: Fiscal Year 2015'', pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3504(e)(2); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7796. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''The D.C. Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board was Substantially in Compliance with the D.C. Official Code for Fiscal Year 2013 but Action is Required for Full Compliance''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7797. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''ANC 8B Financial Operations Were Not Fully Compliant with Law''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7798. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''The Department of Motor Vehicles' Performance Measures Were Effective but Lacked Proper Controls''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7799. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''District of Columbia Agencies' and Contractors' Compliance with Subcontracting Requirements Needs Significant Improvement''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7800. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the strategic plan for fiscal years 2014–2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7801. A letter from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7802. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers employed at Simonds Saw and Steel Co. in Lockport, New York, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7803. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the report ''Tribal Crime Data

Collection Activities, 2014''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7804. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the first quarter of fiscal year 2014 (October 1, 2013—December 31, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7805. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report entitled, ''Debt Collection Recovery Activities of the Department of Justice for Civil Debts Referred to the Department for Collection Annual Report for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7806. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) report, 2015–2019, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); Public Law 97–248, section 504(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7807. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''Department of Energy FY 2013 Methane Hydrate Program''; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

7808. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''The Department of Labor's 2013 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7809. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of the Adelaida District, Creston District, El Pomar District, Paso Robles Estrella District, Paso Robles Geneseo District, Paso Robles Highlands District, Paso Robles Willow Creek District, San Juan Creek District, San Miguel District, Santa Margarita Ranch, and Templeton Gap District Viticultural Areas [Docket No.: TTB–2013–0009; T.D. TTB–125; Ref: Notice No. 140] (RIN: 1513–AB68) received October 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7810. A letter from the Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter regarding a new trade agreement in the World Trade Organization aimed at eliminating tariffs on a wide range of environmental goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7811. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Applicable Federal Rates—November 2014 (Rev. Rul. 2014–28) received October 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7812. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the November 2014 Annual Report of Payment Recapture Audits in Compliance with Section 2(h)(2)(D)(ii) of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7813. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the annual report on the Administration's processing of continuing disability reviews for FY 2012; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7814. A letter from the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report entitled ''DHS Privacy Office 2014 Annual Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

7815. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a response to the Speaker's letter sent on May 20, 2014 regarding a Transportation Security Administration rule; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

7816. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report entitled ''Fifth Report to Congress on the Evaluation of the Medicare Coordinated Care Demonstration (MCCD)—Findings over 10 Years'' as required by Section 4016(c) of Public Law 105–33, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

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. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2689. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities; with an amendment (Rept. 113–627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 5737. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibilities with respect to Internet domain name functions unless it certifies that it has received a proposal for such relinquishment that meets certain criteria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5738. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for purposes of establishing and maintaining mobile hospital units for responding to an epidemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 5739. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 5740. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 5741. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require a voter-verified permanent paper ballot under title III of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 5742. A bill to provide to the Secretary of the Interior a mechanism to cancel contracts for the sale of materials CA–20139 and CA–22901, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5743. A bill to establish a commission to identify and examine issues of national concern related to the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, to make recommendations for the resolution of the issues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 5744. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require recipients of State Homeland Security Grant Program funding to preserve and strengthen interoperable emergency communications capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 5745. A bill to direct certain actions of the United States Government with respect to recognizing the service and sacrifice of veterans of the Korean Constabulary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Res. 759. A resolution recognizing Survivors Victory Day to celebrate and honor the victims and survivors of trauma; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H. Res. 760. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 2, 2014, as World MRSA Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

327. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 15, opposing any international designation of Alaska land or water as an international park, world heritage site, biosphere reserve, Ramsar site, or other classification of land or water that affects the use of land or water by the state or an Alaska Native corporation without approval by the U.S. Congress and the Alaska State Legislature; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

328. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to House Joint Resolution 26, urging Congress to provide a means for consistently and equitably sharing with all oil and gas producing states a portion of revenue generated from oil and gas development on the outer continental shelf; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

329. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 15, opposing any international designation of Alaska land or water as an international park, world heritage site, biosphere reserve, Ramsar site, or other classification of land or water that affects the use of land or water by the state or an Alaska Native corporation without approval by the U.S. Congress and the Alaska State Legislature; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

330. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 24, relating to certain holiday practices at federal Veterans Health Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other Bills.''—U.S. Constitution, Article I, section 7, clause 1

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''—U.S. Constitution, Article I, section 9, clause 7

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 5739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 5740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 5741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 5742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Sec. 3 refers to the managerial authority over property owned by the Federal Government

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 5743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 5744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 5745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, . . .

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 14—To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 543: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1041: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. KIND, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and. Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1563: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1761: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2073: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 2139: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2330: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2417: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 2591: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2794: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2945: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2994: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LYNCH, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3331: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3410: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 3708: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3742: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3877: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 4351: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 4440: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 4577: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 4693: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 4717: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4720: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 4793: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 4826: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 4930: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 4962: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 5065: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5130: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 5213: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 5241: Mr. PERRY and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 5262: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 5269: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 5320: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 5324: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 5381: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 5403: Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 5503: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 5504: Mr. HANNA, Mr. LANCE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5505: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 5547: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5578: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 5589: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 5632: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 5646: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 5650: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5656: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BASS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5658: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 5661: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 5693: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 5697: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 5706: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 5733: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. FLORES.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JONES, and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 72: Ms. HAHN.

H. Res. 596: Mr. RIGELL.

H. Res. 688: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 711: Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 714: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H. Res. 728: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LATHAM, Ms. MENG, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H. Res. 755: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 758: Mr. STOCKMAN.