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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

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

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we acknowledge today that without Your protection, we labor in vain. Give rest to the weary and joy to those who work for liberty.

Lord, use our Senators to join You in bringing deliverance to captives and sight to the morally and ethically blind. Grant that our lawmakers will focus more on donation than duration as You remind them of their accountability to You. May looking to You for help become their first option.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:00 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 928, 930, 1032, 1033, 1034; further, that if cloture is invoked on any of those nominations, that on Thursday, November 20, at 2:00 p.m., all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order above.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY).

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that—we had some nominations on which cloture was filed last night—there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote and that all rollcall votes after the first vote in each sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, with respect to the nominations in this agreement, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that following the cloture vote on Executive Calendar No. 1034, the Senate consider Executive Calendar Nos. 596, 699, 957, 1044, 1045, and 1056; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes following the first in the series be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we expect these nominations I just listed to be confirmed by voice vote.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each. The time from 1:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. will be under the control of the Republicans, and the majority will control from 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

As a reminder, there will be an all-Senators briefing on ISIS at 4:30 p.m. this afternoon in the regular location.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am glad that for a few minutes the President pro tem is here in this body and presiding over the Senate.

For years I have heard from Senate Republicans that they simply wanted to do some legislating; they were tired of being shut out of the legislative process; they were not able to debate legislation and amendments. They have assured the American people they want to be wholly dedicated to open and robust debate on legislation on the Senate floor.

Yesterday a bill that was bipartisan in nature and came out under the auspices of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, after actually years of consternation, debate, and work by so many different people, came to the floor. That was blocked yesterday, blocked from even having a hearing here on the Senate floor. That is wrong. This is a very important piece of legislation. It protects Americans' rights to privacy without sacrificing the U.S. intelligence community's ability to gather information.

I also say through the Chair to my friend the President pro tem of the Senate that it does not matter if you agree with the statement I just made. Maybe some people disagree with this legislation. Certainly there are people who disagree with it. But shouldn't we at least be able to debate the issue here

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

on the floor? Doesn't legislation of this magnitude merit the Senate's consideration? Yet yesterday we were shut down once again—this has been going on for years—before we even got started. They would not even let the Senate debate this very important piece of legislation. We were ready to legislate in good faith. We have been ready to legislate for the last 4 years. We have been prevented numerous times from doing that.

The Republican leader and his caucus will have to do more than just pay lip-service to an open, bipartisan legislative process. At some point they must practice what they preach. Maybe that will be the case come January.

Last night, just after the vote on Keystone, I heard the Republican leader say he will bring this same legislation to the Senate floor early next year. So we look forward to coming to the floor early next year. I would hope we can have an open amendment process and ample debate on that legislation that the Republican leader for months on record has wholeheartedly endorsed.

I feel very bad that the chairman of our Judiciary Committee has worked so hard during the time—when we were in recess, we talked several times about the importance of this legislation and how we were going to try to move it forward. We determined yesterday we are not going to move forward even without a debate or a vote on anything. That is really too bad.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words of the majority leader. He and I have been friends for decades. He worked with me and was in touch with me throughout the recent effort on the NSA reform bill, the USA FREEDOM Act of 2014. He knew we had cosponsors, Republicans and Democrats, from across the political spectrum. This was an effort to do what was best for America and do it at a time when we would not be under urgent deadlines. Several of the authorities we were trying to amend expire on June 1 of next year.

We had a piece of legislation that began in the House of Representatives by a Republican chairman. We added to the bill in the Senate. There was a very clear signal from the House of Representatives that if we had passed the USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 here in the Senate, they would have taken it up and passed it. We would be enacting legislation that would improve not only the security of Americans, but also the privacy and individual liberties of Americans. And we would not do it under a deadline. So it was unfortunate last night that there was a partisan effort to stop it. There was some of the worst fear-mongering I have heard on this floor in 40 years. But I say this as more of a way to thank the distinguished majority leader for his steadfast support.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the reason I feel—and I have made my remarks regarding the Senator from Vermont. There has been no one in modern history who has done more to protect the civil liberties of people than the senior Senator from Vermont. This legislation was drafted toward that effect, to make sure we were able to do the necessary work for this country as it relates to what was in this bill but also to protect the liberties of Americans.

I have such admiration for my friend from Vermont, for his work on landmines. At the time he started the conversation on landmines, he was it, but of course there are now people all over the world who are following his lead on the maiming, people who have been killed, thousands of people. Thousands of people, as we speak, are still being killed by landmines from wars past. So the fact that we were not able to get to this legislation does not in any way take away from the legacy of this good man who has done so much to protect the individual liberties of the people in Vermont and across the country.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JOSHUA A. GRAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise this morning to celebrate the life and mourn the loss of a soldier from Kentucky who died while serving in uniform. PFC Joshua Gray of Van Lear, KY, lost his life on February 10, 2014, at Bagram Airfield, Afghanistan, from a noncombat-related incident.

Private First Class Gray was 21 years old. For his service in uniform, Private First Class Gray received several medals, awards, and decorations, including the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the NATO Medal, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, and the Expert Marksmanship Badge.

Josh's life may have been tragically cut short, but it was full of promise. He excelled as a student. He scored a 34 out of 36 on the ACT standardized test in high school, putting his score in the 99th percentile. Friends and teachers from Johnson Central High School, where Josh graduated in 2011, remember how very bright he was.

''Josh was a very high-end student. He was an amazing kid,'' says John Robinson, one of Josh's teachers. ''He was very super-smart. He was always looking something up. He always had this thirst for knowledge—computers, math, science and technology. He was always more than willing to do work. He often came to me with questions—or answers.''

Josh's fascination with computers led him to salvage an old, massive IBM server that he brought to school to tinker with. John Robinson remembers the unit was so heavy it should have required two people to carry it. John said:

> He was carrying it around like it was nothing. He left it here. I still have it.

Josh was known around school for carrying something else around—Mr. Waddles, his stuffed penguin and constant companion. Though Josh carried the stuffed penguin at first for laughs, it soon became his trademark. As Tim Adams, district director of operations for Johnson County Schools, said:

> He took Mr. Waddles everywhere with him. It started out as a joke, but then it just caught on. Mr. Waddles became part of the class.

Joshua participated on the Johnson Central High School academic team and the SkillsUSA team. Popular with his classmates, he was also named prom king and voted ''Most Unforgettable'' by his senior class.

Lindsey Patrick, a classmate of Joshua's, stated:

> He could have done anything with his life, he was one of the most brilliant people I've ever met, and [service] is what he chose to do and give his life. That is why he is so unforgettable.

Josh was also musically gifted as well. Angie Carriere, his former music teacher, remembers Josh's musical talent:

> He was in my violin/fiddle class. He never wanted to learn to read music, instead he insisted on playing music 'by ear.' Actually, he never really needed the [sheet] music; he could just listen to the song and play it.

Josh joined the Army in November of 2012. He completed training at Fort Jackson, SC, and was assigned to Headquarters and Headquarters Battalion, 10th Mountain Division, based out of Fort Drum, NY, as a satellite communications system operator and maintainer. He deployed to Afghanistan in

support of Operation Enduring Freedom in January of 2014.

Joshua's funeral was held at Johnson County Middle School. He was buried with full military honors at Highland Memorial Park in Staffordsville, Johnson County.

We are thinking of Josh's family as I recount his story for my Senate colleagues, including his parents Seth William Gray and Robin Rena Gray, his brother Dustin Mollett, his sister Delaney Mollett, his maternal grandparents Andy and Kathleen Price, his paternal grandmother, Irene Gray, and many other beloved family members and friends.

PFC Joshua A. Gray was truly a talented and bright young man who could have done many things. The fact that he chose to serve his country in the U.S. Army is a testament to his character and his patriotism. I hope the family of Private First Class Gray knows that we in the Senate honor his choice to serve and we are grateful for his sacrifice.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE AND ENFORCING THE LAW

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, it is good to be here.

I was disappointed yesterday to see that we weren't able to move forward on the Keystone Pipeline. It has become symbolic in many ways of whether we are willing to embrace the opportunities of more American energy.

The American people clearly have a sense that it is to their advantage for us to take advantage of those opportunities, for us to deal with not only our own economy, with the energy we can produce but even with our next-door neighbors. Canada is our greatest trading partner, and Mexico continues to play a bigger and bigger role as a trading partner—I think now No. 4 and No. 5 of all the countries in the world we have economic exchanges with—but friendly neighbors in North America that can produce energy in ways that meet every logical standard.

I heard some discussions about the pipeline, that once this is built, even though it may create tens of thousands of jobs in building the pipeline, it will only take three dozen or so people to run the pipeline. Of course that is right; it is a pipeline. It is an efficient, safe way to transport the energy we need. But I think it is important to understand that just the jobs to run the pipeline have nothing to do in many ways with the job potential that is created when we embrace the energy potential we have. If we ask about that energy potential, the American people say yes. If we ask about lower utility bills or dependably payable utility bills, the American people say yes. If we ask about price at the pump, the American people say yes.

But beyond that, if somebody is thinking about a manufacturing job or any other job as a job creator, if they have that utility bill they can pay, if they have the delivery system they can rely on, the country is much more likely to make things again, the country is much more likely to compete, and the American people understand that.

Even if we ask specifically about this one small part of that puzzle—the Keystone Pipeline—the American people say yes. Six years is enough. The State Department has evaluated this over and over again under two different Secretaries of State. Both times they have said there is no problem moving forward with this. I was disappointed that we didn't.

Even the White House suggesting they would veto that if it was sent to them seems to continue to indicate to me that nobody is listening to what the people we all work for are saying.

The President said he wasn't on the ballot but his policies were. If his policies were on the ballot, as he said they were, those policies were widely rejected—not just to change next year in the body we get to serve in here, but also two-thirds of the legislative Houses in the country are no longer run by the President's party, and 60 percent-plus of the Governors are no longer run by the President's party.

People are trying to send a message. It would be a good idea if the White House would get on the receive and begin to figure out what that message is and what is wrong with those policies that the American people don't like. I don't think it is because they don't understand them. I know there would be one sense probably most closely held at the White House: If they just understood what we were trying to do, they would be for what we are trying to do.

I think it is not that way, even though the President might like to think it would be. In fact, the clear message is that people are concerned about costly energy policies, they are concerned about the President's recent overreach on a topic we wouldn't even think people would have engaged on, but they have: net neutrality, where even the Chairman of the FCC, nominated by the President and confirmed by this Senate—even the Chairman of the FCC said: I think the President is headed in the wrong direction there, and we need to do something different than that.

The SBA recently called on the EPA to withdraw one of their proposals and try again because it had too much negative impact on the economy.

I can't think of a similar situation ever, where an administration finds itself so often in conflict even with itself, even having the administration challenged. When the SBA thinks the EPA is off target, and that was empaneled sometime before a rule was laid down—a proposed regulation was laid down—we wonder, why not? Why wouldn't we be managing this discussion in a better way? Why wouldn't we be moving the country forward in a better way?

Ignoring the voters is an incredible tragedy in a democracy. Ignoring the law is an even more incredible tragedy in a constitutional democracy.

According to reports, the President is considering two requirements deciding on the 11 million people who are here without documents who either came illegally or stayed illegally and what to do about that. The President is looking at the length of time as a qualifier. Nowhere in the law is that a qualifier. The President is looking at the ties people might have to others in the country. These requirements, depending on how broadly they are drawn, could wind up with the President's announcement as early as Friday, leaving another 5 million people in the country in a status I don't quite understand and they will not either.

When someone is here based on an Executive order, that is totally dependent on one thing: Who is the Executive?

When someone is here based on the law, that is very dependent on everything having to come together that changes the law before their status will change.

Why would we put people in that kind of jeopardy? Why would we send that kind of mixed message?

After legislation overhauling the immigration process died in the Congress, the President said he is going to act on his own. I can't find that part of the Constitution which allows that to happen. In fact, in statements made more than one time, he couldn't find it either—statements made more than one time where the President said: I can't do this on my own. We are a nation of laws. That is his observation about who we are, not my observation about who we are.

I know there will be people on this side of the Capitol Building who will say: We sent something over there, I didn't vote for it, but it doesn't mean I am not aware that it was sent to the House. But the House sent a bill over here too. Apparently both the House and the Senate are so far from where the other side is that neither is willing to take up the other bill.

But that is the Constitution. The Constitution is designed so that when we change law, we do that in a fairly cumbersome way, but that has served our country pretty well for a long time, and it is not up to the President to decide that can be suspended on a topic he thinks is important and a topic he in fact has previously said he couldn't do on his own.

As he was talking about this the last several months, not just Republicans but Republicans and Democrats—and I

will admit particularly Democrats in close races around the country—said the President was overstepping his authority; the President is putting people in jeopardy of not knowing whether they are here on some kind of basis that nobody has quite defined or quite understands even after he acts.

Recently, a union representing thousands of Federal immigration officers raised an alarm that the U.S. Government had ordered supplies to create millions of blank work permits and green cards. According to reports following that union report, the new Federal contract proposal for Homeland Security would allow the government to buy enough supplies to make as many as 34 million immigrant work permits and residency cards over the next 5 years.

We issue immigrant work permits all the time but not at the level that is being talked about here. Nobody has contended, by the way, that we just got a particularly good opportunity to buy a lot of card stock. I haven't heard that given as the reason.

So these people who work with that every day are saying: What is going on here? The President of the National Citizenship and Immigration Services Council—the union representing 12,000 immigration service agents—called reports about planned Executive action dangerous, people who deal with this every day—his words—said it would increase exponentially the health risks, the threats to national security, and expense to taxpayers that he said are on the rise because of lax enforcement of immigration laws already.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution declares that the President ''shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

Simply put, these constitutional requirements are just that. They are requirements the President shall take care that the laws are faithfully executed, to execute the acts of the Congress, to enforce the law as written. Signed into law by some President and never changed by the current President would indicate that is what the law is and the President is supposed to enforce the law.

Yet President Obama continues to refuse in this and other areas to show a willingness to try to convince the Congress to change the law rather than assume: If the Congress doesn't do this, I will.

As I said earlier, and will say again, I am still trying to find that phrase in the Constitution that says: If the Congress doesn't do this, the President can. Whether it is issuing waivers to States from the work requirements contained in the bipartisan Welfare Reform Act of 1996 or announcing another change in the President's health care law—and I have lost count of how many changes on his own the President has had the administration do—they continue to look for ways to circumvent what the law says: a nation of laws, respect for the laws.

Americans are appropriately concerned the government is just too willing to overreach and at the same time unbelievably dysfunctional, whether it is kids at the border or a Secret Service that can't keep people out of the White House or how we deal with Ebola.

We have a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and when we have a disease control problem we have to put somebody else in charge. What is wrong with that?

That is why I introduced the ENFORCE the Law Act in March, a bill that would allow Congress to authorize a legal case to be brought against a President if he fails to uphold the law as written.

This bill would restore the system of checks and balances reiterated in the Constitution. The ENFORCE the Law Act removes the procedural barriers and then would allow the House or Senate or both together to jointly adopt the resolution that just says we don't believe the law is being enforced.

There is a set of regulations out now on the Clean Water Act which did authorize the Federal Government, the EPA, to monitor and have some authority over the navigable waters of the United States. I don't have any doubt that in the 1970s when that happened, people thought navigable waters meant the same thing they thought navigable waters meant when it was first put into Federal law in the 1880s. Suddenly, navigable waters in the new rule means any water anywhere that could ever become part of water that could become part of water that could become navigable. This is a case that can easily be litigated sooner rather than later, long before people try to comply with an area where the Federal Government will turn out not to have control, as they did in a number of areas this year. So I hope we will look at that again. The House has passed it in a bipartisan manner. The Congress should be concerned about enforcing the law as written. As the Constitution says, both the Members of the Congress and the President of the United States should be concerned about enforcing the law as written.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TOM HARKIN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the 75th birthday of my friend and longtime colleague from our home State of Iowa, Senator TOM HARKIN.

As the Presiding Officer knows, Senator HARKIN will be retiring from public office in a few weeks. At the end of the 113th Congress, Senator HARKIN will then close a chapter on public service that spans more than a half century, including four decades in Congress. He also served 27 years in the U.S. Navy and U.S. Naval Reserves, 10 years in the House of Representatives, and 30 years here in the U.S. Senate.

Now, I think anybody looking at that would say that is a remarkable and distinguished record of public service. After 40 years of representing Iowans in Congress, my friend TOM soon will leave behind the Halls of the U.S. Capitol. He also will leave behind a legacy of fiery floor speeches, passionately delivered on behalf of individuals with disabilities, also for Iowa farmers, also for the elderly, also for child laborers, and for many causes that he championed such as early childhood education, nutrition and wellness, conservation, renewable energy and the environment, and probably lots of others. But those are things everybody knows that he has worked hard on.

Throughout the years TOM and I have served side-by-side in Washington for the good of our home State. For three terms we worked together in the U.S. House of Representatives. It was here in the Senate our shared commitment to give rural America a voice at the policymaking table was sown, and for many years we worked together on the Senate agriculture committee, looking out for the millions of Americans who choose to work and earn a living in rural America. We worked together to advocate for rural infrastructure and investment, access to health care, housing, technology, and transportation.

For the last three decades we have served alongside one another in this distinguished body, the U.S. Senate, an institution that both of us hold near and dear to our hearts. Although some of our silver-tongued critics over the years may have ascribed TOM'S views as those of a bleeding-heart liberal or mine mischaracterized as that of a cold-hearted conservative, we both, TOM and I, know that our hearts have always been in the right place.

Neither of us was born with a silver spoon in our mouth and we learned early on to appreciate the work ethic of our parents and grandparents. Each of us raised our families with the hopes that our children and grandchildren would achieve the promise of America's prosperity and grow up to enjoy the pursuits of happiness.

As Iowa's U.S. Senators, we have worked to keep alive the dream of hard-working Iowan families.

Now of course it is true that we have vastly different views on the government's influence on America's ladder of opportunity. However, we do wholeheartedly agree it is an honor and a privilege to serve the people of our State. For some reason our respective reelections every 6 years have actually confounded political observers. Many couldn't seem to square the notion that Iowans would continue to elect two U.S. Senators from opposite sides of the political spectrum for the last three decades.

So to explain—or perhaps I don't have to because it is widely understood—Iowans are not casual political

observers. Our electorate takes pride in retail politicking and it is first in the Nation's political caucuses. We certainly have given Iowan voters a night-and-day choice between these two U.S. Senators. So while we may not see eye-to-eye on politics and ideology, we do see eye-to-eye when it comes to working for Iowa's best interests. Although our voting records may reflect night-and-day positions on some public policy, you wouldn't see the light of day between us when we worked together on matters that are of most importance to Iowans, including but not limited to natural disasters such as the tremendous floods of 1993 and 2008, Iowa farmers and agriculture, notably recovering from the farm crisis. Renewable energy and rural infrastructure have been our mutual interest. We have also enjoyed welcoming economic development leaders and constituents to the Nation's Capital.

Between the famous Siouxland steak dinner in Washington and the Harkin steak fry in Indianola, there is no doubt TOM will miss staking out Iowans to discuss politics and policy. However, I have no doubt my home State colleague will continue to champion the causes for which he has devoted a lifetime of service. In fact, I have read in news media about his retirement of what he intends to pursue, and so I have no doubt he is going to pursue out of the Senate what he has pursued in the Senate.

To his credit, my colleague's legacy reflects the priorities he set out to achieve decades ago, to make a difference for those on the downside of advantage.

My wife Barbara and this Senator extend our warmest wishes to TOM and his wife Ruth, and of course to the entire Harkin family, as he starts life's next chapter. I see my colleague on the floor, so I can look at him.

As you start life's next chapter, may you enjoy the blessings of hearth and home, health and happiness. Although TOM is retiring from public office, I am confident he is not retiring from serving the public interest. From one constituent to another, I thank you for your lifetime of public service and I wish you good luck and Godspeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

A GREAT ASSOCIATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, first let me thank my friend and colleague for his lifetime characteristic which is being very gracious and very generous in his remarks.

CHUCK GRASSLEY and I have served together since 1974. I like to tell people that in 1974, that was a big wave of Democrats who came in. They called us the Watergate babies. We came in a big wave, won a lot of elections. In fact in Iowa that year they elected a Democratic U.S. Senator and every House seat—I think there were six at that time—six House seats all went Democratic except one, and that was the seat that CHUCK GRASSLEY won that year, bucking the trend—the tide—in 1974.

So it is kind of a funny thing, CHUCK,—I speak to my friend across the aisle here—that a lot of times people, this year, have said, ''All you Watergate babies are gone now, you and MAX BAUCUS, and CHRIS DODD and on the House side GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN. So this is the last of the Watergate babies.''

I said, ''No, there is one left.''

''Well, who is that,'' they say.

I say, ''It is a Republican.''

''A Republican? Who is that?''

I say, ''My colleague from Iowa, CHUCK GRASSLEY, is sort of, shall I say, the last man standing from that class of 1974.''

Again, it is a tribute to Senator GRASSLEY that through all these years he has won the hearts and minds of the people of Iowa, been elected and reelected. Of course he came to the Senate before I did. He came in 1981 and I came in 1984. So I like to think we at least share in common bucking the trend a little bit—the tide—because in 1984 someone said, ''Harkin ought to run for the Senate in 1984 because there will be a big Democratic landslide,'' and so I ran. The tide was just the opposite. There was a Reagan landslide here. But I was fortunate enough to win the election. So I think the two of us share the bucking of the tide, so to speak, getting into office when we ran. But it has been a great association all these years.

As I stand here today on my 75th birthday, I guess when you are this age, I think I have two kinds of emotions. One, I wonder where the heck did all the years go and how did they go by so fast. And sometimes I say, gosh, sometimes I wish I could turn the clock back and do it all again. The other emotion is sort of my Irish side of me. The Irish have a saying that any time you are on this side of the grass is a good day. So I am sure happy that I made it this far.

I again want to say that since the time we took our oath of office on January 4, 1975, we have served together both in the House and in the Senate. A lot of the time we were on the same committee, the agriculture committee, working on a lot of different agriculture bills. I remember back in the 1980s working on the credit bill at that time when so many farmers were underwater. As the Senator said, it has been a great honor and a privilege to represent the people of Iowa.

As he mentioned, we belong to different parties, we have different philosophies of approach in government, but I like to think we share a commonsense Iowa way of looking at the world. We are not monolithic out in Iowa. We are not all one philosophy or all the other philosophy. Sometimes I find very conservative friends of mine and I may have a liberal view of one thing and I find liberals and I may have a more conservative view of something else. So the people of Iowa, as my friend has said, think a lot about these things, and they take these things into consideration.

My friend has said, well, a lot of people say how can Iowans elect someone who is conservative and someone who is liberal. I think that is because there are common strains of that wave itself to the people of Iowa in so many ways where there is a cross of conflicts of maybe a conservative approach and a liberal approach.

I say to my friend, I value his friendship and his counsel through all these years, even though, again, as my friend said, we approach things maybe from a different philosophical standpoint. That is fine. That is okay. But we have never let a disagreement on philosophy ever be the last word between us or the final word or anything like that. It is always, well, that is that. What is next? And the one thing I really appreciate that my friend said is that when it comes to Iowa, you don't find any daylight when it comes to a disaster on what we can do for Iowa and Iowans. We have had a wonderful relationship through all these years and it is one that I have cherished very much.

I heard my friend, in making some notes, say that sometimes they say he is a cold-hearted conservative and I am a bleeding-heart liberal. I am going to set the record straight. He is not a cold-hearted conservative, he is a caring conservative. He cares deeply about people. He cares deeply about the people of Iowa, too. And I hope I am not a bleeding-heart liberal. I hope I am a liberal who believes in individual responsibility—individual responsibility.

My friend has been a very caring conservative through all these years. I think together we have achieved important things for our State: economic development, rural development, agriculture, energy, all these things we worked together on for Iowa. I am proud of the fact that in Iowa right now with regard to energy production, 25 percent of our energy comes from wind energy in Iowa. We produce the blades and turbines and everything in Iowa and all the jobs there. That is something we have worked together on through all these years.

Again, people have asked me why I am leaving the Senate. Well, it was my decision. At the time—almost 2 years ago—I said, you will never hear me ever say bad things about the Senate or denounce the Senate or say terrible things. I love the Senate. This is a wonderful institution. Yes, we hit a few bumps in the road once in a while, but that is to be expected in a legislative process that represents 300 million people in this country. But working together you form friendships and alliances.

I have often said that as a progressive, I want to go this far this fast and the conservatives want to go this far this slow, but by working together, you

can make progress. You can make progress, and that is what I think both Senator GRASSLEY and I have worked on together. We try to make progress, especially for the people of Iowa.

I thank the Senator for his kind words. I know we are not supposed to say this on the Senate floor; we are always supposed to speak in the third person. But I never wanted to follow all of the rules anyway. So I wish to speak directly and say: Thank you very much, CHUCK GRASSLEY, for your friendship, your counsel, and for working together through all these years. I will miss that relationship—working on the Senate floor.

I will be in Iowa. I will be working with the Harkin Institute at Drake University. I will be spending a lot of time on the disability policies and advancing the cause of people with disabilities in some way, shape or form. I don't know how but in some way. It is a nonpartisan institute, and we have a great board of directors. The former chair of the Iowa Republican Party is on the board of the Harkin Institute, and I want to keep it nonpartisan.

I ask that my friend come and speak—and perhaps lead a discussion at some time—at the institute at Drake University. I would be honored if my friend would do that sometime down the road. I don't know when, but sometime when we can work it out. I know my friend will be well received, and I think the young people at Drake need to hear the conservative side of the story as well as the liberal side of the story. They need to have that kind of input. I hope we can work it out.

I say again that I know in the future my friend and his wonderful wife Barbara, a great and wonderful person, and Ruth and I will maintain friendships and our connections as we move into the future. If there is any way we can work together for the benefit of Iowans, just let me know, and I will be glad to be the Senator's lieutenant in the field out there in Iowa sometime.

Again, I thank my friend so much for so many years of counsel and friendship and working together. Thank you, CHUCK.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank my colleague for his kind remarks and for being here and for serving the people of Iowa.

Mr. President, I wish to take 4 more minutes to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, many children and families around the country will celebrate National Adoption Day. It's a day that many adoptions are finalized and youth find their forever families.

It's very comforting and fitting that this day helps kick off the holiday season. Families will be formed and strengthened. This Thanksgiving, many children will celebrate with their new families and not have to worry about their next placement or their next meal. And this month, we give thanks to the men and women who make their dreams come true.

Since the first National Adoption Day in 2000, nearly 50,000 children have joined ''forever families'' during National Adoption Day. In 2013 alone, adoptions for 4,500 children were finalized through 400 National Adoption Day events across the country.

These are impressive numbers—numbers that make us proud of the work being done to help children in foster care find loving families. But there is always more work to be done.

Today, there are over 102,000 children in the foster care system. Iowa alone has over 6,200 children in foster care, many of whom are waiting for a loving family to adopt them.

There are so many issues facing foster youth—in addition to being torn apart from their families. They face serious trauma. They are likely to be treated differently and don't get to do the same activities as other kids. They transition from home to home and school to school. They don't know normalcy, and they may never know permanency. And, after years of challenges, some are forced to transition to adulthood on their own. Unfortunately, each year over 23,000 youth age out of care in the U.S.

Too many older children in foster care, especially those with special needs, are often the ones who wait the longest to leave foster care. Foster youth simply desire to have what so many of us were blessed to have—a home with caring, loving parents and siblings. These kids are less likely than younger children to find ''forever homes.''

That is why I helped form the Senate Caucus on Foster Youth. I wanted to draw attention to the challenges that older foster youth face. The caucus has allowed congressional leaders to become more aware of the issues faced by young people and families who are involved in the foster care system.

The caucus cannot function without the input and insight from foster youth. These children are the experts on the foster care system. They tell us what works or what needs to change. They share their experiences and provide us with real world stories about how our policies truly affect them.

The caucus and the youth who share their experiences remind us that no child is unadoptable. No child should be without a mom and dad, and we must remember that foster care should be a layover, not a destination.

November is National Adoption Month, a time to raise national awareness of adoption and celebrate families, advocates, and volunteers involved in adoption. It's also a time to devote more attention to policies and practices that protect the safety and well-being for all children.

I am hopeful that Congress will continue to look for ways to improve the foster care system and promote adoptions. I am glad Congress worked to enact a bill this year to renew the adoption incentives program and to do more to screen and help foster youth who may be trafficked. We must continually examine how the system is treating youth and whether the policies in place are strengthening families.

There are many youth who will celebrate this holiday season without a permanent family. Hopefully, our celebration of National Adoption Month will raise awareness of the issues they face and the need to find them a mom and a dad. We need to keep working together to break down the barriers to adoption.

So today, I thank all those who have adopted or who have fostered children who needed it, and I thank the many individuals and organizations that work to make permanency possible for children. I know many dreams will come true this Saturday, and I wish the very best to the youth as they begin their journey with their new families.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of National Adoption Month, and I know our great colleague Senator LANDRIEU will be here to also address this important month. She has been such a great leader in fighting for this cause. She has literally gone to Guatemala to make sure that children who are awaiting loving homes in our country get to come to those homes. She literally knows the names of those kids and is hands-on every step of the way and has been the leader in Congress.

She established the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, which has brought together Senators and Members of Congress on behalf of children who need loving homes and families who want to welcome them home. We are very pleased with her leadership.

Senator LANDRIEU is joining us right now, and I will be able to flip it over to my friend at any time it is appropriate. But I do wish to speak about National Adoption Month. It is especially important in my home State of Minnesota.

Many people don't know this, but Minnesota actually has the highest rate of international adoptions in the country. Minnesota families have opened their homes and their hearts to children from all over the world—from

Vietnam to Guatemala to Nepal to Haiti.

I have had the opportunity to witness the power of adoption firsthand. Before being elected to the Senate, I spent 8 years as Hennepin County attorney, the largest county in Minnesota. We had jurisdiction over foster care and adoption. I actually worked to speed up those adoptions. I remember saying we need to eliminate this delay and reduce the time it takes for a child who has been going from foster care home to foster care home in half, and we were able to do that because people understood the need for children to have a permanent home.

I know Senator LANDRIEU is here right now and has a busy schedule, and I will turn it over to her as soon as I finish.

In the United States, nearly 400,000 children are living without permanent families in the foster care system. Over 100,000 of these children are eligible for adoption, but too many of them will wait for years and years to be adopted. Some will not be adopted at all.

Last night I attended an event called Kidsave. It is about children who are older and in other countries. This group has actually set up an incredible system where the kids come to our country for a few weeks and many of them end up being adopted. As the kids get older, it becomes harder and harder for them to become adopted.

Senator LANDRIEU and I are aware that as some of these countries, such as Russia, completely close their doors to adoption, there will actually be more and more children who are older that will need to be adopted. We hope the system changes and they do eventually open up their doors.

Around the world it is estimated that nearly 18 million orphans who have lost parents are living in orphanages or are on the streets and lack the care and attention required for healthy development. As a nation, we must open our arms to these children. Just last night at this event, I had the opportunity to hear the story of Jennifer Baumann, a 17-year-old girl from Colombia. She spent years in a broken home and then in a broken foster care system in that country. She was exposed to violence. She would go to bed hungry.

At age 14, she was still in foster care and had lost hope for her future. She was considered too old to be adopted. As she said in her own words, she ''cried for a year.''

But then, miraculously, she had the chance to visit a family here in America as part of the program that Kidsave organized. The family fell in love with her, she fell in love with them, and in 2011 she was adopted into a loving home. We have seen this time and time again in my State, and that is why I got involved in legislation with my mentor, MARY LANDRIEU.

One of the things we found out is—we had a family called the Makorises, and they were adopting nine children from the Philippines who had first lost their father, and their mother kept them together, and then their mother died, and it was the two oldest children who held those kids together. When they turned 16 and 17, they couldn't be adopted. The Makorises of Cambridge, MN, had to make a decision: Were they going to strand those two kids who held the family together, leave them in the Philippines, and take the other children? It was like Sophie's choice. That was their choice.

They decided there was a better way. They came to Congress. I led the bill in the Senate with the help of Senator LANDRIEU, Senator SESSIONS, Senator INHOFE, as well as House Members, and we were able to pass a bill that allowed kids who had reached an age where they were not legally allowed to be adopted, to be adopted if a younger sibling had been adopted. That means that retroactively, thanks to the work of Senator LANDRIEU, 10 million children all across the world were allowed to be adopted into loving families. And how fun was it to be in the Makorises' living room and see all nine children, like some Minnesota version of ''The Sound of Music,'' with a place for all of their winter boots and their coats. They came from the Philippines in the middle of the winter to Minnesota; yet they were still as happy and as warm as can be because now they have parents who love them.

The Senator from Maine understands how important adoption is because it has touched his own family. This has touched every Member of the Senate.

As we focus on National Adoption Month, we have to continue to look at policies and changes we can make to our laws to make them better. We passed that law to allow those older siblings to be adopted. We passed a law to allow vaccinations to be allowed in our country to make sure they are safe and that they are actually done. But there is more work to do with these intercountry adoptions, and I can think of no one better to lead that charge than the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU.

So I am here to acknowledge the work we have done with the adoption tax credit, which we have gotten into law, and the work we have done to make sure it is easier for these international adoptions. Every single family out there knows there are problems right now with international adoptions. A lot of them stem from people such as Vladimir Putin. By the way, the reason Senator LANDRIEU was banned from going to Russia is because of the work she is doing for kids, being willing to take Putin on because of the fact that he was closing the doors to kids and using them as pawns for political gain. That is an amazing story, and that shows a fighter.

(Mr. KING assumed the Chair.)

I thank the Presiding Officer for his work with adoption and his personal story, as well as all the Members on both sides of the aisle who have devoted themselves to looking out for these kids who have no one else to look out for them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, yesterday we had a very different topic—the Keystone XL Pipeline—on the floor of the Senate. That fight is over for now, but the fight for adoption, foster care children, and all children in the world who are in desperate need of parents to love them and to nurture them goes on.

I could not be surrounded with a better team than Senator GRASSLEY, who has been fighting for this in the Senate since before I arrived—and 18 years ago when I got here, I quickly joined with him to continue the fight—and then AMY KLOBUCHAR joined us a few years ago and has become an extraordinary, effective, and willing soldier to go to the frontlines of this battle. I can't thank the Senator from Minnesota enough. She brings tremendous experience as a former prosecutor, which I didn't have and I don't think Senator GRASSLEY had, and she really understands the inner workings of the court systems in a way that has brought a lot of value to our coalition.

In addition, as she said, we are so proud of Minnesota as the State in our Union that has the highest per capita rate of international adoptions. So the leaders in Minnesota of all political parties and stripes as well as the faith-based community really understand this issue and have stood up time and time again. I wish to recognize Minnesota's leadership and particularly Senator KLOBUCHAR.

This month is November. It is a great month. It is Thanksgiving month. We give thanks for so many things in our country. It is a wonderful celebration—I think in some ways even better than Christmas because we are not so much focused on gifts; we are focused on really understanding the blessings we have received. One of those great blessings is a family.

I am so fortunate to have been born into one of the most remarkable families—not rich when I was born into my family and still not rich, and when I was born into my family we were not at all famous either, but we have two extraordinary parents, and to this day they continue to teach all 9 of us, 37 grandchildren, and now 5 great-grandchildren the value of family.

I have said many times, and Senator KLOBUCHAR has shared this with me, governments do a lot of things well, but raising children isn't one of them. I will repeat that. Governments do a lot of things well, but raising children isn't one of them. Actually, we were created and wired for one human to raise another. It just doesn't happen any other way. Our faith tells us that.

But now, interestingly, some really extraordinary science is being done by some of the most brilliant scientists in the world and sociologists, and one of

them is from my State, Dr. Charlie Zeanah. I want to give him a shout-out. When the terrible tragedy happened in Romania and Ceausescu fell—that crazy man who starved his country and put millions of children in orphanages—Charlie was one of the Americans who got on the plane with me and went to Romania, and he has never left. He stayed—not physically the whole time, but his colleagues stayed and did the most extraordinary science on the planet of what happens to a child who is detached from their birth parent or from a loving caregiver—just detached.

They also did the leading study in the world on institutionalization. The findings are remarkable in such a way that if they can't make us change the way we think—group homes are not sufficient. No matter how well run, they are not sufficient. No institution, no matter how beautifully it is run, no orphanage in the world, no matter how magnificently it is run, how clean and brightly painted—nothing can substitute for what an infant and a toddler and a young child and a teenager and an adult, amazingly, but particularly an infant need when they are born. They actually need it before they are born, and that is a whole other story. But when they are born, it says that the brain literally reacts physically to the fact that there is no caregiver who is consistent, and that is what happens when a child is abandoned. They go through what they are calling now this toxic stress.

The way I like to describe it—and I know maybe I only have 10 minutes, but it is worth talking about. Every adult in this world within the listening of my voice knows what stress is to an adult. We can literally feel it. Some people go out for a run. Some people have a couple of glasses of wine. Some people have long talks with their friends. We can feel that we have to do something. An infant feels that but in multiples, and an infant can't go out for a run, and a toddler doesn't know what to do. So that toxic stress goes right inside of them and they cannot release it. They don't know how. So it begins to affect the development of their brain.

These scientists are saying that when a child doesn't have, from the moment it is born, a constant, caring, confident touch and talk the way that loving parents demonstrate—as we know, as we hold our infant children in our arms, we give them strength. I used to think they just needed food and warmth, but that is not what the science says. The science says it is so much beyond that. We should have known this by our faith, but sometimes we doubt. So now the science is stepping up and saying exactly what we know by faith, which is that it is imperative that children have a loving, safe place.

I have been to orphanages all over this world, and I will never forget some of the visions I have seen. This is the most common vision we will see in an orphanage anywhere, particularly an orphanage where they have infants who are in cribs who are let's say around 1 year old. We walk into a room as big as this—sometimes smaller, but I have been in ones as large as this—with cribs everywhere, and the infants just sit there, those who can sit up, and they stare into space and they just rock themselves. The scientists say that is their last desperate attempt to console an inconsolable emptiness. So they just rock and they stare. They don't cry. The reason they don't cry is because they cried incessantly for the first 30 or 60 days of their lives, and then when no one came they just stopped because little babies are really smart. Contrary to popular belief, they are literally born with an exceedingly brilliant brain, but the more toxic, the more distorted it gets. So by the time a child is 3—not 13, not 30, but 3—their brain is like a muscle that kind of—it just doesn't function. It doesn't form correctly. And we can see this on this new imaging.

I know there are those who think this is a soft issue. People look at AMY and they look at me and they look at CHUCK GRASSLEY and think, why do these people keep talking about this? It is like nothing. Well, it is a lot. It is not nothing. It is very serious science, and it is very serious community development, and it is very important for this world to get this and get it quickly.

We wonder why prisons are filled. We wonder why psychiatric wards are filled. It is not because people are born bad because even though—I won't even go into mortal sin and my Catholic background. Let's just say forget that. Children are actually born beautifully made because God made them, and it is what we do to them in the time of their birth and the few years after that really shapes what they are going to be.

So, in my view, as a leader, that is why I have spent a great deal of my time on this subject. It is not a soft issue. It is as hard and as important as any Army or any trade policy, and I am never going to stop talking about it because it is so clearly the truth that I just can't stop talking about it.

So, again, this is National Adoption Month. We have put a resolution on the floor. We always get a remarkable amount of support from our Members.

I want to also give a special shout-out to Senator BLUNT, who has a child and who is very engaged in this issue, and he has really stepped up. He has a child who was adopted, as do I and as do other Members who have adopted children or grandchildren. ROSA DELAURO has been a remarkable leader in the House. Her grandchild was adopted from Guatemala. She has become an extraordinary voice. SUSAN BONAMICI, the Congresswoman from Oregon, has also been a great leader. And I just can't say again how happy I am that AMY KLOBUCHAR has been here to help.

I have some amazing photographs to share, and I thank the Huffington Post because that is where they came from. This is National Adoption Month. The Huffington Post has a great picture—and my colleagues can go online and see this—of many of the most remarkable adoption stories on Adoption Day.

These are all children I am going to show you, and I am going to tell you a little bit about them. This is a domestic adoption out of foster care. This is the Michael family. The parents are Tiffanie and Adebayo Michael from New York. The couple fostered two siblings, a boy and a girl who are pictured here. After 2 years and 4 months, the couple adopted these two children out of foster care on National Adoption Day. You can see the smiles.

It is so amazing to see these stories that happen all over the country. On National Adoption Day, this Saturday, many of the judges—this was started by a judge in California. I want to give him credit. His name is Judge Nash.

Judge Nash started this 20 years ago because he was in his courtroom. He was so frustrated—as Amy has been as a prosecutor—that no one was processing these adoption cases that he decided. This was how simple this was. He said: You know what. I am tired of the backlog. I am going to come in on Saturday. That is what he did. He said: I am just tired of it. So staff, we are coming in on Saturday. We are going to process 25 adoptions, 30 adoptions when we are not distracted and where we can get people in.

This is how National Adoption Day started. Judge Nash is my hero. National Adoption Day was started 20 years ago by one judge in one courtroom, and then lots of other organizations joined in. Now it is really a big movement.

This is a happy picture. This is a picture of parents from Baltimore who adopted an infant with a cleft palate from China in 2012. When this little infant was born—I know something about what happens in China and many countries. If an infant is born in almost any country in the nondeveloped world and they have anything wrong with them like a finger is missing or they have a cleft palate or, particularly, if they have something like spina bifida or a leg missing, in some countries they are literally put in rooms called dying rooms. They just leave them because they don't have the same understanding that we do in the United States about A, the dignity of every life, which our faith in this country teaches us; and B, in some countries they actually think it is a curse by God if a child is born with a defect, so they just sort of take it as if God never meant for this child to have a life.

I don't know what would have happened to this little boy. Trust me; it would not have been happy. The only little problem with him is he had a cleft palate.

This couple traveled a long distance. Under the law now, they would probably have to go back two or three

times because we have made it harder, not easier, for these parents. I don't know how many times they traveled, but they probably took their own money, borrowed money—unless they are super rich—from their relatives and went twice to get this little boy and finally brought him home.

The next picture is the Haden family. This is my favorite picture. They have two adopted children. Crew is a 1-year-old. He was adopted from Niger in 2013. Shepherd was 2 years old and was adopted from the DRC in 2012.

The most amazing thing is the biological children, which you can see, were the ones who received the children when they came. I have hardly seen a more beautiful picture than this that represents what the future could be if we would do our jobs.

The fourth picture is the Williams family. Jeff and Kelley Williams are from Nashville, Tennessee. Their faith called them to adopt in 2012. They brought daughter Haley home to Nashville from an orphanage in Ethiopia. This is how many relatives gathered to meet her. The most amazing thing about this picture is how tightly her father is holding her.

The fifth is a picture of the Hardbarger family. They are angels this year. They are from Shreveport. They are an amazing family from Louisiana. Chad is a pastor of a church. He is the senior pastor at Emmanuel Baptist Church in Shreveport. They formed an adoption ministry because they became so moved by their own experience in adopting.

They adopted all of these children. Monique is 19, Chris is 14, Bryce is 11, Jordan is 9, Bailey is 8, and Gavin is 7. He is a pastor of a really wonderful church. They have now taken this as a ministry and are developing—I see the leader on the floor.

I will wrap up in 2 minutes.

They are developing a wonderful ministry in Shreveport, and many of our churches in Louisiana are really stepping up to do this.

You may not believe this because this is a very famous family. They are admired—or otherwise—depending on what circles, so I have a lot of respect for the ''Duck Dynasty'' family in this area of what they have done. Willie and Korie Robinson have five children, three biological, one adopted, and one fostered. The couple adopted Willie, often called little Will, through a private adoption agency when he was born. They have a foster daughter from Taiwan named Rebecca. Since becoming rich and famous, which they weren't always—just a little simple family making duck calls, but now they are one of the most famous families in the world. They were our national angel 2 years ago, and they have continued to promote adoption, both domestic and international.

I wanted to just show a few of the most extraordinary families, both famous and not so famous, who are doing this great work.

I want to thank my colleagues for supporting this resolution, calling on us all in every elective office—Governors, Presidents, Members of Congress, and then at home in our districts, our courts, our judges, our prosecutors—to do everything we can to help.

I want to show you the last picture because this is our challenge. Domestic adoption—I am very proud to have moved this line. I want to give Secretary Hillary Clinton a shout-out—Senator Clinton—who helped to move this line. She really did remarkable work since 1999—basically 2000 to 2014. We now have more children being adopted domestically than ever before at all ages—infants, teenagers, et cetera.

Our challenge is international adoptions have dropped precipitously. I am going to come back to the floor and give a speech about why this is happening and what we have tried to do—a few of us—to turn it around, but our voices are hitting the wall and bouncing off because the State Department is not listening. We will continue the fight. This number is going down dramatically.

There are children such as that little boy in China with a cleft palate who will rot for the rest of their lives. If you want to wonder where terrorists come from, I will tell you where they come from. They come from families that are dysfunctional, and they come from places where there is no hope, no love, and no faith. That is where terrorists come from. If you want to stop it, I would suggest we start turning this line the other way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, a lot of these adoptions wouldn't have happened without Senator LANDRIEU. When we go anywhere in this country on the adoption issue and mention her name, we see nodding of heads of so many parents because they actually know what she has done to fight for domestic adoptions and foster kids and also on the international level. There is so much more work to be done.

Thank you so much. I will be there when you give your speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me add my voice in this chorus because it is true. Senator LANDRIEU, more than any Member of the Congress, has made adoption her cause. We are reminded by Senator LANDRIEU what a difference it makes in the lives of children and their families and the world. I want to commend her. Senator LANDRIEU is the best.

As the grandfather of an adopted child, I know the difference, the joy, the importance of that moment in our family life. I thank her for continuing this battle to make certain that we understand the importance of adoption.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. There was a moment in the Civil War when President Abraham Lincoln sent a message to General McClellan. General McClellan was in charge of the Union troops, but he wouldn't use them. He sat encamped, intense, preparing for battle, and never going forward.

Lincoln, in his frustration, understood as he waited that the Confederate forces were getting stronger and the opportunities were slipping away. Lincoln sent a message to General McClellan. His message was this: If you are not going to use your Army, would you send it my way so I can use it?

I am reminded of that story when I address this issue on the floor of the Senate this morning because the issue I am going to address is the issue of immigration.

I come to this issue with personal and family experience, as so many Members of Congress do when it comes to an issue. In this circumstance, my mother was an immigrant to this country, and she was brought here at the age of 2 from Lithuania. Somehow my grandmother, with my aunt and uncle, made it across the ocean to Baltimore, landing in 1911, and then catching a train heading for the land of opportunity—East St. Louis, IL, which is where many Lithuanian families gathered and where my grandfather was waiting.

That was the city of my birth. My mother grew up there speaking Lithuanian and English—an immigrant family who worked hard and struggled. From family stories, I know they had little or nothing in their lives but the hope that the next generation, their children, would have a better life.

That is my story. That is my family's story, but that is America's story, too.

If we chart immigration as an issue in the course of America, we will find something very interesting. Political parties that become anti-immigrant parties eventually wither and disappear. Why? Because they are denying the fundamentals of America. They are saying that we are going to close the doors and pull up the ladder, and we don't need any more of those people.

We do need more of those people because the immigrant families who come to this country bring more than just determination and strength and a work ethic. They bring a level of courage that many families can't muster. These are families in different parts of the world who say at some point we are going to America. We may not speak the language, we may not even know what will happen to us once we arrive, but we are going to America—and they do. The vast majority of them who come to this country stay and make a difference. They sacrifice. They work night and day, but their moment comes when they become part of America. They are proud of where they came from but even more proud of the fact that they are part of the United States of America.

When any political party in history has decided to make anti-immigration their standard and their value, they have withered and disappeared as they should. They are ignoring and turning their back on who we are—what America is all about.

I was part of a group 2 years ago. We sat down—four Democratic Senators and four Republican Senators—and we worked for months to write a comprehensive immigration reform bill. I will tell you the names of the Senators so you know there was no secret deal here. JOHN MCCAIN led the Republicans, the former Republican candidate for President of the United States. By his side was LINDSEY GRAHAM, Republican from South Carolina—it was not exactly viewed as a liberal State but a very conservative one—and MARCO RUBIO of Florida, whose father and mother were immigrants to this country, refugees from Cuba; and JEFF FLAKE of Arizona, a conservative Republican by every measure. That was the team on the Republican side of the table.

On our side of the table we were led by CHUCK SCHUMER, from the State of New York, chairman of the immigration subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. I joined him as a member of the Judiciary Committee and someone that has been involved in some of these issues for a long time. There was BOB MENENDEZ, the head of the Democratic Hispanic Caucus, which is a caucus of one at this point, by himself, the son of Cuban refugees who came to the United States; and MICHAEL BENNET of Colorado. The eight of us sat down for months, literally for months, hours at a time, sometimes angry and ready to walk out of the room.

We wrote a bill, a 200-page bill to rewrite the immigration laws in America, to fix the broken immigration system. Then we took it to committee, and the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, PATRICK LEAHY, had open hearings and allowed any amendment to be offered that anyone wished.

Then we brought it to the floor after it was reported from the committee. We again gave an opportunity for amendments to be offered. Significant amendments were offered. Senator CORKER of Tennessee offered an amendment to even strengthen what was a very strong border security section of this bill. The net result of that of course was we brought it to a vote.

I will tell you, it was an incredible day, because on June 27 of 2013 we passed, on the floor of the Senate, comprehensive immigration reform by a vote of 68 to 32. Fourteen Republicans joined the Democrats in a bipartisan effort to fix our broken immigration system. It was a proud moment. We had the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. We had the support of organized labor. We had every major religious group in America supporting our efforts. We had the ultraconservative Grover Norquist supporting this and liberals as well came together and said: Finally, we are going to do something about our broken immigration system.

But under the law of the land, passing in the Senate is not enough. The measure was then sent over to the House of Representatives on June 27, 2013. Today, November 19, 2014, the Republican-led House of Representatives has not only failed to have a hearing on this bill, it has refused to bring this bill to the floor, it has refused to bring any immigration bill to the floor. They refuse to address the obvious. We have a broken immigration system. We need to come up with a fair solution to it.

They refuse to act. It is within their power to call that bill today, as it has been every day since June 27, 2013, but for a year and a half the House Republican leadership has refused to act. Oh, they tempted us. They teased us time and again: We are thinking about it. We are going to put out a list of principles that we Republicans believe in, in the House of Representatives. We are going to tell you that maybe we would support something like the DREAM Act—maybe. We are going to tell you we want strong border enforcement, which of course the bill already has.

They have said all of those things and have done nothing. I am reminded of President Lincoln saying to General McClellan: If you are not going to use your Army, may I borrow it? The House Republicans have refused to address the immigration issue almost entirely, with one exception. They did call one immigration matter to the floor. It was one of the most hateful pieces of legislation which I have seen.

Here is what it said. Before they adjourned in August, the Republicans in the House of Representatives passed a measure with only four of their Members refusing to vote for it. Here is what it said. We have created an opportunity for about 2 million children brought to this country who have lived good lives, finished school, have no problems with the law and want to become part of America. The President has created an Executive order giving these children a chance to come forward, register with the government, pay their filing fee, and not be deported.

Madam President, 600,000 of them have taken advantage of that. This is called DACA. The President's Executive order gives them a chance to live in America, to go to school in America, to get a job in America, to make this a better nation. So 600,000 have done it. We believe 1.4 million more are eligible. They have not signed up yet.

So the Republican House of Representatives, in August, before they adjourned, passed a measure which said: The remaining 1.6 million who may be eligible for this protection cannot be allowed to be part of the DACA Program. Those 1.6 million young people should be subject to deportation—deportation.

Think about that for a moment; brought here at the age of 2 or 3 as infants, living in the United States their entire lives, standing in classrooms across America every morning pledging allegiance to the only flag they have ever known, and the Republicans voted, with an overwhelming majority, to deport them—to deport them.

That is not bad enough. That overwhelming vote that they cast, that hateful vote that they cast—they were so proud of themselves, that after voting they stood and applauded themselves. What a great moment in their minds for the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. What a terrible moment in the history of this Nation. The President of the United States, having waited for a year and a half, having heard all of the promises of the House Republicans, that they would move forward and finally call this bill, having been promised privately and even publicly by many of those Republicans that they were going to do something, now the President has said: I am going to use my authority, my authority under the law, to try to fix at least some part of this broken immigration system.

We are expecting, any day now, for the President to announce his Executive order. He will not be the first President to do this. Past administrations, Democratic and Republican, have stopped the deportation of low-priority cases in our country. Every President of the United States—every President of the United States since Dwight David Eisenhower has used his Executive authority to improve our immigration system by Executive order, every single one of them.

President George H.W. Bush issued a family fairness policy allowing 1.5 million people in America to apply for deferred action and work permits. It is clear that Presidents have the authority to do this. Yet the Republicans in the Senate and House have threatened this President that if he uses his Executive authority, as every President since President Eisenhower has done: We are going to hold it against you and you are going to pay a price, President Obama.

I hope the President pays little or no attention to that kind of threat. What is at stake is the future of millions of family members who are now subject to deportation. What is at stake is whether the Republican Party will come into the 21st century in this land of immigrants and join us in a bipartisan effort to fix this broken immigration system.

What is at stake are literally the futures of millions of families who just want a chance. That is all they are asking for, to earn their way into legal status in America. It is almost 13 years

now since I introduced the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act—I described it earlier—gives young people brought to the United States at an early age, who had no voice in what their families were going to do, to come to this country and eventually find their way to legal status.

At one point even the House Republicans said they supported this so-called DREAM Act. Time and again we have faced filibusters stopping the DREAM Act from passing in the Senate, but it was part of comprehensive immigration reform. This DREAM Act all started with this young lady, Tereza Lee, Korean, brought to the United States at the age of 2, grew up in a poor family in Chicago, had an amazing musical talent and was accepted to the Manhattan Conservatory of Music and the Julliard School of Music. Because she was undocumented she had no place to go.

Her mother called our office. Her mother, who incidentally worked night and day in a dry cleaning establishment in Chicago said: What can we do? The law had no real answer, other than to say to this then-18-year-old girl: Go back to where you came from for 10 years and try to come here legally.

That was the law. I introduced the DREAM Act. Since then we have seen a growth in support for this because it is only fair. We cannot, should not, hold children responsible for the decisions and wrongdoing of their parents. These kids deserve a chance. That is what the President's Executive action is about. That is why the action by the House Republicans was so reprehensible.

Tereza Lee, incidentally made it. She went to the Manhattan Conservatory of Music. She ended up not only getting a bachelor's degree, she did not receive any government assistance. She had friends and sponsors who stepped in to pay for it. She played at Carnegie Hall. She is now working on her Ph.D. in music.

She is now an American citizen, by virtue of the fact that she married this young American jazz musician. They are living in New York and recently had a baby.

I could not be prouder of Tereza Lee and what she has done with her life. There is a picture with her mom and dad. Her dad passed away. He had a serious medical illness that could not be treated adequately because he does not qualify for any kind of government health insurance. They did not have the money to provide him the care he needed.

But Tereza Lee's story is one that inspires me every day to come to this floor and remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, these are real human beings we are talking about. These are not political pawns. These are young people who deserve a chance to become part of the future of America. Sometime soon, I hope very soon, maybe even this Friday, the President of the United States is going to announce his Executive order.

He is going to say that, as he did with DACA, the Deferred Action Program, he is going to give more undocumented people in this country a chance. It will be a narrow category, not as broad as we would like it—at least some of us would like it—but it will be consistent with what every President of the United States has done since President Eisenhower.

It is fair. It is just. It recognizes our birthright as Americans, as a nation of immigrants. It says we are willing to stand and fight for fairness. I would hope—I would just hope that a few Republicans will stand and acknowledge this. I hope a few of them will join us in a bipartisan recognition that our broken immigration system cannot be fixed if the Congress of the United States—particularly the Republican House—refuses to even call the bill for a year and a half.

Instead, the President is using his authority and doing the best he can to make this Nation of immigrants proud again that we are welcoming a new generation of people who will make us even stronger in the future.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order be modified so that the following nominations be added following Executive Calendar No. 1056: Executive Calendar Nos. 966 and 967, with all the other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I am glad I got to the floor to listen to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, the majority whip, make his remarks. It reminds me of his great passion and commitment to the DREAMers and to the cause of repairing our broken immigration system.

While he and I differ on the details, and the feasibility of passing comprehensive immigration reform, we have been trying to do this for—laboring with this for at least the 10 or 11 years that I have been here. We have been unsuccessful. What does that tell us? It tells us we need to try something different. We need to break this down into smaller pieces. In the House, Speaker BOEHNER I know has made this pledge to the President and others. I know Senator MCCONNELL, the new incoming majority leader, believes immigration reform is important and we ought to use our best efforts to make progress.

But unfortunately the message the President of the United States has sent is he is giving up. To listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who support this unprecedented Executive action by the President that is going to be announced on Friday, they have given up. They have given up.

What the Senator from Illinois did not say is even the President's deferred action order involving these young people—by the way, I support providing them an opportunity to become American citizens and productive members of society. I think we are all better off—these young people who are not culpable, they did not commit any offense or crime, they came with their parents, and we are much better off. They are much better off. Their families are much better off.

Our country is better off if we find a solution—which I am confident we could do. But the message the President has given and our Democratic friends have given is: We give up. We are not going to do our job as legislators.

We are going to let the President, with the stroke of a pen, provide an Executive amnesty to millions of people and create an awful lot of harm in the process.

The tragedy is we are a nation of immigrants and proud of it. Our rich, diverse heritage would not have been the same without the contribution of immigrants who have come from around the world, contributions that have become part of the very fabric of our lives and our society.

Millions of foreign-born immigrants who have come to the United States legally have become successful, patriotic citizens of the United States. We have been the beneficiary because of the opportunities that our Nation provides that nowhere else on Earth provides, and that is the opportunity to pursue the American dream.

But part of what makes the American dream possible is the rule of law. It is our Constitution. It is not Presidents getting frustrated with Congress, issuing an Executive order, defying the Constitution, and ignoring his oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. That undermines the American Dream.

So I listened to my colleague and friend from Illinois saying that this is a question about: Are immigrants good for America or not?

I stipulate they are good for America. As a matter of fact, my ancestors weren't born in the United States. We all came from somewhere else.

This is really, at bottom, whether the President, when he put his hand on the Bible and he took a sacred oath to uphold and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States, whether he really meant it or whether he had his fingers crossed behind his back.

Like many of my colleagues, I have had the privilege of participating in naturalization ceremonies all across my State, where I have seen individuals from Vietnam, India, Mexico, and

from countries all around the world take the oath of allegiance to the United States of America. It is an inspiring and heartwarming occasion and, of course, many of them have taken that oath while wearing the uniform of the U.S. military, where they have served with honor and dignity as they await approval of their citizenship.

One of the first bills I passed when I came to the Senate was with Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts, the liberal lion of the Senate. What we did is we passed a simple piece of legislation that expedited the process whereby immigrants who serve in the military can become American citizens. That was one of the first bills I was a part of that passed when I came to the Senate.

Of course, these naturalization ceremonies represent a proud day, not only for these new Americans but for all Americans and for our Nation as a whole, where we welcome new citizens with open arms to this country to find a better life for themselves, for their family and, in the process, for all of us.

But the President has now threatened—and he is the one who has made the threat: If you don't do it on my timetable, according to the terms I prefer, I am going to do it myself.

He said that time and time again. There is no President who has abused the authority to issue Executive orders more than the current occupant of the White House. All Presidents have issued Executive orders since President George Washington, but no one has held Congress and the Constitution in such contempt that they feel as if Congress is irrelevant—except when I need them to appropriate money or to help them serve my purposes.

But the President is going to take steps in the coming days that would send men and women—such as those I have mentioned—who came, playing by the rules, pursuing legal immigration to the United States. He is going to basically tell those folks: Get to the back of the line.

We are the most generous country in the world when it comes to naturalization—almost 1 million people a year. But the President is going to tell the people who have been waiting patiently in line, playing by the rules: Get in the back of the line. I am going to put millions of people ahead of you in front of the line who have not played by the rules.

Well, it is a sure way to send a message to the rest of the world that our country does not enforce its own laws, which is an essential part of who we are, and where everybody, from the humblest to the most exalted in our country, are all bound by the same laws, whether you are President of the United States or whether you are one of these new Americans who takes an oath to uphold and defend the laws and the Constitution of the United States.

I have to say, because I come from a big State that sees disproportionate negative consequences of illegal immigration, this is a sure way to continue to reward the criminal organizations that get rich on the status quo. The 60,000 unaccompanied children that came from Central America that were part of this humanitarian crisis we had last summer continue to come, and the criminal organizations that continue to profit from this money-making operation are continuing to get rich. It encourages children to take a perilous journey, for many of whom it ends in kidnapping, sexual assault or death to get to the U.S. border.

The worst part is we just had a national election, as we do every 2 years. I have been in Congress when my side of the aisle wins elections, and we have had a pretty good election. I have been here when we lost, as we did in 2008. But that doesn't mean we can give up on our job, which is to legislate.

One of the saddest parts about what the President is going to do is he will poison the well and make it much harder, if not impossible, for us to do the sorts of things for which a bipartisan, bicameral commitment exists to do, which is to make serious progress on our broken immigration system. I am not sure whether we will be able to do as much as I would like to do or the Senator from Illinois would like to do, but we all know the status quo is unacceptable.

The President seems intent on provoking a constitutional crisis by adopting policies that he previously said were illegal. He said he didn't have the authority to do it time and time again. Now he has totally done a flip-flop of 180 degrees saying: I have discovered I now do have the authority. I was wrong when I said I didn't have the authority to do it. He seems intent on exacerbating partisan polarization and weakening democratic accountability.

We are the ones who are responsible for making these decisions, and we are accountable to our electorate, our voters. Unfortunately, it is going to make it much harder for us to make necessary progress on a number of different matters next year.

The President says we haven't acted on his timetable in a way that he prefers, so he is going to go it alone. But just think for a moment about the larger implications of that argument.

Every President in history has clashed with Congress. That is part of what we do. That is what the separation of powers is all about. It forces us to build consensus as opposed to pursuing our own agendas, and that is important. That is essential. But failing to get your way in Congress doesn't mean the President can simply override Congress with the stroke of his pen.

There is broad support for passing a series of commonsense immigration reform bills. I know the Speaker has said that publicly. The majority leader in the House, Congressman MCCARTHY, I believe, believes that, and I certainly do. The incoming majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has told me he does as well. But what there is no support for, other than purely partisan support, is what the President is proposing to do.

So in other words, if the President were willing to negotiate in good faith—and, yes, when your proposal is that I want everything I want or I want nothing, you frequently get nothing. You always get nothing because nobody gets everything they want, and it requires genuine compromise and it requires hard work. Nothing sustainable or meaningful will ever be done in this place without bipartisan support. We have learned that lesson time and time again.

But the President seems absolutely allergic—allergic—to good-faith negotiating and genuine compromise. In fact, I am not even sure he likes the job he ran so hard to get elected to, because that is part of his job—to work with Congress in a bipartisan way to achieve genuine consensus and compromise where possible.

He is claiming now, apparently, on Friday in Las Vegas, a right that no other President has claimed and, in fact, that he said he did not have, time and time again.

I know the White House Counsel's office is preparing a convoluted legal case to justify the President's actions. Most Americans will correctly view this as an abuse of power.

Earlier, I asked the President to think about the human costs of encouraging another massive wave of illegal immigration. My State is disproportionately affected, given our 1,200-mile common border with Mexico. It is not only people coming from Mexico; it is from Central America and around the world. But I urged him to think about all the men, women, and children from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador who have suffered terrible violence and, indeed, some have died during their long journey through Mexico from Central America.

I urged him to think again about whether what he is doing inadvertently rewards and helps fund the criminal organizations that are creating such havoc in Mexico and in parts of Central America.

I can only hope the President will reconsider. I certainly am not optimistic because now the White House is leaking press reports about this announcement on Friday. But I believe his unilateral action, which is unconstitutional and illegal, will deeply harm our prospects for immigration reform. It will be deeply harmful to our Nation's tradition of the rule of law and deeply harmful to the future of our democracy.

Many Democrats believe, as I do, that this is a mistake. The President should heed their advice, stop making threats, and respect the Constitution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NET NEUTRALITY

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise today to call the Senate's attention to one of the most important economic issues before us, and that is the issue of Net neutrality.

We face a pivotal moment in the fight to preserve an open and fair Internet. Last week, the President called on the FCC to protect the bedrock principle of Net neutrality.

A strong, open Internet is one of the best ways to protect the innovation that supports millions of American jobs. It is one of the best ways to protect the competitiveness of the digital economy.

Now the FCC is working on formulating ways to protect a robust Internet. We know that the FCC received over 4 million comments on the issue of Net neutrality, and it registered many concerns by the public in making sure that we protect what has been a great resource for them.

They have spoken. They want to protect innovation, and they want to protect a free Internet.

Consumers should know for a fact that their Internet service is being held to the same standards as everywhere else. But we know now there are concerns about the concentration of players in the cable and large telephone market as it continues to develop. Maybe two providers will provide as much as 85 percent of the provider market, which raises concerns to many consumers.

Today I am calling on the FCC to take forceful action that adopts the strongest rule possible to provide maximum protection for consumers—maximum flexibility to promote the Internet economy.

I encourage the FCC to adopt robust and durable rules to prevent locking, throttling, fast lanes, and to safeguard transparency for consumers. These rules should apply both to the wired and wireless broadband networks so that your Web browser, your personal computer, your apps on your phone, all are treated in the same way.

This important policy would provide certainty to startup and business communities the same way as it will to support the Fortune 500 companies. In other words, we will treat an entrepreneur who started their company in their garage the same way we treat a big multinational corporation.

We need to send a clear message: We do not want artificial toll lanes on the innovation economy of the future. It is my hope the FEC arrives at a conclusion next year and issues these rules. The Internet has been an engine for unprecedented economic growth for our country. Today, the text-up sector represents 3.9 millions jobs, according to Pew Research, and it is continuing to grow. It really does represent the American entrepreneurial spirit.

YouTube was created in a garage in San Mateo; Facebook launched in a dorm room in Cambridge, MA; Amazon—when Jeff Bezos came to Bellevue, WA—has now become a juggernaut in downtown Seattle for new growth and development. These companies might have started in a garage, but they are supporting thousands of jobs across our country.

So today we want to make sure the Internet is not under attack by those who would prefer a pay-for-play system. The biggest telecom companies are trying to write the rules of the road that would crowd out some of these opportunities for unique entrepreneurs to continue to grow the application economy of the future. That is why we can't allow Internet service providers to set up fast lanes for those who can pay and slow lanes for those who can't. Our innovation economy depends on equal access for ideas.

Between 2007 and 2012, development of applications for smart phones and tablets created over 466,000 high-tech jobs and generated more than $20 billion in annual revenue. A tiered Internet system would put all of that at risk. It would allow Internet service providers to cut back from the deals to determine what information America can access on line.

We live in an economy based on speed, and a tiered Internet system would give the power to set speed limits to those few Internet service providers and what they wanted to do. This has a major ripple effect. Imagine your doctor examining a patient via telemedicine or a student trying to access a report through a university server, all of this put at challenge by whether they have fast access.

As an editorial in the Seattle Times said: America's democracy is in trouble when information is throttled or controlled by a few. The FEC must reverse this shameful trend.

What they are really trying to say is that creating additional barriers is tantamount, in my mind, to creating a tax on the Internet. A tiered Internet provider would have the range of control, and it means that individual users could be challenged. Strong Net neutrality rules will help maintain the same Internet we have today, and that is why the FEC should act.

Across the country, innovators, entrepreneurs, are experimenting with different app designs and different content creation and they rely on this open Internet to pursue those new business models. Nearly every startup relies on understanding that their product can reach any user connected to the Internet. So allowing Internet service providers to erect toll lanes would threaten the fundamental nature of the Internet and every business plan of every startup that relies on the consumer's ability for equal access to content.

We must do better than what has been done so far, and I encourage this body to make sure we too are going to stand up and protect the American spirit of entrepreneurship by making sure that Net neutrality is the law of the land.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

(The remarks of Mr. WHITEHOUSE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2940 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank my colleague for allowing me the extra time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF STEVE BACCUS, PRESIDENT OF KANSAS FARM BUREAU

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, agriculture is the lifeblood of my home State of Kansas. It drives our economy, but more importantly, it offers our citizens a way of life that is unique in today's world.

Within that industry I often encounter thoughtful, committed men and women who work every day to raise their families, run their businesses, serve their neighbors, and provide a better future for the next generation. Those qualities are found in Steve Baccus, who for the past 17 years has served on the Kansas Farm Bureau Board of Directors and for the last 12 served as its president.

Kansas Farm Bureau is our State's largest general farm organization, with nearly 105,000 members. Under Steve's leadership, the organization has influenced policy and politics, promoted rural values, and worked to show an increasingly urban population how food is produced and why technology is indispensable to feeding a hungry world.

Steve is a native Kansan, a veteran, a husband, a father of five, and a grandfather. His fourth-generation family farm in Ottawa County produces wheat, corn, soybeans, and occasionally a sunflower or a bit of sorghum.

I met Steve now many years ago when he was on his local farm bureau board, and we grew to be friends over the years. He was always someone I could count on to give trustworthy advice and counsel.

As agricultural issues repeatedly come to the forefront of debate in Washington, DC—from trade and energy, to the economy, overregulation, and the farm bill—Steve has worked to make certain the voices of Kansas farmers and ranchers are heard in the Nation's Capital.

Steve's passion for improving the lives of Kansans and advocating for the future of our rural State has always impressed me. His service on the Kansas Farm Bureau board was inspired by Steve's deeply held belief that there is a better future ahead for Kansas agriculture and for our State. He has always been selfless in his service, often

taking time to drive across all 105 Kansas counties over the years to update members of the farm bureau on issues that impact their lives and the lives of their family members in rural Kansas and across our State. KFB members always knew where to find Steve and felt comfortable seeking his help.

In addition to his service as president of the Kansas Farm Bureau, Steve has led multiple boards and organizations, including the Board of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company, whose board he currently chairs. He has led trade missions, presented testimony before Congress and State legislative committees, and has championed the cause of agriculture for much of his adult life.

Steve embodies many traits we can all admire, including a deep love for the great State of Kansas and gratitude for the many hard-working families who provide food, fuel, and fiber on which Americans and the world rely. These traits have earned Steve the respect of his peers across the country. Steve has been a true public servant to agriculture, and he did it for all the right reasons. Not often do you find someone who has such good and clear intentions of service. Kansas farmers and ranchers found that in Steve Baccus in spades. He is a tremendous role model for all of us who want to make a difference in the lives of others.

Steve, we congratulate you for your service and wish you and your wife Patricia well in the next chapter of your life as you retire as president of Kansas Farm Bureau.

REMEMBERING ROSS AND MARIANNA BEACH

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, last Sunday I was at a funeral service in Manhattan, KS, because Kansas lost one of its greatest philanthropists and education advocates when Marianna Kistler Beach passed away on November 1, 2014.

Marianna and her late husband Ross Beach—who passed away in 2010—were residents of my hometown of Hay, KS, for more than 60 years before moving to Lawrence. This devoted couple was well known and well loved for their acts of service and kindness to others. Because of Marianna and Ross Beach, numerous Kansans have been inspired through the arts, and individuals with disabilities and their families have lived healthier, more productive lives.

Marianna was born on November 24, 1919, in Lincoln, KS, and Marianna learned the importance of empowerment through education at a young age from her parents. Elmer and Myrtle Kistler moved their family from Lincoln—including their 15-year-old daughter Marianna—to Manhattan, KS, in 1934 in order to give their children the opportunity for a college education during the Great Depression. Marianna graduated from Manhattan High School and Kansas State University, where she was a member of Pi Beta Phi, Sigma Phi Journalism Honorary, and Mortar Board.

Marianna married Ross—whom she always called Rossie—in 1941, and they were devoted to each other for 69 years until his death in 2010.

Ross Beach was a pioneer in banking, radio and television, and oil and gas, and Marianna was a support system behind all that success. Ross was the president of Kansas National Gas Company and chairman of the board of the Douglas County Bank, and with Marianna by his side Ross created economic opportunities for many Kansans. But the Beaches' business success was overshadowed by Ross and Marianna's generosity.

Marianna Beach worked hard to make certain education and the arts would be a priority of Kansans. She and her husband assisted with the formation of the Beach-Schmidt Performing Arts Center and the Sternberg Museum of Natural History at Fort Hays State University. Marianna was a member of the Mid-America Arts Alliance, president of the Hays Arts Council, and wrote a column on art and city beautification for the Hays Daily News for more than 20 years.

For the Beaches' 50th wedding anniversary, Marianna convinced her husband to establish the Marianna Kistler Beach Museum of Art on the campus of Kansas State University to ensure that art is accessible to all Kansans. My wife Robba and I have had the honor to serve on the board of visitors of this museum that bears their name. We are able to witness firsthand the positive consequences of the passion and commitment Ross and Marianna had for culture and for the arts in our State.

Marianna's priorities were guided by a belief in the value of each individual, which was illustrated by her lifelong commitment to supporting and uplifting individuals with special needs. Supported by her husband, Marianna worked tirelessly to maximize the potential of handicapped individuals, serving on the President's Committee on Mental Retardation from 1969 to 1975. She was also actively involved at the local level. She did everything personally. In fact, the Beach Center on Disability at the University of Kansas is named in her honor. The research done there focuses on disability policy, employment, family support, and early childhood services.

The Beaches' level of generosity will truly live on for generations to come.

Despite their stature in our community and State, Marianna and Ross Beach always treated every person they encountered with respect and dignity. As a young newlywed couple starting a new life in Hays, the first invitation Robba and I received was to come to Ross and Marianna's home for dinner. There was never a more gracious, caring couple than the Beaches, who wanted to make sure everyone was included.

For a large portion of my life, I joined Ross and other businessmen and professionals for lunch at The Roundtable. While there was a lot of talk about sports and politics, I learned a lot about life by listening to Mr. Beach. My friendship with Ross Beach certainly opened doors for me in business and politics, but more importantly, it gave me the confidence to realize that this smalltown Kansas kid could one day be able to serve here with my colleagues in the Senate.

While my family and I are saddened by the death of Marianna Beach, we take comfort knowing that the legacy of the Beach family will endure far beyond our generation. While Marianna and Ross Beach donated their talents and treasure, it is their character and generous souls that I and many others will miss the most.

Marianna was loved by all who knew her but especially by her family. I extend my heartfelt sympathies to her daughters Mary, Terry, and Jane, as well as her brother Lee, sister Janet, and eight grandchildren and six great-grandchildren. I know you loved your mother, grandmother, and sister dearly, and she will be greatly missed. I hope you find comfort in knowing that she and Ross are united in their Heavenly home.

We are told that to whom much is given, much is expected. Ross and Marianna Beach more than fulfilled any expectations. I am thankful for having the good fortune of knowing them for more than 40 years.

God bless Marianna and Ross Beach for their life together and let them be a role model for all of us.

Thank you, Madam President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you very much, Madam President.

There is a lot of talk here in Washington and across our country right now about how to fix a very broken immigration system. The message the American people sent us earlier this month was very clear. I don't think anybody should miss it. They want us to work together, and they want us to get things done for the country and move things forward. They know we can still do big things when we put aside partisan politics and sit down together and work in the best interests of the country.

I know that firsthand because of the farm bill. It was not easy. It was complicated. There were regional differences. There were partisan differences. There were differences between the House and the Senate. But we wanted to get it done. We stuck with it, we worked hard, and in the end, a lot of people working together made that happen. So we know how to do that.

We know how to do that in the Senate on immigration as well because a

whole different group of people across the aisle sat down with very different ideas. How do we strengthen the border? How do we have a system that works for agriculture and business? How do we create a pathway of earning their citizenship in this country? People worked in a very complicated situation, they worked together, and ultimately, after a lot of amendments and slogging it through on the floor, just as we did on the farm bill, we achieved that. We achieved that. We achieved that 510 days ago.

So 510 days ago we passed overwhelmingly—I believe it was 68 votes—a comprehensive immigration reform bill and sent it to the House of Representatives—510 days ago. What has the Republican House of Representatives done with that comprehensive, bipartisan bill that was sent to them 510 days ago? Nothing. A great big zero. They have done nothing. They refused to even have a vote on it. They refused to suggest changes to the bill and work on the opportunity to bring their ideas to the table. They refused to even debate the bill. Why? Amazingly—amazingly—it is because the Speaker and the Republicans and the House know it would pass if they brought it up. And the public looks at that and says: What? Are you crazy? You don't want to bring up a bill because you know it would actually pass on a bipartisan vote?

But that is exactly what is happening. In fact, that is how it is supposed to work. There was a tremendous amount of effort by this body and by leaders on both sides of the aisle, who should feel very proud of the work that was done. It was sent to the House of Representatives 510 days ago, and nothing has been done. Zero has been done.

So I have a very simple message for Speaker BOEHNER: Let the House vote. Let the House vote. The time is now. The time is now to solve this problem, and it can be solved today if people want to do that.

House Republicans still have an opportunity to show the American people that they can be trusted to do the work that people sent them to do—sent all of us to do. They can do it today. They can do it tomorrow. They can get this done before Thanksgiving. Everyone knows that the bipartisan Senate immigration bill would pass right now with both Democrats and Republicans supporting it if Speaker BOEHNER would simply let the House vote.

As we in the Senate showed over a year ago, people on both sides of the aisle want to fix this broken system that hurts families, workers, businesses, and farmers. I could tell you story after story of crops being left in the field because of a broken immigration system. This is an urgent problem, and the time to act is now.

If our Republican colleagues in the House don't want President Obama to use his authority to help fix the broken immigration system—just as every President, by the way, since President Eisenhower, including Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush, has done—all they have to do is simply vote. Just have a vote. Then we don't have to have this back-and-forth about how do we work together on appropriations or how do we get all the work done that desperately needs to be done. Just vote. It is in their hands.

We cannot afford to wait another 510 days to begin to address this urgent problem, which is why if the House will not act the President has no choice but to act. But the good news is that we don't have to wait.

Americans didn't send us here to talk about impeachment or shutting down the government again. They sent us here to get things done. They sent us here to create opportunities for them to work hard and get in the middle class and stay in the middle class, which is harder and harder to do every day.

So I would say to Speaker BOEHNER: Let the House vote. Let's get the bipartisan immigration bill on the President's desk today. This isn't about the President waving a red flag in front of a bull, by the way—which is, frankly, a lot of bull—this is about waving the bill in front of the House of Representatives.

Yoo-hoo, Mr. Speaker, you have a bill. You have a bill. It passed with 68 votes in the Senate. It will pass in the House of Representatives. It will avoid what you say is going to be a big fight and legal challenges. Just vote. It is that simple.

Let's show the American people that we can put aside our differences, that we can work together and do what is best for the country. It is as simple as having a vote.

Thank you, Madam President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

TRIBUTE TO ABDUL-RAHMAN ''PETER'' KASSIG

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, this is a speech I hoped to never give and one I give with an incredibly heavy heart. I wish to speak about a young man from my home State of Indiana, Abdul-Rahman Kassig, known to many who loved him as Peter or Pete. He was a Hoosier, a son of Indiana, and we could not feel more proud of him or lucky about the fact that he was one of us.

Abdul-Rahman was a son of the United States of America who served our country and also served the world. He was a man of peace and healing and caring. Abdul-Rahman was with us for 26 years, and what he gave us during his life is so much greater and so much more important than how he died. The intensity and focus and desire to make a difference was the hallmark of Peter's life, and it stands in stark contrast to the cruelty and disdain for human life of the ISIL terrorists who took Peter from us.

Every one of us is heartbroken for his parents Paula and Ed, who have lost their son in the most nightmarish of circumstances and have been the most extraordinary people during this whole situation. The world mourns the loss of Abdul-Rahman along with us. His life is one to be admired.

As one of his teachers wrote to his parents: ''Peter's life is evidence that he's been right all along; one person can make a difference.''

While we mourn the loss of our fellow Hoosier in America, we are rightfully angry about his murder and we hunger for justice, but we are challenged to face the fact that there are others still being held by these terrorists, and we must work and pray for those who continue to be held against their will.

Today I want to talk about Abdul-Rahman—Peter. I know his wonderful parents Paula and Ed. They are extraordinary people. I was not lucky enough to meet Peter before he headed over to Syria to help provide emergency medical care there. However, through his folks and these many months, I feel as though I have gotten to know his spirit through his words, his actions, and the many stories from those who loved him. Some stories can be told, some stories can't be told, but he is an extraordinary young man in every way.

This was a selfless, courageous young man with a big heart who saw suffering and wanted to help, and ultimately he laid down his life in service to others. If you look at these pictures, this is Peter at the ambulance that he worked on as an emergency medical technician, and all he did was try to make other people's lives better by helping them when they were injured and wounded. You will hear that when his organization ran out of money, he took his own money out of his own pocket to buy bandages, equipment, and gas for the van. That is the kind of guy he was.

He was a son of Indiana, growing up near Broad Ripple as the only child of Paula and Ed. He graduated from Indianapolis North Central High School, spending his high school days as many kids in Wisconsin do—the home State of the Presiding Officer—running cross country and track and playing his guitar. He then served in the U.S. Army with a brief time in Iraq before being honorably discharged and enrolling in Hanover College back home in Indiana.

Abdul-Rahman was described as an intense young man who was always ready to help his friends in need. One classmate from Hanover said, ''From the moment you meet Abdul-Rahman, you know that he is a man that is destined for great things.''

Abdul-Rahman left Hanover in 2009 for training and then certification as an emergency medical technician, followed by attending Butler University. It was during his time as a student at Butler that Pete traveled over to Beirut during spring break in 2012. While other kids were heading to Florida and

Texas and the Bahamas over spring break, Pete went to Beirut to try to help people.

He saw the refugee crisis stemming from the Syrian civil war firsthand and decided to stay there.

I wish to read some of what he wrote to his family and friends at that time about the decision he made. These are Peter's words:

I do not know much, every day that I am here I have more questions and less answers, but what I do know is that I have a chance to do something here, to take a stand. To make a difference. Yesterday my life was laid out on a table in front of me. With only hours left before my scheduled flight back home to the United States, I watched people dying right in front of me. I had seen it before and I had walked away before . . .

I am staying in the region indefinitely. I am formally requesting that I be withdrawn from my courses for the remainder of the semester. I have had the conversation with my parents and it was the easiest one we ever had. They knew simply from the sound of my voice. I have never been freer, more alive, happier, or better received than in this place.

There is too much work to be done here. Too many people in need of immediate help . . .

This decision isn't one that everyone would make, most people wouldn't I guess, but those of you that really know me understand that this is what I was made to do. My whole life has led me to this point in time.

In May of 2012, Abdul-Rahman moved to Lebanon to work as a volunteer emergency medical technician, serving in a hospital in the region there.

By September 2012, Abdul-Rahman, still in his young twenties, formed his own nongovernmental organization to even better help those in need around him. It was called the Special Emergency Relief and Assistance, or SERA.

In the summer of 2013, Abdul-Rahman moved SERA's headquarters to Gaziantep, Turkey, where the organization provided first response assistance to refugees fleeing the Syrian civil war.

SERA provided food and medical supplies to the refugee camps on both sides of the border. SERA also provided primary trauma care and first-aid training to civilians in Syria so others could also provide that same care.

When fundraising was not going as well as needed, Abdul-Rahman donated his own money, giving not only his time and his talent, but everything he had financially to keep it going and assist those suffering around him. He was working on a project for SERA when he was detained on October 1, 2013.

When he was detained, he was traveling in the back of an ambulance on his way to Deir Ezzour in eastern Syria to help provide medical care. He was in the back of an ambulance when he was taken.

Peter showed incredible strength while in captivity—demonstrating his love for his parents while reflecting on the possibility that he might not make it home.

In a letter written while he was in captivity, and received by his parents in early 2014, Abdul-Rahman wrote:

It is still really hard to believe all of this is happening . . . as I am sure you know by now, things have been getting pretty intense. We have been held together, us foreigners . . . and now about half the people have gone home . . .

I hope that this all has a happy ending but it may very well be coming down to the wire here, if in fact that is the case then I figured it was time to say a few things that need saying before I have to go.

The first thing I want to say is thank you. Both to you and mom for everything you have both done for me as parents; for everything you have taught me, shown me, and experienced with me.

I cannot imagine the strength and commitment it has taken to raise a son like me but your love and patience are things I am so deeply grateful for.

Secondly, I want you to know about things here and what I've been through straight from me so you don't have to wonder, guess, or imagine (often this is worse than the reality). All in all I am alright. Physically I am pretty underweight but I'm not starved, & I have no physical injuries, I'm a tough kid and still young so that helps.

Mentally I am pretty sure this is the hardest thing a person can go through, the stress and fear are incredible but I am coping as best I can. I am not alone. I have friends, we laugh, we play chess, we play trivia to stay sharp, and we share stories and dreams of home and loved ones. I can be hard to deal with, you know me. My mind is quick and my patience thinner than most.

But all in all I am holding my own. I cried a lot in the first few months, but a little less now. I worry a lot about you and mom and my friends.

They tell us you have abandoned us and/or don't care but of course we know you are doing everything you can and more. Don't worry Dad, if I do go down, I won't go thinking anything but what I know to be true. That you and mom love me more than the moon & the stars.

I am obviously pretty scared to die but the hardest part is not knowing, wondering, hoping and wondering if I should even hope at all. I am very sad that all this has happened and for what all of you back home are going through.

If I do die, I figure at least you and I can seek refuge and comfort in knowing that I went out as a result of trying to alleviate suffering and helping those in need.

In terms of my faith, I pray everyday and I am not angry about my situation in that sense. I am in a dogmatically complicated situation here, but I am at peace with my belief.

I wish this paper would go on forever and never run out and I could just keep talking to you. Just know I'm with you. Every stream, every lake, every field and river. In the woods and hills, in all the places you showed me. I love you.

If you look at the pictures, you can see Peter and his mom in this picture and Peter and his dad off fishing in Indiana. This is the story of Abdul-Rahman Kassig. Nothing you have seen on TV over the past 3 or 4 days is the story of Abdul-Rahman Kassig. This is the story. Those are his parents and this is what he did—he devoted his life to others.

He was a young man who was taken from us in the most barbaric way, yet whose life stands for all that is good in our world.

Abdul-Rahman, we will miss you catching more fish than your dad Ed when you went out fishing together and then laughing with him and rubbing it in that you caught more than he did. Best friends right there.

We will miss you giving your mom Paula a big hug and telling your parents how much you love them. Folks around the world and every American will miss you terribly, but we will never forget how kind you were to the sick and injured people you cared for and the sick and injured people you made well, and everyone whose hearts you filled with love and passion and laughter.

This was a man all Hoosiers and everyone else was so proud of, who touched more people and helped more folks in his 26 years than most of us do in a lifetime.

I will close with something that Paula Kassig said on Monday:

Our hearts are battered, but they will mend. The world is broken, but it will be healed in the end. And good will prevail . . .

Abdul-Rahman spent the last years of this life working for good, serving those in the greatest need in the most dangerous of situations because his fellow citizens of the world needed him. He truly believed good would prevail.

Let us keep the Kassigs and those who are still currently being held against their will and their families in our prayers and thoughts.

Abdul-Rahman, we have been humbled by your generosity and your love. May God bless you and may God bless the United States of America.

I yield back and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEW REPUBLICAN MAJORITY AGENDA

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today is our first full week back in session since the election 2 weeks ago. While we haven't had the change of control yet in the Chamber—it doesn't happen until next year—Republicans are setting out our priorities for the new Congress and looking forward to getting to work.

Two weeks ago the American people spoke. They sent a clear message to Washington that they are tired of the status quo, tired of gridlock, tired of obstruction. They are tired of Washington wasting their money. They want change, and on election day, they asked Republicans to make that happen.

Republicans are humbled by the trust the American people have placed in us, and we are not going to let them down. We look forward to setting a positive and a constructive agenda and getting the Senate working again for the American people.

Over the past several years, the Senate Democratic leadership has stifled debate, ignored the regular order of business, and wasted the Senate's time on partisan pieces of business that Democratic leaders knew would not pass. That means that very little time has been spent on American families' priorities.

Even many Democrats have grown frustrated with the highly partisan direction the Senate has taken under Democratic leadership. Republicans intend to chart a different course.

Starting in January, we will ensure that the Senate returns to the committee process and that the Senate floor once again becomes a forum for debate and amendments and votes. I am encouraged that this week a number of rank-and-file Democrats abandoned their leadership and joined Republicans to support legislation to approve the Keystone Pipeline and the more than 42,000 jobs it will create. Republicans hope we can continue to have that kind of collaboration in the new Congress.

Americans have had a rough time over the past several years, including a weak economy, few jobs, high prices on everything from health care to electricity, and the list goes on and on. Our first priority in the 114th Congress will be enacting policies that will help create jobs and increase economic opportunity for American families. A good place to start is the dozens of House-passed jobs bills that have been gathering dust on the Senate Democratic leader's desk. Many of these bills passed the House with bipartisan support, and it is high time they get a vote in the Senate so they can get on the President's desk.

We hope the President will work with us on priorities such as expanding trade to open new markets for American agriculture and manufacturing overseas.

I have to say I am a little concerned that the President has indicated his intention of continuing to operate on his own. The American people made it clear on election day that they have rejected his policies, and I hope the President will take that message to heart and rethink his plans to go it alone on important issues such as immigration.

Finally, Republicans will get to work on some of the big-ticket items that need to get done in Washington, including issues such as reforming our Tax Code to make it simpler and fairer and to make us more competitive in the global marketplace, eliminating the hundreds of inefficient regulations that are driving up prices for American families and killing jobs, and issues such as conducting oversight of the executive branch to ensure that the cycle of abuses such as the IRS scandal and the Veterans Affairs scandal stops now.

Republicans understand the opportunity we have been given and we don't intend to waste it. We are going to make Washington work again, we are going to make government more efficient and effective and stop the waste of taxpayer dollars, and we are going to get our economy going again to put our Nation on a path to growth and shared prosperity.

Divided government has been historically a time when great things have been accomplished. We can go back to Social Security reform in 1983 when we had a Republican President working with a Democratic House or tax reform in 1986 when we had a Republican President working with a Democratic House or 1996 when we had a Democratic President working with a Republican Congress on welfare reform. There are lots of examples throughout our history where divided government has led to big accomplishments and big results for the American people.

I submit that we can do that again. The American people are counting on us. Republicans are ready to roll up our sleeves and get to work, and we invite Democrats and the President to join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, this past Saturday the open enrollment period for the Obama health care law opened in terms of the health care exchange. People who bought health insurance through healthcare.gov or through their State's exchange are finally allowed to see how much their insurance is going to cost next year. Things were pushed back beyond the election so people wouldn't be able to find out before the election what it was going to cost. So the Obama administration had all of this information for awhile, but they intentionally kept it secret until after election day. Now people get to see the prices, and many people across the country are absolutely in shock at the increased costs of the health care law.

Millions of Americans are learning their health insurance is going to cost them a lot more. As a matter of fact, when the exchanges opened November 15, on the front page of the New York Times: ''Cost of Coverage Under Care Act Set to Increase.'' The article says:

> The Obama administration on Friday unveiled data showing that many Americans with health insurance bought under the Affordable Care Act could face substantial price increases next year—in some cases as much as 20 percent.

Substantial price increases, 20 percent.

For some people it is going to be even higher than that.

The Wall Street Journal took a look at it and they had a large story with a picture on Friday and the headline is: ''Consumers Still Confused Ahead of Insurance Sign-ups.''

The article describes a man named Bob Sorey, who is a real estate salesperson in Mount Juliet, TN. He had a plan through Blue Cross Blue Shield, and he says his premiums are going up nearly 25 percent next year. He told the newspaper, ''I just can't absorb that.''

President Obama promised the American people they would save $2,500 per year per family under his health care law. NANCY PELOSI, the former Speaker of the House, went on ''Meet the Press'' at one point and said everyone's rates would go down—everyone, she said. What does the President have to say now? What will he tell those people whose rates have continued to go up? What does he say to this real estate broker in Tennessee who can't absorb a 20-percent increase?

In Anchorage, AK, a typical plan is going to cost 28 percent more next year. That is for the second cheapest silver plan, what they call the benchmark plan.

In Minneapolis rates are going up almost 19 percent, and that is just for the premiums. For many people their copays are going up and their deductibles are going up as well. In some parts of Georgia 70 percent of the plans sold on the exchange have deductibles of at least $2,500. Is that affordable for people? Millions of Americans will be paying more in premiums as well as more out of their pocket—millions of people such as Bob Sorey, the real estate broker in Tennessee, who, as he said, just can't absorb the cost.

These skyrocketing premiums may explain why the President's health care law is more unpopular right now than ever before.

According to the latest Gallup poll, only 37 percent of Americans approve of the law. It was supposed to get more popular. That is what the Democrats on this floor told people across the country and told us. Instead, the opposite has happened. People see how much their costs have increased because of the law, and many people are learning that having coverage under the law is not the same as having care. There is a difference between coverage and care.

That is what USA Today found out. They had a front-page article last Friday with the headline: ''Rural Hospitals in Critical Condition.''

So not just the cost of coverage under the care act set to increase, but rural hospitals are in critical condition.

Obama critics say the law is speeding up the demise of rural facilities, of rural hospitals. That is the problem.

The article talks about a small hospital in Georgia that had to close in the spring of last year because of all the new burdens of the health care law. People in that town now have to travel many miles to get to another hospital in another town. One of those people was Bill Jones. He was a peanut and cotton farmer who lived about 9 miles away from the old hospital. Bill suffered a heart attack 1 month after the hospital had to close. The ambulance had to take him to another hospital in

a town further away. I can tell my colleagues, as a doctor who practiced medicine for 25 years, when someone has a heart attack, every minute counts. Bill Jones didn't survive his heart attack. Maybe he wouldn't have survived a trip to a closer hospital; we won't know that. But the hospital is gone now and it is gone because of the President's health care law. For people living in rural States such as Georgia and my own State of Wyoming, this is a terrifying prospect.

The article says that since January of 2010, more than 40 rural hospitals have closed across the country. There is a map of the country of all the places where hospitals have closed. Ezekiel Emanuel, who worked on the health care law, says that 40 hospitals is not enough. He is one of the architects of course of the President's health care law. He says that over the next 6 years, more than 1,000 hospitals will close. In more than 1,000 American communities, people will be further away from medical care. That is precious lost time for people who have heart attacks or for women with high-risk pregnancies who are further from the help they need to deliver a healthy baby. They may have coverage under the President's health care law, but that is not the same as getting the care they need.

We are also seeing that for people whom the law has pushed into Medicaid—because Medicaid, of course—the President's goal was to push more and more people into Medicaid—that pays less for services than traditional insurance companies pay. A lot of doctors and other providers can't afford to take new Medicaid patients.

There was a front-page story in the Wall Street Journal last Friday that says as more join Medicaid, health care systems feel strained.

As more join Medicaid—the President's goal—health systems feel the strain. The article says that about one-third of all primary care physicians aren't taking new Medicaid patients. One of them is Dr. Holly Abernathy. She is a family physician in Farmington, NM, and she says she just can't afford to take any new patients under the program. She says: ''I would love to see every Medicaid patient that comes through my door.'' She also says: ''If you give people coverage, they should be able to utilize it.''

Premiums are going up, out-of-pocket costs are going up. Hospitals are closing. Doctors are having to turn away patients—all because of the President's health care law.

ObamaCare was too long, too complicated, too expensive, and it took away too much from the people who like the care and the coverage they had before the law was passed. That is why Republicans are going to vote to repeal the entire health care law.

Meanwhile, we will also vote to strip away the worst and most destructive parts of the law—parts such as the employer mandate, the arbitrary 30-hour workweek, that has been devastating to part-time workers across the country and others such as the unfair medical device tax that sends American jobs overseas and threatens lifesaving innovation.

Republicans are going to keep fighting for Americans who have been harmed by the President's health care law. We are going to keep offering the real solutions that people wanted all along—access to the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost. That is what the American people are demanding, and that is what they deserve. It is what Republicans are going to give them.

I thank the Presiding Officer, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INNOVATION AGENDA FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to emphasize the importance of keeping our technology industry in the forefront of our global economy. America has made extraordinary strides in innovation. For decades we have been the world's leader in developing new technologies and advancing the Internet age, but we are not the only nation in this hunt.

Across the globe, and particularly in China and other parts of Asia, our international competitors are working furiously to catch up. If the United States is to enjoy continued success in the technology arena, the policymakers must ensure that we have a legal and regulatory landscape that will enable our innovators to thrive.

As chairman of the Senate Republican High-Tech Task Force, I have been working with colleagues and stakeholders to develop an innovation agenda for the coming Congress. Today I would like to highlight several bipartisan initiatives that we should prioritize early next year to help ensure the continued success of our high-tech economy.

First, Congress must act to protect America's innovation and inventiveness. An essential part of fostering innovation is protecting legitimate intellectual property rights. In particular, we must enact legislation to combat abusive patent litigation.

Patent trolls—which are often shell companies that do not make or sell anything—are crippling innovation and growth across all sectors of our economy. It is estimated that abuse of patent litigation costs our economy over $60 billion every year. With so much on the line, how can we afford not to act? Yet the current Senate did exactly that and ignored the very real opportunity we had, to follow the House of Representatives and pass bipartisan legislation that would be supported by the White House.

Why would anyone walk away from the opportunity to enact pro-innovation policies that would do so much good for our economy?

It is no secret that trial lawyers and others told the current majority leader not to bring patent troll reform up for a vote. We all know when the trial lawyers say ''jump,'' the only answer for some of my Democratic colleagues is ''how high.''

While I am disappointed the Senate failed to act during this Congress, I intend to help ensure we pass legislation next year. Fortunately, combating patent trolls is a priority for incoming Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY and House Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE.

I look forward to working with them and others who are committed to making long overdue reforms to our patent laws—including mandatory fee shifting, heightened pleading and discovery standards, demand letter reforms, and a mechanism to enable recovery of fees against shell companies or those who are behind them.

In addition, we must improve the quality of patents issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Low-quality patents are essential to a patent troll's business model. I am optimistic we can reach agreement on how best to improve our patent process.

We also need a high-functioning and well-funded USPTO. A fully funded patent office would, at the very least, mean more and better trained patent examiners, more complete libraries of prior art, and greater access to modern information technologies to address the Agency's growing needs. All of these improvements would lead to higher quality patents that are granted more quickly. The good news is we can make these changes at no cost to taxpayers since the USPTO is a fee-generating agency.

Now, there are some who argue here that patent troll legislation is not necessary in light of the Supreme Court's decisions in the Octane Fitness and Highmark cases. Ms. Charlene Morrow and Mr. Brian Lahti, however, writing in the BNA's Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal confirm that ''nothing in these cases addresses the proposed reforms to make the real parties in interest who are managing patent assertion entities responsible for fees and costs.'' This is something I worked on for quite a few months. As these experienced practitioners acknowledge such legislation is essential to address fee-collection concerns faced by defendants in present patent litigation. One of the legislative approaches Ms. Morrow and Mr. Lahti proposed is to make bonding more readily available at an early stage of litigation. I could not agree more.

We must ensure that those who defend against abusive patent litigation

and are awarded fees will actually get paid. Even when a patent troll structured as a shell company has no assets, there are other parties with an interest in the litigation. These parties are often intentionally beyond the jurisdiction of the courts. They stand to benefit if their plaintiff shell company forces a settlement and are protected from any liability if they lose.

It is a win-win situation for them and a lose-lose situation for America's innovators. Since we cannot force parties outside of a court's jurisdiction to join in a case, we must incentivize those interested parties to do the right thing.

That is the whole purpose behind my recovery-of-award provision. Under this provision, those who are deemed interested parties may either voluntarily submit to the court's jurisdiction and become liable for any unsatisfied fees awarded in the case or they may opt out by renouncing any meaningful interest in the litigation. If interested parties stand aside and do nothing, the original plaintiff must post a bond to ensure that any shifted fees are paid.

Bottom line: Without such bonding measures, all defendants have is a toothless joinder provision that can be easily circumvented by bad actors with no intention of paying the court-awarded fees for their abusive lawsuits.

I have said this before but it bears repeating. Fee shifting without such a recovery provision is like writing a check on an empty account. You are purporting to convey something that isn't there. Only fee shifting coupled with this recovery provision will stop patent trolls from litigating-and-dashing.

The House has already demonstrated that Members from both sides of the aisle can come together to craft and pass commonsense legislation to combat abusive patent lawsuits. President Obama supports such efforts. It is past time the Senate does its part. We ought to get rid of this phony attitude of obeisance to the personal injury lawyers and trial lawyers in this country.

I am determined to make such patent reform a priority early next year and to make sure we send the President a bill that he can sign into law for the good of all American innovation.

In addition to patent troll legislation, there is strong bipartisan, bicameral support for creating a harmonized, uniform Federal standard for protecting trade secrets.

Here in the Senate, Senator CHRIS COONS and I introduced the Defend Trade Secret Act on April 29, 2014. In the House of Representatives, Representative GEORGE HOLDING introduced the Trade Secrets Protection Act on July 29, 2014. Through our collective efforts we have shed light on an often overlooked form of intellectual property.

Trade secrets, such as customer lists, formulas, and manufacturing processes are an essential form of intellectual property. Yet trade secrets are the only form of U.S. intellectual property where misuse does not provide its owner with a Federal private right of action. Currently trade secret owners must rely on State courts or Federal prosecutors to protect their rights.

The multi-State procedural and jurisdictional issues that arise in such cases are costly and complicated, and the Department of Justice lacks the resources to prosecute many such cases. These systemic issues put companies at a great disadvantage, since the victims of trade secret theft need to recover information quickly before it crosses State lines or leaves the country.

Unfortunately, in today's global information age, there are endless examples of how easy and rewarding it can be to steal trade secrets. While the maximum penalty for trade secrets theft is 10 years in prison and a $250,000 fine, few of these thefts actually result in Federal prosecutions. While $250,000 may sound like a steep penalty, most stolen trade secrets amount to tens or even hundreds of millions of dollars in lost profits and sales. Even when thefts are prosecuted, victim companies rarely recover the full extent of their losses.

We have made some progress in moving forward trade secret legislation. Earlier this year, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism held a hearing on the importance of creating a private right of action for trade secret theft. The House Judiciary Committee reported its bill—by voice vote—on September 17. Although we did not get the bill across the finish line this Congress, we are well positioned to move the trade secret legislation early next year.

It is past time to enable U.S. companies to protect their trade secrets in Federal court.

Another bipartisan initiative ready for congressional action relates to our privacy laws. I speak about the need to update the Electronic Communications Privacy Act or ECPA to require a warrant for all email content within the United States and to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access.

Enacted in 1986, ECPA prohibits communication service providers from intercepting or disclosing email, telephone conversations or data stored electronically, unless such disclosure is authorized. Virtually everyone agrees that Americans should enjoy the same privacy protections in their online communications that they do in their offline communications.

But Congress has not adequately updated the law since its enactment, and technological developments have resulted in disparate treatment. As currently written, ECPA requires law enforcement to obtain a warrant for emails that are less than 6 months old but only a subpoena to access older electronic communications.

Think about your own email account. You may have hundreds of emails that you have received over many years. Additionally, ECPA has allowed law enforcement to access emails that have been opened with just a subpoena, even though a search warrant would be required for a printout of the same communication sitting on your desk.

Those conflicting standards should cause great concern to everyone who values personal privacy. Now to make matters more complicated, ECPA is silent on the privacy standard for accessing data stored abroad. Storing digital information around the world, a practice that did not exist when ECPA became law, is now routine. Moreover, the Federal Government has taken advantage of this statutory silence to apply its own standard, requiring access to data abroad if the company storing it has a presence in the United States.

For that reason alone, Congress should amend the law. That is why, together with Senators CHRIS COONS and DEAN HELLER, I introduced the Law Enforcement Access to Data Stored Abroad Act. The LEADS Act would require a warrant when the government demands customer communications from third-party service providers. Such a warrant would only apply to data stored in the United States, unless the data is owned by a U.S. corporation, citizen or lawful permanent resident.

To provide additional protections, the bill requires courts to modify or vacate such warrants if they would require the service provider to violate the laws of a foreign country. The practice of extending warrants extraterritorially presents unique challenges for a number of industries which increasingly face a conflict between American law and the laws of the countries where the electronic data is stored.

Additionally, if the United States expects to extend its warrants extraterritorially, we should not be surprised if other countries, including China and Russia, seek to do the same for the emails of Americans and others stored in this country.

Congress must ensure that law enforcement has the tools to execute search warrants where necessary so long as officials comply with the laws of the foreign country where the electronic data is stored.

The LEADS Act also provides needed improvements to the mutual legal assistance treaty process, which are formal agreements for sharing evidence between the United States and foreign countries in international investigations. Currently, the MLAT process is slow and unreliable, sometimes taking several months to access data held by foreign jurisdictions.

The Department of Justice not only needs additional funds to hire more people to handle MLAT requests, but reforms to the underlying program are needed to improve transparency and efficiency. The legislation recognizes, through a sense of Congress, that data

providers should not be subject to data localization requirements. Such requirements are incompatible with the borderless nature of the Internet——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to finish my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Such requirements are incompatible with the borderless nature of the Internet. They are an impediment to online innovation and they are unnecessary to meet the needs of law enforcement. It is time to act to update our electronic communications privacy laws.

Finally, there is widespread consensus and real opportunity for bipartisan bicameral reform of our outdated visa system for economically essential high-skilled immigrants. For too long our country has been unable to meet the ever-increasing demand for workers trained in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics or STEM fields.

As a result, some of our Nation's top technology markets are in desperate need for qualified STEM workers. We face a high-skilled worker shortage that has become a national crisis. In April, for the second year in a row, the Federal Government reached its current H–1B quota just 5 days after it began accepting applications.

Employers submitted 172,500 petitions for just 85,000 available visas, meaning American companies were unable to hire nearly 90,000 high-skilled workers essential to help grow their domestic businesses, develop innovative technologies at home rather than abroad, and compete internationally. This is one of the principal reasons why I, together with Senators AMY KLOBUCHAR, MARCO RUBIO, and CHRIS COONS, introduced the bipartisan Immigration Innovation or I-Squared Act.

To date the legislation has 26 bipartisan cosponsors. Among other things, the I-Squared Act provides a thoughtful, lasting legislative framework that would increase the number of H–1 visas based on annual market demand to attract highly skilled workers and innovators. The bill also reforms fees on H–1B visas and employment-based green cards for funding a grant-based State program to promote STEM education and worker retraining.

The I-Squared Act addresses the immediate short-term needs to provide American employees with greater access to high-skilled workers, while also addressing long-term needs to invest in America's STEM education. I am confident this two-step approach will enable our country to thrive and help us compete in today's global economy. No doubt, a concrete legislative victory, when there is already considerable consensus, would help build trust and good will among those who disagree sharply over other areas of immigration policy. It would mark a critical first step along the path to broader reform.

I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues in introducing I-Squared early next year. As Senators can see, there is a lot we can agree on and much we can and must accomplish. Looking ahead to the next Congress, I intend to do everything in my power to enact protechnology, pro-innovation policies that will ensure the continued success of our high-tech economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise to voice my continued support for the enactment of the Marketplace Fairness Act this year. There have been a number of editorials and letters and emails and other messages lately that have left out part of the story and have some of the other parts of the story wrong. I am not sure the people behind these messages have read the bill.

Last year the Senate passed this bill with a strong bipartisan vote of 69 Members. I believe that now is the time to get this issue done. I have been working on this sales tax fairness issue since joining the Senate in 1997, because as a former State legislator, mayor and small business owner, I believe it is important to level the playing field for all retailers—in-store, catalog, and online—so an outdated rule for sales tax collection does not adversely impact small business and Main Street retailers.

In the last century, the Supreme Court challenged us to solve this problem. We have been working on it. Thanks to a suggestion by Senator ALEXANDER, we made this bill a States rights bill. The States passed laws a long time ago that required the collection of sales tax. And those laws say that if the tax is not collected by the retailer out of State, it has to be paid directly by the purchaser in state. Most people do not even know about that requirement, but I do understand in Wyoming we collect about $1.5 million from people voluntarily realizing the law and complying with it.

But that is a minority of people. Right now, thousands of local businesses are forced to do business at a competitive disadvantage because they have to collect sales and use taxes and remote sellers do not, which in some States can mean that 5 to 10 percent advantage.

I recently talked with a fellow who had a camera store. A person came in. He was interested in this $2,000 camera and accessories. So of course the store owner helped him to figure it all out and gave him instructions on the camera. Then the guy pulled out his smart phone and clicks on the bar code of the camera and said he could get it cheaper. Of course the owner of the store wondered how much cheaper. It happened to be exactly the amount of sales tax. The small business owner lost the sale.

I am willing to bet that if the person has a problem with the camera, he is going to come back to that store and ask for help with it. Those people who have those small businesses hire locally. It is actually people from the community who are earning money they spend in the same community. They are paying property tax. I would be willing to bet that none of the online companies, unless they are local, are participating in the community the way those businesses are.

Of course, additionally, sales taxes go directly to State and local governments, which brings in the needed revenue for maintaining our schools, fixing our roads, supporting local law enforcement, fire departments, and emergency management crews. An interesting part of that is the smaller the town, the more important that is.

In Wyoming the smaller towns rely on their sales tax to provide police protection and fire protection. People in small towns in Wyoming are sometimes surprised to find out that sales taxes support these services, but realize then that they ought to be paying this sales tax. The smaller the town, the bigger the impact.

If Congress fails to let States collect taxes on remote sales this year, we are implicitly blessing a situation where States will be forced to maybe raise other taxes, such as income or property taxes, to offset the growing loss of sales tax revenue. Do we want this to happen?

There is another side to this too; that is, that some of the people, some of the Governors and legislatures have said: If that passes, we will reduce another tax because sales tax is a more constant flow of dollars that we can rely on more than virtually anything else we do.

So now is the time for Congress to complete action on this issue by enacting the Marketplace Fairness Act this year. Today I want to spend a few minutes debunking some of the myths and allegations that have been raised against the bill. First, some opponents argue the bill is unfairly burdensome to online retailers by forcing them to comply with the various sales tax rates across the country.

In response, I would first note that the Marketplace Fairness Act includes a small seller exemption. It is set at $1 million in remote sales each year. Until they pass that $1 million mark in a given year, states cannot make them comply with sales tax laws. If they do pass the million-dollar mark, then the Marketplace Fairness Act requires that the State provide the sellers with software, free of charge, that can calculate the sales and use tax due on each transaction at the time the transaction is completed. It would also file the sales and use tax returns and be updated to reflect any rate changes.

So all they have to know, to be able to do is, is the purchaser's ZIP Code. They are going to have to know the ZIP Code if they are sending something

somewhere. So it is not that complicated a process. Incidentally, some of the online companies opposing this bill sell the very same program. They make it available to a number of providers. So it is already being used by retailers across the country to accurately collect and remit State and local sales and use taxes.

In addition, opponents of the Marketplace Fairness Act argue that our bill violates States rights by setting tax rates. In fact, our bill does not change State law. It does not require States to do anything. The bill does not create new taxes or increase existing taxes. It simply gives the States the ability to collect the taxes owed, to enforce their own sales and use tax laws.

Our bill is a States rights bill, which is why the National Governors Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of Counties, and the National League of Cities support the bill. Wyoming passed a law in 1934. It says: If someone buys something out of State and they do not pay sales tax on it, by the end of the month they have to fill out a form which they have and submit the money. Our bill makes it easier for Wyomingites to comply with this law. Most people don't realize this, but it is much easier if the person who collects the sales tax is the one who sells the item.

Opponents of the Marketplace Fairness Act also suggest it benefits big business at the expense of small online retailers. Remember I mentioned that $1 million exemption if a business sells less than $1 million online? They are not subject to this bill. That is to give small businesses a chance to grow into big businesses—and we do hope they do pass that $1 million threshold. In fact a $2 million threshold would be fine with me.

But the exemption already protects small businesses. Last year a Small Business Administration study determined that the small seller exemption included in the Marketplace Fairness Act would exempt 99.96 percent of all sellers from the bill's requirements. So it is just the big ones that fall into this bill.

Opponents of marketplace fairness suggest it creates a massive new tax requirement. The truth is the bill that passed the Senate with an overwhelming bipartisan vote of more than two-thirds of the Senate last year does not create any new taxes.

Consumers already owe the sales and use taxes on the goods they purchase if they reside in a State that has a sales tax—whether those purchases are made over the phone, by mail or by the Internet. Unfortunately, as I mentioned, most consumers are unaware that they are required to pay the tax when the retailer does not collect it at the time of the purchase.

Marketplace fairness provides States the authority to reduce the burden of self-reporting from consumers and allow States to enforce the existing State and local sales and use tax laws, and it eliminates the competitive disadvantage for the small retailers in the State. It is an advantage that is currently enjoyed by the remote retailers at the expense of those small businesses.

Additionally, the Marketplace Fairness Act does not tax Internet use. I repeat that it does not tax Internet use. It doesn't even tax Internet services. For many years I have worked with all the interested parties to find a mutually agreeable legislative package to enact this bill.

This Congress, I've worked with Senator DURBIN, Senator ALEXANDER, who as I mentioned inserted the States rights approach to this issue that reduced the bill from about 35 pages down to about 9 pages, and Senator HEITKAMP, who has been involved in the court case as all of these e-fairness challenges have progressed.

When the Supreme Court heard this challenge and realized there are some other things coming along that could greatly distress States if they don't take some action because of what the courts could do, I worked together with the three colleagues I mentioned and 26 of our Senate colleagues to produce a bipartisan bill that helps sellers, States, and local governments to simplify sales and use tax collection and administration.

We are working with our House supporters, including House of Representative Members STEVE WOMACK, JACKIE SPEIER, PETER WELCH, and JOHN CONYERS, and have found common ground on this important issue that is supported by more than 200 groups. I publicly commend all of my Senate and House colleagues in taking a leadership role in working on this important policy issue.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the goals of States rights and a level playing field for all businesses—making sure the revenue that is owed particularly for small towns makes it to the small towns—by pushing for the enactment of the Marketplace Fairness Act this year.

I yield the floor for my colleague, Senator ALEXANDER, who has done an outstanding job on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Senator ENZI has been a leading proponent of the Marketplace Fairness Act. I congratulate him for his persistence in recognizing its importance.

I will make three points in support of what he said: No. 1, why conservatives support it; No. 2, why it is easy to do; that is, to comply with it; and No. 3 is to ask the basic question, which is: Do you trust Washington or do you trust your Governor and your State legislature to decide what your State taxes ought to be? Do you trust Washington or do you trust people closer to home?

I will begin with why conservatives support it. If I were to ask the question, what do the following people have in common, and the following people would be Al Cardenas, the most recent chairman of the American Conservative Union; the late William F. Buckley; Art Laffer, who is President Reagan's favorite economist; Governor Mike Pence, the conservative Governor of Indiana; Governor Gary Herbert; Governor Robert Bentley; former Governor Mitch Daniels; and former Governor Jeb Bush, you might say: What do they have in common?

Well, they are Republicans; that is right. They are conservatives; that is true. But the other thing we could say is they all support the Marketplace Fairness Act or the principles that underlie it.

Why is that? Because the Marketplace Fairness Act is a 12-page bill about two words, which are States' rights. If I am the Governor of Tennessee—which I once was—and I am sitting down there thinking: Well, we have a State sales tax in Tennessee such as almost every State has, and the way we collect it is this—let's say I am in my home town of Marysville, TN, and I want to buy a television set. I can go downtown to buy it from one of my local stores. They collect the State sales tax, which in our State, including State and local taxes, is nearly 10 percent. They send it to the State.

If I go online or into a catalog and order the same television set, the seller does not collect it. This bill is about allowing the State of Tennessee to decide whether it wants to require the out-of-state sellers to do the same thing that instate sellers do, whether it wants to prefer some distant seller over the local man and woman on Main Street, the mom-and-pop stores. That is the decision.

Whatever decision they would make, the question is this. Do you think we should be deciding that for Tennessee? Our Governor doesn't think so, our Lieutenant Governor doesn't think so, our legislature doesn't think so. They don't trust Washington to make the decision. They trust themselves to make that decision.

Ohio doesn't think so. Ohio has already taken a look at this subject and said: We would prefer to collect our sales tax from everybody who owes it. Rather than have everybody in Ohio fill out a form every time they go online to order from a catalog, Ohio wants to require the out-of-State sellers do the same thing in-State sellers do, and that is to collect the tax when they sell it. Ohio has said if they do that, they will lower taxes.

Ohio has already passed a law and says if Congress passes the Marketplace Fairness Act taxes in Ohio will go down.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a list of conservatives and Republican Governors who support e-fairness and why they do so.

The other point is how complicated is this for somebody who might sell online? Well, as Senator ENZI said, it exempts 99 percent of all out-of-state

sellers. So if you are selling on eBay today and you are worried about this bill, the chances are 99 out of 100 it is not you this bill affects because it has a $1 million exemption.

But even if it did affect you, how hard would it be to comply with the requirements. It must not be too hard because you could also go on eBay, I am assured, and you can purchase software from eBay that costs $15 or $20 and it will do the work for you. In other words, if you are selling something online and you are selling it to Maryville, TN, they will put the zip code in and tell you the tax. You can collect it and remit it to the State government. It is about as easy as what I do every morning.

I go to my computer, I type in ''Google,'' put my zip code in, and I put ''weather.'' I want to know it is 24 degrees in Washington, DC, this morning. It tells me in an instant.

If you are selling online—unless you are selling more than $1 million in out of state sales it doesn't affect you at all. If you need some help to figure that out, you can get software that figures out the tax for you.

But remember, all we are asking—we are not even saying that we think if you sell online or if you sell by catalog that you ought to be made to collect the tax when you sell. We are just saying we think States should make the decision about their own tax policy which is consistent with the 10th Amendment to our Constitution.

That leads me to my last point. The real issue here is two words. You can make a lot of good conservative reasons why this bill attracted half the support of Republicans and passed with 69 votes when it was considered by the Senate, and why it has so much support from Governors and mayors of all political persuasions across the country. But the bottom line is all we proposed to do is to let States make decisions about their own tax policy.

The Supreme Court more than 20 years ago said it was too complicated to require businesses to collect, but they invited Congress to create a way that was simple enough to do that. Twenty years has gone by, software is already available, the Internet is advanced, and so today it is very easy to do.

There is no reason in the world for Senators to say: You know, I just flew from Nashville today. It took me an hour. That makes me a lot smarter than the Governor of Tennessee, so I am going to decide for Tennessee whether it can collect all the taxes that are already owed. I am going to say I am going to let the Governor of Tennessee make that decision. If I were the Governor of Tennessee, I would collect it, and I might lower the taxes for everybody. I don't think it is fair to say to shopkeepers in Maryville, TN, that you have to collect the tax and send it to the State, but to say to some seller in Illinois or some catalog seller in North Dakota that you don't have to collect the tax, because that means our local businesses are being dealt with in an unfair way.

I also don't think Tennesseans appreciate what will happen if we don't act, because do you know what is going to happen? The Governor is going to collect the sales tax. How is he going to do it? Well, he is going to have to start auditing everybody.

If you buy online—which everybody almost does today; just think of the Christmas season coming up—you would have to write down every single thing you bought. You would have to put the tax down, and you would have to send it in—that is the law. That is a very difficult thing to do and most people don't do it.

So the easy way to do this and the right way to do this is for Congress to pass the Marketplace Fairness Act, which is a 12-page bill about two words—States rights—and say to Tennessee, Wisconsin or Wyoming, of course you should make your own decision about how to collect your taxes. Let them decide, as Ohio decided. They will collect the State sales tax which is already owed from everybody who owes it. The collectors of the tax will be anyone who sells into Ohio or Tennessee or Wisconsin or Wyoming.

That is the fair thing to do. That is the right thing to do. That is what respects our constitutional federalism and the 10th Amendment to the Constitution. It shows that we in Washington, DC, aren't so arrogant to think that we should make those state tax decisions.

I conclude by saying I just had the pleasure of going through a reelection campaign. A lot of Members, about one-third of the body, were in an election this year. I was trying to remember this morning if one single person came up to me in the past 2 years and said: I just wish you would give Washington more control over how Tennessee collects its taxes.

I don't think one single person said that to me. But I will guarantee that about every other person said to me: I wish you would stop Washington from telling us to do things or decide things that we should be deciding for ourselves.

That is what this bill is about. This bill empowers every State to make its own decision about how to collect its taxes—to do what Ohio did, to do what other Governors have said. We are going to collect it from everybody who already owes it and, when we do, we are going to lower everyone's taxes. That would be a very happy result.

We have 2 or 3 weeks left in the session. This Senate has fully considered this. The bill is in the House of Representatives. I very much hope that the Speaker and the Members of the House will decide that it is time to pass the Marketplace Fairness Act and recognize the principle of States rights in the spirit of the 10th Amendment of our Constitution.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATIVES & REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS SUPPORT E-FAIRNESS

William F. Buckley, Editor At Large, National Review: ''The mattress maker in Connecticut is willing to compete with the company in Massachusetts, but does not like it if out-of-state businesses are, in practical terms, subsidized; that's what the non-tax amounts to. Local concerns are complaining about traffic in mattresses and books and records and computer equipment which, ordered through the Internet, come in, so to speak, duty free.'' (William F. Buckley, ''Get That Internet Tax Right,'' National Review Online, 10/19/01)

Arthur B. Laffer, Wall Street Journal: ''In-state retailers collect sales taxes at the time of purchase. When residents purchase from retailers out of state (including over the Internet) they are supposed to report these purchases and pay the sales taxes owed—which are typically referred to as a ''use tax.'' As you can imagine, few people do. The result is to narrow a state's sales-tax base. It also leads to several inefficiencies that, on net, diminish potential job and economic growth. Exempting Internet purchases from the sales tax naturally encourages consumers to buy goods over the Web; worse, the exemption incentivizes consumers to use in-state retailers as a showroom before they do so. This increases in-state retailers' overall costs and reduces their overall productivity.'' (Arthur B. Laffer, ''Tax Internet Sales, Stimulate Growth,'' The Wall Street Journal, 4/17/13)

Al Cardenas, former Chairman of the American Conservative Union (ACU): ''When it comes to sales tax, it is time to address the area where prejudice is most egregious—our policy towards Internet sales. At issue is the federal government exempting some Internet transactions from sales taxes while requiring the remittance of sales taxes for identical sales made at brick and mortar locations. It is an outdated set of policies in today's super information age, when families every day make decisions to purchase goods and services online or in person. Moreover, it's unfair, punitive to some small businesses and corporations and a boon for others.'' (Al Cardenas, ''The Chief Threat To American Competitiveness: Our Tax Code,'' National Review Online, 11/8/11)

Charles Krauthammer: ''The real issue here is the fairness argument—that if you're an old fashioned store, you have to have your customers and you pay the sales tax and online you don't. Which, I mean, you're already at a disadvantage if you're an old fashioned store: you have to have, you have to cover rent, you have to cover insurance and all that. So I think you want to have something that will level the playing field. You can do it one of two ways. You abolish all sales taxes for real stores and nobody pays. Or you get the Internet people to pay the sales tax as well. I think the second one is the only way to do it, obviously.'' (''Friday Lightning Round: Internet sales tax bill,'' Fox News Special Report with Bret Baier, 4/26/13)

Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker: ''Since taking office, it has been my priority, and the priority of a number of members of the legislature, to provide tax relief to middle class families, and to foster an environment that promotes job creation. I want to make clear, should federal Marketplace legislation become law, my intention would be for any resulting additional revenue be used to provide individual income tax relief for Wisconsin's taxpayers.'' (Letter to Wisconsin Congressional Delegation, 5/15/2013)

New Jersey Governor Chris Christie: Governor Chris Christie: ''I just want to make clear that I have been working on this issue in my role on the executive committee of the National Governors Association because it is an important issue to all the nation's governors. And I too—along with governors like Governor Daniels and others—urge the federal government and the Congress in particular to get behind Senator Lamar Alexander's legislation to allow states to be able to make these choices for themselves. And I think Senator Alexander's legislation would be a great step forward in that regard. It would give states options to decide how they want to deal with this and not have to any longer deal with the federal prohibition on dealing with it. So, it would allow us to do it in a much more uniform and broader way. So, I'm with Governor Daniels on this and other Republican governors—Governor Snyder of Michigan and others who feel strongly about it. And we've been working on it at the National Governors Association and I know we will continue to and hope to get some type of resolution to it by the end of this year.'' (Press Conference, Governor Chris Christie, 5/31/12)

Utah Governor Gary Herbert: ''On March 24, 2012, Utah Governor Gary Herbert signed into law an affiliate nexus bill that will require certain remote sellers to collect and remit Utah sales tax, effective July 1, 2012. An out-of-state seller will be considered to have nexus in Utah if the seller holds a substantial ownership interest in, or is owned in whole or in substantial part, by a related seller, and the seller sells the same or a substantially similar line of products as the related seller and does so under the same or a substantially similar business name, or the place of business of the related seller or an in-state employee of the related seller is used to advertise, promote, or facilitate sales by the seller to the purchaser.'' (''Utah Enacts Affiliate Nexus Bill,'' Sales Tax Institute, 3/24/12)

Tennessee Governor Bill Haslam: ''The National Governors Association applauds your efforts to level the playing field between Main Street retailers and online sellers by introducing S. 1832, the 'Marketplace Fairness Act.' This common sense approach will allow states to collect the taxes they are owed, help businesses comply with different state laws, and provide fair competition between retailers that will benefit consumers.'' (National Governors Association Letter To Sens. Durbin, Enzi, Tim Johnson And Alexander Endorsing S. 1832, The Marketplace Fairness Act, 11/28/11)

Indiana Governor Mike Pence: ''I don't think Congress should be in the business of picking winners and losers. Inaction by Congress today results in a system today that does pick winners and losers.'' (House Judiciary Committee, Hearing On ''Constitutional Limitations On States' Authority To Collect Sales Taxes In E-Commerce,'' 11/30/11)

Michigan Governor Rick Snyder: 'Technology currently exists to quickly and effectively calculate taxes due on sales and can be easily be integrated into online retailers' operations,' wrote Snyder, a onetime venture capitalist and former executive at the computer company Gateway. 'It is time for Congress to grant states the authority to enforce sales tax and use laws on all retailers doing business in their state.' (Bernie Becker, ''Michigan Governor Joins Online Sales Tax Chorus,'' The Hill, 5/11/12)

Alabama Governor Robert Bentley: ''Alabama's Republican governor has urged lawmakers from his state to support online sales tax legislation, adding to the growing roster of GOP officials who are on board with the idea. Gov. Robert Bentley told Alabama's two senators and seven House members the online sales tax bills would improve the state's fiscal situation, and stressed that the legislation would not create a new tax. 'The bills will give Alabama the authority to collect sales taxes—as we currently do from local brick-and-mortar retailers—that are already owed from online retailers,' Bentley wrote in a letter dated April 19. 'Allowing us to effectively close this sales tax loophole would help both our state's finances and our state's small businesses.''' (Bernie Becker, ''Alabama Governor Gets Behind Online Sales Tax Push,'' The Hill, 4/25/12)

South Dakota Governor Dennis Daugaard: ''On March 11, South Dakota enacted S.B. 146, sales tax legislation that requires out-of-state retailers that sell to in-state residents to notify their customers of their personal use tax obligation. Under the law, online sellers are required to provide clear notice to consumers during the checkout process that a South Dakota use tax is due.'' (Rosemary Hawkins, ''Sales Tax Bills Pass In Arkansas And South Dakota,'' American Booksellers Association, 3/3/11)

Maine Governor Paul LePage: ''Last week, Gov. Paul LePage, R–Maine, wrote his state's two U.S. senators, Republicans Susan Collins and Olympia Snowe, to urge them to back legislation introduced by Sens. Mike Enzi, R–Wyo., Dick Durbin, D–Ill., and Lamar Alexander, R–Tenn., that would close a loophole left by a 1992 Supreme Court decision. The high court ruled that states can't require retailers such as catalog and now online retailers to collect sales taxes from customers in states where those companies have no physical presence. 'There's no denying that passing the bill would give thousands of small Maine businesses a real boost,' LePage wrote. 'Through no fault of their own, federal policy now gives some out-of-state corporations an unfair advantage over other Maine retailers.''' (Juliana Gruenwald, ''Tea Party Governor Is Backing Net Sales Tax Bill,'' National Journal, 3/20/12)

Nevada Governor Brian Sandoval: '''The only way to completely resolve this issue is for Congress to enact legislation that, within a simplified nationwide framework, grants states the right to require collection by all sellers,' Sandoval said in a statement.'' (Ed Vogel, ''Gov. Sandoval Reaches Sales Tax Deal With Amazon,'' Las Vegas Review-Journal, 4/24/12)

Idaho Governor C.L. ''Butch'' Otter: ''Gov. C.L. 'Butch' Otter backs taxing Internet sales to level the playing field between virtual businesses and brick-and-mortar establishments on Idaho's Main Street. Otter made the remarks to Idaho chamber of commerce leaders meeting in Boise on Monday.'' (''Idaho Governor Supports Internet Sales Tax,'' The Associated Press, 1/30/12)

South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley: '''And I will tell you regardless of what happens with Amazon, we want them. I have told them we want you to do business in this state, but we want you to do it on a level playing field. They got free property, they got tax incentives, they got plenty of things. Don't ask us to give you sales tax relief when we're not giving it to the book store down the street or we're not giving it to the other stores on the other side of town, it's just not a level playing field.''' (Press Conference, Governor Nikki Haley, 4/28/11)

Iowa Governor Terry Branstad Supports Federal E-Fairness Legislation: ''Gov. Terry Branstad of Iowa this week became the latest in a string of top Republican state officials to back federal legislation giving states more freedom to collect online sales taxes. Branstad's letter of support, obtained exclusively by The Hill, comes not long after another prominent Republican governor, Chris Christie of New Jersey, also urged Congress to get moving on sales tax legislation . . . In a letter sent Thursday, Branstad encouraged his home-state senators to support a solution that he said would close a longstanding loophole. 'I understand that the coalition supporting this legislation is now very broad which gives me hope that, under your leadership, this legislation can be passed yet this year,' Branstad wrote to Sens. Chuck Grassley (R) and Tom Harkin (D). 'The Internet is now a robust, mature and dynamic marketplace that does not warrant special protections,' he added. 'The application of sales taxes only to 'brick-and-mortar' retailers, many of which are small businesses, puts those very entities at a competitive disadvantage.''' (Bernie Becker & Kevin Bogardus, ''GOP Governors Bolster Sales Tax Push,'' The Hill, 6/10/12)

Former Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels: ''[S]ales taxes that [states] impose ought to be paid, and paid by everybody equally and collected by everybody in the retail business . . . We're not talking about an additional or new tax here—we're talking about the collection of a tax that's existed a long time.'' (Jeremy Hobson, ''Indiana Makes A Deal With Amazon On Sales Taxes,'' Marketplace Business, 1/12/12)

Former Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour: ''. . .[E]-commerce has grown, and there is simply no longer a compelling reason for government to continue giving online retailers special treatment over small businesses who reside on the Main Streets across Mississippi and the country. The time to level the playing field is now . . .'' (Letter To Sens. Enzi And Alexander Endorsing S. 1832, The Marketplace Fairness Act, 11/29/11)

Former Florida Governor Jeb Bush: ''It seems to me there has to be a way to tax sales done online in the same way that sales are taxed in brick and mortar establishments. My guess is that there would be hundreds of millions of dollars that then could be used to reduce taxes to fulfill campaign promises.'' (Letter To Florida Governor Rick Scott, 1/2/11)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I know the block of time for the majority leader starts at 2 o'clock, but I wanted to say while Senator ENZI and the senior Senator from Tennessee are on the floor how much I appreciate and admire their advocacy for marketplace fairness.

It is so unfair. I go home to Nevada and I see in those little strip malls ''For Lease.'' One reason they are for lease and they are not operating is because people who can go online don't want to pay the taxes that support the people of the State of Nevada.

It is so wrong, what is going on, and I can't imagine why we can't move this legislation forward. This has taken years and years. It is so unfair.

Many businesses have gone bankrupt, out of business as a result of not having a level playing field. It is very unfortunate we are having problems getting this done.

I do not understand the House—why they feel the way they do. I don't understand it, but they do, and I think it is unfair.

I don't think we are getting the support we should from retail people. They have to talk to their Members when we go home and talk to Senators. Of course, there are people in town who make a lot of money representing these

shopping centers and retail merchants. They get paid a lot of money to represent them in Congress. I think they are not doing a very good job if they can't convince Members of the Senate and the House that this legislation should have passed a long time ago.

Madam President, the hour of 2 o'clock is almost here. Please explain to me and the people who are watching what happens at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3 p.m. will be under the control of the majority.

The majority leader.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. REID. Madam President, today marks the 510th day as so well represented on the poster the Senator from California had on display. That is how long it has been since we passed an immigration reform bill—comprehensive immigration reform. The House of Representatives simply has refused to address this issue. They have refused to address the fact that we have a broken immigration system that needs to be fixed. All the Speaker would have to do is bring this up for a vote and it would pass. The bill that passed here 510 days ago would pass the House overwhelmingly. But he refuses to bring it up.

In this bill we passed 73 weeks ago, we were able to pass comprehensive immigration reform because Senate Democrats and Republicans recognized that our immigration laws are failing the American people. We sent that same bipartisan bill to the House 17 months ago. For the last 17 months, the House Republicans, led by a small, vocal, really radical group, has forced the Speaker, I assume, not to do anything. They have neglected to tackle the real issues affecting our immigration system.

We have talked about 510 days, we have talked about 73 weeks, and we have talked about 17 months. That is enough time for them to consider the bill the Senate considered and passed in just a few weeks, but they still refuse to do anything, even as families across the country have been ripped apart.

I have been present at meetings, meetings—I remember one of the last at the White House—where the Republican leaders of the House and Senate have said: Give us some time, give us some time. We have given them time—510 days, to be exact. And they are always saying: Let's do something. Well, something is not enough, they need to do comprehensive immigration reform, and they refuse to do that.

So in light of the fact that families are being ripped apart—and there is no question they are. The first time I saw this, where I really felt it in my heart, Bill Richardson, with whom I served in the House—he was Secretary of Energy and Ambassador to the United Nations—he came to Las Vegas, and he said: Let's go out to the Rafael Rivera Center. It was, at the time, a new place, named after the first non-Indian to see the Las Vegas valley—Rafael Rivera. I have a painting in my office that reflects that. So we went to that center, and I can remember so clearly these mostly women crying over the fact that their husbands had lost their jobs, they were being deported, and they had little American boys and girls there with them. These were boys and girls who had been born in the United States. I thought, gee, that is terrible. I mean the suffering and the sadness. I have never forgotten that, and that is one of the main reasons I have worked so hard on immigration reform.

In light of the Republicans' inaction, and our action and our advocacy of this issue, it seems to me what the President said at his State of the Union Address is really applicable here. Here is what he said: If the Republicans continue to do nothing, I am going to be forced as the President of the United States to do something by Executive order. And I am glad. I am glad he is going, in the next couple of days for sure, to use his constitutionally established authority to fix as much of our broken immigration system as is possible. He told everybody he was going to do it in his State of the Union and he has waited and waited and nothing has happened.

Some Republicans are threatening to shut down the government. They have done it once before, so I guess we should take their threat seriously. They want to shut down the government because of what the President said he is going to do and what he is going to do. But this isn't about the Republicans and President Obama, this is about where the Republicans stand with the immigrant community.

My father-in-law, my wife's dad, was an immigrant. He was born in Russia. He came to the United States to escape the oppression in Russia. So this whole issue is about how Republicans stand with the immigrant community.

The immigrant community is what has made this country what it is. Those who will come forward under this Executive action the President is going to take are, with rare exception, hard-working immigrant dads and moms who are supporting their families. They came to America for the same reasons early immigrants came to America, just like my father-in-law, Earl Gould, did. By the way, he changed his name when he came to the United States. He came here as Israel Goldfarb, and he changed his name, as many immigrants have done.

As my father-in-law did, the people who are going to come here under this Executive order can build a better life for themselves and their families. They have deep ties in America. They work hard. As I have indicated, they have spouses and children. Under our broken immigration system, there is no line for these people to get into, no process for them to sign up for, and no way to remedy this situation. They are in limbo. They are in the shadows. They are in darkness.

President Obama, fortunately, is going to do something to give them just that, a line to come forward, a line that he recognizes must be done to get the system started.

We can't give these people their green cards and put them on the path to citizenship immediately. Only Congress can and must finish the job in overhauling and rewriting these laws. I want to be clear that Executive action is important, but it is not a substitute for legislation, and the Speaker should understand that.

Yes, we passed a bill. The President will be happy to sign such a bill. But because Republicans have refused to legislate, President Obama is taking what steps he can to keep these families together and enforce the laws. The President is acting within his legal authority to use his Executive power to improve the immigration system.

Did he just dream this up one night meeting with his staff? Did someone suddenly come to him and say, I have a great idea. Why don't we try to do something different? He is going to do something that has been tried 39 times since Dwight Eisenhower was President. Virtually every President since Eisenhower was President has done Executive actions as relates to immigration.

I would also say to my Republican friends who are always talking about, boy, we have to do something important financially for the good of this country, why not pass this bill? It would benefit our country to the tune of $1 trillion.

I strongly support the steps the President is going to take. I support him, and I hope he does it as soon as possible, because his Executive action will help keep families together and focus law enforcement resources on real criminals.

We have waited a long time for House Republicans. Since they won't act, the President will, and he should act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to remind my colleagues that it has been over 500 days since the Senate passed a strong bipartisan bill to fix our broken immigration system.

There is a lot of hand-wringing going on on the other side of the aisle about the President taking Executive action, as he has now announced he intends to do. Republicans are saying that anything and everything is on the table to stop the President from taking Executive action. Well, if the bounds are anything and everything, I have a suggestion. Pass our bill. It is a very simple suggestion.

If the House votes on our bipartisan bill, the discussion about Executive action would be made moot. It is the other body of Congress that has led us to the point where we are today. The only reason the administration has to take Executive action is because the

House has failed to address our broken immigration system. I think everyone on our side agrees it would be far preferable to pass the bipartisan bill that passed the Senate 68 to 32 than any Executive action.

Let me say a few things. The bill is a bipartisan bill with support from every corner of the political map—business, labor, evangelicals, Catholics—and it has been sitting on the shelf gathering dust for 500 days. So it is the absolute height of hypocrisy for House leadership to say that now Congress should be in the driver's seat on immigration reform when they refused to take the wheel.

And let me say this, Mr. President. I don't think anyone has any faith that if they were given another 3 months or 6 months or 9 months that they would come to any kind of real bill. They can't. They have the tea party. Such a high percentage of their primary voters strongly argue against doing a bill. In fact, many of those tea party types are saying shut down the government.

The dithering and dawdling on the House side is particularly perplexing because our bill would achieve so many goals the Republicans claim are part of their agenda. It would secure the border, create jobs, add economic growth, and cut the deficit.

The bipartisan bill that passed the Senate provides more than $40 billion to secure our border. This would mean more than doubling the Border Patrol presence on our Southwest border, completing the border fence, setting up much more surveillance technology—sensors, drones, many of which are so good they can detect—these are the drones that surveil, not shoot—they can detect the difference when a deer or a person crosses the border. They are not on the border now.

Yes, the border needs help. Blocking our bill, not passing our bill, keeps the status quo, which nobody likes. Passing our bill solves the problem. With a Republican amendment authored by the Senator from Tennessee, Senator CORKER, and the Senator from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, that tightens up the border tougher than it has ever been.

The bipartisan bill also strengthens interior enforcement of our immigration laws. So many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep saying E-Verify, E-Verify, E-Verify. Well, it is in the bill to crack down on unscrupulous employers requiring an entry-exit tracking system at our airports and seaports to catch people who overstay their visas, and reforming and clarifying the list of violent crimes that make an immigrant deportable so law enforcement officials have the tools they need to keep us safe.

For America to remain competitive, we must have a legal immigration system that works. Right now we have it backwards. We turn away people who would create jobs. Our bipartisan bill will change all that for farm workers, tech firms, entrepreneurs, and so many more, while leveling the playing field for American workers. Because of internal enforcement, when someone crosses the border and doesn't have a real job available and has no family connection, they can't stay. They won't get a job.

Many of our labor friends are for this bill. The construction trades, which probably suffer more from illegal immigration than any other, are strongly for our bill. The bill clears the employment and visa backlogs so American businesses can have access to the workers they need and their families will be united, decreases family wait times at our bridges and ports of entry. It is great for the tourism industry, making it easier for foreign travelers to spend their dollars here instead of somewhere else and, finally, a tough but fair pathway to citizenship.

The other side says it is amnesty. They are listening to Rush Limbaugh—amnesty, amnesty, amnesty. Amnesty means you get away with it without paying a price. Here is the price someone has to pay if they cross the border illegally: No. 1, they have to pay all their back taxes; No. 2, they have to keep working; No. 3, they have to admit wrongdoing; No. 4, they have to pay a fine; No. 5, they have to learn English; No. 6, they have to go to the back of the line, which is what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have always asked for.

This system was set up by none other than MARCO RUBIO in our Gang of 8, and it says: If somebody crossed the border illegally in 2008, but someone else has waited patiently at the Embassy since 2007, the 2007 person gets to come into this country before the 2008 person.

Because of all this, here is what the bill does:

First, it would grow the economy by 3.3 percent over the next 10 years and 5.5 percent over 20. No Republican tax cut, no Democratic spending program would have that effect—and without any cost to the deficit. In fact, at the same time we are growing our economy with this proposal—this is CBO, not CHUCK SCHUMER—we reduce the deficit by $150 billion in the next 10 years and $900 billion over the next 20 years. So $1 trillion in savings, as we benefit America.

The bill has unprecedented support: the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the guardian of business interests; the AFL–CIO, the protector of American workers; the faith community, evangelicals, Protestants, Mormons. The liberal and conservative religious sectors in America are for our bill, America's farmers, growers, and American farmworkers, law enforcement, the immigrant rights community.

So the historic coalition came together because again this bill strengthens our borders and national security, provides an enormous boost for the American economy, fairly and conclusively addresses the status of people here illegally, and prevents future waves of illegal immigrants.

When we got this bill passed we were almost certain the House would pass it. It is a conservative bill, and try and try and try as they might, they couldn't. So now we are up to the last hours of this Congress and there is one more chance. Just put the bill on the floor, Speaker BOEHNER. You don't have to twist a single arm. It has the votes to pass. It will do America so much good.

I love America. I want to see us stay No. 1 in every way and economically above all. This bill will do it more than anything else we could do.

I would say to my colleagues, don't be afraid of the Tea Party. They are afraid of the word ''amnesty,'' even though the bill is not amnesty at all as I mentioned. But Rush Limbaugh says ''amnesty'' incessantly, and I know my Republican colleagues—I am a political guy in some ways—they are afraid primary voters that skew far right believe it is amnesty. The Tea Party may be a sliver of the American public, but they are a huge percentage of primary voters in too many Republican districts and that is what they are afraid of. Talk about courage. Talk about loving the country. Talk about doing the right thing. We have to pass the bill.

The real Republican Party position on immigration is pretend to be pro-immigration reform rhetorically but never allow immigration reform to come to a vote. That is the bad news.

The good news is there is still time to fix it. So I urge my colleagues, avoid this conundrum, avoid your dilemma that you will create. Pass the bill, and we will not even have to debate Executive action.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to talk about one of the most important issues facing our Nation as we have been hearing for the past 15 minutes; that is, our longstanding, desperate need to finally fix our Nation's broken immigration system.

Too often in the debate about immigration it is difficult for some people to understand that the millions of undocumented families in our country are already an important part of our communities. Immigrants work hard and they pay their taxes, they send their children to American schools, and they make up a critical part of the fabric of our society. They are Americans in all but name.

So when we talk about immigration reform, we are not talking about some vague philosophical issue. This is an issue that impacts families, it impacts our businesses, it impacts our national security, and it impacts what we stand for as Americans.

It is not a new issue either. It is something we have been debating and arguing about for more than a decade, but it is something we have never been able to tackle, and that is not for the lack of trying.

As everyone here remembers, more than 500 days ago now the Senate did something remarkable. Members from different backgrounds and different States and different parties came together to reach an agreement, and in the Senate we passed a real bipartisan coalition of 68 Republicans and Democrats, a comprehensive immigration reform bill that would finally start to fix our broken immigration system.

As we heard from the Senator from New York, it would improve our security, provide businesses with the certainty they need, and provide a real path to citizenship for the millions of undocumented immigrants who are forced to live in the shadows.

Not only was this bill a step toward fixing our broken immigration system, it was good for our economy. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Senate bill would reduce the deficit by nearly $1 trillion over the next two decades.

So we sent the bill to the House of Representatives knowing the path forward there might not be easy, but we heard from Members of the House on both sides of the aisle that they also knew immigration reform had to happen this Congress.

Back then, in June of 2013, we knew we had time on our side. Speaker BOEHNER had a full year and a half to do one simple thing, bring the bipartisan Senate bill up for a vote. We knew then what we still know today; that if the Speaker brought that bill up for a vote, it would pass with bipartisan support and become law.

But instead of doing that, the Speaker sided with the Tea Party and refused to move our country forward. He has made it very clear that the House will refuse to act this Congress and ignore the historic opportunity we have.

For years and years millions of immigrant families who have played by the rules—paid their taxes, raised their children in the United States—have waited and waited for action. They have organized, they have hoped and they have prayed and they have trusted the system would eventually work. The system has failed. So now it is time to act.

President Obama has made it clear that because the House refuses to act—because the House refuses to act—he will take administrative action before the end of the year to improve our immigration system, and I support his decision to do that.

The President's authority to take action is well established. In fact, every President since Eisenhower, including Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush, has used his authority to improve the administration of our immigration system and to focus enforcement resources on serious criminals rather than on hard-working immigrants with deep roots in our communities.

When the President does act, I have encouraged him to do several things: expand the already successful implementation of deferred action for DREAMers to include people with strong ties to the United States who have not committed serious crimes; to change implementation of our laws to make immigration and border enforcement humane, nondiscriminatory, and respectful of due process; and, finally, I have asked the President to improve the legal immigration system to keep immigrant families together, to protect our workers, and to provide employers—from agricultural producers to high-tech firms—certainty in a system that has often left them without answers.

But I also want to be very clear that administrative action is not a long-term solution. Plain and simple, the only way for us to permanently and effectively fix our broken immigration laws is through comprehensive immigration reform legislation. Administrative action is a bandaid, but it is better than nothing, and nothing is what the House Republicans are offering.

So I also wish to say it has been deeply disappointing to hear that some of my Republican colleagues are now threatening to shut down the government just to keep families from getting some initial relief from the pain our broken immigration system is causing. That is the latest example of extreme Republicans creating uncertainty and threatening to hurt our economy if they don't get their way, and it is the exact opposite of the approach Congress needs to take going forward.

We all know what happens when Tea Party Republicans go down this road. We saw it just last year when we had a 16-day government shutdown that brought the day-to-day workings of the government and businesses across the country to a screeching halt. That shutdown, we all know, was bad for our economy. It hit workers' paychecks, it made families across our country question whether their elected officials could get anything done at all. It was all because of a failed Tea Party political effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the umpteenth time.

Look. Even children understand that flipping the table over doesn't help win the game. It just means someone has to pick up the mess they just made. When it comes to Tea Party political tactics, we have seen more than enough of that in this Congress.

As we all remember, the budget deal I reached with Chairman RYAN wasn't perfect—I know Chairman RYAN would say the same thing—but it was an important step away from brinkmanship and toward bipartisanship on the budget.

In the next week Republican leaders are going to have an important choice to make. They can choose bipartisanship and continue to push the Tea Party aside and work with Democrats on issues such as the budget and fixing our broken immigration system or they can go back to Tea Party-style governing by crisis, which hurts families and communities and our economy and will make it much more difficult to put in place the lasting comprehensive immigration reform we need.

I urge them to take the bipartisan path. I am ready and willing to work with them if they do, and I know my Democratic colleagues are as well. I know our country will be stronger for it now and for decades to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Washington for her strong statement. It makes so much sense.

We have this poster here, ''510 Days.'' That is how long ago the Senate passed the bipartisan immigration bill that Senator MURRAY talked about and Senator SCHUMER talked about. That is 17 months; 510 days is 17 months.

So here is the deal. The Republicans in the House refuse to take up the Senate bill, which strengthens the border while giving a pathway of legality to hard-working immigrants here who are undocumented.

It is pretty simple but comprehensive—common sense. Here is the thing: They will not take up the bill. So then we say: What is your idea? Where is your bill? They don't have one.

So then President Obama, knowing we have 11 million undocumented immigrants living in America, realizes he can't let this matter go on. He has waited 100 days, 200 days, 300 days, 400 days, 500 days. The country has waited for 17 months.

So the President is going to do what Presidents are supposed to do, which is look at a problem that is hurting the country and do his best to fix it. The President has said to the House he would be thrilled to sign the bipartisan immigration bill the Senate passed. Take it up and pass it.

Oh, no. Do you know what their answer is? To verbally threaten the President and, frankly, the American people by such comments as—this is one that I heard the Republican leader MITCH MCCONNELL say: If he does this, if he takes this action, if he takes action on immigration, it would be like waving a red flag in front of a bull.

No, it wouldn't be. It would be a President who understands that action is needed. Guess what. Eleven other Presidents, Republican and Democrat, have taken Executive action on immigration. I never in all my years ever heard one Republican take to task any of those other Presidents, and I will give you the list of who they are: Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George Bush, Sr., Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and President Obama used his authority for the DREAMers.

The charts are being held up to show you how many actions have been taken. We have these two charts here that show a lot of Executive actions by Presidents on immigration.

What is wrong with my Republican friends? Do they not know history or

are they just blindly attacking this President because they are annoyed that he got reelected?

Step up to the plate, smell the roses, look at the reality. The reality is all these other Presidents have taken action. Look what the immigration council says, the American Immigration Council said:

> Past Republican presidents have not been shy to use the White House's power to retool immigration policy. In fact, Obama could learn a lot from Presidents Ronald Reagan's and George H.W. Bush's Executive actions to preserve the unity of immigrant families and move past congressional refusal to enact immigration reform.

So, Earth to the Republicans: You refuse to take up the bipartisan Senate bill which strengthens our border while giving a legal path to citizenship or legality to our undocumented, making sure that those who commit crimes are deported. We look at what is happening in our ag community and fix that. They won't do it.

So they are stamping their foot and saying what President Obama wants to do is unconstitutional. Excuse me, unconstitutional? Presidents Reagan, Bush, Clinton, Eisenhower—I read the list. They never said that before. They never said that before. Carter, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Clinton, Bush, Sr., Reagan, George W., and Obama. Now they say to the President—and I don't have the exact quote. We heard a comment from the Republican leader. What they are basically saying to the President is, If you do your job, we are going to be mad. And what the President has said to them is, Please do your job. If you do your job, I won't have to take Executive action. I would prefer to have this in legislation. And as Senator MURRAY has said, that is the preferable road. But they either won't do it or they don't want to do it or they want another confrontation with the President.

I think it was JOHN BOEHNER, the Republican Speaker, who said if the President takes this Executive action, which as I have shown you many other Presidents have done, he will ''poison the well.'' He is telling the President that if the President does his job—my words—as 11 Presidents have done, it will ''poison the well.''

And what are they going to do about it? Who knows. Are they going to try to impeach the President or sue the President? I guess they have to impeach 10 others.

And by the way, I wrote the President a letter and asked him to take Executive action. In my view, it is absolutely necessary, because if you follow the law, 11 million people could be deported—our neighbors, our friends, families would be split up.

I thought Republicans were the party of family values. Family values—I have been lectured on family values. Somehow if one supports a woman's right to choose and to get health care, it is not following family values, but one can break up families and have parents and children separated, and that, I guess, doesn't fall under the definition.

It has been 17 months since we passed our bill and either they are too lazy to take it up or they don't want to take it up. They would rather threaten this President. I just have to tell them, we have a Congress, we have a court system, and we have a President. We don't have President McConnell, we don't have President Boehner, we don't have President Reid, we don't have President Boxer. We have President Obama, and he has to do his job. If you don't like it, that is fine. Lord knows I have served with five Presidents. I didn't agree with them half the time, but I didn't threaten to shut down the government or impeach them or sue them.

Now here is the deal: Why can't they find time to take up our bill? They have voted 50 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act—50 times—but they cannot find time to debate or pass a bill to reform our Nation's immigration laws.

I served in the House for 10 years. The rules in the House are easy. It is nothing like the Senate where you need unanimous consent to do anything, to even open up the Senate. In the House, if the majority, who are now the Republicans, wants to introduce a bill, all they have to do is introduce a bill.

They won't do it. It has been 17 months. Then the President says, oh, my God, we have got an issue here. Everyone agrees we have 11 million undocumented immigrants here. We have issues at the border. We have issues at detention facilities. We have issues in the ag industry. We have issues of families being torn apart. The President is going to do what he can do, just as 10 other Presidents have done previously. So what does he get in response from our Republican friends? Nothing that would allay our concerns. They don't say, Mr. President, we understand your frustration. Don't worry, we will get a bill done. It may not be the same as the Senate. We have other ideas. They do nothing. They are do-nothing and they want our President to be do-nothing when it comes to immigration.

Frankly, if our President did not take action, it would be a terrible mistake. I have already established that he is within his constitutional rights. He would be joining 10 other Presidents who, by the way, acted on 40 occasions over the last 60 years. So here is a group of Republicans threatening to impeach the President, sue the President, shut down the government over something that 11 Presidents have done over the past 60 years on 40 occasions. I never ever, ever heard one Republican or Democrat threaten to shut down the government when a President took action over immigration.

The Republicans won't act. So what do they think is going to happen, status quo? The status quo doesn't work. It is not working at the border. It is not working for our families. It is not working at the workplace. It is not working in our communities.

I was in the House when President Reagan signed into law a major immigration bill legalizing 3 million immigrants in 1986, and then the Congress didn't do the next step. They didn't take the next step. So he took Executive action to stop deportations that would interfere with family reunification. President Reagan—I didn't hear one Republican threaten to impeach the President, sue the President, take action, shut down the government, make life miserable for the American people. No. But they are doing it now.

In 1990, President George Herbert Walker Bush directed his Attorney General to halt deportations of an estimated 190,000 Salvadorans who were fleeing the civil war there, and he used his power to halt the deportation of up to 1.5 million spouses and children. I did not hear one Republican—not one—threaten to sue the President, threaten to take him to court, threaten to impeach him, threaten to shut down the government and make life miserable for the American people.

President Bush's family fairness policy Executive action was sweeping. It affected more than 40 percent of the undocumented population in the United States at the time. He thought big—George Bush, Sr.—he thought big, and this President should think big.

I will tell you why. If you ask economic experts what are the best measures we can do for our economy, they are clear about it. They say one measure we should implement is to raise the minimum wage. We Democrats are trying to do that and we will never give up trying to do that. Reforming immigration is another measure that is one of the best ways to stimulate our economy and create jobs, and it is all laid out in a USC study which shows that immigration reform with a path to citizenship would inject $8 billion into my State's economy—my State of California—each year—$8 billion each year. Nationwide it would increase our gross domestic product by $1.5 trillion over 10 years, increase wages for workers, and lead to between 750,000 to 900,000 new jobs. That is almost a million new jobs created, according to the Center for American Progress.

So help me out here, Republicans. What is your problem? You never complained when Republican Presidents took Executive action to fix a broken immigration system. You say you are for jobs and the economy and business, and if you look at the support for immigration reform, it runs right through our society from the Chambers of Commerce to labor and everybody in between. And if we don't act, the dire situation of undocumented immigrants will only get worse. Families will continue to be torn apart. People will continue to live in the shadows. The reason our economy will be thriving once people get out of the shadows is they are not afraid to come out. They are not afraid to buy a house. They are not afraid to spend money. They are not afraid to start new businesses. They

are not afraid to hire workers. It is a no-brainer. This is one of the most important things we can do for our economy, for jobs, for prosperity, for our communities.

In closing, because I see my friend from Connecticut is here, and I want to yield the floor, there are two priorities that are at stake: a healthy economy—and I have laid that out—and family values. The American people, including the people of California, support bold and compassionate action on immigration reform. We have already established that the President has the legal authority to act just as other Presidents of both parties have in the past.

I say to the President today, as I have said to him in writing, if you act you will have my strong support and you will have the support of so many people across this country. You will keep our families together, you will strengthen our economy, and you will make our country stronger.

I say to the House again, while you are still here in Washington, if you don't want the President to fill the void for your lack of action, then take up and pass the Senate immigration bill. Get to work. If you don't like that bill, then make another bill, but take care of this problem because if you continue to be a do-nothing House when it comes to immigration, I can assure you this President will not follow your lead and be a do-nothing President when it comes to immigration. That would be terribly wrong. It would be wrong not only for our immigrant community but for every single one of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have two articles printed in the RECORD, along with an article in the National Journal that details the number of times Presidents have used their authority to act on immigration.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From huffingtonpost.com, Nov. 15, 2014]

REAGAN, BUSH ALSO ACTED WITHOUT CONGRESS TO SHIELD IMMIGRANTS FROM DEPORTATION

(By Andrew Taylor)

WASHINGTON (AP).—Two presidents have acted unilaterally on immigration—and both were Republican. Ronald Reagan and his successor George H.W. Bush extended amnesty to family members who were not covered by the last major overhaul of immigration law in 1986.

Neither faced the political uproar widely anticipated if and when President Barack Obama uses his executive authority to protect millions of immigrants from deportation.

Reagan's and Bush's actions were conducted in the wake of a sweeping, bipartisan immigration overhaul and at a time when ''amnesty'' was not a dirty word. Their actions were less controversial because there was a consensus in Washington that the 1986 law needed a few fixes and Congress was poised to act on them. Obama is acting as the country—and Washington—are bitterly divided over a broken immigration system and what to do about 11 million people living in the U.S. illegally.

Obama wants to extend protection from deportation to millions of immigrant parents and spouses of U.S. citizens and permanent residents, and expand his 2-year-old program that shields immigrants brought illegally to this country as children.

A tea party-influenced GOP is poised to erupt, if and when Obama follows through on his promise.

''The audacity of this president to think he can completely destroy the rule of law with the stroke of a pen is unfathomable to me,'' said GOP Rep. Steve King of Iowa, an outspoken opponent of relaxing U.S. immigration law. ''It is unconstitutional, it is cynical, and it violates the will of the American people.''

Some Republicans have even raised the possibility of impeachment.

Here's a timeline of then and now:

1986. Congress and Reagan enacted a sweeping overhaul that gave legal status to up to 3 million immigrants without authorization to be in the country, if they had come to the U.S. before 1982. Spouses and children who could not meet that test did not qualify, which incited protests that the new law was breaking up families.

1987. Early efforts in Congress to amend the law to cover family members failed. Reagan's Immigration and Naturalization Service commissioner announced that minor children of parents granted amnesty by the law would get protection from deportation. Spouses and children of couples in which one parent qualified for amnesty but the other did not remained subject to deportation, leading to efforts to amend the 1986 law.

1989. By a sweeping 81–17 vote, the Senate in July voted to prohibit deportations of family members of immigrants covered by the 1986 law. The House failed to act.

1990. In February, President George H.W. Bush, acting through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, established a ''family fairness'' in which family members living with a legalizing immigrant and who were in the U.S. before passage of the 1986 law were granted protection from deportation and authorized to seek employment. The administration estimated up to 1.5 million people would be covered by the policy. Congress in October passed a broader immigration law that made the protections permanent.

2012. In July, the Obama administration announces a new policy curbing deportations for certain immigrants brought illegally to the country as kids. The policy, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), applies to people younger than 30 who were brought to the U.S. before they turned 16 and meet other criteria such as graduating high school. It has now granted two-year deportation reprieves and work permits to nearly 600,000 people.

2013–2014 (Congress). After months of work, the Senate in June 2013 passes, 68–32, a huge immigration overhaul bill that includes a path to citizenship for immigrants who meet strict criteria. The House fails to act. In a televised interview with Telemundo, Obama says expanding the DACA program to cover the parents of children allowed to remain in the country under the program ''would be ignoring the law in a way that I think would be very difficult to defend legally. So that's not an option.''

2014 Frustrated by Congress' inability to act on immigration, Obama announces in June that he'll use executive powers to address other elements of the flawed immigration system. Like Bush, Obama is expected to extend deportation protections to families of U.S. citizens or permanent residents. Obama's anticipated action would not award legal status, but it would offer temporary protection from deportation to up to 5 million people, as well as the possibility of obtaining a work permit. He delayed action until after Election Day. On Monday, Democratic leaders sent a letter to Obama saying they strongly support his plans to take executive action on immigration.

[From the hill.com, Oct. 2, 2014]

WHEN REAGAN AND GHW BUSH TOOK BOLD EXECUTIVE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION

(By Mark Noferi)

Congressional Republicans are outraged that President Obama may take executive action on immigration reform after the midterm elections—perhaps by deferring deportations and providing work authorization to millions of unauthorized immigrants with strong family ties to the United States. However, past Republican presidents have not been shy to use the White House's power to retool immigration policy. In fact, Obama could learn a lot from presidents Ronald Reagan's and George H. W. Bush's executive actions to preserve the unity of immigrant families, and move past Congressional refusal to enact immigration reform.

The story begins on November 6, 1986, when Reagan signed the last comprehensive legalization bill to pass Congress. The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) gave up to 3 million unauthorized immigrants a path to legalization if they had been ''continuously'' present in the U.S. since January 1, 1982. But the new law excluded their spouses and children who didn't qualify. As the Senate Judiciary Committee stated at the time, ''the families of legalized aliens . . . will be required to ''wait in line'.

Immediately, these split-eligibility families became the most polarizing national immigration issue. U.S. Catholic bishops criticized the government's ''separation of families,'' especially given Reagan's other pro-family stances. In early 1987, members of Congress introduced legislation to legalize family members, but without success.

Shortly after Congress' failure, Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) commissioner Alan Nelson announced he was ''exercising the Attorney General's discretion'' to assure that children would ''be covered'' by legalization. The administration granted a blanket deferral of deportation (logistically similar to today's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program) for children under 18 who were living in a two-parent household with both parents legalizing, or with a single parent who was legalizing.

Lawmakers and advocates, however, urged Reagan to go further. Spouses and some children who had one parent able to legalize but not the other remained unprotected. A California immigrants' rights group called this ''contrary to the American tradition of keeping families together.'' And as Rep. Howard Berman (D-Calif.) told the INS, ''If you have the discretion to protect children, why not a family?''

In July 1989, the Senate moved to protect a bigger group—all spouses and children of those who legalized under IRCA. The Senate passed legislation 81–17 that prohibited the administration from deporting family members of immigrants in the process of legalizing and directed officials to grant them work authorization. The House failed to act on the Senate's bill.

George Bush Sr. then responded in February 1990 by administratively implementing the Senate bill's provisions himself. As Bush's INS Commissioner, Gene McNary, stated: ''It is vital that we enforce the law against illegal entry. However, we can enforce the law humanely. To split families encourages further violations of the law as they reunite.'' Under Bush's ''family fairness'' policy, applicants had to meet certain criteria, and reapply to the INS every year for extensions.

The Bush administration anticipated its family fairness program could help enormous numbers of immigrants—up to 1.5 million family members, which amounted to over 40 percent of the 3.5 million unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. at the time.

After the Bush administration moved, the House followed. In March 1990, 33 House members introduced legislation with similar provisions to stay deportation of family members. In October, Congress then passed a combined Immigration Act of 1990, with a permanent ''Family Unity'' provision. The Act broadened Bush's family fairness policy to include children under 21 and increased family immigration visas, ultimately providing more families a path to citizenship.

If voters thought Bush overstepped his authority, the midterm elections didn't show it. In 1990, the Republicans lost a scant nine House seats and one Senate seat (out of 33 up for election)—far lower than average midterm losses by a president's party. Bush then signed the Act in November, hailing it as continuing ''support for the family as the essential unit of society'' and ''our tradition of family reunification.'' (Bush did issue a signing statement reserving the ''authority of the executive branch to exercise prosecutorial discretion in suitable immigration cases.'')

The success of the Reagan-Bush family fairness policy serves as a strikingly similar historical precedent for Obama. Bush Sr. ''went big'' to treat families fairly—deferring deportations for over 40 percent of unauthorized immigrants. Reportedly, Obama's actions could be similarly broad and help up to 5 million immigrants—over 40 percent of today's unauthorized population. Bush Sr.'s actions gave immigrants a safe haven and spurred the House to act without negative impacts in the subsequent midterms. And the Reagan-Bush fairness policy deferred deportations to protect families, compared to previous uses of presidential authority to protect war refugees or immigrants stranded by a foreign policy crisis.

We don't know what executive action Obama will take. But we can say with certainty that presidents Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush led the way.

CRITICS SAY EXECUTIVE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION WOULD BE UNPRECEDENTED. THEY FORGET THEIR HISTORY

PRESIDENTS HAVE ALMOST ALWAYS ACTED FIRST TO PERMIT IMMIGRATION OR PREVENT DEPORTATION—WITH CONGRESS RATIFYING THOSE ACTIONS LATER ON.

(By Charles Kamasaki)

The president's announcement that he would soon take executive action to ''to do what he could'' to fix a broken immigration system in the absence of legislation has prompted critics to assert that this would be unprecedented unless first authorized by Congress. In fact, the record demonstrates the opposite. For at least the last 70 years, presidents have routinely acted first to permit the entry of people outside normal channels or to protect large numbers of people from deportation, with legislation ratifying the executive action coming later.

During World War II, the Roosevelt administration negotiated a temporary worker arrangement with the Mexican government, later known as the Bracero program, an action Congress ratified a year later. When the authorization expired in 1947, the Truman administration continued the program until it was reauthorized in 1951. Before it ended in 1964, millions of workers entered the United States under the auspices of the Bracero program, hundreds of thousands under executive—not legislative—authority. The program was rightly criticized for numerous labor and human-rights violations, but few questioned the executive authority it operated under.

After the war ended, President Truman used his executive authority to permit 250,000 people from Europe to enter or stay in the U.S. outside normal immigration channels. It was only three years after this exercise of discretion that Congress passed the Displaced Persons Act, permitting some 400,000 additional entries.

In April 1975, at the end of the Vietnam War, President Ford used parole authority to authorize the evacuation of 200,000 South Vietnamese to this country; it was not until a month later that the Indochina Migration and Refugee Act of 1975 was enacted, providing resettlement funding for 130,000 of those parolees. Full legislative authorization to resettle those fleeing Indochina did not come until 1980, when Congress passed the Refugee Act, resulting in permanent resettlement of 1.4 million Indochinese in the U.S.. Although most entered as bona fide refugees, hundreds of thousands were paroled into the country when statutorily authorized numbers proved inadequate.

But these broad exercises of discretion were limited to refugees fleeing wars a long time ago, right? Wrong. Presidents have exercised their discretion more than 20 times since the mid-1970s to permit people already in the U.S. from being deported. Some sought to avoid return to a Soviet bloc country. Iranians in the 1980s sought protection from the regime that overthrew the shah and occupied the American Embassy there. Afghans in the U.S. in the 1980s and 1990s were protected first from the Soviet puppet state and later from the Taliban. Others would have been returned to face civil war or natural disasters abroad. Not until 2003, several decades after the practice of country-specific relief from deportation was first deployed, did Congress codify the practice known as ''temporary protected status.''

The record also shows that Congress made many executive orders of temporary relief permanent, often years after the fact. As Fidel Castro took power in Cuba in 1959, more than 900,000 Cubans fled to the United States, the vast majority paroled into the country by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. Not until 1966, some seven years after the influx began, was the Cuban Adjustment Act passed.

In 1980, 130,000 Mariel Cubans and nearly 40,000 Haitians arrived in South Florida. Most, but not all, of the Cubans were paroled into the U.S. by President Carter. Haitians initially were protected from deportation by litigation challenging the denials of their asylum claims; most of these Haitians, and some Cubans whose entry had been challenged, eventually received discretionary ''Cuban-Haitian entrant status'' in the Reagan administration. Six years later, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 provided lawful permanent resident status for Cuban-Haitian entrants.

In 1987, Reagan administration Attorney General Edwin Meese directed the Immigration and Naturalization Service not to deport an estimated 200,000 Nicaraguans in the United States without authorization, including those whose asylum claims had been denied. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush instructed his attorney general to provide ''deferred enforced departure'' status to an estimated 190,000 Salvadorans fleeing civil war. In 1997, a decade after Meese's initial action, Congress passed legislation permitting these groups' adjustment to permanent residence.

In 1989, the Bush administration provided DED status to 80,000 Chinese students in the U.S. who feared returning to the strife that eventually led to the Tiananmen Square massacre and later issued an executive order extending their status. Congress then passed the Chinese Student Protection Act in 1992, three years following the initial executive action, making the students eligible for green cards.

OK, but major exercises of prosecutorial discretion have been used only for foreign policy reasons, right? Wrong again. Executive actions have been used by every modern administration on more than a dozen occasions to further purely domestic policy objectives. After domestic emergencies—the San Francisco earthquake, the 9/11 attack, Hurricanes Katrina and Ike, and others—immigration officials relaxed enforcement efforts to advance public health and safety. Beginning with President Carter in 1980, every administration has instructed immigration officials to reduce enforcement efforts during the census.

Other exercises of discretion went beyond specific emergencies or events. In 1977, Carter administration Attorney General Griffin Bell suspended deportation of about 250,000 people unfairly denied visas by a quirk in the allocation process. It was not until nearly a decade later, via IRCA in 1986, that all of these cases were resolved.

In 1990, INS Commissioner Gene McNary issued a ''Family Fairness'' policy deferring the deportation of 1.5 million immediate family members of people receiving legalization under IRCA, building on a more-limited exercise of discretion in 1987 by Edwin Meese. Three years after Meese's original executive action, Congress codified the action in the Immigration Act of 1990.

In 1997, President Clinton provided DED status to some 40,000 Haitians previously paroled into the U.S. At the end of the 105th Congress a year later, legislation passed allowing these Haitians to permanently adjust their status.

The record is clear: Presidents of both parties have used discretionary powers on multiple occasions to protect various groups from deportation for an enormously wide variety of reasons. Except for temporary conditions, Congress acted later—often years later—to ratify the president's decisions.

Looking back now, would we reverse any of these executive actions? Should we have returned Eastern Europeans to behind the Iron Curtain, Cambodians to the killing fields, Ethiopians to a brutal civil war, Iranians to the arms of the ayatollah, or Chinese students to face the tanks in Tiananmen Square? Would we be better off without the Cubans and Haitians who revitalized South Florida over the past 40 years? Were we wrong to prevent the separation of 1.5 million people from family members getting right with the law under IRCA's legalization?

Many of these actions were controversial when first announced. But Congress later affirmed virtually all of them—without explicitly reversing any of them—suggesting that eventually they were widely accepted. Decades from now, people looking back on President Obama's imminent announcement of broad-scale executive action will see that he prevented the separation of families, began fixing a badly broken immigration system, and improved wages, housing, and education for those receiving legal status, thus immeasurably enriching the economy. They'll likely see that Congress later ratified his actions, as happened so often before.

And, they'll wonder: what was all the fuss about?

Mrs. BOXER. I say to my colleagues who have come to the floor this afternoon and are still to come to the floor, thank you.

Republicans have threatened to close down this government. They are having a temper tantrum and refuse to act

on immigration and want to paralyze the Presidency.

It is time to get behind this President. It is time to get behind the American people. It is time to take a stand for this economy and for family values.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am grateful for the strong and eloquent words that were said by my colleague Senator BOXER. I am grateful to so many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle for supporting the President as he considers Executive action that would essentially enforce the law on immigration more rationally and effectively, which is what prosecutorial discretion means.

As a former U.S. attorney as well as the State attorney general in my own State for 20 years, I know about prosecutorial discretion. I know that in exercising his discretion, the President is aware that there is simply no way every undocumented person in the United States of America can be deported tomorrow, let alone this year—probably ever.

There are 11.5 million undocumented people who live in the shadows, and the question is, How do we use the resources of the Federal Government most rationally and effectively to serve the public interest and uphold the rule of law?

The question is, essentially, How should law enforcement use its resources? That question arises every day in the United States when there is a Federal or State prosecution. It arises every day on our borders when the agents of our Federal administrative law enforcement apparatus make decisions about law enforcement. As I have learned from my experience in law enforcement, it best serves citizens when it uses those resources efficiently, effectively, and humanely in a concerted effort to address a direct threat to public safety. Law enforcement has a job to do, and it can't do everything all the time everywhere.

Decisions are necessary in the real world in practical circumstances to preserve public order and protect public safety, and that is what the President is doing by issuing an Executive order which, in effect, directs Federal resources to deport undocumented immigrants who represent a threat to this country by virtue of their criminal activity or criminal background or other circumstances that justify that rational and selective approach to law enforcement.

This approach is hardly novel, and it is highly unoriginal. In fact, President Obama's authority to direct how Federal immigration resources will be marshaled in the service of protecting public safety is very much in the tradition and history of this office. Every President since Dwight Eisenhower, whether Democratic or Republican, has done exactly what President Obama is doing in this Executive order.

In 1990 President George H.W. Bush took Executive action to defer removal and grant work permits to roughly 1.5 million undocumented individuals—nearly half the undocumented population at the time. Think about that for a moment. Out of 3 million people, President Bush decided that 1.5 million of them should, in effect, not be prosecuted. He set law enforcement priorities. That was his job, and that is President Obama's job.

Many of us—and I am very much in this camp—would prefer to address this situation through legislation. I worked hard, along with the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee and Members on both sides of the aisle of the Judiciary Committee and of this body, to approve legislation. It was resolved and written up after several days of detailed and painstaking markup. I was told that is the way legislation used to be routinely done in this body—Members trading ideas, exchanging views and perspectives, drilling down on facts, and arriving at a bipartisan solution that eventually was approved by 68 Members of this body from both sides of the aisle. That is a matter of history.

My hope was and still is that we have legislation along the lines of what was approved by the Senate. That legislation was far from perfect. In my view, it was way short of the ideal immigration reform I would favor, but the good cannot be the enemy of the perfect and the perfect cannot be the enemy of the good. What we need now is a practical approach to this problem through legislation. The House refused to take up the Senate bill. It didn't even consider it and never voted on it.

The President has a responsibility, and his job is to take actions that are within his legal authority to address a system that is broken and takes a toll on human lives that is intolerable. It threatens to divide families, to put people out of work—not just undocumented immigrants out of work but citizens of this country because they work for businesses that are owned and operated by those immigrants who might be deported. I have seen that firsthand in Connecticut, and I know it is true around the country.

This measure is not only good for human lives, it is good for our economy. It is essential to make sure our immigration system—a broken, failed system—is at least prepared in the short term while we work toward legislation that is absolutely necessary to comprehensively revise and reform that system.

Every day that the Federal Government fails to act on immigration reform, people in this country are forced to live in fear and the anxiety and apprehension that children suffer when they are afraid they will lose their parents and siblings. Connecticut citizens live in fear of losing their neighbors and their employers, their congregates in church, and members of their immediate and extended families. Millions of immigrants who have lived in this country for years—5 or 10 years or longer—and are working hard, paying taxes, abiding by the law, and contributing and giving back to their communities are forced to live in fear that they will have to leave everything they have worked so hard to build and everything that means so much to them—their families, their homes, and the country they have come to love. They appreciate the freedoms of this country and the opportunities it offers in ways we routinely take for granted. For them, this country is a beacon of hope and opportunity which they appreciate so deeply and fervently that they are willing to lay down their lives for it and, in fact, sometimes do as members of our armed services.

The lack of action on immigration reform hurts everyone. When businesses employ workers under the table, our economy and our Nation are deprived of their taxes. They are often ducking regulations and taxes, which in turn drives down wages for every working American.

Immigrants should be able to come out of the shadows not just for their sake but for the Nation's sake. They are a resource that can be used so much more fully to the benefit of our Nation. When they come out of the shadows, they should be forced to undergo background checks, obtain work permits and proof that they are abiding by the law. That is necessary to show they are not a threat to public safety.

When immigrants live in fear, law enforcement can't know who lives in the communities they police. Immigrants who live in fear are simply not going to be as willing to report individuals living near them and represent a real threat to public safety because they feel uncomfortable reporting crimes and cooperating with authority when they feel they may then be the object of enforcement. Getting more people who are already living in this country into the system will allow law enforcement to go after the truly bad actors—serious criminals, serious national security threats, and people who seriously should not be in this country.

As the American people wait for legislative action and wait for the House to act on the Senate bill and perhaps wait on the Senate to act again, President Obama has both the authority and the moral responsibility to institute these reforms. These reforms are crucial. He has the authority under law to exercise his discretion. He has the moral responsibility to fix this broken system as long and as well as he can using that responsibility.

I am encouraged to hear that the President intends to focus his authority on serious criminals, not law-abiding individuals. At a minimum, my hope is that he will ease the minds of children and put to rest the anxiety children feel when they fear they may lose their parents. Whether they are DREAMers or U.S. citizens, they should be spared that apprehension and

anxiety that interferes with everything they do in school or work.

My hope is that he will exercise that authority on behalf of the parents of those children—U.S. citizens, permanent residents, and DREAMers.

My hope is that he will ease some of the arbitrary restrictions that prevent the DOCA program from achieving its full purpose—restrictions like the cutoff age.

As he acts to exercise his prosecutorial discretion with respect to deportation, he should also consider his administration's policies with respect to detention. As I wrote to the President earlier this year, along with my colleague and friend Chairman LEAHY, I believe the administration's decision to dramatically expand the detention of whole families, many of whom have shown a credible fear of being returned to dangerous situations in their home countries, is counterproductive and harmful. Migrants must be given an adequate opportunity to show they have a valid claim as refugees.

The policy of indiscriminately holding families in enormous, privately run facilities leads to inhumane living conditions. Violence against women and children and simply inefficient use of resources are more the rule than the exception. Warehousing young children in complexes that are little more than jails is deeply incompatible with our national values and it serves none of the goals of an effective immigration system.

Tomorrow marks the 25th anniversary of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child. Faith leaders and community members from around the country will be doing vigils and telling the stories of children and mothers who are spending this holiday season behind bars. Yes, in the greatest country in the history of the world, children and their moms will be spending Thanksgiving behind bars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. These families are not flight risks and they are not dangerous. We owe it to them to do better. I am proud of standing with my colleagues on calling on the President to keep families together, target resources effectively, and run an immigration system that reflects America's values and builds a stronger future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to executive session.

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Pepper nomination.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Tom Udall, Mazie K. Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 283 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Ayotte	Franken	Mikulski
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Begich	Harkin	Murphy
Bennet	Heinrich	Murray
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Nelson
Booker	Hirono	Pryor
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Brown	Johnson (WI)	Reid
Cantwell	Kaine	Rockefeller
Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Collins	Levin	Shaheen
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Donnelly	Markey	Tester
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Feinstein	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Flake	Merkley	Walsh
		Warner
		Warren
		Whitehouse
		Wyden

NAYS—39

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Hagan	Landrieu	Vitter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 39.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF PAMELA PEPPER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Sannes nomination.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Brenda K. Sannes, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Tom Udall, Mazie K. Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Brenda K. Sannes, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 284 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Levin	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall (CO)
Collins	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Walsh
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Harkin	Nelson	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Flake	Moran
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Hagan	Landrieu	Vitter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF BRENDA K. SANNES TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brenda K. Sannes, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Madeline Cox Arleo.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Madeline Cox Arleo, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Tom Udall, Mazie K. Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Madeline Cox Arleo, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 285 Ex.]

AYES—56

Ayotte	Harkin	Nelson
Baldwin	Heinrich	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Levin	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall (CO)
Collins	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Walsh
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	

NAYS—40

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kirk	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	
Fischer	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—4

Chambliss	Landrieu
Hagan	Vitter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF MADELINE COX ARLEO TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Madeline Cox Arleo, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote to invoke cloture on the Beetlestone nomination.

Who yields time?

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about this nomination. This is the nomination of Wendy Beetlestone to be U.S. district court judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. She has great qualifications. She is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, an honors graduate in her undergraduate institution. She has worked now for 19 years at the law firm of Hangley Aronchick Segal Pudlin & Schiller, has 19 years of experience in litigation in a wide variety of matters. She worked in education law and has broad experience there. She worked as a journalist as well before she was a lawyer and, during her time working in Philadelphia as a lawyer, as a great advocate for people who don't have a voice and also someone who brings a wide experience to the Federal bench.

I am honored to be working with Senator TOOMEY on this nomination, working together to get these nominations through, and I am so grateful for the work of the Judiciary Committee and especially Chairman LEAHY moving these nominations through.

I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I wish to say briefly that I thank Senator CASEY for the terrific cooperative working relationship he and I have. When Wendy Beetlestone is confirmed, that will make the 11th Federal judge who has been confirmed as a result of the work we have done together.

Wendy is an outstanding candidate, and I think she will make a great Federal judge. I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Wendy Beetlestone, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Tom Udall, Mazie K. Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Wendy Beetlestone, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 286 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Ayotte	Harkin	Pryor
Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Begich	Heitkamp	Reid
Bennet	Hirono	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boxer	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Levin	Tester
Carper	Manchin	Toomey
Casey	Markey	Udall (CO)
Collins	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Walsh
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Flake	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Nelson	

NAYS—38

Alexander	Fischer	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Coats	Hoeven	Roberts
Coburn	Inhofe	Rubio
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johanns	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Crapo	Kirk	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Wicker
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—4

Chambliss	Landrieu
Hagan	Vitter

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF WENDY BEETLESTONE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Wendy Beetlestone, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we will have one more vote. As soon as that is turned in, we will go to recess subject to the call of the Chair for a briefing which everyone should go to, and we will come back and do some wrap-up. This is the last vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Bolden nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time has been yielded back.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Victor Allen Bolden, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Tom Udall, Mazie K. Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Victor Allen Bolden, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 287 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Udall (CO)
Collins	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Walsh
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—44

Alexander	Flake	McConnell
Ayotte	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Tester
Crapo	Kirk	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Manchin	Wicker
Fischer	McCain	

NOT VOTING—5

Chambliss	Landrieu	Vitter
Hagan	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF VICTOR ALLEN BOLDEN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Victor Allen Bolden, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:46 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 6:31 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUMENTHAL).

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the business before the body?

NOMINATION OF JON M. HOLLADAY TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

NOMINATION OF MAUREEN ELIZABETH CORMACK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

NOMINATION OF ALLAN P. MUSTARD, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO TURKMENISTAN

NOMINATION OF EARL ROBERT MILLER, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BOTSWANA

NOMINATION OF JUDITH BETH CEFKIN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FIJI, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI, THE REPUBLIC OF NAURU, THE KINGDOM OF TONGA, AND TUVALU

NOMINATION OF ROBERT T. YAMATE, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MADAGASCAR, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNION OF THE COMOROS

NOMINATION OF MICHELE JEANNE SISON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY, AND THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

NOMINATION OF MICHELE JEANNE SISON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Jon M. Holladay, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Agriculture; Maureen Elizabeth Cormack, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bosnia and Herzegovina; Allan P. Mustard, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkmenistan; Earl Robert Miller, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Botswana; Judith Beth Cefkin, of Colorado, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Services, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu; Robert T. Yamate, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Madagascar, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of the Comoros; Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations; and Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

VOTE ON HOLLADAY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Holladay nomination.

Mr. REID. I yield back the time, with the Chair's permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jon M. Holladay, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Agriculture?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON CORMACK NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Maureen Elizabeth Cormack, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bosnia and Herzegovina?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MUSTARD NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Allan P. Mustard, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkmenistan?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MILLER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Earl Robert Miller, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Botswana?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON CEFKIN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Judith Beth Cefkin, of Colorado, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the

United States of America to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON YAMATE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert T. Yamate, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Madagascar, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of the Comoros?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SISON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SISON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATION SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

Mr. REID. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Iowa for joining me.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 1034, the Senate consider Calendar Nos. 955, 1054, 639, 641, 999, 998, 1028, 953, 696, 540, and 962; that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, we expect these votes to be such that we can confirm them by voice vote.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BILL SCHWERI

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend of mine and a great friend to the Bluegrass State and the University of Kentucky, Mr. Bill Schweri. Bill recently retired from the University of Kentucky after dedicating over 40 years to working at the university, the last two decades of which were spent as the director of Federal relations.

It has been Bill's job to serve as a liaison between the university and its faculty and the executive and legislative branches of State and Federal Government. I am a proud graduate of UK's College of Law, and Bill has represented my alma mater exceedingly well over the years.

Bill has been a staunch advocate for new research initiatives at the university in fields as varied as agriculture, biotechnology, clean coal technology, energy, engineering, and transportation. He has helped transform UK into one of the most prominent economic drivers in the State.

He has been instrumental in bringing about such UK achievements as the Marty Driesler Cancer Project, the expansion of a teaching space in the College of Nursing, the creation of a bioinformatics core in the university's medical center, and Fedtrak, a project with the Transportation Security Administration to track sensitive material shipments.

Bill also played a key role in UK's Markey Cancer Center being awarded a National Cancer Institute designation. With NCI designation, UK is better positioned to recruit researchers, receive grants, and to develop new breakthrough treatments to lead the fight against cancer. This means that fewer Kentuckians will have to travel out of State to find the most advanced care and clinical trials, and instead will be able to find it within the Commonwealth, which is critical as Kentucky suffers from the highest combined cancer mortality rate in the country.

Bill has worked actively to help maintain congressional support for student financial aid, which is so important to many Kentucky students. He has worked tirelessly to ensure his school's visibility here in Washington, DC and to fight for legislation that is important to UK. And he is fiercely loyal to the University of Kentucky.

Bill is not just an employee of UK, he's also an alumnus. Bill earned his bachelor's degree in anthropology from the University of Kentucky in 1969 and his master's degree, also in anthropology, from UK in 1978.

In his youth he served in the Peace Corps in Guatemala, and he also served as the past president of the Society of Research Administrators, International from 1997 to 1998. Bill previously served as UK's director of sponsored program development in the 1980s and '90s before becoming the director of Federal relations in July of 1994.

Bill has been a leader in the Science Coalition, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization of more than 50 of the Nation's leading research universities dedicated to sustaining the Federal Government's investment in scientific research. He has also been actively involved in the Council on Governmental Affairs of the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities.

Bill is well known and highly respected among his colleagues in Federal relations at other research universities, just as he is throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky. I wish to personally thank Bill for his service to the University of Kentucky and to our State. Although his retirement is well earned, he will certainly be missed, by me, by my staff, and by the many people across Kentucky who have benefited from his efforts. I ask my U.S. Senate colleagues to join me in bidding a fond farewell to Mr. Bill Schweri.

LETTERS IN RELATION TO RESIGNATION

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters related to my resignation as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
November 12, 2014.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BIDEN,
President of the U.S. Senate.

DEAR VICE PRESIDENT BIDEN, please find the attached document officially notifying Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin of my intent to resign my Senate seat on January 3, 2015. I further note that my resignation will be effective at 11:59 AM on that date.

Thank you for your service to our nation.

Sincerely,

TOM A. COBURN, M.D.

U.S. SENATE,
January 17, 2014.

Governor MARY FALLIN,
Oklahoma City, OK.

DEAR GOVERNOR FALLIN, serving as Oklahoma's senator has been, and continues to be, one of the great privileges and blessings of my life. But, after much prayer and consideration, I have decided that I will leave the Senate before the end of my term.

I am therefore resigning my Senate seat effective January 3, 2015. I am giving you substantial advance notice with the hope that you will be able to schedule a special election concurrent with the existing election schedule and not impose any undue burden on Oklahoma taxpayers.

Thank you for your service to our great state.

Sincerely,

TOM A. COBURN, M.D.

REMEMBERING PHILIP CRANE

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, Illinois lost its longest-serving Member of the House of Representatives and this country lost one of the great leaders of the conservative movement last week when Philip Crane passed away at the age of 84.

For 35 years Phil Crane represented Chicago's northwest suburbs, a region I know well. He was first elected to Congress in 1969, winning a special election, and ultimately became the longest-serving House Republican when he was finally defeated in 2004. While I served with Congressman Phil Crane in the House of only 4 years, our districts were adjacent to each other and together we fought for many issues important to suburban Chicago and Illinois.

Before conservative principles were fashionable, Phil was leading the way for conservatism, working for Barry Goldwater in 1964 in Illinois. When some said Phil's politics of small government and low taxes were backward looking, he responded with gusto, arguing in support of free markets and trade, prudent economics policies, a strong national defense, and traditional values.

Phil was courageous and had foresight. In 1976 he was the first sitting Congressman to publicly support Reagan in his effort to defeat President Gerald Ford. He also founded the Republican Study Committee, which still exists today in the House of Representatives. He also was deeply involved in the early days of two of the most influential conservative think tanks, the Heritage Foundation and the American Conservative Union.

In 1980 Phil took a run for President, ultimately falling to Ronald Reagan. As a young House staffer, I noted that numerous Congressmen respected Phil for his early advocacy of conservative principles and his ties to the early days of the modern conservative movement. If you want to get a feel of Phil, then read his 1976 book ''The Sum of Good Government.''

Phil Crane fought tirelessly as a senior member of the House Ways and Means Committee for his conservative principles, including for lower taxes and increasing trade. One of his greatest legislative achievements was the North American Free Trade Agreement, which created the world's largest free trade zone, linking up billions of dollars annually.

With the passing of Phil Crane, Illinois and Washington have lost one of its greats. Thank you, Phil Crane, for your service to the State of Illinois and to our country.

CONGRATULATING JOHN COX

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and congratulate John Cox the Director of the Wyoming Department of Transportation. On November 24, 2014, Director Cox will be elected as president of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, AASHTO. John is currently serving as the association's vice-president and has worked his way to the top through various positions in AASHTO.

Since 2005, he has continually served Wyoming as the WYDOT director. The respect for John is deep and widespread. He was appointed by Democrat Governor Dave Freudenthal and reappointed by our current Republican Governor Matt Mead.

John Cox is not your traditional State Department of Transportation director. Director Cox has a 28-year background in law enforcement. As a young patrolman, John patrolled thousands of miles on the rural roads of Wyoming. Director Cox's law enforcement background provided him with a unique perspective on the needs of rural States like Wyoming. John understands rural transportation. He also understands that our transportation system must be whole. I believe his experience and leadership will be key to the success of AASHTO and its members over the next year.

Director Cox and I have worked closely together for over a decade. When I was in the Wyoming Legislature, I chaired the Senate Transportation and Military Affairs Committee. In the Wyoming Legislature, we worked to improve our State's highways. In the U.S. Senate, we worked on the 2012 highway reauthorization bill. In 2014, Director Cox and I focused on improving the current law by cutting Washington redtape and providing flexibility and equity for rural States like Wyoming.

I look forward to continuing to work with Director Cox as all of America can now benefit from his leadership.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOHN R. BALLENTINE

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor John R. Ballentine, who will retire as the Alma City Mayor after more than two decades of public service to the citizens of Arkansas in this elected position.

As Alma City Mayor, John was a constant advocate for services, programs and improvements for Alma residents. After leading the city out of debt, John oversaw the construction and financing of the city's first waterpark. In 2000, John opened the Alma Aquatic Center, which has become a centerpiece of the city bringing in more than 50,000 people annually. What started as an idea dreamed up while baling hay became a significant contributor to the City of Alma's economy.

John fought hard to enhance existing public facilities and finance the new construction of amenities including area parks, a $4 million water treatment plant, an annual Independence Day fireworks show, and the annual Alma flying disk golf tournament which brings in over 100 participants every November.

John's passion for public service extends beyond his most recent position as Alma's longest standing mayor since 1872. In addition, John served on the Alma City Council for 4 years, as a member of the Crawford County Quorum Court for 10 years, and in the U.S. Army Reserves for 21 years.

I congratulate John for his commitment to public service. We are all grateful for his years of service and leadership to Alma, Crawford County and Arkansas. John is truly a public servant. I wish him continued success in his future endeavors.•

CONGRATULATING THE STAMFORD JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

• Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Stamford Jewish Community Center for being the 2014 S.T.R.I.V.E., Sports Teach Respect Initiative Values and Excellence, Organization of the Year. Each year the National Council of Youth Sports, NCYS, recognizes five finalist organizations that most meet the ''kids first'' approach, evidenced by their implementation of best practices and policies that protect kids and promote safety. Those five finalist organizations are then put on the NCYS website for voting by the public. The award, sponsored by AIG, is presented to organizations that exhibit heartfelt passion and show a committed spirit to helping kids succeed in sports, while maintaining a commitment to safety procedures.

Since opening its doors in 1916, the Stamford JCC has become a valuable community resource, especially well-known for its continuum of safe, supportive, and inclusive health and fitness programs for children and youth

of all abilities, backgrounds, and financial circumstances. This year, more than 1,500 kids, ages 3 to 16, have taken part in their ''kids-first'' recreational activities, created to promote such attributes as teamwork, community engagement, and sportsmanship.

NCYS is the largest known organization in America representing the youth sports industry, and this award is an important recognition that the Stamford JCC is excelling at helping kids in our community. Comprised of the who's who in the youth sports industry, NCYS was founded in 1979, and its membership represents more than 200 organizations/corporations serving 60,000,000 registered participants in organized youth sports programs. Its members include organizations such as the American Association of Cheerleading Coaches and Administrators—Cheer Safe, American Legion Baseball, American Youth Soccer Organization, Jewish Community Centers Association of North America, YMCA of America, Pop Warner, Special Olympics North America, and the U.S. Tennis Association.

Again, I commend the Stamford JCC for this wonderful achievement, and the great work they are doing in the city of Stamford.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:40 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

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 for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY)

At 1:44 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1422. An act to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1422. An act to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, November 19, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

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 for devices licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–7782. A communication from the Board Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7783. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Internal Affairs Investigations for the period of January 2014 through June 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7784. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–441, ''Business Improvement Districts Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7785. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–424, ''Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Support Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7786. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–437, ''Voter Registration Access and Modernization Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7787. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–442, ''Extension of Time to Dispose of the Strand Theater Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7788. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–443, ''Medical Marijuana Expansion Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7789. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–440, ''Special Election Reform Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7790. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–439, ''Critical Infrastructure Freedom of Information Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7791. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–438, ''Workers' Compensation Statute of Limitations Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7792. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–425, ''Small and Certified Business Enterprise Development and Assistance Waiver Certification Temporary

Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7793. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–423, ''Sustainable Solid Waste Management Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7794. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Council Resolution 20–624, ''Transfer of Jurisdiction of a Portion of Reservation 497 (Square 3712, Lots 101–104) Approval Resolution 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7795. A communication from the Director, Policy and Planning Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Program Modification of Eligibility to Certain Employees on Temporary Appointments and Certain Employees on Seasonal and Intermittent Schedules'' (RIN3206–AM86) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 3, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7796. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7797. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Corrections Based on Public Law 104–262'' (RIN2900–AO93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–7798. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Regulation Policy, Tracking, and Control Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Designee for Patient Personal Property'' (RIN2900–AO41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–7799. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Expanded Access to Non-VA Care through the Veterans Choice Program'' (RIN2900–AO24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 4, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–7800. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Exempting Mental Health Peer Support Services from Copayments'' (RIN2900–AP11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–7801. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, legislative proposals relative to the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–7802. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report entitled, ''Acceptance of Contributions for Defense Programs, Projects, and Activities; Defense Cooperation Account''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–7803. A communication from the Admiral, Naval Reactors, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relative to the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program's reports on environmental monitoring and radioactive waste disposal, radiation exposure, and occupational safety and health; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–7804. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense and Global Security), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a consolidated budget justification display that includes all programs and activities of the Department of Defense combating terrorism program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–7805. A communication from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–7806. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2013 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7807. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Excess Spoil, Coal Mine Waste, Diversions, and Buffer Zones for Perennial and Intermittent Streams'' ((RIN1029–AC69) (Docket ID OSM–2012–0010)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–7808. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2013 Methane Hydrate Program''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–7809. A communication from the Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–7810. A communication from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's annual report for calendar year 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–7811. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 1 (Scotch) Spearmint Oil for the 2014–2015 Marketing Year'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–13–0087; FV14–985–1A IR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–7812. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Softwood Lumber Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Industry Information Order; Late Payment and Interest Charges on Past Due Assessments'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–12–0023) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–7813. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Basis in All Cash D Reorganizations'' ((RIN1545–BJ21) (TD 9702)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–7814. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Earnings and Profits in Tax-Free Transfers from One Corporation to Another; Acquiring Corporation for Purposes of Section 381'' ((RIN1545–BK73 and RIN1545–BL80) (TD 9700)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–7815. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2015 Limitations Adjusted As Provided in Section 415(d), etc.'' (Notice 2014–70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–7816. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Member, IRS Oversight Board, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–7817. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was originally declared in Executive Order 13611 on May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7818. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7819. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic that was declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7820. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clarifications and Corrections to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Control of Spacecraft Systems and Related Items the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML)'' (RIN0694–AF87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7821. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Venezuela: Implementation of Certain Military End Uses and End Users License Requirements under the Export Administration Regulations'' (RIN0694–AG31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 13, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7822. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, four (4) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7823. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2014–0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7824. A communication from the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, transmitting, pursuant to law, the October 2014 Quarterly Report to Congress of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7825. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to Excepted Benefits'' (RIN1210–AB60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–7826. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to Excepted Benefits'' ((RIN0938–AS16) (CMS–9946-F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–7827. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Targeted Grants to Increase the Well-Being of, and to Improve the Permanency Outcomes for, Children Affected by Methamphetamine or Other Substance Abuse: Fourth Annual Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–7828. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense Agency Financial Report (AFR) for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7829. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2013 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7830. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Veterans' Employment Redress Laws in the Federal Civil Service''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7831. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Outcomes of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Employment Program''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7832. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–451, ''Rent Control Hardship Petition Limitation Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7833. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–453, ''Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7834. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–452, ''Georgia Avenue Great Streets Neighborhood Retail Priority Area Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7835. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20–458, ''Protecting Pregnant Workers Fairness Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7836. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Annual Privacy Activity Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2014''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7837. A communication from the Director, Retirement Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees' Retirement System; Present Value Conversion Factors for Spouses of Deceased Separated Employees'' (RIN3206–AM99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 7, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7838. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense Agency Financial Report (AFR) for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7839. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of Social Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7840. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disaster Assistance; Fire Management Assistance Grant (FMAG) Program—Deadline Extensions and Administrative Correction'' ((RIN1660–AA78) (44 CFR Parts 204 and 206) (Docket No. FEMA–2013–0004)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7841. A communication from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to ten audit reports issued during fiscal year 2014 relative to the Agency and the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7842. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Audit of the Anacostia River Clean Up Protection Fund''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7843. A communication from the Administrator and Chief Executive Officer, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Annual Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7844. A communication from the Director of the Regulations, Legislation, and Interpretation Division, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishing a Minimum Wage for Contractors'' (RIN1235–AA10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 13, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–7845. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report on the Use of Special Immigrant Status for Citizens or Nationals of Afghanistan or Iraq: Combined Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7846. A communication from the Director of Congressional Activities (Intelligence), Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a delay in submission of a report relative to data mining; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7847. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2013 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7848. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes to Continued Prosecution Application Practice'' (RIN0651–AC92) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7849. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes to Permit Delayed Submission of Certain Requirements for Prioritized Examination'' (RIN0651–AC93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7850. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Training, Qualification, and Oversight for Safety-Related Railroad Employees'' (RIN2130–AC06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7851. A communication from the General Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule: Safety Standard for Magnet Sets'' (CPSC Docket No. CPSC–2012–0050) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the

Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7852. A communication from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Environmental Impact and Related Procedures—Programmatic Agreements and Additional Categorical Exclusions'' (RIN2125–AF59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7853. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emergency Relief Program'' (RIN2132–AB13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7854. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Environmental Impact and Related Procedures—Programmatic Agreements and Additional Categorical Exclusions'' (RIN2132–AB14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 9, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7855. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of the Eagle Peak Mendocino County Viticultural Area and Realignments of the Mendocino and Redwood Valley Viticultural Areas'' (RIN1513–AB96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7856. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''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, San Miguel District, Santa Margarita Ranch, and Templeton Gap District Viticultural Areas'' (RIN1513–AB68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7857. A communication from the Chief of the Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 22, 24, 27, 90 and 95 of the Commission's Rules to Improve Wireless Coverage Through the Use of Signal Boosters'' ((WT Docket No. 10–4) (FCC 14–138)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7858. A communication from the Chief of the Policy Division, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reform of Rules and Policies on Foreign Carrier Entry Into the U.S. Telecommunications Market'' (FCC 14–48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7859. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7860. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Orlando Sanford International Airport (SFB); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7861. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Access for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers; AT and T Corporation Petition for Rulemaking to Reform Regulation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Rates for Interstate Special Access Services'' ((WC Docket No. 05–25) (DA 14–1327)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 20, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7862. A communication from the Legal Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Acceleration of Broadband Deployment by Improving Wireless Facilities Siting Policies; Acceleration of Broadband Deployment: Expanding the Reach and Reducing the Cost of Broadband Deployment by Improving Policies Regarding Public Rights of Way and Wireless Facilities Siting; 2012 Biennial Review of Telecommunications Regulations'' ((WT Docket No. 13–238; WT Docket No. 11–59; WT Docket No. 13–32) (FCC 14–153)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 3, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7863. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Pearsall, Texas)'' ((MB Docket No. 13–23) (DA 13–1603)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7864. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Altamont, Oregon); Station KYSF(FM), (Bonanza, Oregon)'' ((MB Docket No. 11–167) (DA 13–2003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7865. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Mount Vernon, Illinois)'' ((MB Docket No. 14–139) (DA 14–1579)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7866. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Rome, Georgia)'' ((MB Docket No. 14–141) (DA 14–1577)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7867. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Kansas City, Missouri)'' ((MB Docket No. 14–140) (DA 14–1578)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7868. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Centerville, Texas); Station KKEE, Centerville, Texas'' ((MB Docket No. 14–56) (DA 14–1360)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7869. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Toquerville, Utah); New FM Station, Peach Springs, Arizona'' ((MB Docket No. 14–54) (DA 14–1361)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7870. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Aviation Consumer Protection; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7871. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) 2015–2019''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7872. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fishery'' (RIN0648–BE26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7873. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Several Groundfish Species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XD535) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7874. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries; 2015 Fishing Quotas for Atlantic Surfclams and Ocean Quahogs; and Suspension of Minimum Atlantic Surfclam Limit'' (RIN0648–XD515) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7875. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XD542) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7876. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (RIN0648–XD511) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7877. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Temporary Rule that Established Separate Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures for Blueline Tilefish in the South Atlantic Region'' (RIN0648–BD87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7878. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 21'' (RIN0648–BD91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7879. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; 2015–2017 Specifications'' (RIN0648–BE37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7880. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XD544) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7881. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' (RIN0648–XD496) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7882. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XD577) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7883. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Extension of the 2014 Gulf of Mexico Recreational Red Grouper Season'' (RIN0648–XD479) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7884. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction'' (RIN0648–X100714b) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7885. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; 2014–2015 Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf King Mackerel in the Florida West Coast Northern Subzone'' (RIN0648–XD586) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7886. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2014 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for the South Atlantic Porgy Complex'' (RIN0648–XD495) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7887. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Reallocation of Halibut Prohibited Species Catch Allowances in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XD565) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7888. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; 2014–2015 Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf King Mackerel in Western Zone'' (RIN0648–XD559) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7889. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2014 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean'' (RIN0648–XD504) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7890. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XD566) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7891. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Accountability Measures and Closure for Commercial Wrasses in the U.S. Caribbean Off Puerto Rico'' (RIN0648–XD549) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7892. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch, Northern Rockfish, and Dusky Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XD545) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7893. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments (4); Amendment No. 516'' (RIN2120–AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7894. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (113); Amdt. No. 3608'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7895. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (42); Amdt. No. 3607'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November

14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7896. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (81); Amdt. No. 3609'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7897. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (48); Amdt. No. 3610'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7898. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; 'Other Rockfish' in the Aleutian Island Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XD537) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 12, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 2917. A bill to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, of South Dakota, for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Therese W. McMillan, of California, to be Federal Transit Administrator.

*Lourdes Maria Castro Ramirez, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Mary Lucille Jordan, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2020.

*Adri Davin Jayaratne, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*P. David Lopez, of Arizona, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of four years.

*Michael Young, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2020.

*Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2019.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2940. A bill to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission fees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2941. A bill to combat human trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2942. A bill to establish a Hospital Fund for the treatment of individuals with Ebola or other specified infectious diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2943. A bill to amend Public Law 110–299 to extend the time period during which permits are not required for certain discharges incidental to the normal operation of vessels; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2944. 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 Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2945. A bill to repeal section 910 of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CORKER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 2946. A bill to provide improved water, sanitation, and hygiene programs for high priority developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. Res. 583. A resolution designating November 30, 2014, as ''Drive Safer Sunday''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 584. A resolution commending Jerald D. Linnell on his service to the United States Senate; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 526

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes and diabetes.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1695

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1695, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 2115

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2115, a bill to provide for the establishment of a fund to provide for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research.

S. 2159

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2159, a bill to restore long-standing United States policy that the Wire Act prohibits all forms of Internet gambling, and for other purposes.

S. 2689

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2689, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 2746

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2746, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

S. 2762

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2762, a bill to prevent future propane shortages, and for other purposes.

S. 2828

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2828, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, to provide additional assistance to Ukraine, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2828, supra.

S. 2917

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2917, a bill to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

S. 2930

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2930, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of an evaluation of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 570

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 570, a resolution designating October 17, 2014, as ''National Alternative Fuel Vehicle Day''.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 578, a resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the world's poorest countries have access to vaccines and immunization through Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance.

S. RES. 580

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 580, a resolution expressing support for the goals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2940. A bill to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission fees; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here now for the, I guess, 80th time in my weekly series of speeches about carbon pollution to ask the Senate and Congress to wake up to the growing threat from climate change, and today I am also announcing the introduction of the American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act.

Carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels is changing the atmosphere and the oceans. We see it everywhere. We see it in storm-damaged homes and flooded cities. We see it in drought-stricken farms and raging wildfires. We see it in fish disappearing from warming and acidifying waters. We see it in shifting habitats and migrating contagions.

All of these things we see carry costs—real economic dollars-and-cents costs—to homeowners, to business owners, and to taxpayers. That cost is described as the social cost of carbon. It is the damage that people and communities suffer from carbon pollution and climate change. None of those costs from carbon pollution are factored into the price of the coal or the oil or the natural gas that releases this carbon. The fossil fuel companies that sell and burn those products have taken those costs and offloaded them onto society—onto the rest of us.

That is not fair. If you rake your lawn, you don't get to dump all the leaves over your neighbor's fence and leave him or her the problem of cleaning up your leaves. If you are located on a river, you don't get to dump your garbage in the river and leave it to the downstream property owners to clean up your mess. Yet the big carbon polluters transfer the costs—all those costs of climate change—onto everyone else—all the rest of us.

The U.S. Government has done some estimating about what that social cost of carbon pollution is and their estimate is that it is around $40 per ton of carbon dioxide emitted, and that that amount rises over time as carbon pollution creates more and more harm and havoc. So a climbing $40 per ton is the cost, but the current effective price on carbon pollution is zero.

By making their carbon pollution free, we subsidize fossil fuel companies to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars annually. By making their carbon pollution free, we actually rig the game, giving polluters an unfair advantage over newer and cleaner technologies. It is a racket. It is a form of cheating. And corporate polluters love it because it gives them advantage, and they fight tooth and nail to protect it in this body. But it is wrong.

As University of Chicago economics professor Michael Greenstone recently explained, this concept—that offloading social costs is wrong and that there should be a proper price on carbon—is very widely accepted. Here is what he said:

> The media always reports that there's near consensus among scientists about the fact that human activity impacts climate change. What does not receive as much attention is that there's even greater consensus among economists, starting from Milton Friedman and moving into the most left-wing economists that you could find, that the obvious correct public policy solution to this is to put a price on carbon. It's not controversial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, an article from The Economist magazine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The economics editor of The Economist magazine—which is certainly no hotbed of left wing sentiment—Ryan Avent, has posted a comment on climate policy and his question is: ''Do economists all favour a carbon tax?'' He says:

> The economic solution is to tax the externality—

That is the offloaded cost.

> —so that the social cost of carbon is reflected in the individual consumer's decision. The carbon tax is an elegant solution to a complicated problem.

So today I am introducing this bill to put a price on carbon emissions. It is simple. It will require the polluters to pay a per-ton fee for their pollution and all of the revenue generated by those payments will go back to the American people.

I want to thank Senator BRIAN SCHATZ of Hawaii for cosponsoring this measure. He has been a great colleague on environmental issues and on our discussion regarding climate change. The bill that we introduce today establishes an economy-wide fee on carbon

dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions, tracking that social cost of carbon, starting at $42 per ton and going up by 2 percent per year, plus inflation.

We know how much carbon dioxide each unit of coal, oil, and natural gas produces, so we assess the fee on fossil fuel producers, processors, and importers. That makes it simple to administer. The whole bill is only 29 pages long.

For other varieties of greenhouse gases and nonfossil fuel sources of CO_2, we assess our fees only on the very largest emitters—those emitting more than 25,000 tons a year. This is the same universe of companies that we already require to monitor and report on their carbon emissions.

A significant greenhouse gas concern is the methane that escapes throughout production and distribution. To address this, we require annual reports on methane leakage and direct the Treasury Secretary to adjust the fees on fossil fuels to account for that leakage. This fee will promote innovation and help further reduce carbon emissions.

Fossil fuel companies that capture and sequester or use carbon dioxide or innovate new ways to encapsulate it in materials or products will get credits to offset the carbon fee.

We also take care to ensure that American manufacturers are not put at a competitive disadvantage globally. Imports from nations that don't price emissions will face a tariff that the Treasury Secretary is authorized to impose at the border. Likewise, the Secretary is authorized to rebate American producers on their exports.

I would note one thing. Since regulation is usually a response to market failure, a well-designed carbon fee would also properly open a conversation about which and, indeed, whether carbon regulations are still needed. A carbon fee by itself is much more efficient and predictable than complex regulations, and I am open to that conversation.

That is it. It is that simple. Make the polluters pay the full costs of their products; end the cheating; level the playing field for other forms of energy, such as wind and solar, to compete fairly; keep the fee mechanism simple; and maintain a border adjustment that keeps American goods competitive. Twenty-nine pages.

On the flip side, the carbon fee will generate significant new Federal revenue. The technicians are still working on the official revenue estimate for the bill, but it should be at least $1.5 trillion and perhaps more than $2 trillion over the 10-year budget periods we work with in Congress and on the Budget Committee.

Whatever the exact number is, all of it should be returned to the American people. So the bill establishes an American opportunity trust fund to hold the revenue and return it to the American people. This could include through tax cuts, through student loan debt relief, through increased Social Security benefits for seniors, through transition assistance to workers in fossil fuel industries, or even just a direct dividend back to the American family. I am looking forward to deciding with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle what is the best way to return this revenue, but I do believe every dollar should go back to the American people in some form. To use economic jargon, this should be revenue neutral.

This is one example to consider, just a hypothetical: What could we do? We could cut the corporate tax rate in America from 35 percent to 30 percent. That has been a bipartisan goal for a long time. It was part of Romney's Presidential campaign. We could accomplish it with this measure.

We would have enough money left to go to the payroll tax and for every worker rebate the first $500 they paid in payroll tax. So every American worker who paid more than $500 in payroll tax would get a $500 check to spend on whatever they wanted. The first tax reduction at the corporate level uses about $600 billion to offset. This uses about $700 billion to offset.

Third, we could add to that a boost to the EITC—the earned income tax credit—which supports many American families at the very low end of the economic spectrum. We could do that by literally hundreds of dollars a year for millions of lower income families. Again, there has been bipartisan support for expanding the earned income tax credit.

Three important goals, all reducing taxes or adding to a tax credit—all should have strong bipartisan support.

The American Opportunity Carbon Fee Act has revenue that could make our companies more competitive, could give every single worker a tax rebate, and could boost benefits for struggling low-income families.

Last month the Des Moines Register ran a column titled ''Carbon tax' would help Iowa, planet.'' The column said this:

> The United States could take the lead by acting on its own, watch its economy grow, and let the rest of the world catch up.
>
> In the process, the United States would gain mastery of the sustainable-energy technology that will drive economic growth in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

George W. Bush's Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson gave the same message earlier this year, saying:

> A tax on carbon emissions will unleash a wave of innovation to develop technologies, lower the costs of clean energy and create jobs as we and other nations develop new energy products and infrastructure.

Emphasizing that, coincidentally, is an article in today's New York Times headed ''A Carbon Tax Could Bolster Green Energy.'' As we all know, green energy jobs are exploding in this country, and we need more of them.

Treasury Secretary Paulson continued:

> Republicans must not shrink from this issue. Risk management is a conservative principle.

Secretary Paulson is not alone. Conservative figures such as George Shultz, who was Secretary of State under President Reagan, emphatically support a carbon fee as the best way to address carbon pollution.

Art Laffer, one of the architects of President Reagan's economic plan, had this to say about a carbon tax and related payroll tax cut:

> I think that would be very good for the economy and as an adjunct, it would reduce also carbon emissions into the environment.

I ask unanimous consent that a 2013 New York Times op-ed be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. In this New York Times op-ed, Bill Ruckelshaus, Christine Todd Whitman, Lee Thomas, and William Reilly wrote:

> A market-based approach, like a carbon tax, would be the best path to reducing greenhouse-gas emissions.

I know the big carbon polluters want this issue ignored. I know that. They want to squeeze one more quarter, one more year of public subsidy for their product from the rest of us. From their point of view, lunch is good when someone else is picking up the tab. But notwithstanding the power of the big carbon polluters, I still believe this is a problem we can solve.

Not long ago this would have been a bipartisan bill. Not long ago leading voices on the Republican side agreed with Democrats that the dangers of climate change were real. Not long ago leading Republican voices agreed that carbon emissions were the culprit. And it was not long ago that leading Republican voices agreed that Congress had a responsibility to act. One Republican Senator won his party's nomination for President on a solid climate change platform. Other Republican colleagues in the Senate introduced, cosponsored, or voted for meaningful climate legislation in the past. Some of the proposals were market-based, revenue-neutral solutions aligned with Republican free market values, just like my bill today.

The junior Senator from Arizona—a Republican—was an original cosponsor of a carbon fee bill when he served in the House of Representatives. That proposal, introduced with former Republican Congressman Bob Inglis, would have placed a $15-per-ton fee on carbon pollution in 2010, more than $20 in 2015, and $100 in 2040. At the time, our colleague from Arizona had this to say:

> If there's one economic axiom, it's that if you want less of something, you tax it. Clearly, it's in our interest to move away from carbon.

We simply need conscientious Republicans and Democrats to work together in good faith on a platform of fact and common sense. We know this can be done because it is being done.

At the end of a speech about the American Revolution, the historian David McCullough was asked by someone in the audience why it was that our Founding Fathers had the courage to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the cause of independence when signing the Declaration was signing their own death warrant. He had a very simple answer. He said: It was a courageous time.

Well, clearly in courageous times Americans have done far more than simply stand up to polluters to serve the interests of this great Republic. It only takes courage to make this a courageous time too.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Register, Oct. 4, 2014]

'CARBON TAX' WOULD HELP IOWA, PLANET

(By Richard Doak)

Six years ago, the Canadian province of British Columbia decided to go it alone in fighting climate change. It imposed a tax on fossil fuels—coal gasoline, diesel fuel, propane and natural gas.

By most accounts, the ''carbon tax'' has been a success. It made fossil fuels more expensive, so British Columbians began to conserve them and use them more efficiently. Revenue from the carbon tax allows other taxes to be reduced, so the province enjoys the lowest personal income tax rates in Canada and some of the lowest corporate taxes in the developed world.

Contrary to fears, the carbon tax did not cause the economy of the province to collapse. Economic growth is slightly better than in the rest of Canada, and the forward-looking energy policy gives British Columbia a reputation as a world leader in green entrepreneurship.

Why can't Iowa be like that?

Indeed, Iowa should be like that, and circumstances might be right for Iowa to become the first American state to employ a full-fledged carbon tax.

Iowa and other states already have partial carbon taxes. We pay them at the pump when we buy gasoline or diesel fuel.

In Iowa, all gasoline and diesel fuel tax revenue is earmarked for highway construction, maintenance and administration. Paying the gas tax is how motorists pay for the bridges and highways.

After the November election, when candidates are no longer afraid to talk about taxes, a consensus will probably develop to raise Iowa's motor fuel taxes. The current gasoline tax of 21 cents per gallon (19 cents for ethanol blend) and diesel tax of 22.5 cents bring in about $450 million but leave the state an estimated $215 million short of what's needed for highways every year.

Closing that gap would require raising motor fuel taxes by about 10 cents per gallon.

Instead, why not abolish motor fuel taxes and replace them with a carbon tax?

A carbon tax would apply to all fossil fuels, not just gasoline and diesel fuel. The tax on each fuel would be based on its carbon content. Carbon-dense coal would be taxed more heavily than relatively carbon-light natural gas.

The carbon tax on gasoline and diesel fuel could be calibrated to bring in about the same amount of revenue as the existing motor fuel tax. Additional revenue to close the highway-funding gap could come from the carbon tax paid on coal and natural gas used to generate electricity. This would be a way for electric car owners to begin paying their share of highway maintenance.

Electric cars contribute less for highway maintenance than gasoline- or diesel-burning vehicles. (Electric cars don't pay gasoline tax, but they do pay license fees and use taxes.) In the future, if electric vehicles become ubiquitous, it will be essential to have some source of highway money beyond the gasoline tax. Having a carbon tax would put Iowa ahead of the game of paying for roads in an electric-car future.

Additional revenue from a carbon tax, beyond that needed for roads, could be used to lower other taxes, as in British Columbia. Since the biggest burden of a carbon tax would fall on low-income people, reductions or credits for low-income people should be the first priority. Lowering for abolishing the corporation tax, as an incentive for businesses to locate in Iowa, might be the second choice.

The idea of a carbon tax is to use market forces to reduce the amount of carbon dioxide spewed into the atmosphere when fossil fuels are burned. Economists use the term carbon pricing. When the price of something goes up, people use less of it. A carbon tax is intended to raise the price of fossil fuels enough to discourage consumption as well as to create an incentive to find alternatives.

As leader in biofuels and wind turbines, Iowa should be for anything that incentivizes the switch to alternatives.

Perhaps Iowans should even be cheering for a carbon tax to be imposed nationally, because, among the states, Iowa may be one of the best positioned to benefit from it.

Of course, a national carbon tax is off the table as long as Congress is full of climate-change deniers who are beholden to the fossil-fuel industries. But, outside of Congress, the carbon tax and other carbon-dioxide-reducing strategies appear to be gaining credibility.

A number of major corporations, banks and institutions have begun to question the conventional thinking that the economy would suffer if carbon dioxide emissions were curbed. Most recently, the Global Commission on the Economy and Climate, a group of heavyweight international leaders and economists, issued a report showing that reducing carbon emissions would cost the economy very little and might actually stimulate economic growth. Other research published by the International Monetary Fund suggests that carbon taxes, rather than being a drag on an economy, can be a benefit.

It also appears that cutting carbon emissions can help a country's economy even if other countries don't go along. British Columbia has shown that a state can go it alone without other states.

Nationally, the United States is waiting around for some big international agreement that will require all countries to reduce their emissions in unison. That shouldn't be necessary. The United States could take the lead by acting on its own, watch its economy grow, and let the rest of the world catch up.

In the process, the United States would gain mastery of the sustainable-energy technology that will drive economic growth in the future.

Sadly, the odds of the president and Congress acting that boldly on climate change are roughly nil. But maybe the little state of Iowa, out here in the heart of America, could nudge the nation in the right direction by setting an example on its own.

[From the New York Times, August 1, 2013]

A REPUBLICAN CASE FOR CLIMATE ACTION

(By William D. Ruckelshaus, Lee M. Thomas, William K. Reilly and Christine Todd Whitman)

Each of us took turns over the past 43 years running the Environmental Protection Agency. We served Republican presidents, but we have a message that transcends political affiliation: the United States must move now on substantive steps to curb climate change, at home and internationally.

There is no longer any credible scientific debate about the basic facts: our world continues to warm, with the last decade the hottest in modern records, and the deep ocean warming faster than the earth's atmosphere. Sea level is rising. Arctic Sea ice is melting years faster than projected.

The costs of inaction are undeniable. The lines of scientific evidence grow only stronger and more numerous. And the window of time remaining to act is growing smaller: delay could mean that warming becomes ''locked in.''

A market-based approach, like a carbon tax, would be the best path to reducing greenhouse-gas emissions, but that is unachievable in the current political gridlock in Washington. Dealing with this political reality, President Obama's June climate action plan lays out achievable actions that would deliver real progress. He will use his executive powers to require reductions in the amount of carbon dioxide emitted by the nation's power plants and spur increased investment in clean energy technology, which is inarguably the path we must follow to ensure a strong economy along with a livable climate.

The president also plans to use his regulatory power to limit the powerful warming chemicals known as hydrofluorocarbons and encourage the United States to join with other nations to amend the Montreal Protocol to phase out these chemicals. The landmark international treaty, which took effect in 1989, already has been hugely successful in solving the ozone problem.

Rather than argue against his proposals, our leaders in Congress should endorse them and start the overdue debate about what bigger steps are needed and how to achieve them—domestically and internationally.

As administrators of the E.P.A. under Presidents Richard M. Nixon, Ronald Reagan, George Bush and George W. Bush, we held fast to common-sense conservative principles—protecting the health of the American people, working with the best technology available and trusting in the innovation of American business and in the market to find the best solutions for the least cost.

That approach helped us tackle major environmental challenges to our nation and the world: the pollution of our rivers, dramatized when the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland caught fire in 1969; the hole in the ozone layer; and the devastation wrought by acid rain.

The solutions we supported worked, although more must be done. Our rivers no longer burn, and their health continues to improve. The United States led the world when nations came together to phase out ozone-depleting chemicals. Acid rain diminishes each year, thanks to a pioneering, market-based emissions-trading system adopted under the first President Bush in 1990. And despite critics' warnings, our economy has continued to grow.

Climate change puts all our progress and our successes at risk. If we could articulate one framework for successful governance, perhaps it should be this: When confronted by a problem, deal with it. Look at the facts,

cut through the extraneous, devise a workable solution and get it done.

We can have both a strong economy and a livable climate. All parties know that we need both. The rest of the discussion is either detail, which we can resolve, or purposeful delay, which we should not tolerate.

Mr. Obama's plan is just a start. More will be required. But we must continue efforts to reduce the climate-altering pollutants that threaten our planet. The only uncertainty about our warming world is how bad the changes will get, and how soon. What is most clear is that there is no time to waste.

[From the Economist, Sept. 19, 2011]

DO ECONOMISTS ALL FAVOUR A CARBON TAX?

(By R.A. Washington)

Last week, a Twitter conversation broke out among a few economists concerning whether any serious economists opposed a carbon tax. No, concluded the tweeters, but Tyler Cowen *begged to differ*. Mr. Cowen writes that he personally favours a carbon tax but can imagine a number of principled reasons other economists might not.

Why would we expect economists to support a carbon tax? Its very close to the economic ideal. Global warming is a phenomenon associated with emissions of greenhouse gases over and above natural cycles—largely those resulting from the burning of carbon fuels humans have dug up out of the ground. We expect normal economic activity to maximise social good because each individual balances costs and benefits when making economic decisions. Carbon emissions represent a negative externality. When an individual takes an economic action with some fossil-fuel energy content—whether running a petrol-powered lawnmower, turning on a light, or buying a bunch of grapes—that person balances their personal benefits against the costs of the action. The cost to them of the climate change resulting from the carbon content of that decisions, however, is effectively zero and is rationally ignored. The decision to ignore carbon content, when aggregated over the whole of humanity, generates huge carbon dioxide emissions and rising global temperatures.

The economic solution is to tax the externality so that the social cost of carbon is reflected in the individual consumers decision. The carbon tax is an elegant solution to a complicated problem, which allows the everyday business of consumer decision making to do the work of emission reduction. It's by no means the only economically sensible policy response to the threat of climate change, but it is the one we'd expect economists to embrace.

Mr. Cowen argues for caution on this point for several reasons. A carbon tax will be less effective if it's not universally applied, potentially leading to carbon leakage to countries with looser environmental rules. He worries that where carbon fees have been applied innovation has not been quick to respond. He fears that good substitutes for carbon fuels don't exist, especially in the transport sector, and worries that higher fuel prices might harm the economy. He suggests that a ''green-energy subsidies first'' policy might make more sense, and he talks about distributional and rent-seeking costs of the policy.

I think the weakness of these arguments is telling, and it's not surprising that Mr. Cowen continues to support a carbon tax. What if a carbon price doesn't immediately drive emission reductions? Then the tax will be an effective revenue raiser, much more efficient than a tax on income. Either way you win. The worry about carbon leakage is a real one, but this dynamic also implies that each new country that prices carbon increases the benefit of existing carbon-price policies in other countries.

Substitution in the transport sector is somewhat problematic, but a viable carbon price would not have much effect on petrol costs at the outset. A carbon tax of $30 per tonne of CO2 would only increase petrol costs by about 9 cents per gallon. This is dwarfed by moves in the market price of petrol. The vulnerability of the American economy to oil shocks argues for an increased tax on petrol, but that's a different policy debate. Mr. Cowen seems to ignore the fact that oil is just one small part of the American economy's fossil-fuel use.

A carbon tax would attract rent-seeking, but arguably less than alternative policies, like subsidies or a cap-and-trade system. Importantly, money spent on adaptation or post hoc climate-disaster relief is *also* subject to rent-seeking and corruption issues. Given that many poor countries with weak institutions are likely to feel the brunt of the impact of global warming first and are likely to be poor spenders of the aid money that will invariably flow, a carbon tax looks like one of the policy solutions best suited to the minimisation of these ills.

Mr. Cowen doesn't mention what I see as one of the most important roles of a carbon tax: as a check on other ill-advised programmes. A carbon tax would have quickly made the net dirtiness of corn-based ethanol obvious (by helping to offset subsidies and making corn-based ethanol more expensive). It would be more difficult to roll out and sustain such misguided programmes with a carbon tax, and the ones that went ahead anyway would do less damage. A carbon tax is also the easiest way to capture whatever low-hanging emission-reduction fruit is out there. Right now, consumers are generally indifferent between similarly-priced goods with wildly different carbon profiles. A carbon tax encourages consumers to realise the easy carbon gains available from switching to good low-carbon substitutes wherever they exist.

The biggest problem with a carbon tax is that America's government seems unable to deliver one. Attitudes may change, however, and near-uniform economist support for the policy (probably) doesn't hurt its odds of eventual passage.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 2014]

A CARBON TAX COULD BOLSTER GREEN ENERGY

(By Eduardo Porter)

ECONOMIC SCENE

A couple of years ago, the smart money was on wind. In 2012, 13 gigawatts worth of wind-powered electricity generation capacity was installed in the United States, enough to meet the needs of roughly three million homes. That was some 40 percent of all the capacity added to the nation's power grid that year, up from seven gigawatts added in 2011 and just over five in 2010.

But then a federal subsidy ended. Only one gigawatt worth of wind power capacity was installed in 2013. In the first half of 2014, additions totaled 0.835 gigawatts. Facing a Congress controlled by Republicans with little interest in renewable energy, wind power's future suddenly appears much more uncertain.

''Wind is competitive in more and more markets,'' said Letha Tawney at the World Resources Institute. ''But any time there is uncertainty about the production tax credit, it all stops.''

Wobbles on the road to a low-carbon future are hardly unique to the United States. In its latest Energy Technology Perspectives report, the International Energy Agency noted that the deployment of photovoltaic solar- and wind-powered electricity was meeting goals established to help prevent temperatures from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) above the average in the preindustrial era, the limit agreed to by the world's leaders to avoid truly disruptive climatic upheaval.

In the same report, however, the organization noted that other technologies—bioenergy, geothermal and offshore wind—were lagging. And it pointed out that worldwide investment in renewable power was slowing, falling to $211 billion in 2013, 22 percent less than in 2011.

These wobbles underscore both the good news and the bad news about the world's halting progress toward reducing the greenhouse gas emissions that are capturing heat in the atmosphere and changing the world's climate.

The good news is that humanity is developing promising technologies that could put civilization on a low carbon path that might prevent climate disruption.

These technologies allowed the Environmental Protection Agency to pass new rules aimed at achieving a 30 percent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions from American power plants by 2030, compared with 2005.

They allowed President Obama last week to promise that the United States would curb total greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent from 2005 levels by 2025—a big step that, White House officials say, can be achieved without further action from Congress. And they allowed China to commit to start cutting emissions after 2030.

The bad news is that civilization is mostly not yet on such a low carbon path. While promising technologies to get there have been developed, it is unclear whether nations will muster the political will and mobilize the needed investments to deploy them.

New energy technologies have become decidedly more competitive. The United States' Energy Information Administration projects that the levelized cost of onshore wind energy coming on stream in 2019—a measure that includes everything from capital costs to operational outlays—could be as little as $71 per megawatt-hour measured in 2012 dollars, even without subsidies. This is $16 less than the lower cost projection four years ago for wind energy coming online in 2015.

Similarly, projections for the levelized cost of energy from photovoltaic solar cells have tumbled by more than 40 percent, much faster than the cost projections of energy from coal or natural gas.

Challenges remain to relying on intermittent energy sources like the sun or the wind for power. Still, experts believe that hitching solar and wind plants to gas-fired generators, and using new load management technologies to align demand for power with the variable supply, offer a promising path for aggressively reducing the amount of carbon the power industry pumps into the atmosphere, which accounts for nearly 40 percent of the nation's total carbon dioxide emissions.

And new Energy Information Administration projections to 2040 show prices for renewables falling even lower. By then, electricity from photovoltaic solar plants could be generated for as little as $86.50 per megawatt-hour, without subsidies. In some areas wind-based plants could produce it for as little as $63.40.

Nuclear energy is also becoming more competitive. Without any subsidies, new-generation nuclear power coming on stream in 2040 could cost as little as $80 per megawatt-hour, all costs considered. This is only marginally more expensive than electricity produced with coal or natural gas, even without the added cost of capturing the carbon dioxide.

And there are much more optimistic cost assessments out there than the Energy Information Administration's.

But for all the optimism generated by cheaper renewable fuels, they do not, on their own, put the world on the low-carbon path necessary to keep climate change in check.

Progress is faltering on several fronts. The precipitous fall in the prices of photovoltaic cells from 2008 to 2012 pretty much stopped in 2013, after rapid consolidation of the industry.

The International Energy Agency now projects that installed global nuclear capacity in 2025 will fall 5 percent, to 24 percent below what will be needed to stay on the safe side of climate change. And carbon capture technologies, which will be essential if the world is to keep consuming any form of fossil fuel, remain hampered by high costs, meager investment and scant political commitment.

''The unrelenting rise in coal use without deployment of carbon capture and storage is fundamentally incompatible with climate change objectives,'' noted the International Energy Agency in its Technology Perspectives report.

Despite the falling costs of renewable energy in the United States, the Energy Information Administration's baseline assumptions project that in 2040 only 16.5 percent of electricity generation will come from renewable energy sources, up from some 13 percent today. More than two-thirds will come from coal and gas. Without some carbon capture and storage technology, drastic climate change is almost certainly unavoidable.

What is necessary to get us on a safer path?

White House officials trust that the administration has the tools, including fuel economy and appliance efficiency standards, the Environmental Protection Agency's new limits on power plant emissions and regulations to limit other greenhouse gases.

Yet the Energy Information Administration's projections suggest how hard the task will be. Though they were developed before the Environmental Protection Agency issued its new rules, they included hypothetical outlines that could mimic some of its effects. In one, coal power plants were decommissioned more quickly; in another, subsidies to renewable energy were kept until 2040. In another, the price of renewables fell faster than expected. None of them did much to move the carbon dial.

There is one tool available to trim carbon emissions on a relevant scale: a carbon tax. That solution, however, remains off the table.

If a carbon tax were to be imposed next year, starting at $25 and rising by 5 percent a year, the Energy Information Administration estimates, carbon dioxide emissions from American power plants would fall to only 419 million tons by 2040, about one-fifth of where they are today. Total carbon dioxide emissions from energy in the United States would fall to 3.6 billion tons—1.8 billion tons less than today. By providing a monetary incentive, economists say, such a tax would offer by far the most effective way to encourage business and individuals to reduce their use of fossil fuels and invest in alternatives.

Is this enough? No. This proposal still leaves the United States short of the 80 percent cut in greenhouse gas emissions that the White House is aiming for and that experts consider necessary by 2050 to prevent climatic havoc. But at least it's in the same order of magnitude.

Most important, perhaps, the Energy Information Administration's estimates make clear that the real constraint lies not in our ability to develop the necessary technologies but in our political will to deploy them.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2941. A bill to combat human trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, along with Senator PORTMAN, the Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2014.

Human trafficking is estimated to be a $32 billion criminal enterprise, making it the second largest criminal industry in the world, behind the drug trade. Many steps need to be taken to combat this problem. But we cannot escape this simple truth: without demand for the services performed by trafficking victims, the problem would not exist.

The bill we are introducing today would reduce the demand for human trafficking, particularly the commercial sexual exploitation of children, by holding buyers accountable and making it easier for law enforcement to investigate and prosecute all persons who participate in sex trafficking.

Sex trafficking is not a victimless crime. In the United States, the average age that a person is first trafficked is between 12 and 14. Many of these children continue to be exploited into adulthood. A study of women and girls involved in street prostitution in my hometown of San Francisco found that 82 percent had been physically assaulted, 83 percent were threatened with a weapon, and 68 percent were raped. The overwhelming majority of sex trafficking victims are American citizens—83 percent by one estimate from the Department of Justice.

I am encouraged that Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies are taking steps to combat human trafficking. Between January and June of this year, the Federal Bureau of Investigation recovered 168 trafficking victims and arrested 281 sex traffickers in ''Operation Cross Country.''

I commend these efforts, but more needs to be done to target the perpetrators who are fueling demand for trafficking crimes—the buyers of sex acts from trafficking victims. Many buyers of sex are ''hobbyists'' who purchase sex repeatedly. Because buyers are rarely arrested, much less prosecuted, the demand for commercial sex continues unabated.

Without buyers, sex trafficking would cease to exist. As Luis CdeBaca, the U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, noted, ''[n]o girl or woman would be a victim of sex trafficking if there were no profits to be made from their exploitation.''

The Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2014 would address this problem, by incentivizing federal and state law enforcement officers to target buyers and providing new authorities to prosecute all who engage in the crime of sex trafficking.

First, the bill would clarify that buyers of sex acts from trafficking victims can be prosecuted under the federal commercial sex trafficking statute. This provision would codify the Eighth Circuit's decision in United States v. Jungers, which held that this statute encompasses buyers, in addition to sellers. Despite this favorable ruling, there is no guarantee that other courts will follow this precedent.

Second, the bill would hold buyers and sellers of child sex acts accountable for their actions, even if they claim they were unaware of the age of a minor victim. At times, it can be difficult for a prosecutor to prove that a buyer was aware of the victim's age. Successful cases can require the child victim to testify to this fact, subjecting the victim to re-traumatization. The bill would draw a clear line: if you purchase sex from an underage child, you can be prosecuted. Period.

Third, the bill would grant judges greater flexibility to impose an appropriate term of supervised release on sex traffickers. Current law contains an anomaly: a person convicted of violating the commercial sex trafficking statute or attempting to violate the statute may be subject to a longer term of supervised release than a person who is convicted of conspiring to violate the statute. Conspiring to traffic underage children is as serious as attempting to commit this crime and should be punished the same.

Fourth, the bill would require the Bureau of Justice Statistics to prepare annual reports on the number of arrests, prosecutions, and convictions of sex traffickers and buyers of sex from trafficked victims in the state court system. Very little data is available on the prosecutions made under anti-trafficking laws. This provision would provide additional data and encourage state and local governments to increase enforcement against sellers and buyers of sex from trafficked victims.

Fifth, the Combat Human Trafficking Act would ensure that training programs for federal and state law enforcement officers include components on effective methods to target and prosecute the buyers of sex acts from trafficked victims. This would equip prosecutors with the tools they need to target buyers, encouraging prosecution of these perpetrators.

Sixth, the bill would authorize federal and state officials to seek a wiretap to investigate and prosecute any human trafficking-related offense. Under current law, a federal law enforcement officer may seek a wiretap in an investigation under the commercial sex trafficking statute, but not under a number of other statutes that address human trafficking-related offenses, such as forced labor and involuntary servitude. Similarly, a state law enforcement officer may seek a wiretap to investigate a kidnapping offense, but not an offense for human trafficking, child sexual exploitation,

or child pornography production. Our bill would fix those omissions.

Finally, this legislation would strengthen the rights of crime victims. The bill would amend the Crime Victims' Rights Act to provide victims with the right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea agreement or deferred prosecution agreement. The exclusion of victims in these early stages of a criminal case profoundly impairs victims' rights because, by the nature of these events, there often is no later proceeding in which victims can exercise their rights.

The bill would also ensure that crime victims have access to appellate review when their rights are denied in the lower court. Regrettably, five appellate courts have mis-applied the Crime Victims' Rights Act by imposing an especially high standard for reviewing appeals by victims, requiring them to show ''clear and indisputable error''. Four other circuits have applied the correct standard: the ordinary appellate standard of legal error or abuse of discretion. This bill resolves the issue, setting a uniform standard for victims in all circuits by codifying the more victim-protecting rule, that the appellate court ''shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.''

I am pleased that this bill has the support of numerous law enforcement and anti-trafficking organizations: the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, Shared Hope International, ECPAT-USA, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, CATW, Human Rights Project for Girls, Survivors for Solutions, Sanctuary For Families, World Hope International, Prostitution Research & Education, MISSSEY, and Breaking Free. These groups are on the forefront in the fight against sex trafficking, and I am proud to have their support.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator PORTMAN in supporting this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2941

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 ''Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING; LOWER MENS REA FOR SEX TRAFFICKING OF UNDERAGE VICTIMS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF RANGE OF CONDUCT PUNISHED AS SEX TRAFFICKING.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''or maintains'' and inserting ''maintains, patronizes, or solicits'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or obtained'' and inserting ''obtained, patronized, or solicited''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or obtained'' and inserting ''obtained, patronized, or solicited''; and

(3) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) In a prosecution under subsection (a)(1), the Government need not prove that the defendant knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person recruited, enticed, harbored, transported, provided, obtained, maintained, patronized, or solicited had not attained the age of 18 years.''.

(b) DEFINITION AMENDED.—Section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) is amended by striking ''or obtaining'' and inserting ''obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting''.

(c) MINIMUM PERIOD OF SUPERVISED RELEASE FOR CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT COMMERCIAL CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.—Section 3583(k) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''1594(c),'' after ''1591,''.

SEC. 3. BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS REPORT ON STATE ENFORCEMENT OF SEX TRAFFICKING PROHIBITIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms ''commercial sex act'', ''severe forms of trafficking in persons'', ''State'', and ''Task Force'' have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

(2) the term ''covered offense'' means the provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons; and

(3) the term ''State law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(b) REPORT.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

(1) prepare an annual report on—

(A) the rates of—

(i) arrest of individuals by State law enforcement officers for a covered offense;

(ii) prosecution (including specific charges) of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(iii) conviction of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(B) sentences imposed on individuals convicted in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(2) submit the annual report prepared under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Task Force;

(D) the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)); and

(E) the Attorney General.

SEC. 4. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TRAINING AND POLICY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms ''commercial sex act'', ''severe forms of trafficking in persons'', and ''State'' have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

(2) the term ''Federal law enforcement officer'' has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code;

(3) the term ''local law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of a unit of local government authorized by law or by a local government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law; and

(4) the term ''State law enforcement officer'' means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(b) TRAINING.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice, including each anti-human trafficking training program for Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers, includes technical training on effective methods for investigating and prosecuting individuals who obtain, patronize, or solicit a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(c) POLICY FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that Federal law enforcement officers are engaged in activities, programs, or operations involving the detection, investigation, and prosecution of individuals described in subsection (b).

SEC. 5. WIRETAP AUTHORITY FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING VIOLATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(c)—

(A) by inserting before ''section 1591'' the following: ''section 1581 (peonage), section 1584 (involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),''; and

(B) by inserting before ''section 1751'' the following: ''section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''human trafficking, child sexual exploitation, child pornography production,'' after ''kidnapping,''.

SEC. 6. STRENGTHENING CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.

(a) NOTIFICATION OF PLEA AGREEMENT OR OTHER AGREEMENT.—Section 3771(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) The right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea agreement or deferred prosecution agreement.''.

(b) APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: ''In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.''.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CORKER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 2946. A bill to provide improved water, sanitation, and hygiene programs for high priority developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2946

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 ''Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) water and sanitation are critically important resources that impact many other aspects of human life;

(2) the United States should be a global leader in helping provide sustainable access to clean water and sanitation for the world's most vulnerable populations; and

(3) the ''USAID Water and Development Strategy, 2013–2018'', which was released by the United States Agency for International Development in May 2013—

(A) improves USAID's capacity to provide sustainable water, sanitation, and hygiene assistance;

(B) advances implementation of portions of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533), and

(C) should inform the Global Water Strategy required under section 136(j) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE SAFE WATER AND SANITATION TO INCLUDE HYGIENE.

Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 135 (22 U.S.C. 2152h), as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as section 136; and

(2) in section 136, as redesignated—

(A) in the section heading, by striking '**AND SANITATION**'' and inserting ''**, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE**''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''and sanitation'' and inserting '', sanitation, and hygiene''.

SEC. 4. IMPROVING COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT OF SAFE WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT.—

''(1) USAID GLOBAL WATER COORDINATOR.—

''(A) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this paragraph as 'USAID') or the Administrator's designee, who shall be a current USAID employee serving in a career or non-career position in the Senior Executive Service or at the level of a Deputy Assistant Administrator or higher, shall serve concurrently as the USAID Global Water Coordinator (referred to in this subsection as the 'Coordinator').

''(B) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall—

''(i) provide direction and guidance to, coordinate, and oversee the projects and programs of USAID authorized under this section;

''(ii) lead the implementation and revision, not less frequently than once every 5 years, of USAID's portion of the Global Water Strategy required under subsection (j);

''(iii) seek—

''(I) to expand the capacity of USAID, subject to the availability of appropriations, including through the designation of a lead subject matter expert selected from among USAID staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h);

''(II) to implement such programs and activities;

''(III) to take advantage of economies of scale; and

''(IV) to conduct more efficient and effective projects and programs;

''(iv) coordinate with the Department of State and USAID staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h) to ensure that USAID activities and projects, USAID program planning and budgeting documents, and USAID country development strategies reflect and seek to implement—

''(I) the safe water, sanitation, and hygiene objectives established in the strategy required under subsection (j), including objectives relating to the management of water resources; and

''(II) international best practices relating to—

''(aa) increasing access to safe water and sanitation;

''(bb) conducting hygiene-related activities; and

''(cc) ensuring appropriate management of water resources; and

''(v) develop appropriate benchmarks, measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans for USAID projects and programs authorized under this section.

''(2) DEPARTMENT OF STATE SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR WATER RESOURCES.—

''(A) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of State or the Secretary's designee, who shall be a current employee of the Department of State serving in a career or non-career position in the Senior Executive Service or at the level of a Deputy Assistant Secretary or higher, shall serve concurrently as the Department of State Special Advisor for Water Resources (referred to in this paragraph as the 'Special Advisor').

''(B) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—The Special Advisor shall—

''(i) provide direction and guidance to, coordinate, and oversee the projects and programs of the Department of State authorized under this section;

''(ii) lead the implementation and revision, not less than every 5 years, of the Department of State's portion of the Global Water Strategy required under subsection (j);

''(iii) prioritize and coordinate the Department of State's international engagement on the allocation, distribution, and access to global fresh water resources and policies related to such matters;

''(iv) coordinate with United States Agency for International Development and Department of State staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h) to ensure that United States diplomatic efforts related to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including efforts related to management of water resources and watersheds and the resolution of intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources, are consistent with United States national interests; and

''(v) represent the views of the United States Government on the allocation, distribution, and access to global fresh water resources and policies related to such matters in key international fora, including key diplomatic, development-related, and scientific organizations.

''(3) ADDITIONAL NATURE OF DUTIES AND RESTRICTION ON ADDITIONAL OR SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION.—The responsibilities and specific duties of the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (or the Administrator's designee) and the Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee) under paragraph (2) or (3), respectively, shall be in addition to any other responsibilities or specific duties assigned to such individuals. Such individuals shall receive no additional or supplemental compensation as a result of carrying out such responsibilities and specific duties under such paragraphs.''.

SEC. 5. PROMOTING THE MAXIMUM IMPACT AND LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF USAID SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE-RELATED PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS.

Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) PRIORITIES AND CRITERIA FOR MAXIMUM IMPACT AND LONG TERM SUSTAINABILITY.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall ensure that the Agency for International Development's projects and programs authorized under this section are designed to achieve maximum impact and long-term sustainability by—

''(1) prioritizing countries on the basis of the following clearly defined criteria and indicators, to the extent sufficient data are available—

''(A) the proportion of the population using an unimproved drinking water source;

''(B) the total population using an unimproved drinking water source;

''(C) the proportion of the population without piped water access;

''(D) the proportion of the population using shared or other unimproved sanitation facilities;

''(E) the total population using shared or other unimproved sanitation facilities;

''(F) the proportion of the population practicing open defecation;

''(G) the total number of children younger than 5 years of age who died from diarrheal disease;

''(H) the proportion of all deaths of children younger than 5 years of age resulting from diarrheal disease;

''(I) the national government's capacity, capability, and commitment to work with the United States to improve access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including—

''(i) the government's capacity and commitment to developing the indigenous capacity to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors; and

''(ii) the degree to which such government—

''(I) identifies such efforts as a priority; and

''(II) allocates resources to such efforts;

''(J) the availability of opportunities to leverage existing public, private, or other donor investments in the water, sanitation, and hygiene sectors, including investments in the management of water resources; and

''(K) the likelihood of making significant improvements on a per capita basis on the health and educational opportunities available to women as a result of increased access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including access to appropriate facilities at primary and secondary educational institutions seeking to ensure that communities benefitting from such projects and activities develop the indigenous capacity to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors;

''(2) prioritizing and measuring, including through rigorous monitoring and evaluating mechanisms, the extent to which such project or program—

''(A) furthers significant improvements in—

''(i) the criteria set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1);

''(ii) the health and educational opportunities available to women as a result of increased access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including access to appropriate facilities at primary and secondary educational institutions; and

''(iii) the indigenous capacity of the host nation or community to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors;

''(B) is designed, as part of the provision of safe water and sanitation to the local community—

''(i) to be financially independent over the long term, focusing on local ownership and sustainability;

''(ii) to be undertaken in conjunction with relevant public institutions or private enterprises;

''(iii) to identify and empower local individuals or institutions to be responsible for the effective management and maintenance of such project or program; and

''(iv) to provide safe water or expertise or capacity building to those identified parties or institutions for the purposes of developing a plan and clear responsibilities for the effective management and maintenance of such project or program;

''(C) leverages existing public, private, or other donor investments in the water, sanitation, and hygiene sectors, including investments in the management of water resources;

''(D) avoids duplication of efforts with other United States Government agencies or departments or those of other nations or nongovernmental organizations;

''(E) coordinates such efforts with the efforts of other United States Government agencies or departments or those of other nations or nongovernmental organizations directed at assisting refugees and other displaced individuals; and

''(F) involves consultation with appropriate stakeholders, including communities directly affected by the lack of access to clean water, sanitation or hygiene, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations;

''(3) seeking to further the 'USAID Water and Development Strategy, 2013–2018' through 2018; and

''(4) seeking to further the strategy required under subsection (j) after 2018.

''(g) USE OF IMPROVED DATA COLLECTION AND REVIEW OF NEW STANDARDIZED INDICATORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to use improved data collection—

''(A) to meet the health-based prioritization criteria established pursuant to subsection (f)(1); and

''(B) to review new standardized indicators in evaluating progress towards meeting such criteria.

''(2) CONSULTATION AND NOTICE.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) regularly consult with the appropriate congressional committees; and

''(B) notify such committees not later 30 days before using improved data collection and review of new standardized indicators under paragraph (1) for the purposes of carrying out this section.

''(h) DESIGNATION OF HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—

''(1) INITIAL DESIGNATION.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the President shall—

''(A) designate, on the basis of the criteria set forth in subsection (f)(1) and in furtherance of the 'USAID Water and Development Strategy, 2013–2018', not fewer than 10 countries as high priority countries to be the primary recipients of United States Government assistance authorized under this section during fiscal year 2016; and

''(B) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such designations.

''(2) ANNUAL DESIGNATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President shall annually make new designations pursuant to the criteria set forth in paragraph (1).

''(B) DESIGNATIONS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2018.—Beginning with fiscal year 2019, designations under paragraph (1) shall be made—

''(i) based upon the criteria set forth in subsection (f)(1); and

''(ii) in furtherance of the strategy required under subsection (j).

''(i) TARGETING OF PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS TO AREAS OF GREATEST NEED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days before the obligation of any funds for water, sanitation, or hygiene projects or programs pursuant to this section in countries that are not ranked in the top 50 countries based upon the WASH Needs Index, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the planned obligation of such funds.

''(2) DEFINED TERM.—In this subsection and in subsection (j), the term 'WASH Needs Index' means the needs index for water, sanitation, or hygiene projects or programs authorized under this section that has been developed using the criteria and indicators described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of subsection (f)(1).''.

SEC. 6. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO INCREASE APPROPRIATE LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY AND ACCESS TO SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) GLOBAL WATER STRATEGY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2017, and every 5 years thereafter, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, shall submit a single government-wide Global Water Strategy to the appropriate congressional committees that provides a detailed description of how the United States intends—

''(A) to increase access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene in high priority countries designated pursuant to subsection (h), including a summary of the WASH Needs Index and the specific weighting of data and other assumptions used to develop and rank countries on the WASH Needs Index;

''(B) to improve the management of water resources and watersheds in such countries; and

''(C) to work to prevent and resolve, to the greatest degree possible, both intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources in such countries.

''(2) AGENCY SPECIFIC PLANS.—The Global Water Strategy shall include an agency-specific plan—

''(A) from the United States Agency for International Development that describes specifically how the Agency for International Development will—

''(i) carry out the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Global Water Coordinator under subsection (e)(1);

''(ii) ensure that the Agency for International Development's projects and programs authorized under this section are designed to achieve maximum impact and long-term sustainability, including by implementing the requirements described in subsection (f); and

''(iii) increase access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene in high priority countries designated pursuant to subsection (h);

''(B) from the Department of State that describes specifically how the Department of State will—

''(i) carry out the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Special Coordinator for Water Resources under subsection (e)(2); and

''(ii) ensure that the Department's activities authorized under this section are designed—

''(I) to improve management of water resources and watersheds in countries designated pursuant to subsection (h); and

''(II) to prevent and resolve, to the greatest degree possible, both intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources in such countries; and

''(C) from other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, that describes the contributions of the departments and agencies to implementing the Global Water Strategy.

''(3) INDIVIDUALIZED PLANS FOR HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—For each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall—

''(A) develop a costed, evidence-based, and results-oriented plan that—

''(i) seeks to achieve the purposes of this section; and

''(ii) meets the requirements under subsection (f); and

''(B) include such plan in an appendix to the Global Water Strategy required under paragraph (1).

''(4) FIRST TIME ACCESS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Global Water Strategy shall specifically describe the target percentage of funding for each fiscal year covered by such strategy to be directed toward projects aimed at providing first-time access to safe water and sanitation.

''(5) PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—The Global Water Strategy shall include specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, performance metrics, timetables, and monitoring and evaluation plans required to be developed by the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B)(v).

''(6) CONSULTATION AND BEST PRACTICES.—The Global Water Strategy shall—

''(A) be developed in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies; and

''(B) incorporate best practices from the international development community.

''(k) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

''(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

''(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

''(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.''.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF STATE AGENCY SPECIFIC PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit an agency-specific plan to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 136(k) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (a)) that meets the requirements of section 136(j)(2)(B) of such Act, as added by subsection (a).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) is repealed.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 583—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 30, 2014, AS ''DRIVE SAFER SUNDAY''

Mr. ISAKSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 583

Whereas motor vehicle travel is the primary means of transportation in the United States;

Whereas every individual traveling on the roads and highways needs to drive in a safer manner to reduce deaths and injuries that result from motor vehicle accidents;

Whereas according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, wearing a seat belt saves as many as 15,000 lives each year; and

Whereas the Sunday after Thanksgiving is the busiest highway traffic day of the year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages—

(A) high schools, colleges, universities, administrators, teachers, primary schools, and secondary schools to launch campus-wide educational campaigns to urge students to focus on safety when driving;

(B) national trucking firms to alert their drivers to be especially focused on driving safely on the Sunday after Thanksgiving, and to publicize the importance of the day through use of the Citizens Band Radio Service and at truck stops across the United States;

(C) clergies to remind their congregations to travel safely when attending services and gatherings;

(D) law enforcement personnel to remind drivers and passengers to drive safely, particularly on the Sunday after Thanksgiving;

(E) motorists to drive safely, not just during the holiday season, but every time they get behind the wheel; and

(F) all people of the United States to understand the life-saving importance of wearing a seat belt and to use the Sunday after Thanksgiving as an opportunity to educate themselves about highway safety; and

(2) designates November 30, 2014, as ''Drive Safer Sunday''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 584—COMMENDING JERALD D. LINNELL ON HIS SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. REID of Nevada (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 584

Whereas Jerry Linnell, a native of Minnesota, graduated from the court reporting program of the Minnesota School of Business in Minneapolis;

Whereas Jerry Linnell, joined the Official Reporters of Debate of the United States Senate in 1982 and became Chief Reporter in 1999 supervising a staff of reporters and transcribers and producing the Senate's portion of the Congressional Record with remarkable accuracy;

Whereas Jerry Linnell has earned the respect and affection of the Senators, their staffs and all of his colleagues for his professionalism, dedication and good humor;

Whereas Jerry Linnell now retires from the Senate after 32 years to spend more time with his wife Jane, his four children and five grandchildren: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its appreciation to Jerry Linnell and commends him for his lengthy, faithful and outstanding service to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Jerald D. Linnell.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3949. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3949. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

Subtitle I—Uniform Code of Military Justice Reform

SEC. 591. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014''.

SEC. 592. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE TO PROCEED TO TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL ON CHARGES ON CERTAIN OFFENSES WITH AUTHORIZED MAXIMUM SENTENCE OF CONFINEMENT OF MORE THAN ONE YEAR.

(a) MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in paragraph (2) and not excluded under paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the determination under section 830(b) of such chapter (article 30(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on whether to try such charges by court-martial as provided in paragraph (4).

(B) HOMELAND SECURITY.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in paragraph (2) and not excluded under paragraph (3) against a member of the Coast Guard (when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for the determination under section 830(b) of such chapter (article 30(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on whether to try such charges by court-martial as provided in paragraph (4).

(2) COVERED OFFENSES.—An offense specified in this paragraph is an offense as follows:

(A) An offense under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that is triable by court-martial under that chapter for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for more than one year.

(B) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(D) An attempt to commit an offense specified in subparagraphs (A) through (C) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(3) EXCLUDED OFFENSES.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to an offense as follows:

(A) An offense under sections 883 through 917 of title 10, United States Code (articles 83 through 117 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under section 933 or 934 of title 10, United States Code (articles 133 and 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(D) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(E) An attempt to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (D) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(4) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—The disposition of charges pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following:

(A) The determination whether to try such charges by court-martial shall be made by a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces designated in accordance with regulations prescribed for purposes of this subsection from among commissioned officers of the Armed Forces in grade O–6 or higher who—

(i) are available for detail as trial counsel under section 827 of title 10, United States Code (article 27 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice);

(ii) have significant experience in trials by general or special court-martial; and

(iii) are outside the chain of command of the member subject to such charges.

(B) Upon a determination under subparagraph (A) to try such charges by court-martial, the officer making that determination shall determine whether to try such charges by a general court-martial convened under section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or a special court-martial convened under section 823 of title 10, United States Code (article 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A determination under subparagraph (A) to try charges by court-martial shall include a determination to try all known offenses, including lesser included offenses.

(D) The determination to try such charges by court-martial under subparagraph (A), and by type of court-martial under subparagraph (B), shall be binding on any applicable convening authority for a trial by court-martial on such charges.

(E) The actions of an officer described in subparagraph (A) in determining under that subparagraph whether or not to try charges by court-martial shall be free of unlawful or unauthorized influence or coercion.

(F) The determination under subparagraph (A) not to proceed to trial of such charges by

general or special court-martial shall not operate to terminate or otherwise alter the authority of commanding officers to refer such charges for trial by summary court-martial convened under section 824 of title 10, United States Code (article 24 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or to impose non-judicial punishment in connection with the conduct covered by such charges as authorized by section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(5) CONSTRUCTION WITH CHARGES ON OTHER OFFENSES.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter or affect the disposition of charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense triable by court-martial under that chapter for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for one year or less.

(6) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall revise policies and procedures as necessary to comply with this subsection.

(B) UNIFORMITY.—The General Counsel of the Department of Defense and the General Counsel of the Department of Homeland Security shall jointly review the policies and procedures revised under this paragraph in order to ensure that any lack of uniformity in policies and procedures, as so revised, among the military departments and the Department of Homeland Security does not render unconstitutional any policy or procedure, as so revised.

(7) MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall recommend such changes to the Manual for Courts-Martial as are necessary to ensure compliance with this subsection.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a), and the revisions required by that subsection, shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to charges preferred under section 830 of title 10, United States Code (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), on or after such effective date.

SEC. 593. MODIFICATION OF OFFICERS AUTHORIZED TO CONVENE GENERAL AND SPECIAL COURTS-MARTIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph (8):

''(8) the officers in the offices established pursuant to section 593(c) of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014 or officers in the grade of O–6 or higher who are assigned such responsibility by the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, but only with respect to offenses to which section 592(a)(1) of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014 applies;''.

(b) NO EXERCISE BY OFFICERS IN CHAIN OF COMMAND OF ACCUSED OR VICTIM.—Such section (article) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) An officer specified in subsection (a)(8) may not convene a court-martial under this section if the officer is in the chain of command of the accused or the victim.''.

(c) OFFICES OF CHIEFS OF STAFF ON COURTS-MARTIAL.—

(1) OFFICES REQUIRED.—Each Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces or Commandant specified in paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by subsection (a), shall establish an office to do the following:

(A) To convene general and special courts-martial under sections 822 and 823 of title 10, United States Code (articles 22 and 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), pursuant to paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as so amended, with respect to offenses to which section 592(a)(1) applies.

(B) To detail under section 825 of title 10, United States Code (article 25 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), members of courts-martial convened as described in subparagraph (A).

(2) PERSONNEL.—The personnel of each office established under paragraph (1) shall consist of such members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, or such members of the Coast Guard or civilian personnel of the Department of Homeland Security, as may be detailed or assigned to the office by the Chief of Staff or Commandant concerned. The members and personnel so detailed or assigned, as the case may be, shall be detailed or assigned from personnel billets in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 594. DISCHARGE USING OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall carry out sections 592 and 593 (and the amendments made by section 593) using personnel, funds, and resources otherwise authorized by law.

(b) NO AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL OR RESOURCES.—Sections 592 and 593 (and the amendments made by section 593) shall not be construed as authorizations for personnel, personnel billets, or funds for the discharge of the requirements in such sections.

SEC. 595. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES ON COURTS-MARTIAL BY INDEPENDENT PANEL ON REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

Section 576(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1762) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraph (J):

''(J) Monitor and assess the implementation and efficacy of sections 592 through 594 of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014, and the amendments made by such sections.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 19, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 19, 2014, at 2:00 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 19, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 19, 2014, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Preparedness and Response to Public Health Threats: How Prepared Are We?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 19, 2014, in room SD–628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Protecting our Children's Mental Health: Preventing and Addressing Childhood Trauma in Indian Country.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 19, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on November 19, 2014, in room SD–562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building at 2:15 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Private Industry's Role in Stemming the Tide of Phone Scams.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mary Futcher, a detailee on my staff from the Department of Justice, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENDING JERALD D. LINNELL ON HIS SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 584, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 584) commending Jerald D. Linnell on his service to the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 584) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 20, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. For the information of Senators, there will be up to five rollcall votes at 2 p.m. on confirmation of the Pepper, Sannes, Arleo, Beetlestone, and Bolden district judicial nominations.

I would ask of my friend, the Senator from Iowa, how long he is going to speak.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will speak for 20 to 25 minutes.

Mr. REID. For up to 30 minutes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator GRASSLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in his State of the Union Address last January, President Obama announced what he called a year of action. Armed with pen and phone, he promised to take action where Congress wouldn't. At the time, I warned that these threats were a gathering danger to the separation of powers established in our Constitution.

The President is now threatening to implement a mass amnesty from our immigration laws by Executive fiat. He plans to act without the support of Congress or the American people. In fact, he has conveniently waited until after the recent elections to do so in order to avoid being punished at the ballot box. This Executive order will be the culmination of his self-proclaimed year of action.

The President may think of this Executive action as a political victory in a year filled with so many failures and defeats for him and his party, but history will surely view it as a serious blow to the systems of checks and balances established by the Framers. In reality, this was a year in which the President's abuse of Executive power came into clear focus.

Today I would like to review President Obama's pattern of unconstitutional Executive action this year. I would like to explain why the mass amnesty he has been threatening is merely the latest in a long list of abuses of his Executive authority. And I would like to offer a few thoughts about what the Senate can do about these kinds of abuses.

After the President's State of the Union Address, I wrote to the Attorney General on January 31. I wrote that I was ''gravely concerned that the system of checks and balances enshrined in the Constitution [was] threatened by the President's determination to take unilateral action.'' In short, I made clear that ''while the President has a pen and phone, we have a Constitution that places limits on his use of them to issue Executive Orders.'' Indeed, my concern about the President's threat to take action on his own was ''heightened by the administration's record of failing to discharge his constitutional duties to 'take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.' ''

By then, President Obama had already failed to execute the laws in many areas. For example, the administration was rewriting ObamaCare's deadlines at will and was making little effort to enforce the Controlled Substances Act in some States. These abuses rang like alarm bells—alarm bells in the night—even before the so-called year of action began.

Indeed, in December of 2013 a liberal law professor testified before the House Judiciary Committee that ''despite the fact that I once voted for President Obama, personal admiration is no substitute for the constitutional principles at stake in this controversy.''

The professor went on:

When a President claims the inherent power of both legislation and enforcement, he becomes a virtual government unto himself. He is not simply posing a danger to the constitutional system; he becomes the very danger that the Constitution was designed to avoid.

Against this backdrop, I asked the President to defend the legal basis for the actions he was threatening. In my letter I asked the Attorney General to direct the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel to publicly disclose its opinions concerning the lawfulness of the Executive orders proposed by the President. That is what the Office of Legal Counsel does—it reviews all Executive orders to determine whether they are constitutional and lawful. Many of its opinions have been made public in the past. I hoped this transparency would allow Congress and then the American people to better understand the alleged legal basis for these orders and challenge them, if necessary.

Providing Congress and the American people with the legal opinions supporting his unilateral actions seemed like a reasonable request of a President who had claimed to support ''an unprecedented level of openness'' and transparency in government. But February passed, March as well, April came and went, winter turned into spring, and summer was around the corner. Finally, on May 20 I received a response from the Justice Department. In summary, the Department told me no, they wouldn't disclose these opinions to the public. However, the Department assured me that if I had questions about particular Office of Legal Counsel advice documents, it would assist me in understanding them—in their words—to the fullest extent possible. In short, the administration stonewalled legitimate questions from Congress, as it often does, and stymied this Congress from carrying out its constitutional responsibility of oversight.

As it turned out, within a few weeks I and many others in Congress had very serious questions about a specific Executive action and its effect on our national security, and we had questions about the advice provided by the Office of Legal Counsel. The American people had the same questions as well.

In early June the President decided to release five Taliban detainees held at Guantanamo Bay in exchange for SGT Bowe Bergdahl, a U.S. soldier who had been captured in 2009. The detainees were reportedly senior-level Taliban commanders. Some had direct links to Al Qaeda, and all were reportedly determined to be a high risk to the United States and were recommended for continued detention. Nonetheless, President Obama decided to free these prisoners from Guantanamo.

There was one problem, however: The National Defense Authorization Act required the administration to notify Congress 30 days before any detainee could be transferred from Guantanamo. Under this statute, the notification was required to include lots of detailed information about the basis for the transfer—why it was in our national security interests and any actions taken to prevent detainees from returning to the battlefield. In fact, none of this information was provided to the Congress before these detainees were released, as the very law requires. And perhaps not coincidentally, this was information that Members of Congress and the American people were very interested in learning. There were and still are serious questions about whether releasing these detainees from Guantanamo was a good idea.

So the President decided to act alone, without regard to Congress's role in our system of checks and balances and directly contrary to a law the President had recently signed.

Then the administration began changing its story about why it broke the law. First, they said it was Sergeant Bergdahl's health that required his release—his release without notifying Congress. Then they said it was operational security surrounding the release itself. Then they said it was the nature of the negotiations with the Taliban.

But there was one point administration officials were clear about—the Department of Justice had provided legal advice that justified transferring these detainees from Guantanamo without informing Congress as the law required. This was difficult to square with the limited powers of the Executive established in the Constitution.

In Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company v. Sawyer, otherwise known as the steel seizure case, the Supreme Court set a clear precedent establishing what a President can and cannot do. In that case the Supreme Court held that President Truman's Executive order seizing steel mills to avoid a strike during the Korean war was unconstitutional. In doing so, the Court emphasized that the Executive isn't above the law as written by Congress.

> The Founders of this Nation entrusted the lawmaking powers to the Congress alone in both good and bad times. It would do no good to recall the historical events, the fears of power and the hopes for freedom that lay behind their choice. Such a review would but confirm our holding that this seizure order cannot stand.

Moreover, Justice Jackson emphasized that point here:

> When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, the authority of the President is at its lowest [ebb].

Just as the Supreme Court held that President Truman had unlawfully seized the steel mills, President Obama's release of the Taliban detainees without a required notification effectively rewrote the law contrary to the will of Congress.

In short, there didn't seem to be a lawful basis for what the President had done. In fact, it seemed plainly illegal.

So I took the Department up on its offer. In a letter to the Attorney General dated June 5, I requested that he direct the Office of Legal Counsel to make public ''its opinions, analyses, and conclusions concerning the lawfulness'' of the transfer without compliance with the statute that required congressional notification. I went on to say:

> It is obviously too late for Congress to express its concerns about these transfers in time to prevent them. However, this measure of transparency will at least allow the American people to better understand the Administration's purported basis for ignoring the legal requirement that Congress be notified in advance, and shed additional light on this controversial decision.

It is now 6 months later, and the Attorney General hasn't given me the courtesy of a response to my letter. We still don't know how the Department justified the release of these detainees. We don't know the legal basis or the underlying facts that were relied upon. That should not be acceptable to anyone, but sadly it has become commonplace with the Obama administration.

It turns out that to this Justice Department, assisting me ''to the fullest extent possible'' is actually indistinguishable from ignoring my request completely.

Shortly thereafter, in August, the Government Accountability Office concluded that the administration acted illegally when it released these senior-level Taliban commanders from Guantanamo without notifying Congress, as the law recently signed by the President demanded.

Let's be clear. That wasn't a Member of Congress reaching that conclusion. It wasn't a political operative or a talking head on television. It was an independent, nonpartisan government agency. So the GAO effectively said: President Obama, you broke the law.

So perhaps it makes sense that the Department of Justice couldn't respond to my letter. Maybe even the very smart lawyers in the Office of Legal Counsel couldn't come up with a justification for what happened that could pass the laugh test.

But that wasn't the only rebuke the President suffered this year after trampling on Congress's role under the Constitution. The Supreme Court was forced to rein in President Obama as well in a dispute over his powers to make recess appointments.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution provides for only two ways in which Presidents may appoint certain officers. First, it provides that the President nominates and, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoints various officers. Second, it permits the President to make temporary appointments when a vacancy in one of those offices happens when the Senate is in recess.

Back in 2012, President Obama made four appointments to various executive branch positions. They were purportedly based on the recess appointments clause. But he took this action even though they weren't made, in the words of the Constitution, ''during the recess of the Senate'' because the Senate was still in session.

No President in history had ever tried to make recess appointments when the Senate said it was in session, but this President once again decided to go around Congress.

In June of this year, the Supreme Court struck down these appointments as unconstitutional. It wasn't a split decision. It wasn't 5 to 4 along party lines. It was unanimous. Every Justice agreed—those appointed by both Republicans and Democrats. That included two Justices appointed by President Obama himself. It was the Supreme Court's biggest rebuke to any President since 1974, when it ordered President Nixon to produce the Watergate tapes.

This was a case where the Office of Legal Counsel's opinion didn't pass the laugh test again. So the Supreme Court unanimously said: President Obama, you broke the law.

So this purported year of action has brought into focus a President with little respect for the roles of the coequal branches of government, unwilling to explain the legal basis for his actions, and rebuked by the courts and independent agencies for overstepping his bounds—quite out of character with somebody who proudly says he is a professor of constitutional law.

Now, again, the President is threatening to act unilaterally on immigration. If we thought this year's events so far would have given the President pause about his ''go it alone'' approach, apparently we would be wrong.

Of course one of the reasons I oppose mass amnesty is because it is bad policy. Immigration reform should begin with securing our borders. Border security is among the most basic responsibilities of any country and somewhat the definition of what sovereignty is all about.

But this administration hasn't done that. To the contrary, according to recent news reports it has freed alleged kidnappers, rapists, and murderers into communities in the United States rather than deport them. It has sacrificed public safety in order to provide relief for people who are here illegally.

But the President's unilateral action on immigration isn't just bad policy, it is contrary to the rule of law. It is unconstitutional for the executive branch to nullify or even unilaterally rewrite the immigration laws that the people of the United States through their elected representatives have chosen to enact.

We have been hearing about the possibility of an Executive action on immigration for many months. It will apparently involve steps to allow millions of people illegally present in the United States to live, work, and collect benefits here.

The Democratic leadership wants to compare what is being threatened here to the Executive actions of past Presidents on immigration, but the actions of Presidents Reagan and Bush were merely tying up loose ends, carrying out a law Congress at that time had just passed. They established policies that were later put in the statute in 1990. President Obama is threatening to act directly against the wishes of Congress and on a far greater scope and scale. That is why I and 21 other Senators wrote to the President on April 24 to express our grave concerns about the lawfulness of what was reportedly under consideration, and apparently our warnings were not heeded.

Now, if the President acts after repeated calls by congressional leaders not to do so, it will severely damage his relationship with the new Congress elected by the American people.

But the core issue is this: Under our Constitution, the Congress makes the law. Under article II, section 3, the President is charged with taking care that these laws are faithfully executed. But if President Obama effectively legalizes people who are here unlawfully, no one will be able to reasonably argue that he is faithfully executing our laws. Once again, that doesn't pass the laugh test.

So, like the Government Accountability Office and the Supreme Court earlier this year, I say: President Obama, if you take this Executive action on immigration, you will be breaking the law, and even more than that, you will be violating the Constitution.

And the President knows this. Just a few years ago he conceded:

> This notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. The fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there's been a great disservice done to the cause of getting . . . comprehensive [immigration] legislation passed by perpetrating the notion that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It's just not true. We live in a democracy. We have to pass bills through the legislature, and then I can sign it.

That is the end of a quote of the President that speaks to exactly what the responsibilities of a President happen to be and how they should be viewed and how he ought to be acting now. The President was right then, even if he doesn't want to live by his own words now. There are no shortcuts to following the Constitution.

Now what we are likely to hear from the administration is that this Executive action is simply a lawful exercise of enforcement discretion. It is not. It is simply not an exercise of enforcement discretion. Lawful enforcement discretion is exercised on an individual case-by-case basis. So whether enforcement action takes place is informed by a careful evaluation of the facts in a particular case as each case presents itself. Lawful enforcement discretion isn't selecting entire categories of individuals and telling them that going forward the law won't be applied to them. That is what President Obama is threatening to do.

This shouldn't only concern constitutional scholars and lawyers. It is no exaggeration to say that the freedom of the American people is at stake. That is what the Framers believed. Listen to Federalist Paper 51. James Madison wrote that ''separate and distinct exercise of different powers of government'' is ''essential to the preservation of liberty.''

Moreover, in the Steel Seizure case I quoted, Justice Frankfurter warned that ''the accretion of dangerous power does not come in a day. It does come, however slowly, from the generative force of unchecked disregard of the restrictions that fence in even the most disinterested assertion of authority.''

President Obama's actions this year wreak of unchecked disregard for the restrictions of his authority. In his remarks after the recent elections, President Obama repeatedly emphasized that his Executive actions would be lawful, but, as this year has shown, he has repeatedly acted illegally even though the Department of Justice evidently had assured him otherwise. The Office of Legal Counsel doesn't appear to be providing independent legal advice to the President; it is simply rubberstamping whatever he wants to do. So it is cold comfort for the President to assure us that anything he will do is legal.

Let's go back to the bedrock principles of our country's Founders. The Framers of the Constitution knew an abusive Executive when they saw one. They sent the Declaration of Independence to a King who had ignored and abused their legislatures and laws. The Framers would also have recognized the specific kinds of Executive abuses as reflected in President Obama's mass amnesty. They would have referred to them as the royal suspending and dispensing powers. But George III didn't even try to abuse colonists with these powers. Why? Because Parliament had denied them to the King 100 years before the American Revolution.

You see, the Kings of England had traditionally asserted the power to suspend the operation of certain laws or to grant dispensations prospectively excusing particular individuals from compliance. But as deference to the King's authorities eroded, these powers became more controversial.

As part of the Glorious Revolution in the late 17th century, these royal powers were terminated. The first two articles in the English Bill of Rights of 1689 made it illegal for the King to exercise the ''pretended power of suspending the laws and dispensing with the laws.'' This happened a century before our own Constitutional Convention. So when the Framers met in Philadelphia, these were abuses long since remedied in England. Instead, the Framers charged the President with the constitutional duty to take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

With his talk now of mass amnesty, President Obama is threatening to abandon his constitutional duty. He is threatening to reassert royal powers that even the Framers thought were long abolished. He is threatening to take our country backward a century before the American Revolution.

When talking about immigration policy, the President has acknowledged that he isn't a King, so common sense tells me he shouldn't act like one.

During the President's remaining 2 years in office, how should the Senate respond to his illegal Executive action on immigration or any other Executive abuses? In some cases we can use the power of the purse to defund them. In other cases we may use our congressional oversight tools to expose them. In still other cases, we may be able to pass legislation to do away with them completely. These tools have been available to the Senate since President Obama was elected. It should come as no surprise that the Democrats in the majority didn't use them to confront his abuses of power. So in the 114th Congress, we Republicans intend to use that.

The best course of action for the President is this: Learn from President Clinton. He lost control of the Congress 2 years after he became President. He decided to show leadership and work with the Congress of the United States. Great things happened with a Republican Congress and a Democratic President. We had welfare reform. We had 40 percent of the people leave the welfare rolls. We had tax reform. We had budgets that were balanced and paid down $568 billion on the national debt. There are things we can do together very early.

The President wants patent trolling and corporate tax reform. There are a lot of things we can work on together.

I have been led to believe that the President is very much a free trade person, and I believe he is. We could pass trade promotion authority. We could work together with the President in the early months of next year and we could gain credibility. Under his leadership, we could reform an immigration system that needs reform. But, no, I think the President is going to take another route and retard the cooperation that is potentially available to him just as it was when President Clinton was President.

I hope the President will rethink what he wants to do and show the same leadership that President Clinton did so we can get off to a very good start next year.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:11 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, November 20, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MARK R. ROSEKIND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, VICE DAVID L. STRICKLAND, RESIGNED.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

MATTHEW STUART BUTLER, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2015, VICE ROSEMARY E. RODRIGUEZ, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES J. BURKS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. SCOTT H. SWIFT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAY E. CLASING

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 19, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

JON M. HOLLADAY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MAUREEN ELIZABETH CORMACK, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA.

ALLAN P. MUSTARD, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO TURKMENISTAN.

MICHELE JEANNE SISON, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY, AND THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

MICHELE JEANNE SISON, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

EARL ROBERT MILLER, OF MICHIGAN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BOTSWANA.

JUDITH BETH CEFKIN, OF COLORADO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FIJI, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI, THE REPUBLIC OF NAURU, THE KINGDOM OF TONGA, AND TUVALU.

ROBERT T. YAMATE, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MADAGASCAR, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNION OF THE COMOROS.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message transmitted by the President to the Senate on November 19, 2014 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

MYRNA PEREZ, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2015, VICE ROSEMARY E. RODRIQUEZ, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 6, 2014.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORTING FUNDING FOR NIH AND ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to vote to fully fund the National Institutes of Health as we consider appropriations for FY2015.

Restoring the agency to its pre-sequestration spending level is critical to American health and medical innovation. The consequences of insufficient funding for the agency's work are not always immediately apparent but are significant. Serious investments in research are required if we hope to develop new cures, treatments, and vaccines for complex diseases such as cancer and Alzheimer's.

Without this type of significant commitment, the costs of Alzheimer's to Americans in 2050 will be a predicted $1.2 trillion dollars.

As recent events have demonstrated, global health is also becoming a national security issue. We have seen how research conducted at the National Institutes of Health can be key to protecting American health and playing our part as a global health leader. Restrictions on research based on funding limitations can also hinder our efforts to combat such health crises.

Mr. Speaker, as a world leader in research and innovation we must dedicate the appropriate level of funding to the National Institutes of Health.

CONGRATULATING COLUMBIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY ON THE GRAND OPENING OF THE CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Columbia Southern University on the grand opening of their new Center for Continuing Education in Orange Beach, Alabama.

Established in 1993 by Dr. Robert Mayes, Columbia Southern University offers individuals with demanding schedules a way to achieve their dreams of higher education through online learning. By 2001, Columbia Southern was granted accreditation through the Distance Education and Training Council. Columbia Southern went on to become one of the first United States universities to offer a degree program in Vietnam. After Dr. Mayes' death in 2005, his son, Robert Mayes, Jr., was appointed President. Robert built on his father's success and continued to expand Columbia Southern's footprint.

Mr. Speaker, the new Columbia Southern Education Group Center for Continuing Education will include staff offices, meeting rooms and a large training area that can be partitioned off to accommodate a variety of training needs. The 10,600 square foot facility will also serve as the regional training center for the Alabama Fire College and Personnel Standards Commission.

I am proud of the work Columbia Southern does to promote higher learning, and I take pride in knowing they are located in the heart of the First Congressional District. I know I join with many others in saying congratulations on the new facility, and we look forward to continued growth and success.

HONORING JOHN C. ADAMS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize John C. Adams. John is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

John has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years John has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, John has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending John C. Adams for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING BANDERA, TEXAS AS THE COWBOY CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 1852, despite the danger posed by Indian raids at the time, a group of entrepreneurs acquired land on a cypress-lined bend in the Medina River. The following year, members of the group surveyed the town of Bandera and opened a sawmill and commissary. The town quickly became a thriving settlement due to the success of the founders' water-powered lumber mill.

In the years that followed, local farmers and ranchers prospered, supplying products to United States Cavalry troops at Camp Verde, growing and ginning cotton, and raising cattle, sheep, and goats.

In the 1870s, as the threat of Indian attacks receded, the county became a staging area for cattle drives and its population grew markedly. It is estimated that between 1874 and 1894, seven to 10 million longhorns and one million horses were driven by 30,000 cowboys to a staging area near Bandera, a major gathering point connecting with the Western Trail. During this time, Bandera became known as a place where cowboys could relax and buy supplies.

Dude ranching began in 1920 when the Buck Ranch took in paying summer guests, with the Bruce Ranch taking the overflow. In the 1930s, the dude ranching industry continued to expand and over 30 dude ranches were operating near Bandera.

Rodeos began in the 1920s when cowboys who worked on ranches displayed the skills they used at roundups and on cattle drives. The first advertised rodeo near Bandera was held at Mansfield Park in 1924. Bandera cowboys became rodeo world champions and were inducted into the National Cowboy Hall of Fame.

The citizens of Bandera are heirs to a rich western heritage. Today this charming town continues on as a living testament to the courage, talent, and vision of the men and women who shaped the Old West. Since 1920 the community has been a popular tourist destination, each year drawing visitors from around the state and beyond to attractions that include area resorts, dude ranches, rodeos, and hunting and camping areas.

The wild and rugged town of Bandera has long displayed the qualities that earned it the designation, "Cowboy Capital of the World" in 1948.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the rich history of Bandera, Texas and pay tribute to its citizens' many contributions to the Lone Star State.

HONORING DR. JULIAN CROCKER

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and celebrate a dedicated public servant and a dear friend, Dr. Julian Crocker.

Dr. Crocker has honorably served the educational community for 50 years. He began his career as a classroom teacher after earning both his undergraduate and graduate degrees from Vanderbilt University and later earning his doctorate from Harvard University. He has served school districts around the country, primarily serving as the superintendent for multiple school districts over the course of his career including the San Mateo City School District, Palo Alto Unified School District, and the Paso Robles Joint Unified School District.

This year marks 16 years of Dr. Crocker's remarkable career as the County Superintendent of Schools for the San Luis Obispo County Office of Education. Drawing upon his distinguished career in education, Julian's

leadership has helped generations of students successfully prepare for the future. His passion and tireless efforts have succeeded in closing achievement gaps and improving student achievement.

Beyond his role as Superintendent, Julian has served on numerous committees and task forces dedicated to serving the schools, employees, students, and youth of the Central Coast. As an active member and leader of several educational associations throughout the state of California, he has earned the respect and admiration of so many in the educational field. Julian has also served as an adjunct faculty member of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education at the University of California, Santa Barbara, as well as in the School of Education at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

As a military veteran, educator, and community leader, Julian's commitment to helping others and strengthening our Central Coast community is truly inspiring. I thank him for his passion, dedication, and friendship and join our community in wishing him the best in retirement and in future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO TEXAS PANHANDLE HONOR FLIGHT

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 33 veterans from Texas who visited Washington, D.C., on October 10, 2014, through the Texas Panhandle Honor Flight. My wife, Sally, and I had the distinct pleasure of welcoming these heroes to the Capitol.

The veterans on this flight were: Brown, Jerry; Chambers, Obra Gerald; Crittenden, Max; Ediger, Walt; Elliott, Glenn; Godowic, Paul; Hartley, Gary; Hickey, D.W.; Howell, Jack; Hunter, Vaughn; Hutson, James; Jones, Dick; Keller, Walt; Kennedy, James; Kinser, David Wayne; Lewis, Carroll; Mantooth, Billy; McManaman, Dennis; Megert, Russell; Merrick, Jim; Morris, Jerry; Pollard, Patrick; Putnam, Julian; Runion, Thomas; Saiz, Jimmy; Schramm, Bert; Smith, Berry; Smith, Benjamin; Stratton, Henry; Swearengen, Gordon; White, Pete; Wilhelm, Tom; Williamson, Norman.

It was an honor to have the opportunity to visit with these veterans and the volunteers who traveled with them and to show them a symbol of their dedication to this country and the democracy for which they fought. The willingness of the men and women in our military to put their lives on the line to protect our country and all of the freedoms we enjoy deserves our utmost gratitude and respect. I hope that their visit to Washington, D.C., and the Capitol was a small token of our appreciation for all they have given us throughout the years.

Colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and their families for their exemplary dedication and service to this great nation. I want to extend a significant thank you to the local communities, all of the volunteers, and America Supports You Texas for their extensive work in organizing this Honor Flight. This trip would not have been possible without all of the financial and emotional support of those people.

THE FUTURE OF ENERGY IN AFRICA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the 21st century, energy has become vital to modern societies. We no longer have to shop for food each day because refrigerators keep food cold and preserved longer—whether in our homes, in restaurants or during the process of trade. Cell phones, computers, televisions and other electronics require electrical power to allow us to lead more productive lives in the modern world. As we have seen in the current Ebola epidemic, it is necessary that medicines and plasma be kept cold so that they do not lose their potency.

It is both unfortunate and unnecessary that more than half a billion Africans, especially in rural areas, live without electricity.

Perhaps, the great irony is that Africa has more than enough energy capacity to join the rest of the world in utilizing modern technologies that require regular energy supplies. Ironically, 30% of global oil and gas discoveries over the past five years have been in sub-Saharan Africa. Yet currently, only 290 million out of 914 million Africans have access to electricity, and the total number lacking such access continues to rise. Bioenergy, mainly fuel wood and charcoal, is still a major source of fuel. Hydropower accounts for about 20% of total power supply in the region, but less than 10% of its estimated potential has been utilized.

A hearing I convened last week examined the current and prospective impact of U.S. government programs such as Power Africa and Electrify Africa, as well as private international energy projects.

Last year, Chairman ROYCE—backed by Ranking Members ELIOT ENGEL and KAREN BASS—and I introduced H.R. 2548—the Electrify Africa Act. This legislation seeks to build the African power sector—from increased production to more effective provision of energy. H.R. 2548 passed the House this past May, but has languished in the Senate ever since. If no Senate action is taken during the remaining days of this session of Congress, this legislation will have to be reintroduced next year.

Days after the Electrify Africa Act was introduced in the House, the Administration announced its Power Africa initiative and has committed up to $7.81 billion in various types of U.S. technical and credit assistance and other aid to build the capacity of the African power sector.

It seems that every few months, there is yet another discovery of petroleum or natural gas in Africa. Nevertheless, African countries remain net importers of energy, and the distribution of power from the many new sources of energy in Africa remains unfulfilled. This constrains trade and economic progress, social development and overall quality of life in Africa. Even now, one country—South Africa—accounts for two-thirds of Africa's electricity generation. All of Africa produces less than 10% of the energy produced in the United States.

Meanwhile, people across the continent are forced to meet their energy needs by gathering or purchasing charcoal or wood, often putting women in dangerous situations too far from home. Even when such fuels are safely brought back home, their use produces indoor pollution that too often contributes to sickness and early death.

The current situation cannot continue much longer. Even with 13% of the world's population, Africa represents only 4% of the world's energy demand, but this situation is changing. According to a report this year by the International Energy Agency (IEA), since 2000, sub-Saharan Africa has seen rapid economic growth and a rise in energy use by 45%.

We often speak of the rise in African economies, but for that rise to be truly realized, the rates of power generation and supply must match the growing demand for power. Those cell phones that are transforming all forms of commerce in Africa must be charged. The consumer goods the growing African middle class is purchasing need electricity. Africans are increasingly unwilling to accept the blackouts and power surges that have made life so difficult for so long. Africans who have traveled or lived elsewhere know this doesn't have to be their lot in life. In fact, even those who don't travel have seen how others live on their televisions—when power is available for them to operate.

During the colonial period in Africa, countries were limited in their industrialization, but that period is now long past. It must no longer be used as the reason why African countries are behind in the process of industrialization or power generation. Today, this lag in power generation is more due to inadequate or unrealistic regulation, lack of finance for significant power generation projects, underinvestment in power generation even when financing is available, the disconnection of rural populations from national and regional power grids, high costs for electricity and other factors.

These obstacles can be overcome, but they will require international and national collaboration, public-private partnerships and the will of governments and their citizens. We will not get to the point we believe is necessary overnight, but we will not get there at all if we do not take serious measures now and implement them faithfully and completely.

African people, like people everywhere, deserve the benefits that modern technology has produced. Africa has become a prized global consumer market, but that market cannot be fully realized without electricity. Anyone visiting stores in Africa can see the many modern technologies offered to African consumers today; they merely need guaranteed electricity for those goods to be useful.

With regular electricity, young students can not only study under electrical light, but also use computers to advance their studies. Homemakers can keep food fresh longer with refrigerators and can stretch household income farther. And hospitals can preserve blood plasma and medicines that can save lives.

The two panels at the hearing I held last week examined international and national programs to achieve regular, sufficient electrical power in Africa and private projects to add to the supply of energy on the continent. The future of energy in Africa is brighter than it has been in the past, but diligent actions must be taken now to seize the opportunities that lay before us.

HONORING LONE OAK UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lone Oak United Methodist Church, a congregation that has been an integral part of the Lone Oak community for generations.

The history of Lone Oak United Methodist Church can be traced back to 1854 when eleven charter members gathered in the private home of Ruffus Elliott at the Sabine Forks, west of Lone Oak, forming the Lone Oak Methodist Episcopal Church South. The members met in the home until 1858 when the church was moved to the Hunt School Building in Lone Oak where they continued to worship until 1871, when the congregation merged with the Hall Church.

The Hall Church, originally known as Hefner's School or Chapel, was a building constructed for the education of the children of the community, but was also available to the circuit riders and itinerant Methodist ministers and to the local Masonic lodge. Having been destroyed by fire in 1884, a new site was selected at 218 Main Street in Lone Oak. The Vernacular Gothic Revival church structure was completed in 1889 and continues to serve the congregation today.

In 1939, Lone Oak Methodist Episcopal Church South merged with other Methodist Episcopal and Methodist Protestants meeting in Lone Oak to form the Lone Oak Methodist Church. In 1968, with the merging of the Methodist Church USA and the Evangelical United Brethren Church, the church became Lone Oak United Methodist Church.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to congratulate the congregation of Lone Oak United Methodist Church for 160 years of fellowship and worship, and 125 years in their present building. May God continue to bless this congregation and their ministry.

H.R. 4012 AND H.R. 1422

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the last actions this chamber took before recessing for the Elections wasn't to act on Comprehensive Immigration Reform or pass a funding measure to avoid another Republican Government Shutdown. We didn't exercise Congress's constitutional role in debating issues of war and peace and take up an Authorization for Use of Military Force in response to the threat of ISIS. And we didn't address our nation's crumbling infrastructure by passing a long-term transportation bill.

Sadly, just as they did then, the most anti-environmental House majority is once again engaging in science suppression and denial simply because they disagree with the findings and the responsible actions taken based on those findings to protect public health and preserve the environment.

H.R. 4012, for example, is an attempt to tie the EPA's hands by restricting the information it can use in drafting safeguards. If passed, this bill would exclude a host of important data, including university research that is protected by privacy and confidentiality laws, as well as proprietary business information.

Not to be outdone, H.R. 1422 would weaken the EPA's advisory process and make it easier for special interests to be appointed to and influence the Science Advisory Board. Do we really want to have the impartial analysis of our nation's leading experts replaced by big corporate interests? What could go wrong with that?

Unfortunately, the public has grown accustomed to the House majority's repeated efforts to gut important environmental safeguards that protect public health. All told, my friends on the other side of the aisle have voted more than 200 times to block action to address climate change, to halt efforts to reduce air and water pollution, and to undermine protections for public lands, coastal areas, and the environment. The bills before us this week are more of the same.

This know-nothing approach fails the public we are sworn to protect and serve. As elected officials, we have to recognize the valuable role science must play in making good public policy. Not anecdotes . . . not false narratives . . . science.

I urge my colleagues to reject these bills, abandon this war on science, so that we can turn our attention to the pressing issues our country demands we address.

CONGRATULATING THE HONORABLE GREGORY C. PITTMAN FOR RECEIVING THE LIVING LEGENDS AWARD

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable Gregory C. Pittman and his commendable service to Michigan's Western District as a Muskegon County Probate Judge.

After graduating from Michigan State University with his Bachelor's Degree, Judge Pittman went to Indiana University to obtain his Juris Doctor. After receiving his law degree, he returned to his birthplace in Muskegon, Michigan. On January 6, 1998, Governor John Engler appointed Judge Pittman to the Muskegon County Probate Bench. Judge Pittman has now served the Muskegon County Court System for 16 years, and he currently serves as the presiding Judge of the Muskegon County Family Court. Judge Pittman also promotes the strengthening of Michigan families, and in 2001, was awarded the Michigan Family Forum's Champion of the Family award.

Throughout his career, Judge Pittman has been committed to serving his community, and this has led to him being active in many educational, social, and civic organizations. He has served as the President of the Muskegon Heights Public Schools Board of Trustees, as well as a Trustee of the Muskegon Area Intermediate School District. Judge Pittman currently serves his community in many other ways as well. He is a member of the Hackley Hospital Board of Trustees, and the Community Foundation for Muskegon County Board of Trustees. Judge Pittman is also a Fellow of the Michigan Bar Association Foundation.

For all of his work and commitment, on November 22, 2014, Judge Pittman will be receiving the Living Legends Award at the Muskegon BEAT Awards Ceremony. I want to congratulate Judge Pittman for receiving such a prestigious reward, and thank him for his service to Muskegon County and the state of Michigan.

HONORING DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues from the bipartisan Hellenic Caucus to recognize the 85th Anniversary this week of the Daughters of Penelope. Founded on November 16, 1929, this organization works to improve the well-being of women and afford them the opportunity to make important contributions to the United States.

The DOP is a preeminent international women's organization and affiliate organization of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA), the nation's leading association of American citizens of Greek heritage.

Since its founding, Daughters of Penelope has worked through its 250 worldwide chapters to promote the Greek ideals of philanthropy, education, and civic responsibility. Throughout its history, local chapters have identified pressing needs and developed solutions to make a difference in their communities.

Through DOP's sponsorship of affordable housing for seniors, domestic violence shelters in Mobile, Alabama and Brockton, Mass., and many other efforts, its members continue to embody the best ideals of citizenship.

As a co-founder and co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I have had the privilege to see the significant contributions of the Daughters of Penelope in the Greek American community both in New York and across the country. I am proud to say that DOP has lived up to its mission to contribute to the development of America through Hellenic ideals, and I look forward to its continued success.

HONORING NATHANIEL J. BRANCATO

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nathaniel J. Brancato. Nathaniel is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nathaniel has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities.

Over the many years Nathaniel has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Nathaniel has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending Nathaniel J. Brancato for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

FIGHTING EBOLA: A GROUND LEVEL VIEW

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the world community has known of the Ebola Virus Disease, more commonly called just Ebola, since it first appeared in a remote region near the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 1976. In previous outbreaks, Ebola had been confined to remote areas in which there was little contact outside the villages or areas in which it appear. Unfortunately, this outbreak, now an epidemic, spread from a village to an international center for regional trade and spread into urban areas in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone that are crowded with limited medical services and limited resident trust of government. The unprecedented west African Ebola epidemic has not only killed more than 5,000 people, with more than 14,000 others known to be infected. This situation has skewed the planning for how to deal with this outbreak.

In our two previous hearings on the Ebola epidemic, on August 7th and September 17th, we heard about the worsening rates of infection and challenges in responding to this from government agencies such as USAID and CDC and NGOs operating on the ground such as Samaritan's Purse and SIM. The hearing I held yesterday was intended to take testimony from non-governmental organizations providing services on the ground currently in the affected countries, especially Liberia, so we can better determine how proposed actions are being implemented.

In its early stages, Ebola manifests the same symptoms as less immediately deadly diseases, such as malaria, which means initial health care workers have been unprepared for the deadly nature of the disease they have been asked to treat. This meant that too many health care workers—national and international—have been at risk in treating patients who themselves may not know they have Ebola. Hundreds of health care workers have been infected and many have died, including some of the top medical personnel in the three affected countries.

What we found quite quickly was that the health care systems in these countries, despite heavy investment by the United States and other donors, are quite weak. As it happens, these are three countries either coming out of very divisive civil conflict or experiencing serious political divisions. Consequently, citizens have not been widely prepared to accept recommendations from their governments. For quite some time, many people in all three countries would not accept that the Ebola epidemic was real. Even now, it is believed that despite the prevalence of burial teams throughout Liberia, for example, some families are reluctant to identify their suffering and dead loved ones for safe burials, which places family members and their neighbors at heightened risk of contracting this often fatal disease when patients are most contagious.

The porous borders of these three countries have allowed people to cross between countries at will. This may facilitate commerce, but it also allows for diseases to be transmitted regionally. As a result, the prevalence of Ebola in these three countries has ebbed and flowed with the migration of people from one country to another. Liberia remains the hardest hit of the three countries, with more than 6,500 Ebola cases officially recorded. The number of infected and dead from Ebola could be as much as three times higher than the official figure due to underreporting.

Organizations operating on the ground have told us over the past few months that despite the increasing reach of international and national efforts to contact those infected with Ebola, there remain many remote areas where it is still difficult to find residents or gain sufficient trust to obtain their cooperation. Consequently, the ebb and flow in infections continues. Even when it looks like the battle is being won in one place, it increases in a neighboring country and then reignites in the areas that looked to be successes.

The United States is focusing on Liberia, the United Kingdom is focusing on Sierra Leone, and France and the European Union are supposed to focus on Guinea. In both Sierra Leone and Guinea, the anti-Ebola efforts are behind the pace of those in Liberia. This epidemic must brought under control in all three if our efforts are to be successful.

Last week, I, along with Representatives KAREN BASS and MARK MEADOWS of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, introduced H.R. 5710, the Ebola Emergency Response Act. This bill lays out the steps needed for the U.S. government to effectively help fight the west African Ebola epidemic, especially in Liberia—the worst-hit of the three affected countries. This includes recruiting and training health care personnel, establishing fully functional treatment centers, conducting education campaigns among populations in affected countries and developing diagnostics, treatments and vaccines.

H.R. 5710 confirms U.S. policy in the anti-Ebola fight and provides necessary authorities for the Administration to continue or expand anticipated actions in this regard. The bill encourages U.S. collaboration with other donors to mitigate the risk of economic collapse and civil unrest in the three affected countries. Furthermore, this legislation authorizes funding of the International Disaster Assistance account at the higher FY2014 level to effectively support these anti-Ebola efforts.

RECOGNIZING THE FIRST AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL ZION CHURCH, SAN JOSE FOR 150 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend the First African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, San Jose for 150 years of service, fellowship and stewardship to the San Jose community.

The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, the Mother Church, was founded in New York City, in October 1796. The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church was named the Freedom Church because it struggled mightily for the dignity and emancipation of Black people in America.

In 1864, the First African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, San Jose was founded in San Jose and has continued in the tradition of the Mother Church to fight for the dignity, emancipation and rights of all people and has been recognized by the City of San Jose as the oldest Black church in San Jose.

On November 23, 2014 the First African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church will celebrate 150 Years of service to the San Jose community and is planning for the community service demands of the future.

RECOGNIZING E. ROBERT CHAMBERLIN ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM SOURCEAMERICA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize E. Robert Chamberlin on the occasion of his retirement from SourceAmerica at the end of this year. Located in my district, SourceAmerica is a national non-profit that creates employment opportunities for people with significant disabilities. As Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Chamberlin leads a network of more than 500 affiliated non-profit agencies that participate in the AbilityOne Program, which currently provides employment to more than 128,000 people in the United States who are blind or have other significant disabilities. I, and more than 100 of my colleagues, are proud to partner in these efforts as AbilityOne Congressional Champions.

Mr. Chamberlin joined SourceAmerica as Vice President of Operations in December 1999, following a career with the U.S. Armed Forces, and he was appointed CEO in January 2001. During his Navy career, he achieved the rank of Rear Admiral and held key positions afloat, overseas, and ashore. Later, as the Deputy Director of the Defense Logistics Agency at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, he served as the Department of Defense's representative on the AbilityOne Commission, the Federal agency which oversees the AbilityOne Program.

Throughout his career, Mr. Chamberlin has been tireless in his efforts to improve the employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities. In addition to promoting the hundreds of thousands of individuals employed through

the SourceAmerica network, Mr. Chamberlin has provided critical leadership on a number of new employment initiatives, including the establishment of the Institute for Economic Empowerment, the Pathways to Careers Employment Initiative, and the AbilityOne Design Challenge for assistive technology. In addition, he has helped to expand SourceAmerica's outreach to the private sector through new partnerships with large corporations and franchise organizations. Those efforts are particularly important for preserving work opportunities given the current constraints on federal agency budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the distinguished military service and career accomplishments of Mr. E. Robert Chamberlin, and I want to personally commend him for his commitment to safeguarding the rights and opportunities for all Americans, especially those with significant disabilities.

HONORING JACOB P. COGLEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob P. Cogley. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1261, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending Jacob P. Cogley for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF FETHULLAH GÜLEN

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the exceptional work of Fethullah Gülen. Mr. Gülen has long stood as a pillar of peace and humanity and as a model for opposition in the face of rising dictatorship.

A respected member of the Pennsylvania community, Fethullah Gülen has worn many hats throughout his life. A vocal leader of the Turkish civic movement, Mr. Gülen has been forced to live in a self-imposed exile in Pennsylvania for fear for his safety.

The founder of the 'Gülen Movement,' Fethullah Gülen has long been a voice of reason in a world of turmoil. Widely known as a highly-respected leader, he has encouraged Turkish citizens to vote for those who are respectful to democracy and the rule of law, rather than one party or another. He has consistently promoted a moderate blend of Islam in a time of growing radicalism and is well known for his global network of educational establishments, extending to over 140 countries. His views promote a tolerant Islam, emphasizing hard work and education, as well as building bridges between the Muslim and Western world and science and religion.

While the global community looks to Turkey with both growing concern and enduring hope, it is my honor to commend Fethullah Gülen for his tireless efforts to promote the ideals of peace, democracy, an educated electorate, and the human rights of the Turkish people.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EARL SMITTCAMP

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Earl Smittcamp who passed away on the morning of October 20, 2014 at the age of 96. Earl's passion for farming and education exemplify the meaning leadership.

Earl was a prominent agriculture business leader. He alongside his wife Muriel, founded Wawona Frozen Foods which currently leads the industry in development and distribution of fruit and fruit products. A 1939 graduate of Fresno State, Earl recognized the value of hard work and education and spent his time giving back to his community.

Earlier in his life, Earl honorably served our country in the U.S. Marines Corps during World War II. Upon his return, he and his wife purchased her father's 200 acre fruit ranch. Their small business went on dominate the frozen food market, making Wawona Frozen Foods one of the oldest peach processors in the U.S.

Wawona Ranch flourished into a full agricultural operation ranging from fruit farming, packing, frozen-food production to food processing. Earl's sons Bob and Bill manage the business. The Smittcamp's success made a $2 million donation to Fresno State in 1997, possible. This generous donation helped establish the Smittcamp Family Honors College. The Honors College offers a rigorous academic program for top students. The Smittcamp Family Alumni Center was also later established and opened in early 2000.

In addition to his businesses, Earl also received the following government appointments: Sixth Acting Disaster Governor of California by Governor Ronald Reagan from 1966 to 1972, served on the California State Board of Agriculture from 1970 to 1972, was appointed by President Richard M. Nixon to the White House Conference on Food and Nutrition in 1969, served as chairman of the Federal Farm Credit Board in 1971, and finally in 1976 Earl was appointed to the U.S. Advisory Committee on Regulatory Programs.

In 1993 Earl's hard work was recognized by The Fresno Chamber of Commerce's Leon S. Peters Award. Other awards include Clovis' Outstanding Citizen in 1962, Fresno State's Outstanding Alumnus in both 1963 and 1980. In addition, Earl was inducted into the Frozen Food Hall of Fame in 2005.

Earl met his wife Muriel at Fresno State in 1940 and the two happily married. In 2009 he was preceded in death by his wife. They are survived by their four children and 14 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Earl Smittcamp. Earl's children, grandchildren, relatives and many friends have an outstanding role model that they will hold in their hearts forever. His presence will be greatly missed but his legacy will surely live through the Smittcamp family's deep commitment to supporting the community and the university.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,955,187,358,115.74. We've added $7,328,310,309,202.66 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $7.3 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING BEULAH LAND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ON ITS PLATINUM ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join the New Haven community and all of those gathered this evening in celebration of the 20th Anniversary of the Beulah Land Development Corporation—a remarkable milestone for this outstanding organization.

Dedicated to making a difference in a distressed community, the Beulah Land Development Corporation was founded in 1994 with a simple mission—to improve the quality of life for area residents through providing homeownership opportunities for families, the creation of affordable housing for seniors, and supporting innovative economic development initiatives. BLDC also seeks to empower community residents by providing or acting as a gateway to programs and initiatives that provide education, technical and financial assistance to repair and beautify their homes, improve their economic status, and prepare for a sustainable future.

Over the course of the last two decades, BLDC has invested millions in the revitalization of blighted properties. The Orchard Street Townhouses and additional revitalization of several properties along Orchard and Henry Streets have enabled first-time homebuyers to realize their dreams. The Walter S. Brooks Elderly Homes, named in honor of one of the founding members of BLDC, provides safe, affordable rental units for our seniors. Looking to the future, BLDC has recently worked to redevelop a brownfields site where they plan to

provide accessible community based health services.

Perhaps what is most special about BLDC is that it is a family affair. The Brooks family have been and continue to be dedicated community activists. Bishop Theodore Brooks and his late brother, Walter, seeing a real need, opened the doors of BLDC as a way to make a difference in the lives of their neighbors. Today, BLDC is still led by President and CEO Bishop Theodore Brooks and his son, Darrell, works tirelessly by his side. They understand that a home is not simply a place to rest your head—it is a source of comfort and security for families. By making these investments, they are not only leading by example, they are empowering residents and inspiring a renewed pride in and commitment to their community.

For their many invaluable contributions to the Dixwell neighborhood and the New Haven community, I am honored to rise today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Bishop Brooks, his son Darrell, the Brooks family and the staff and supporters of the Beulah Land Development Corporation as they celebrate the organization's platinum anniversary. I have no doubt that even as they celebrate this special occasion, their vision and leadership will continue to make a difference in our community and in the lives of others for many more years to come.

CONGRATULATING MERLE SIDENER ACADEMY FOR HIGH ABILITY STUDENTS, A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding school in my district that is being honored as a 2014 National Blue Ribbon School. It is a pleasure to congratulate the Merle Sidener Academy for High Ability Students in Indianapolis, Indiana in celebration of this special occasion.

The National Blue Ribbon designation, given by the U.S. Department of Education, is awarded to both public and private schools across our great nation. Started by President Reagan and given annually since 1982, the award celebrates great American schools that achieve very high learning standards or are making significant improvements in the academic achievements of their students. In my district and across the country, the award recognizes the great educators, students and parents who have worked so hard to ensure Indiana's children reach their full potential and achieve academic success.

For all of these reasons and many more, I am so proud that the Sidener Academy is receiving this prestigious designation. It is a wonderful acknowledgement of the school's commitment to providing young Hoosiers an exceptional education. While 420 schools nationwide received nominations, only 287 were chosen as National Blue Ribbon Schools, making this recognition all the more impressive.

Since opening its doors in 2008 as a magnet school for Indianapolis' gifted and talented students, the Sidener Academy has grown to nearly 400 students and offers a 2nd–8th grade curriculum. The school was named in honor of Merle Sidener, a prominent figure in the Indianapolis community. After making a successful career in journalism, Sidener eventually served as the President of the Indianapolis Board of School Commissioners.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I also want to acknowledge how important it is to our nation's future to encourage and raise a new generation of Americans who have the skills and knowledge to succeed both in and out of the classroom. Students like those at the Sidener Academy give me hope that we will accomplish this vital mission. Their outstanding work is an inspiration to students, educators and parents across the nation. Once again, congratulations to the Sidener Academy. I am very proud of you.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF JUSTICE MARVIN BAXTER

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Mr. NUNES and Mr. VALADAO to recognize Justice Marvin Baxter for his honorable service to the state of California. For decades, Justice Baxter served as a dedicated leader who willingly and unselfishly gave his time and talent to make our state a better place.

Marvin Baxter was born in Fowler, California on January 9, 1940. He grew up on his family farm as a second generation American. All four of his grandparents emigrated from Armenia in the early twentieth century. After graduating from Fresno State, he went on to the University of California's Hastings School of Law, where he earned his law degree in 1966.

Justice Baxter began his lifelong career in law in 1967 as a Deputy District Attorney for Fresno County. Two years later, he continued on at a private practice focusing on civil law. Justice Baxter worked with the firm Andrews, Andrews, Thaxter, Jones & Baxter for 14 years before he moved back to public service acting as Appointments Secretary to Governor George Deukmejian. In that capacity, Mr. Baxter advised the Governor on judicial and executive appointments.

After working in the Governor's office for five years, Mr. Baxter was appointed by Governor Deukmejian as Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal for the Fifth District. In 1991, he was appointed Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of California. Subsequently, in 2002, Justice Baxter was elected by the California voters to serve an additional 12 years as associate justice.

Throughout his career, Justice Baxter has been a part of many landmark decisions. He is known amongst his peers for being straightforward and clear headed in the courtroom. Colleagues will miss the most senior Supreme Court justice for sound feedback they could regularly count on.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that Mr. NUNES, Mr. VALADAO, and I ask our colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Justice Marvin Baxter for his service to the state of California. Although his time on the California Supreme Court has come to an end, Justice Baxter has made a lasting impression and we commend him for his hard work and dedication.

HONORING AIXA TORRES

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Aixa Torres, a tireless advocate for New York's working families. Born in Santurce, Aixa moved with her parents and sisters to New York City in 1955. Attending public school, she graduated from Central Commercial High School as a certified Bookkeeper. She has lived for over 50 years in the Lower East Side (LES) with her siblings Silvia, Aurea and Arthur.

In 1971, Aixa married the late George Carmona, Jr. and had two children, George III and Liza Noemi. She still lives in the LES with her daughter and grandchildren Mia Noemi and Elijah Michael Daniel.

Aixa has committed her life to caring for her community. For more than three decades she assumed leadership roles on numerous committees and boards for various organizations in the city including parent associations and Action for Progress Adult Day Care center. For twenty-two years she has advocated for District 1 families.

Aixa was elected President of Alfred E. Smith Resident Association in 2010, representing over 4,300 tenants in twelve buildings. Now serving her second term as president, Aixa has stood out as a courageous, committed and caring fighter for Smith residents. She has worked to end neglect and abuse by city agencies, helped stop attempts to develop luxury apartments on open spaces, while caring for residents in the crisis of Hurricane Sandy.

During her tenure as president she and the association have received citations from the New York City Council and recognition from the New York State Assembly and Senate for her work on behalf of Smith residents. Aixa was honored by the New York City Council Women's Caucus at the Inagural #WOMENLEAD Celebration.

Mr. Speaker, this month, Aixa will be retiring from her post as a District 1 Family Advocate. While she is leaving her position with the New York City Department of Education, anyone who knows Aixa recognizes she will certainly remain an active and welcome voice in our community. Today, I would ask all my colleagues to join me in saluting someone who has been a champion for New York residents and a stalwart defender of our city's families—Aixa Torres.

IN MEMORY OF RICK RICHARDSON

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American, a great Georgian, patriot, and personal friend—Rick Richardson, who passed away on November 14th from a sudden stroke.

Rick served the Georgia GOP for 25 years as the president and a national board member of the State Young Republicans, and 4th District chairman.

He had a tremendous impact on his fellow staff, the chairmen of the State Party, and all 159 counties in Georgia through his humble and hard-working attitude.

Rick was not only the party's ''go-to guy'' for history on any level but a great friend to all who knew him.

Rick's father and mother should take great pride in raising a son who touched many lives and will continue to do so in the days ahead.

In return, Rick, who lost his father at a young age, stayed by his surviving mother of 92, whom he cared for and loved.

Today, may we reflect on Rick's singular character and the tremendous work he did for Georgia, his family, and country.

Let us not forget him—a proud son, faithful servant, and example of what it means to be a selfless leader.

IRANIAN GOVERNMENT IS INHUMAN, BARBARIC, AND A TERROR ON THE IRANIAN PEOPLE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in Iran there is no freedom of speech or press. Criticize the government of Iran and you can be arrested, tortured, and even killed. The MEK, an opposition group that only wants freedom for the Iranian people, has seen that firsthand. Hundreds of its members have been executed for doing nothing more than protesting the government.

It isn't just political dissidents who are persecuted in Iran. There is no freedom of religion in Iran. If you are not a Shiite Muslim, you never know when you might be dragged off to jail.

Just like religious minorities, women too are treated like second-class citizens and denied basic human rights. Domestic violence, that evil tactic of cowardly men, is not illegal in Iran. In October, a string of acid attacks injured women deemed ''badly veiled.'' Again, the people rose up. But these protestors were also met with tear gas, violent beatings, and arrests.

But there's a remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, about repression: it cannot suppress the innate desire in all of us to be free.

In 2009, we saw the people of Iran fight against tyranny. Thousands of Iranians marched defiantly in the streets, protesting the fraudulent election of Ahmadinejad.

In response, police on motorbikes ran over protestors, fired tear gas, beat them with batons, tortured them, shot them. Over a hundred protestors were murdered in the 2 weeks that followed the election.

Today, President Rouhani would like us to believe that life in Iran has changed. The truth is that life in Iran has not changed. President Rouhani's words are empty lies.

The Iranians are freedom-loving people, and they deserve the basic human rights. Today, with this bill we tell the people of Iran that they do not fight alone. That we stand together with them against the Supreme Leader and all his cronies. And one day, hopefully soon, we will stand with them in Tehran to celebrate the downfall of the Iranian regime.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING HONORARY CONSUL BERJ K. APKARIAN

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Mr. NUNES and Mr. VALADAO to recognize Mr. Berj K. Apkarian upon his appointment as the first Honorary Consul of the Republic of Armenia in Fresno. This is a monumental occasion for not only Berj but for Fresno's entire Armenian community.

In 1979, Berj immigrated to Fresno, California, from Syria, and he has since been a very active member of Fresno's Armenian-American community. He is the Executive Director of Physician Relations at Community Medical Centers and is also a professor at California State University, Fresno, where he leads the Armenian Studies Program and the Center for Armenian Studies.

In 2009, the City of Fresno established a sister city partnership with the city of Etchmiadzin in Armenia. The partnership enhances the bond between Fresno and Armenia, and Berj was instrumental in forming the relationship. To further strengthen our city's ties with Armenia, the Honorary Consulate of the Republic of Armenia was established on August 14, 2014.

As Honorary Consul, Berj will continue to play an integral role in strengthening our Valley's relationship with Armenia. In addition to forming a stronger relationship with Armenia, Berj plans to take a team of medical professionals to Armenia to educate and provide healthcare services for residents living in rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that Mr. NUNES, Mr. VALADAO, and I ask our colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Mr. Berj K. Apkarian as he begins to serve as the first Honorary Consul of the Republic of Armenia in Fresno.

CELEBRATING PULMONARY HYPERTENSION AWARENESS MONTH

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join those celebrating the month of November as Pulmonary Hypertension Awareness Month and to thank the Pulmonary Hypertension Association for its work in furthering understanding of this life-changing disease.

Pulmonary hypertension (PH) is a chronic, complex, and life-threatening lung disease marked by elevated blood pressure in the lungs. The Pulmonary Hypertension Association (PHA) is a nonprofit organization that seeks ways to prevent and cure pulmonary hypertension and to provide hope for the PH community through support, education, advocacy and awareness. I am particularly proud of the work that the PHA Midwest Chapter is doing to provide support for people living with pulmonary hypertension and those who care for them. Their efforts to raise awareness and push for research into improved treatments and, ultimately, a cure are critical.

PHA is a young organization that is changing the history of this illness. From simple beginnings—four women around a kitchen table in Florida in 1990—PHA has evolved in size and complexity. When the association was founded, there were no support groups to help individuals and caregivers cope with this disease. Today, PHA serves more than 13,000 members and supporters with over 245 support groups that provide knowledge, support, hope and empowerment for the PH community. PHA continues to work every day to find a cure for pulmonary hypertension and believes that no one should face this disease alone.

On November 22, PHA Midwest and the PH community will mark Pulmonary Hypertension Month by hosting the inaugural O2 breathe Hearts PHor Hope Gala. The gala is an opportunity both to focus attention and to recognize the accomplishments and advances made in the PH field, while honoring those who made these advances possible. This special evening will honor Stuart Rich, MD, Clinical Professor of Medicine at the University of Chicago Medicine with the 2014 Heart PHor Hope Legacy Award. A dedicated researcher, passionate physician and continuous supporter of PHA, Dr. Rich has been a groundbreaking leader in the pulmonary hypertension field for more than three decades and continues to show his dedication and support of the PH community.

The PHA Midwest Chapter is a valuable resource, and I am grateful for the job that it is doing to raise awareness through next week's gala and the annual marathon, to provide assistance, and to push for greater research and medical breakthroughs.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MICHELE MARLENE VENABLE

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Michele Marlene Venable and extend my condolences to her family.

Michele, a resident of Florida's 23rd Congressional District and a long-time constituent of mine from the city of Hollywood, tragically passed away on November 8th after a battle with stomach cancer.

All of us that knew Michele could tell you that she represented the very best in our community.

She was dedicated to selflessly helping others, putting her community first, and empowering the most vulnerable.

She was a beacon of light for so many.

She will be tremendously missed, but never forgotten by our South Florida community.

I will remember Michele most for her work as Director of Social Services at the Jubilee Center of Broward County.

In this position, Ms. Venable coordinated delivering food, clothing, and vital personal

items to Broward County's homeless and needy.

She also worked to connect countless numbers of South Floridians with legal aid, veteran's services, Medicaid assistance, and emergency shelters.

She has capably led the Jubilee Center over the past decade and raised it to new heights.

It is worth noting that Volunteer Broward recently honored the Center as the ''Agency of the Year'' for all volunteer groups serving Broward County.

This is a tribute to Michele's tireless and fierce leadership.

She always demanded the best from herself and those around her in the service of others.

Poverty and despair can be powerful forces in society, but they certainly met their match when confronted by Michele's force of will to bring hope to others.

It is also not surprising that before her tireless efforts at the Jubilee Center, she served our community through her ministry work as a pastor.

Anyone who has ever worked with her will tell you that Michele was driven by an astounding love for people.

I and many of my Congressional District Office staff as well as my children, have had the honor of joining Michele every year to help the Jubilee Center serve Thanksgiving dinner to the less fortunate in our community—a job Michele did with grace and pride.

This year on Thanksgiving we will again gather to help our community—Michele Venable's community.

I am sure that we will all be missing Michele's warm smile and bright disposition.

But we honor her memory if we carry on her amazing commitment to helping those less fortunate in our community.

In this way her spirit of compassionate altruism lives on and inspires others to walk in her footsteps.

In this time of Thanksgiving, I give thanks for Michele Venable and a life well lived in service to our South Florida community.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE ANNUAL COWBOY CHRISTMAS COOK-OFF

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the annual Cowboy Christmas Cook-Off which takes place each December, in Mission, Texas.

The Cowboy Christmas Cook-Off is an International Barbeque Cookers Association state championship event; the occasion features a festive combination of good music and good eating, with proceeds benefiting the Silver Ribbon Community Partners, who provide emergency relief assistance and educational programs for seniors and individuals with disabilities.

Talented barbeque chefs from Texas face off to see who can cook up the tastiest brisket, pork spareribs, and chicken. The Cowboy Christmas Cook-Off is an exciting time for young and old alike and is a much-anticipated gathering for residents of South Texas.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize this celebration of Lone Star-style food and music and I thank you for this time.

RECOGNIZING JOHN HARRIS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. John Harris for being the recipient of the 2014 Agriculturist of the Year award from the Greater Fresno Area Chamber of Commerce. John has made countless contributions to California's agricultural economy, and his efforts deserve to be honored.

John was born into a family with strong agricultural roots. His parents grew cotton and grain on their family farm. John attended the University of California at Davis (UC Davis), and later, founded Harris Ranch. Harris Ranch is one of the leading producers of agricultural goods in the nation. His products include: almonds, pistachios, citrus, and various vegetable crops.

Under John's leadership, Harris Ranch has been a leading beef producer in California's Central Valley for years. Additionally, Harris Ranch is the largest cattle feeder ranch in the state, and it produces over 150 million pounds of beef a year.

Harris Ranch also breeds thoroughbred racing horses. This year, Harris Ranch received national media attention because of the racing horse champion, California Chrome.

John served as the president of the California Thoroughbred Breeders Association and is currently a member of the executive committee in the association. John is also a member of the California Horse Racing Board and served as a chairman in 2004, 2005 and 2009. He also is a member of the Jockey Club, and is a very dedicated man to the sport of horse racing.

John is an active community member, and he is a strong supporter of Saint Agnes Medical, the California Cattlemen's Association, and Western Growers Association. Additionally, he supports agricultural education and donates to UC Davis, California State University, Fresno, and the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask our colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Mr. John Harris. He is truly deserving of this recognition, and I thank him for all of the contributions he has made to California's San Joaquin Valley.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. MEREDITH CARTER FOR HIS 32 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the outstanding career and accomplishments of Dr. Meredith Carter. For more than three decades, Dr. Carter has served as an educator, nonprofit administrator, member of the Hamilton County Council and so much more.

Born on May 27, 1939, in Cutler, Indiana, Dr. Carter is a lifelong Hoosier. After graduating from Cutler High School, Dr. Carter earned both a Bachelor's and Master's degree in biology from Butler University. He then went on to earn an Ed.D. in Educational Administration from Ball State University.

Dr. Carter began his tenure on the Hamilton County Council on January 1, 1983. Since then, he has been a leading contributor to the exceptional economic growth and development Hamilton County has experienced. His leadership played a critical role in endeavors such as the building of the County Judicial Center, remodeling of the County Courthouse and the building of multiple transportation infrastructure projects.

Along with his academic achievements and 32 years as an elected official, Dr. Carter is a fixture in the Hoosier education and development communities. Dr. Carter taught for eight years in the public school system before completing a 38 year distinguished tenure as a professor, administrator and chancellor with Ivy Tech Community College. He also serves on the boards of JANUS Development Services, Inc and Aspire Indiana. JANUS is an organization committed to providing individuals with disabilities the opportunity to join the workforce and play an active role in their community. Aspire Indiana provides comprehensive community mental health services, working on issues ranging from youth and family services to helping people overcome substance abuse.

With these accomplishments and many more, it is clear to see that Meredith Carter has been a strong advocate for the people of Hamilton County and the State of Indiana. I am proud to represent a district with a legacy of dedicated public servants like Dr. Carter.

Dr. Carter has dedicated his life in service to Hamilton County, the state of Indiana and the United States. I join the entire Hamilton County community in thanking Dr. Carter for his service and congratulating him on a remarkable career. Although his tenure as an elected official is coming to a close, Hamilton County looks forward to many more years of having Dr. Carter as a key figure in the community.

NATIONAL CAREER DEVELOPMENT MONTH

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Career Development Month.

In conversations with businesses across my home state of Rhode Island, I have been hearing a constant refrain: Employers have job openings but are unable to find local, skilled workers with the expertise necessary to fill the open positions. Meanwhile, job seekers find it hard to acquire these skills without the proper training, a vicious cycle that continues to hold back our economy.

As Co-Chair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, closing the skills gap is one of my top priorities. In order to match students with the skills they need, I have introduced the bipartisan Counseling For Career Choice Act. This bill would help to make sure that school counselors and students know of the full range of options available to them post-graduation. By tracking

workforce trends and increasing collaboration between employers and educators, we can help students to make informed decisions regarding their career paths.

Comprehensive career counseling is a vital component of skills training and helps to better align school curricula with local workforce trends and available post-secondary opportunities. While not every job will require a college degree, some sort of postsecondary education will be necessary. Whether it comes from a community college, a skills training program, or on-the-job-training, we need to change what it means to be college- and career-ready. We need to provide students with the knowledge and experience that will truly prepare them for what's next.

However, we cannot neglect the skills gap that remains for people already in the workforce. Many workers need to learn new skills to advance their careers, and although they may not have the option to work with a school counselor, they can foster connections with career development professionals.

Across the nation, career development professionals help students to achieve their goals by providing professional development resources, scientific resources and advocacy. Each November, career development professionals celebrate the achievements of their clients with career-focused events and activities including the National Career Development Association (NCDA) Poetry and Poster Contest. In fact, this year marks the 49th successful competition, which is appropriately titled, "Reimagining Life's Possibilities: Celebrating First Jobs Through Encore Careers."

NCDA represents a broad range of members that provide career intervention and support services. Members include school and college counselors, One Stop Career Center counselors, Veterans Administration counselors, and private practice counselors, coaches and consultants. NCDA supports its members by providing research, advocacy and training. Last year, NCDA celebrated its 100th year of providing professional service to individuals seeking career advancement and success.

I would like to thank all career development professionals for their dedication to helping Americans improve their skillsets, find quality employment and achieve their professional and personal goals.

RECOGNIZING THE 55 YEARS OF SERVICE TO BARTLETT, IL BY MR. BILL "TIK" TIKNIS

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Mr. Bill "Tik" Tiknis, a resident of Bartlett, Illinois, in my Congressional district.

Bill Tiknis moved with his family to Bartlett in 1956 and dedicated his life in service to his community. Bill gave a remarkable 55 years of service in jobs including serving as Village President, Village Trustee, and the Founder and President of the Bartlett Chamber of Commerce. He was a volunteer Fire Fighter and later District Commissioner of the Bartlett Fire Protection District and was a Charter Member of the Bartlett Rotary and President of the Hanover Township Foundation. Bill's leadership in these roles left an indelible mark on Bartlett and has created a lasting legacy.

Apart from his time spent in local government, Bill helped organize youth football in Bartlett and created the Bartlett Park District. While he was Village President, he helped preserve a town landmark by working to purchase Bartlett Hills Golf Club with overwhelming support from the community. The Village now has a "Bill Tiknis Golf Classic" in his honor.

Recently, the Village of Bartlett has named the seventh of April as Bill Tiknis Day and Hanover Township Administration Center renamed their building the "Bill Tiknis Campus" at a ceremony attended by over 200 community members and leaders. He is a true living legend in the Village of Bartlett.

Mr. Speaker and Distinguished Colleagues, please join me in recognizing Mr. Bill Tiknis as a wonderful example of citizenship and service and wishing him much success in his next chapter.

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL WAR REVISITED

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Fresno Historical Society's Civil War Revisited celebration, taking place on October 18–19, 2014.

On September 29–30, 1990, more than 10,000 visitors in Fresno's Kearney Park were able to travel back in time to witness four battles between Union and confederate soldiers that originally took place in 1864 near Atlanta, Georgia. Three hundred volunteers from throughout California were sponsored by the Civil War Reenactment Society to assemble and act in authentic Civil War battles complete with cannon volleys, musket fire, rebel yells, costumes, and charging horses.

These volunteers were educated in depth about the lives of the characters they portray, leaving visitors with a broader view of the times and lives of people during the time period. Such authenticity allowed the audience, and over 4,000 students to learn firsthand, vivid history lessons from conversations with soldiers in the 1864 setting.

Over the 25 years of its existence, Civil War Revisited has grown to be one of the largest civil war reenactments in the Western United States. So much so, that it is often referred to as "an American history class for thousands."

In 2001, the event expanded by adding a school day program called "Time Travelers at the Civil War." This program allows students to interact with historical figures such as President Lincoln, Clara Barton, Walt Whitman and Harriet Tubman. Additionally, they are able to speak with military re-enactors to learn about life as a part of the war effort, but they are also able to speak to blacksmiths and dressmakers in order to get a glimpse into day to day life in the era.

A unique component of the school day program is a play, featuring a cast of students who bring the voices of children of the Civil War period to life, known as Readers' heater. Students often rehearse at school leading up to a performance during the Civil War reenactment. To date, the Time Travelers program has hosted 22,000 students from throughout the San Joaquin Valley since its establishment. This allows students to learn about history using a more interactive, unique perspective, as opposed to solely reading about the period in textbooks or watching videos.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the outstanding accomplishments of the Fresno Historical Society in its 25 years of excellence in accurately reenacting such an important point in American history.

THE DEDICATION OF A BUST OF VÁCLAV HAVEL IN THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today, Democrats and Republicans from both the House and Senate came together to dedicate a bust of former Czech President Václav Havel that will be displayed prominently in the U.S. Capitol building.

President Havel was both a playwright and a freedom fighter. His literary works artfully undermined the totalitarian Communist system under which Czechs languished from 1948–1989, and he co-founded the Charter 77 Movement that called out the Communist regime for human rights violations as well as the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted, which supported dissidents. He was among the leaders of the Velvet Revolution twenty-five years ago this month, which ended Communist rule and finally opened the door to democracy and freedom of expression.

To his credit, President Havel navigated the difficult process of fostering a democratic political culture in the Czech Republic's new institutions of government while instilling hope for the future in a people whose yearnings and optimism had been suppressed for a generation. In office, he oversaw the first free and fair elections in over four decades and worked to build friendly ties with nations that had been shunned by the Communist bloc. When he retired in 2003, the Czech Republic had developed a vibrant democracy, had joined NATO, and was on the cusp of entering the European Union.

Václav Havel died in 2011, but his legacy continues to inspire freedom fighters and democratic activists throughout the world. In an op-ed in the Washington Post earlier this week, Carl Gershman, President of the National Endowment for Democracy, wrote about Havel's affection for the United States and the values it embodies: "When he addressed a joint session of Congress just three months after the revolution, Havel spoke with deep feeling about his country's indebtedness to the United States, including for President Woodrow Wilson's great support for the founding of Czechoslovakia in 1918, U.S. sacrifice and leadership in three wars—two hot and one cold—to save freedom in Europe, and the American founding documents that 'inspire us to be citizens.'" President Havel's advocacy on behalf of dissidents and freedom fighters

around the world created a forceful, universalist legacy.

President Havel once wrote: ''The real test of a man is not how well he plays the role he has invented for himself, but how well he plays the role that destiny has assigned to him.'' Václav Havel passed that test in sharp contrast to another leader who today is failing it miserably.

Russian President Vladimir Putin came into office in 2000 with an opportunity and an obligation to help the people of his nation transition from the ills of Soviet Communism and foreign aggression to real democracy and peaceful coexistence with other nations. Sadly, over the past fourteen years he has sabotaged Russia's democratic transition by suppressing dissent, fostering a cult of personality, and pursuing violent and aggressive actions against Russia's neighbors.

This has been on full display over the past year in Ukraine, where one year ago courageous protesters gathered in Kiev's Maidan Square to reject Putin's attempts to pull their country closer into Russia's orbit and away from greater democracy and economic opportunity. The Maidan protests and the regime's violent response to them ushered in a new beginning for Ukrainian democracy, with free and fair elections held earlier this year. Unwilling to accept the decision the Ukrainian people have made about the future they want for their own nation, Putin's Russia has violated Ukraine's sovereignty by illegally annexing Crimea as well as sending troops and equipment across the border into southeastern Ukraine, much as it has done in the nation of Georgia.

Vladimir Putin could have used his leadership of Russia to meet the challenge history presented to him and his nation after the fall of Communism. Instead, he seeks to reverse the course of history through his desire to recreate an autocratic and expansionist Russian empire. Putin might have played the role destiny assigned him, but instead he crafted a character that will surely be remembered as one of the chief antagonists of our age—not only for the democratic world but for the Russian people who yearn to be part of it.

The world needs more leaders, philosophers, activists, and humble agents of positive change like Václav Havel, and not those like Vladimir Putin who subvert democracy and upend regional peace and security. I hope my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to President Havel and remembering his extraordinary contributions to his nation, to Europe, and to the world.

CONGRATULATING HAMILTON SOUTHEASTERN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, A BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an outstanding school in my district that is being honored as a 2014 National Blue Ribbon School. It is a pleasure to congratulate Hamilton Southeastern (HSE) Junior High School in Fishers, Indiana in celebration of this special occasion.

The National Blue Ribbon designation, given by the U.S. Department of Education, is awarded to both public and private schools across our great nation. Started by President Reagan and given annually since 1982, the award celebrates great American schools that achieve very high learning standards or are making significant improvements in the academic achievements of their students. In my district and across the country, the award recognizes the great educators, students and parents who have worked so hard to ensure Indiana's children reach their full potential and achieve academic success.

For all of these reasons and many more, I am so proud that HSE Junior High is receiving this prestigious designation. It is a wonderful acknowledgement of the school's commitment to providing young Hoosiers an exceptional education. While 420 schools nationwide received nominations, only 287 were chosen as National Blue Ribbon Schools, making this recognition all the more impressive.

Serving more than 1,200 students in the 7th and 8th grades, HSE is one of the largest junior high schools in Indiana's 5th district. The high level of performance displayed by HSE students is undoubtedly a product of the community's dedication to educational excellence.

As a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I also want to acknowledge how important it is to our nation's future to encourage and raise a new generation of Americans who have the skills and knowledge to succeed both in and out of the classroom. Students like those at HSE Junior High School give me hope that we will accomplish this vital mission. Their outstanding work is an inspiration to students, educators and parents across the nation. Once again, congratulations to Hamilton Southeastern Junior High School. I am very proud of you.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION AND THE WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN PROGRAM

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 40th anniversary of the partnership between the Economic Opportunities Commission and the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program. WIC provides care for women with low to medium income, who are pregnant or have a child who is less than five years old.

In 1968, CBS aired a documentary titled ''Hunger in America,'' that shed light on widespread malnutrition across low income communities. The following year, the White House formed a council to address the issue and a recommendation stemming from the council was to focus on providing nutritional food and education to low income pregnant women and children.

When the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 was amended in 1972, the WIC was authorized as a pilot program for two years. The EOC was one of the agencies participating in the WIC as a pilot program, and they issued the first WIC vouchers in the state of California.

In 1975, the EOC established WIC as a permanent program based on the premise that early intervention during critical times of growth and development can help prevent future medical and developmental problems. The Women, Infants, and Children Supplemental Nutrition Program is a federally-funded health and nutrition program for women who are pregnant, breastfeeding, post-partum and children under 5 years.

Throughout the years, the caseload of the EOC WIC has steadily risen to its present high of 37,500 participants. WIC consists of 72 staff members made up of Registered Dieticians, WIC Nutrition Assistants, Local Vendor Liaisons, Breastfeeding peer counselors, and administrative support staff.

The goal of WIC is to enhance the quality of life for women, infants and children by providing them with healthy food and the knowledge and opportunity to make healthy choices in an atmosphere of dignity and respect.

Women, Infants and Children has provided support for pregnant women, nursing mothers, and children under five years of age and their mothers for nearly 40 years, and they will continue to give them physical aid and knowledge to help improve the quality of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the outstanding work of the Women, Infants, and Children Supplemental Nutrition Program in providing aid and support to mothers and children who are in need.

REMEMBERING CARL E. SANDERS

HON. PHIL GINGREY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of former Governor of Georgia and Chairman Emeritus of Troutman Sanders LLP, Carl E. Sanders, and thank him for his service to country and community.

A Georgia native, Sanders excelled in athletics and attended the University of Georgia on a football scholarship. In 1943, he enlisted in the Army Air Corps to fight in World War II and served honorably as a B–17 Flying Fortress bomber pilot. After the war he completed his degree and entered the University of Georgia Law School. In 1947, he received his LL.B. degree, was admitted to the bar, and married Betty Bird Foy. They settled in Augusta, where their two children, Betty Foy and Carl Edward, Jr., were born.

Sanders's political career began in 1954 when he was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives, and again two years later when he advanced to the State Senate. In 1962, Sanders became the first Georgia Governor elected by popular vote. At the time, he was the youngest governor in the country at 37. He substantially expanded and advanced transportation and education, and supported the Civil Rights movement in a place and in a time where the movement wasn't as popular.

After leaving the Governor's office in 1967, Sanders founded the law firm now known as Troutman Sanders LLP, which has grown into an international firm with more than 600 attorneys. Sanders managed the firm for 25 years and continued to serve the firm as Chairman Emeritus and as a partner—who continued to come to the office most days until his passing.

Sanders was a role model and community leader, his colleagues and friends will always

remember Sanders as a mentor and inspiration to Georgians and Americans everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest condolences to Carl E. Sanders's wife of 67 years, Betty and the rest of his surviving friends and family during this most difficult of times.

THE U.S. AND UK HAVE A UNIQUE BOND ACROSS THE POND

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States and Great Britain have come a long way since we overthrew the tyranny of King George and claimed independence, liberty and freedom. Today, both of our nations stand for those three words.

From the Nazis to the Soviets, throughout the 20th century our two countries have fought those who wanted to take away freedom from others.

That fight continues today. Our troops spilled blood together fighting al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan. We oppose the mullahs in Iran that want to build a nuclear weapon and use terrorism to kill Americans and Britons in Iraq. We decry the anti-semitism at the UN. We beat back the aggression of the Russian bear. We fight for the freedom of the Internet. Pick almost any conflict around the world and Great Britain has our back.

We have nuclear agreements with lots of countries, but our agreement with the UK is the most comprehensive. That is fitting. It shows how deep our relationship runs.

H.R. 5681 would extend the U.S.-UK nuclear agreement, which has to be renewed every 10 years.

I am an original cosponsor of this bill because the UK is a strong ally of the United States. It is in the interest of the American people that the U.S. and UK continue to strengthen one another.

A RESOLUTION HONORING MONSIGNOR FELIX S. DIOMARTICH

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution:

Whereas Monsignor Felix S. Diomartich is the oldest priest in the City of Los Angeles and the Šibenik region of Croatia;

Whereas Monsignor Diomartich was born on November 2, 1914 in Zlarin, Croatia making him 100 years old;

Whereas Monsignor Diomartich is celebrating 77 years of service in the priesthood;

Whereas Monsignor Diomartich began his life's journey at the parish of Vodice as the Associate Pastor;

Whereas Monsignor Diomartich earned two doctorate degrees theology and church law at the Gregorian University in Rome, Italy and obtained the title of the lawyer of the Sacra Romana Rota;

Whereas after Monsignor Diomartich came to the United States and served at three parishes in the Archdiocese of New York before he was invited to serve at St. Anthony Croatian Church in Los Angeles, California;

Whereas Monsignor Diomartich served for 36 years as an administrator and as a pastor at St. Anthony Croatian Church;

Whereas Monsignor Diomartich supported organizations such as the St. Ann's Altar Society for Women and the Holy Name Society for Men;

Whereas Monsignor Diomartich founded two new societies for American-born young adults called the Anthonians and the St. Anthony's Women's Guild;

Whereas Monsignor Diomartich's other accomplishments at the parish include the St. Anthony's Annual Picnic Festival, the building of a new rectory, and remodeling and expanding the original parish hall;

Whereas Pope Paul VI awarded Monsignor Diomartich the title of Monsignor in 1978;

Whereas the Croatian National Association and Foundation awarded Monsignor Diomartich with its Lifetime Achievement award in 2008;

Whereas although Monsignor Diomartich has retired from its administration, he continues to reside at the St. Anthony Croatian Church, helping with masses and confessions; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes that Monsignor Diomartich through his passion of spreading the word of God, has inspired and guided the residents of Los Angeles and has brought unity and pride to the Croatian community.

RECOGNIZING THE HOLY TRINITY ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC CHURCH OF FRESNO

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Holy Trinity Armenian Apostolic Church (Holy Trinity) of Fresno, California in celebration of their 100th anniversary. Holy Trinity's service and dedication to bettering the quality of life in the Fresno community deserves to be recognized.

The Holy Trinity Armenian Apostolic Church that stands today on the corner of Ventura and "M" Street was constructed in 1914. It was the first church ever built in the tradition of Armenian Church architecture in the United States of America. The gorgeous brick church was designed by Fresno's first Armenian architect, Lawrence Karekin Cone. Upon its completion, a handful of soil delivered from the Monastery of St. Krikor the Illuminator Erzeroum, Armenia, was placed in the infrastructure. Additionally, sacred objects from St. James Monastery in Jerusalem were brought as a symbol to bridge the church with the homeland and Holy Land. Holy Trinity is the first and oldest Armenian Church in the western United States. It was added to the National Register of Historic Places on July 31, 1986.

For the past 100 years, Holy Trinity has served the spiritual needs of Fresno's Armenian community. The church has a strong history of assisting the Armenian community by providing various services to those in need. Most notably the church was essential to the lives of immigrants fleeing from fear of genocide by the hands of the Ottoman Empire in 1915. The church continued these charitable efforts by providing aid and services to displaced persons during World War II, after the fall of the Soviet Union, and wars in the Middle East.

Holy Trinity works daily to build upon a strong community. The social hall, Sunday school building, and Fresno's first Armenian day school are all resources used by individuals to connect with one another and demonstrate their faith. Holy Trinity's goal to keep the Armenian Apostolic tradition alive through service to the Armenian and Fresno community is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Holy Trinity Armenian Apostolic Church of Fresno, California as they celebrate their 100th anniversary. Holy Trinity's outstanding history and service to the Fresno Community deserves to be honored.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 14, 2014 I was not present to vote on H.R. 5682, legislation approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. Had I been present for roll call No. 519, I would have voted "YES."

HONORING RAFFAELA CICARELLI ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to wish Raffaela Cicarelli a very happy 100th birthday! Rae, a cousin of my mother Luisa, has been a very special part of my family's life and today she joins my mom as a centenarian!

Rae's story is like that of many others of her generation. Born in Amalfi, Italy in November of 1914, her father left Italy for America when she was just a toddler. At the age of five, she, her mother and her uncle traveled to America to join him. Her family settled on Wooster Street in New Haven, Connecticut. Along with my grandparents, her parents ran Canestri's Pastry Shop above which both families lived.

Rae received her education at Dante and Columbus Schools in New Haven and when she was old enough to work, she was employed by Strouse Adler located in New Haven, making garment labels for brassieres and corsets. She worked at Strouse Adler for thirty-two years. And, much like my own mother, after working her day job, Rae would come home and work at the pastry shop as a sales person.

At just twenty-six years old, Rae married in St. Michael's Church in the heart of Wooster Square. After her wedding, she and her husband settled in a home on Lighthouse Road

and lived there for thirty-one years. She raised three children, two sons, Anthony and Albert, and one daughter, Joanne; and today she is the proud grandmother of eight and great-grandmother of another eight. After her husband passed away in 1979, Rae moved to Quinnipiac Avenue to live with her son.

When Rae was young, she enjoyed basketball and baseball. At 100 years young, Rae enjoys doing word search puzzles, and watching and listening to her television. She is involved in recreational activities such as exercise groups, special events, entertainment and playing games such as Bingo, Pokeno, trivia, Five-Card Bingo and more. She is very active and recreates independently, praying the rosary, and reading prayers daily.

Marking decades of hard work, this occasion reflects an important milestone in Rae's life. Over the years, she has witnessed remarkable changes and extraordinary progress—indeed, she has lived through some of the most exciting times on our nation's history. I am honored to call her family and very proud to stand today to wish Raffaela Cicarelli a very happy 100th birthday! My very best wishes for many more years of health and happiness.

RECOGNIZING PENNSYLVANIA STATE REPRESENTATIVE GENE DiGIROLAMO

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania State Representative Gene DiGirolamo of Bensalem Township has been honored for more than a decade of legislative work to combat drug and alcohol addiction in Bucks County and across our commonwealth. For his commitment, Representative DiGirolamo is being recognized by Steps to Recovery, a Bucks County behavioral health treatment center.

Amid rising problems of opiates, such as heroin, and abuse of prescription pain medications which have contributed to a sharp increase in drug overdose deaths, Representative DiGirolamo has remained an outspoken advocate in the fight against these trends.

His legislative advocacy led to Senate Bill 1182, the ''Good Samaritan'' law. This law includes provisions that give families and all emergency personnel access to the life-saving drug, Narcan, which is used to counteract the deadly effects of a drug overdose. In Pennsylvania, the law also allows fire and police personnel to have Narcan on hand for a drug overdose emergency.

Therefore, I congratulate my friend Representative DiGirolamo for his dedication, compassion and outstanding leadership and wish him continued success.

RECOGNIZING ERNA'S ELDERBERRY HOUSE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Erna Kubin-Clanin, proprietress and chef of Erna's Elderberry House Restaurant. Erna's Elderberry House is a small town treasure located in Oakhurst, California.

In 1982, Erna purchased a nine acre property for the restaurant. In the beginning, she had to overcome a few challenges, but in 1983, construction began, and the following year, the doors opened for Erna's Elderberry House. Now, on October 19, 2014, she is celebrating the restaurant's 30th anniversary.

Erna takes pride not only in the food she prepares, but also in the annual events that she holds, such as ''A Night in Vienna'' and Erna's signature ''Elderberry Harvest Dinner.'' These events, along with the delicious meals she prepares daily, are the reason why so many tourists from Yosemite National Park and the surrounding areas make sure to visit the notable restaurant.

Guests continue to return to the restaurant to experience the quality of food and service. Only the freshest and most pristine ingredients from local Central Valley farms are purchased for the unique cuisine that is on the menu. They also work with the Maitre'd Hotel to ensure flawless service and hospitality and with the Cellar Master to create an extraordinary wine list, which complements the menu each evening.

For more than fifteen years, the restaurant has maintained the Elderberry House Cooking School. It provides knowledge of the culinary arts to its patrons and transforms the restaurant into a creative arena where inspired cooks can develop their skills under the guidance of the executive chef.

Continuing upon her culinary dreams, Erna opened the enchanting Chateau du Sureau in 1991, the elegant Villa Sureau in 1999, and the magical Spa du Sureau in October 2005.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing 30 years of outstanding culinary experience created by Ms. Erna Kubin-Clanin. She has undoubtedly made lasting contributions to the San Joaquin Valley and the entire state of California.

BERGEN 350TH ANNIVERSARY GALA

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 85th Anniversary of the founding of the Daughters of Penelope, the leading international women's organization dedicated to promoting the ideals of ancient Greece. Founded, November 16th 1929 in San Francisco, California the Daughters of Penelope was established to improve the wellbeing of women through community service and volunteerism. Especially, I would like to honor the Daughters of Penelope District 5 who represent chapters in New Jersey for their tireless efforts to improve the lives of women across our great state.

Nationally, one example of the great work done by the Daughters of Penelope can be found in the Penelope House, a shelter for battered women in Mobile, Alabama. The Penelope House focuses on the prevention of domestic violence through education and public awareness. The Penelope House helps victims of intimate partner violence to gain social and economic independence through shelter, counseling, and advocacy.

Clearly, the Daughters of Penelope deserves our recognition and support as they continue to expand the opportunities, status and well-being of women and their families around the globe. Congratulations to the Daughters of Penelope on reaching such a milestone and I look forward to continuing to see the charitable efforts of such a dedicated group of people.

RECOGNIZING THE FRESNO AREA HISPANIC FOUNDATION FOR BEING NAMED 2014 CHAMBER OF THE YEAR

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fresno Area Hispanic Foundation for being selected as the 2014 Chamber of the Year by the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

The Fresno Area Hispanic Foundation (FAHF), a member of the national Hispanic Chamber, was selected from more than 200 chambers for their exceptional service and commitment to promoting and supporting Hispanic businesses in the region. The award was announced at the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce's national convention in Salt Lake City.

The Fresno Area Hispanic Foundation, led by President/CEO Dora Westerlund, was founded in 2001 by a group of business owners determined to find effective and engaging ways to address the needs of a dynamic and emerging population. The FAHF, which is the only Hispanic Foundation west of the Mississippi to own its facility—The Downtown Business Hub, has evolved into a one-stop shop that offers an array of resources ranging from networking opportunities to micro-loan programs. In addition, the FAHF offers bilingual workshops on small business lending and courses on business licenses, market research, operations management, and financial statements, to name a few.

The FAHF also has a very strong philanthropic presence in the San Joaquin Valley. Since its inception, the FAHF has focused on assisting underserved families in the region by providing academic scholarships and personal enrichment activities. Through their scholarship program, the FAHF has awarded more than $200,000 in scholarships, and their Lend-A-Hand program provides over 600 parents and 350 children with free food and toys during the holidays. Additionally, the Fresno Area Hispanic Foundation, in conjunction with the Mexican Consulate in Fresno, established the Plaza Comunitaria in 2003, which touches the lives of local children and families through the center's annual events and fundraisers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Fresno Area Hispanic Foundation for being selected as the 2014 Chamber of the Year by the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. Their unwavering dedication to the success and growth of Hispanic businesses in the San Joaquin Valley and their work to enrich the lives of local families is truly commendable. The Fresno Area Hispanic Foundation has served as a catalyst for economic

growth and sets the standard for Chambers of Commerce throughout the nation.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, November 20, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 21

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To continue hearings to examine Wall Street bank involvement with physical commodities, focusing on the extent to which banks and their holding companies own physical commodities like oil, natural gas, aluminum and other industrial metals, as well as own or control businesses like power plants, oil and gas pipelines, and commodity warehouses.

SD–106

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection

To hold hearings to examine improving financial institution supervision, focusing on addressing regulatory capture.

SD–538

DECEMBER 2

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert M. Scher, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities, Elissa Slotkin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, David J. Berteau, to be Assistant Secretary for Logistics and Material Readiness, Alissa M. Starzak, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army, and Admiral Harry B. Harris, Jr., USN, for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Commander, United States Pacific Command, all of the Department of Defense.

SH–216

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6107–S6162

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2940–2946, and S. Res. 583–584. **Page S6148**

Measures Reported:

S. 2917, to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases. **Page S6148**

Measures Passed:

Commending Jerald D. Linnell: Senate agreed to S. Res. 584, commending Jerald D. Linnell on his service to the United States Senate. **Page S6159**

Resignation of Senator Tom Coburn: Senator Tom A. Coburn, of Oklahoma, submitted a letter of resignation from the United States Senate, effective January 3, 2015. **Pages S6141–42**

Pepper Nomination: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin. **Page S6137**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 58 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 283), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S6137**

Sannes Nomination: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of Brenda K. Sannes, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York. **Pages S6137–38**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 55 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 284), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S6138**

Arleo Nomination: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of Madeline Cox Arleo, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey. **Page S6138**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 56 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 285), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S6138**

Beetlestone Nomination: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of Wendy Beetlestone, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. **Pages S6138–39**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 58 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. 286), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S6138–39**

Bolden Nomination: Senate continued consideration of the nomination of Victor Allen Bolden, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut. **Page S6139**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 287), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S6139**

Pepper, Sannes, Arleo, Beetlestone, and Bolden Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 2 p.m., on Thursday, November 20, 2014, all post-cloture time be expired, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations of Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Brenda K. Sannes, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York, Madeline Cox Arleo, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Wendy Beetlestone, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and Victor Allen Bolden, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, in the order upon which cloture was invoked; and that there be two minutes for debate prior to each vote, and all roll call votes after the first vote in each sequence be 10 minutes in length. **Page S6107**

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that following the vote on confirmation of the nomination of Victor Allen Bolden, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of James D. Pettit, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova, Pamela Leora Spratlen, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uzbekistan, Tamara Wenda Ashford, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years, L. Paige Marvel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years, Cary Douglas Pugh, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years, Ramin Toloui, of Iowa, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, Lisa Afua Serwah Mensah, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development, George Albert Krol, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan, Luis G. Moreno, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Jamaica, Donald Lu, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, and Brent Robert Hartley, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia; that there be two minutes for debate equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees, prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action or debate, on confirmation of the nominations, in the order listed; that any roll call votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; and that no further motions be in order to the nominations. **Page S6141**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Jon M. Holladay, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Agriculture.

Pages S6140–41, S6162

Maureen Elizabeth Cormack, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Pages S6140–41, S6162

Allan P. Mustard, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Turkmenistan. **Pages S6140–41, S6162**

Earl Robert Miller, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Botswana.

Pages S6140–41, S6162

Judith Beth Cefkin, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, and Tuvalu.

Pages S6140–41, S6162

Robert T. Yamate, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Madagascar, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Union of the Comoros.

Pages S6140–41, S6162

Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations. **Pages S6140–41, S6162**

Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations. **Pages S6140–41, S6162**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Mark R. Rosekind, of California, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Matthew Stuart Butler, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term expiring December 12, 2015.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

A routine list in the Army. **Page S6162**

Nomination Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

Myrna Perez, of Texas, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term expiring December 12, 2015, which was sent to the Senate on January 6, 2014. **Page S6162**

Messages from the House: **Page S6143**

Measures Referred: **Page S6143**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S6143**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6143–48**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6148**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6148–49**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6149–57**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6142–43**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6157–58**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S6158**

Privileges of the Floor: **Pages S6158–59**

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—287) **Pages S6137–39**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:11 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 20, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6159.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Lourdes Maria Castro Ramirez, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Therese W. McMillan, of California, to be Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY AND THE MORTGAGE MARKET

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Housing Finance Agency, focusing on balancing stability, growth, and affordability in the mortgage market, including an update on Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Federal home loan banks, after receiving testimony from Melvin L. Watt, Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Antony Blinken, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of State, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE TO PUBLIC HEALTH THREATS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine preparedness and response to public health threats, focusing on how ready we are, after receiving testimony from Nicole Lurie, Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, and Tom Frieden, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, both of the Department of Health and Human Services; R. Gil Kerlikowske, Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection, and Kathryn Brinsfield, Chief Medical Officer, both of the Department of Homeland Security; Nancy Lindborg, Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, Agency for International Development; and David Lakey, Texas Department of State Health Services Commissioner, Austin.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2917, to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases;

H.R. 669, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life; and

The nominations of P. David Lopez, of Arizona, to be General Counsel, and Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member, both of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Adri Davin Jayaratne, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, and Mary Lucille Jordan, of Maryland, and Michael Young, of Pennsylvania, both to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine protecting our children's mental health, focusing on preventing and addressing childhood trauma in Indian country, after receiving testimony from Robert L. Listenbee, Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; Yvette Roubideaux, Acting Director, Indian Health Service, and Kana Enomoto, Principal Deputy Administrator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, both of the Department of Health and Human Services; Rick VandenPol, University of Montana National Native Children's Trauma Center, Missoula; and Verne Boerner, Alaska Native Health Board, Anchorage.

VETERANS' MENTAL HEALTH AND SUICIDE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine veterans' mental health and suicide, after receiving testimony from Harold Kudler, Chief Mental Health Consultant, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Colonel Elspeth Cameron Ritchie, USA (Ret.), District of Columbia Department of Behavioral Health, and The National Academies Institute of Medicine Committee on the Assessment of Ongoing Efforts in the Treatment of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Washington, DC.; Master Sergeant Vincent Vanata, USMC (Ret.), Wounded Warrior Project, Cody, Wyoming; Blayne Smith, Team RWB, Chicago, Illinois; Susan Selke, Katy, Texas; and Valerie Pallotta, Colchester, Vermont.

THE PRIVATE INDUSTRY AND PHONE SCAMS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the private industry's role in stemming the tide of phone scams, after receiving testimony from Steve Streit, Green Dot Corporation,

Pasadena, California; R.B. Rolling, International Communications International, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia; William Tauscher, Blackhawk Network Holdings, Inc., Pleasanton, California; and Lisa LaBruno, Retail Industry Leaders Association, Arlington, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 5737–5745; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 759–760, were introduced. **Page H8132**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H8133**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 2689, to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities, with an amendment (H. Rept. 113–627). **Page H8132**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Black to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H8073**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:33 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H8076**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

John F. Kennedy Center Reauthorization Act of 2014: H.R. 5448, to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; **Pages H8080–81**

STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014: 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; **Page H8081–87**

Providing for the approval of the Amendment to an Agreement for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes: 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; **Pages H8103–04**

Girls Count Act: H.R. 3398, amended, 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; **Pages H8104–06**

Condemning the Government of Iran for its gross human rights violations: H. Res. 754, to condemn the Government of Iran for its gross human rights violations; and **Pages H8106–10**

Malala Yousafzai Scholarship Act: H.R. 3583, amended, to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program. **Pages H8110–13**

Secret Science Reform Act of 2014: The House passed 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, by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 190 noes, Roll No. 528. **Pages H8087–H8103**

Rejected the Eddie Bernice Johnson (TX) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment by a recorded vote of 196 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 527. **Pages H8100–02**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–57 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H8097**

Agreed to:

Gosar amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–626) that mandates that the EPA make all scientific and technical information relied upon for rulemaking available online before proposing or finalizing new regulations. **Pages H8097–98**

Rejected:

Kennedy amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–626) that would have allowed the EPA to use all peer-reviewed scientific publications (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 526). **Pages H8098–H8100**

H. Res. 756, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1422), (H.R. 4012), and (H.R. 4795), was agreed to yesterday, November 18.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, November 20. **Page H8113**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8100, H8101–02, and H8102–03. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Committee Meetings

RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled ''Religious Accommodations in the Armed Services''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING MEDICAL PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT IN THE WAKE OF THE EBOLA EPIDEMIC

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled ''Examining Medical Product Development in the Wake of the Ebola Epidemic''. Testimony was heard from Robin Robinson, Director, BARDA, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response; Luciana Borio, Assistant Commissioner, Counterterrorism Policy, Food and Drug Administration; Rear Admiral Steve Redd, Senior Advisor for Ebola Response, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and Anthony Fauci, Director, National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health.

CYANOTOXINS IN DRINKING WATER

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled ''Cyanotoxins in Drinking Water''. Testimony was heard from Craig W. Butler, Director, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency; Peter Grevatt, Director, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR A PRIVATE AND COMPETITIVE SUSTAINABLE FLOOD INSURANCE MARKET

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance held a hearing entitled ''Opportunities for a Private and Competitive Sustainable Flood Insurance Market''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a markup on H.R. 5648, to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. H.R. 5648 was forwarded to the Full Committee, without amendment.

NEXT STEPS FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY ON SYRIA AND IRAQ

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled ''Next Steps for U.S. Foreign Policy on Syria and Iraq''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the United States Secret Service''. Testimony was heard from Joseph P. Clancy, Acting Director, Secret Service. A portion of this hearing was closed.

COPYRIGHT ISSUES IN EDUCATION AND FOR THE VISUALLY IMPAIRED

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''Copyright Issues in Education and for the Visually Impaired''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on the following legislative measures: H.R. 1561, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make improvements to support facilities for National Historic Sites operated by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; H.R. 1785, the ''Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area Act''; H.R. 4220, the ''School District 318 Land Exchange Act''; H.R. 4668, the ''Point Spencer Coast Guard and Public-Private Sector Infrastructure Development Facilitation and Land Conveyance Act''; H.R. 4924, the ''Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Act of 2014''; H.R. 4979, the ''Red River Private Property Protection Act''; H.R. 5086, to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; H.R. 5176, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to retire coal preference right lease applications for which the Secretary has made an affirmative commercial quantities determination, and for other purposes; and H.R. 5699, the ''John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act''. The following legislation was ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1561, H.R. 4220, H.R. 4668, H.R. 5086, and H.R. 5176. The following legislation was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1785, H.R. 4924, H.R. 4979, and H.R. 5699.

VOLCANO HAZARDS: EXPLORING THE NATIONAL PREPARATION AND RESPONSE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''Volcano Hazards: Exploring the National Preparation and Response''. Testimony was heard from Charles Mandeville, Volcano Hazards Program Coordinator, U.S. Geological Survey; Tom Drean, Director and State Geologist, Wyoming State Geological Survey; Gordon Ito, Insurance Commissioner, State of Hawaii; Darryl Oliveira (via video conference), Director, Hawaii County Civil Defense; and a public witness.

EXAMINING DATA SECURITY AT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service, and the Census held a hearing entitled ''Examining Data Security at the United States Postal Service''. Testimony was heard from the following United States Postal Service officials: Randy Miskanic, Vice President of Secure Digital Solutions; Guy Cottrell, Chief Postal Inspector, Postal Service Inspection Service; and Tammy Whitcomb, Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General; Charles Hamby, Narcotic Enforcement Division, Prince George's County Police Department; and a public witness.

THE ROLE OF THE WHITE HOUSE CHIEF TECHNOLOGY OFFICER IN THE HEALTHCARE.GOV WEBSITE DEBACLE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled ''The Role of the White House Chief Technology Officer in the HealthCare.gov Website Debacle''. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE APPROVING AGENCIES IN ENSURING QUALITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR VETERANS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''The Role of the State Approving Agencies in Ensuring Quality Education Programs for Veterans''. Testimony was heard from Curtis L. Coy, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Opportunity, Veterans Benefit Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on the following legislative measures: H.R. 4720, the ''Medal of Honor Priority Care Act''; H.R. 4887, the ''Expanding Care for Veterans Act''; H.R. 4977, the ''COVER Act''; H.R. 5059, the ''Clay Hunt SAV Act''; H.R. 5475, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; H.R. 5484, the ''Toxic Exposure Research Act of 2014''; and H.R. 5686, the ''Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans Act''. Testimony was heard from the following Representatives: Walberg, Bilirakis, Walz, Collins of Georgia, and Culberson; Rajiv Jain, M.D., Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Health for Patient Care Services, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

SECURITY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine combating corruption in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe region, focusing on the link between security and good governance, including a need to build effective institutions and the important role played by civil society in combating corruption, after receiving testimony from Halil Yurdakul Yigitguden, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Coordinator for Economic and Environmental Affairs, Vienna, Austria; and Shaazka Beyerle, Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies Center for Transatlantic Relations, and Anders Aslund, Peterson Institute for International Economics, both of Washington, DC.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the Takata airbag recalls and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) recall process, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Subcommittee on Primary Health and Aging, to hold hearings to examine the pricing of generic drugs, 1 p.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine Wall Street bank involvement with physical commodities, focusing on the extent to which banks and their holding companies own physical commodities like oil, natural gas, aluminum and other industrial metals, as well as own or control businesses like power

plants, oil and gas pipelines, and commodity warehouses, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2520, to improve the Freedom of Information Act, H.R. 1447, to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and the nominations of Jorge Luis Alonso, and John Robert Blakey, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Allison Dale Burroughs, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, Jeanne E. Davidson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, Haywood Stirling Gilliam, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Amos L. Mazzant III, and Robert William Schroeder III, both to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Amit Priyavadan Mehta, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, Robert Lee Pitman, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, and Sarah R. Saldana, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: business meeting to consider the nominations of Matthew Vincent Masterson, of Ohio, and Christy A. McCormick, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission, 2 p.m., S–216, Capitol.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, November 20, Full Committee, markup on the following legislative measures: H.R. 2901, the ''Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013''; H.R. 5206, to allow Foreign Service and other executive agency employees to designate beneficiaries of their death benefits; H.R. 5241, the ''Crimea Annexation Non-recognition Act''; H.R. 5656, the ''Feed the Future Global Food Security Act of 2014''; H.R. 5685, the ''Rewards for Justice Congressional Notification Act of 2014''; H.R. 5710, the ''Ebola Emergency Response Act''; H. Res. 714, reaffirming the peaceful and collaborative resolution of maritime and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea and the East China Sea as provided for by universally recognized principles of international law, and reaffirming the strong support of the United States Government for freedom of navigation and other internationally lawful uses of sea and airspace in the Asia-Pacific region; and H. Res. 758, strongly condemning the actions of the Russian Federation, under President Vladimir Putin, which has carried out a policy of aggression against neighboring countries aimed at political and economic domination, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

November 20, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled ''Examining What a Nuclear Iran Deal Means for Global Security'', 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, November 20, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, hearing entitled ''Is the Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge Being Properly Managed?'', 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, November 20, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, hearing entitled ''Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund: Inquiry into the Adequacy of Process in Verifying Eligibility'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, November 20, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Cybersecurity Threats: The Way Forward'', 9 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, November 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 2 p.m.), Senate will have a series of up to 5 roll call votes and a series of voice votes on confirmation of nominations.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, November 20

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 4795—Promoting New Manufacturing Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1634, E1636, E1638
Broun, Paul C., Ga., E1634
Byrne, Bradley, Ala.,E1629
Capps, Lois, Calif., E1629
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E1633
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1633
Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E1631, E1632
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1633, E1634, E1635, E1636, E1637, E1638, E1639, E1640, E1640
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E1636
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E1633, E1639
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1640
Gingrey, Phil, Ga., E1638
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1629, E1631, E1633
Hahn, Janice, Calif., E1639
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E1631
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1637
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E1631
Langevin, James R., R.I., E1636
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1632
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1631
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E1640
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1639
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1635, E1639
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E1637
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1635
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1630, E1632
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E1629
Thornberry, Mac, Tex., E1630
Tsongas, Niki, Mass., E1629
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E1634
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E1635

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.