



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2014

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 11, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM 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 1:50 p.m.

BIG BEND COUNTRY

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing efforts to highlight the 23rd District of Texas, I would like to talk about one of my favorite and one of the most rural parts of the 23rd District, the ghost town of Terlingua. Terlingua, the ghost town, is located near Big Bend National Park.

There are not a lot of ghosts there. There is a lot of history. There are very few people. The population is about 100 people or so. The name comes

from tres lenguas, which is Spanish for three tongues because three creeks flow together nearby. It was founded in the mid-1880s as a mining town after the discovery of cinnabar.

There are many things to do there every day. You can go rafting or kayaking on the Rio Grande, mountain biking, camping, hiking, motorcycling, and many, many other outdoor activities.

On the first Saturday in November, more than 10,000 chiliheads convene for two annual chili cookoffs, the Chili Appreciation Society International and the Frank X. Tolbert/Wick Fowler World Chili Championships.

In the 1970s, as a matter of fact, the chili cookoff also sponsored a Mexican fence-climbing contest to parody the U.S. government's plan to reinforce chain link fences along the U.S.-Mexico border.

The other interesting thing about Terlingua is the unique politics of Terlingua. Clay Henry, the first mayor elected, was elected in 1986. Clay Henry was a beer drinking goat, and he defeated a local dog. Some of his campaign posters are still around, and now, they are worth a lot of money.

I invite everyone to explore the beauty of the Big Bend Country and the beauty of the 23rd District.

OBAMACARE WILL LEAD TO DESTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a fundamentally unfair law that is hurting the middle class and lower-income Americans across the country.

In fact, just this week, the labor union Unite Here issued a scathing report on the President's health care law, charging ObamaCare will lead to the destruction of the health care plans for

their members and the like, and it will make inequality in our Nation worse.

Unite Here was the first labor union to endorse the then-Senator Obama in his race for President in 2008. So even one of the President's closest union allies has turned against ObamaCare because, as they report, it will hit the average, hard-working American where it hurts the most, in the wallet.

The President and congressional Democrats sold this law as something that would reduce health care costs for the American people.

It is completely unfair to force the people to participate in a program that doesn't live up to that promise. This law was supposed to help insure the uninsured; yet it has never been more unpopular among those without health insurance.

In fact, a recent Kaiser Family Foundation poll found that 56 percent of the uninsured have an unfavorable opinion of ObamaCare.

A recent McKinsey study found that affordability was the number one reason cited by the uninsured for why they aren't signing up. The uninsured who cannot afford ObamaCare are set to be hit with another cold reality of the President's signature health care law: they will be penalized for being put into this situation.

The President has the audacity to fine hard-working Americans for not being able to afford his costly and disastrous health care product. This despite the fact that he has exempted big business from ObamaCare, and members of his own administration do not have to purchase ObamaCare plans for themselves.

This kind of selective enforcement is unfair to low-income and middle class families. It is why, last week, my House Republican colleagues were joined by 27 Democrats to pass legislation to eliminate the individual mandate tax penalty under ObamaCare for 1 year.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2261

Through ObamaCare, the President is marginalizing the very people he says he wants to help, and now, even his closest allies have taken notice.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's labor union friends are right. ObamaCare is destructive to low- and middle-income families, and the politicians who are responsible for this train wreck must be held accountable.

OUR TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of men and women are in Washington, D.C., this week representing America's transit agencies, millions of transit users, with the highest ridership in over a half century: 10.7 billion rides.

Tomorrow, they will be joined by over two dozen streetcar cities. This is one of the fastest growing new development and transit tools that is taking place all across the United States. They are here seeking the Federal Government to step up and do its job.

For the first time in over 150 years, the Federal Government is in retreat on infrastructure. It all started, as you know, with the Constitution designating postal roads as one of the first obligations of our new country, and then we were involved with the development of a system of canals to help promote American commerce.

152 years ago, the Transcontinental Railroad Act was passed that ultimately tied America together from coast to coast and led to the finest passenger and freight rail system in the world.

Later, there were massive water projects in the West, electrification projects that brought the magic of electricity to rural and smalltown America. The interstate freeway system that began germinating under the administration of President Franklin Roosevelt during the Great Depression, blossomed into full flower, signed by President Eisenhower in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, we have established mass transit, with Ronald Reagan establishing a transit account, guaranteeing 20 percent of the gas tax revenues for that critical function and actually raising the gas tax a nickel a gallon, legislation signed by President Reagan.

And then there was the legislation in 1992, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, that promoted flexibility and a large-scale vision process to make the system work. Even the much-maligned Recovery Act, the so-called stimulus, had billions of dollars to help rebuild the country. But we have been stuck now for over a decade.

In 204 days, the bottom falls out of the highway trust fund, which means the Feds are going to have to cut back

on transportation funding this summer, which means this spring. State and local governments are going to be holding back.

I have been working with business, labor, and environmental leaders, local governments, AAA, the truckers, bicyclists, and contractors to be able to come forward with a funding program that will work. The first gas tax increase in 21 years is what we have proposed that would be indexed for inflation so we wouldn't have to go through this anymore.

In addition, H.R. 3638 would explore the new methodology that was used in an Oregon pilot project that would pay for road use based on a user fee for the distance traveled. It has the opportunity not just to fund transportation but to transform the travel system in the United States.

Congress needs to step up. What are their solutions if they don't want to raise the gas tax for the first time in 21 years? Maybe we could have a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on how we are going to finance the reauthorization.

We can, in fact, solve this problem. We can put millions of people to work to revitalize our communities and to make our families safer, healthier, and economically secure. When these men and women visit you on Capitol Hill, please be prepared to say: If not raising the gas tax, tell them what is your solution so that we don't fall off the cliff in 204 days and retard vital progress?

IN HONOR OF JOHN HENRY DAYTON

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

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of one of my constituents, John Henry Dayton, who passed away on February 9.

John was born in Turlock, California, to Charles and Florence Dayton. He was raised on a ranch in Hughson, California, with his three siblings. Mr. Dayton attended grammar and high school in Hughson and then Oregon State University. In college, he married Beverly Jean Tack. Together, they raised two children.

After college, Mr. Dayton moved back to California. In 1971, John and his business partner, Harold Copp, opened Oakdale Village Pharmacy in the city's first shopping center. Eventually, they opened additional pharmacies in Escalon and Modesto.

Mr. Dayton was later remarried to Susan Thorpe in 1995. Together, they raised two children.

Throughout more than four decades of business in the Oakdale area, John earned a reputation as a knowledgeable, personable, and trustworthy local pharmacist.

In November 2012, John was diagnosed with stage four brain cancer. He was preceded in death by his father,

Charles Dayton, and stepson, Kevin Cooper.

Madam Speaker, please join me in celebrating the life of Mr. John Henry Dayton and all of his contributions to his family and our community.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of a short workweek, we use this moment to be reminded of Your presence, and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this House to do their work as well as it can be done.

May they be led by Your spirit in the decisions they make. May their faith in You deliver them from any tensions that might tear the people's House apart, and from worries that might wear them out.

All this day, and through the week, may they do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation. Please hasten the day when justice and love shall dwell in the hearts of all people and rule the affairs of the nations of Earth.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEG0) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GALLEG0 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.

IRAN ARMS SHIPMENT

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, last week we once again saw what Prime Minister Netanyahu correctly described as “the true face of Iran.”

After Israeli Defense Forces intercepted an illicit shipment of rockets, bullets, and mortars reportedly bound for Hamas fighters in Gaza, Israel was able to publicly show how Iran continues to fund and supply terrorism across the globe.

This operation also demonstrated Israel's inherent right and need to defend its people and homeland from neighboring terror groups. Madam Speaker, while the administration is quick to negotiate terms of a nuclear deal with the regime in Tehran, last week's event should serve as yet another stark reminder of whom this administration is really dealing with, but more importantly, whom they are choosing to trust.

While the face of the regime and some of their rhetoric has changed, Madam Speaker, it is clear that the Iranian regime's true intentions and end game has not.

MAYOR CLAY HENRY

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

Mr. GALLEGRO. Madam Speaker, earlier I was on the floor and I mentioned Clay Henry as one of the former elected officials in the district that I represent. I referred to him as the mayor of Terlingua; and you would think having grown up there and lived there all of my life, I would have remembered that he was actually at one time the mayor of Lajitas. Lajitas is a wonderful resort community in the Big Bend Country, right next to Terlingua. Perhaps I had too many visits with Mayor Clay Henry.

I will tell you that one of the most beautiful parts of the world and one that I urge everyone to get familiar with is the Big Bend Country of west Texas: the Rio Grande River, the canyons. It is an amazing place. I urge everyone to get familiar with that part of the world, as there is really nothing like it in the entire United States.

THE IRS SHOULD BE FORTHCOMING

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the American people have not received the answers they deserved from the IRS. Lois Lerner appeared before the Oversight Committee last week and again refused to provide any insight into her IRS actions in this case.

How can the President claim that there isn't even a “smidgeon of corruption” in the IRS targeting scandal?

The investigation is still ongoing. If the President truly believes that the IRS did nothing wrong, then instruct them to cooperate with our investigation.

If Lois Lerner truly did nothing wrong, which I doubt, then she should testify and lay the issue to rest. If, as the evidence suggests, the targeting of conservative groups was intentional, then what would be wrong with her explaining why she refuses to testify and continues to reassert her Fifth Amendment rights?

The American people deserve to know if their freedom of speech was abridged for political reasons and if this administration is dedicated to silencing those with opposing views. I call on Lois Lerner and the IRS to be forthcoming so we can ensure that this never happens again.

RECOGNIZING WORLD PLUMBING DAY

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

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Madam Speaker, today is World Plumbing Day. It is easy to take for granted that we can simply turn on a facet and enjoy clean water; however, we should not neglect the importance that clean water conveyance presents.

It is imperative that we keep improving water infrastructure through sound legislation to guarantee every citizen access to clean water. It is important to support and collaborate with groups such as the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials, who for almost 90 years have been developing codes and standards that are used to protect systems around the world as well as ensuring America's public health for our communities.

On this World Plumbing Day, I recognize how quality, efficient plumbing systems and those highly trained professionals who work in the industry save our country money and precious resources while enhancing our quality of living, thereby keeping people safe and healthy each and every day.

VOTERS OPPOSE PATH TO CITIZENSHIP

(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. Madam Speaker, the American people continue to oppose amnesty, and they are putting their Member of Congress on notice.

A Washington Post-ABC national survey released last week shows that 39 percent of registered voters are less likely, and only 27 percent more likely, to vote for a congressional candidate who supports a path to citizenship for those in the country illegally.

There is even less support for amnesty among self-described Independents. Forty-one percent are less likely,

and only 28 percent more likely, to back a candidate for Congress who favors a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants.

Considering the media bias in favor of amnesty, these are astounding figures. According to the poll, a supermajority of Republicans, 60 percent, claim that they are less likely to support a candidate who favors amnesty. This stands in stark contrast to the meager 14 percent of GOP voters who want their candidate to confer citizenship on those here illegally.

We should listen to the voters, not amnesty proponents.

DECLARING MARCH 31 AS NATIONAL LINEMAN APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to extend a special thank-you to the hardworking men and women across the Nation, but especially in South Carolina, who dedicate themselves to keeping the lights on during this difficult winter. For so many of us, switching on the light switch is something that we take for granted. It is easy to forget all the hard work that goes into making that happen.

A couple of weeks ago, Winter Storm Pax hit South Carolina leaving a path of destruction in many of the smaller communities in my district without power, crippled by the ice and snow. It is something that was so dramatic that the executive director of the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff said that the storm was the most significant weather event in South Carolina since Hurricane Hugo. And I can assure you that, for us, that is saying a lot.

To give some quick numbers as to what happened, more than 3,000 people went to work in South Carolina. The folks from Duke Energy alone cleared more than 7,000 trees off of the power lines in South Carolina. It is these types of efforts that these folks put in every single winter to make sure that something that we take for granted actually happens when we flip on the lights.

In recognition of those efforts, the efforts that they undertake every single winter, I am introducing a bill today to declare March 31 as National Lineman Appreciation Day.

I hope we can count on my colleagues to send this very small thank-you. It is not much, but it is the least we can do to let these folks know that we don't always take them for granted.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL FROM REDDING, CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University Preparatory School from Redding for winning first place in the 2014 Regional Science Bowl competition.

The National Science Bowl is an annual competition sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy that brings together some of the best and brightest students from across our country. Teams compete in a face-off competition featuring questions on a range of science disciplines including biology, chemistry, earth science, physics, energy, and math. The event, while very competitive, also promotes and encourages discovery, innovation, and teamwork and a commitment to bettering our Nation's future.

We are very proud of all the north State teams that competed against dozens of California high schools for a chance to represent California at the National Science Bowl. Their interest and diligent studies in math and science are a testament to the outstanding work from our students, educators, and parents across our region.

Best of luck to Bond, Tyler, Nathan, Kay, and Colleen, who will be traveling to Washington, D.C., next month to compete against teams from across the country in the National Science Bowl. I know you will make us proud. Good luck.

EXECUTIVE OVERREACH

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again remind the President that it is Congress that makes the laws, not the Executive. It is time the President works with Congress, not around it, to achieve realistic policy goals to help grow the economy for hardworking Americans. They work hard and they play by the rules. We need an administration that does the same.

The President's willingness to go around Congress harms the balance between the branches that our Founders sought to protect. Furthermore, it makes both Chambers consider whether legislation they pass will be faithfully executed—all at a time when it is hard enough to come together on the very critical issues.

Governing by Executive fiat and acting as a Congress-of-one does little to restore the faith of the American people in their government. The businesses and families we represent deserve a government willing to work together.

Mr. President, it is time to stop the overuse of Executive actions and get back to the real work of growing our economy and making our Nation a better place for all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 10, 2014 at 2:19 p.m.:

Appointments:
Public Interest Declassification Board.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 11, 2014 at 9:45 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1917.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 11, 2014 at 10:45 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2019.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

TRANSMITTAL OF ADDITIONAL FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET DOCUMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-84)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United

States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I transmit herewith the following hard copy volumes of the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget: Appendix, Analytical Perspectives, and Historical Tables.

Sincerely,

BARACK OBAMA.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

FARMERS UNDERTAKE ENVIRONMENTAL LAND STEWARDSHIP ACT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 311) to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 311

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 "Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act" or the "FUELS Act".

SEC. 2. APPLICABILITY OF SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in implementing the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to any farm, shall—

(1) require certification of compliance with such rule by—

(A) a professional engineer for a farm with—

(i) an individual tank with an aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons;

(ii) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than or equal to 42,000 gallons; or

(iii) a history that includes a spill, as determined by the Administrator; or

(B) the owner or operator of the farm (via self-certification) for a farm with—

(i) an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than 10,000 gallons but less than 42,000 gallons; and

(ii) no history of spills, as determined by the Administrator; and

(2) exempt from all requirements of such rule any farm—

(A) with an aggregate aboveground storage capacity of less than or equal to 10,000 gallons; and

(B) no history of spills, as determined by the Administrator.

(b) **CALCULATION OF AGGREGATE ABOVEGROUND STORAGE CAPACITY.**—For the purposes of subsection (a), the aggregate aboveground storage capacity of a farm excludes all containers on separate parcels that have a capacity that is less than 1,320 gallons.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following terms apply:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **FARM.**—The term “farm” has the meaning given such term in section 112.2 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

(3) **GALLON.**—The term “gallon” refers to a United States liquid gallon.

(4) **SPILL PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND COUNTERMEASURE RULE.**—The term “Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule” means the regulation promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency under part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore, Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. **CRAWFORD**) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. **NORTON**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **CRAWFORD**. 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. 311.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Undertake Environmental Land Stewardship Act—or the **FUELS** Act—is an important piece of legislation that brings much-needed relief to the Nation’s agricultural community. H.R. 311 is a bipartisan bill that currently has 73 cosponsors from Members on both sides of the aisle.

It passed the House unanimously last Congress and again last year as an amendment to the farm bill. Additionally, this legislation has gained the support of more than 30 producer organizations, including every major farm group.

The EPA-mandated **SPCC**—or Spill Prevention, Control, and Counter-

measure—rules requires that oil storage facilities with a capacity of over 1,320 gallons make costly infrastructure modifications to reduce the possibility of oil spills.

These mandated infrastructure improvements, along with the necessary inspection and certification by a specially licensed professional engineer, would cost farmers tens of thousands of dollars.

The **SPCC** program dates back to 1973, shortly after the Clean Water Act was signed into law. In the last decade, it has come down harshly on agriculture, and the rules have been amended, delayed, and extended dozens of times, creating enormous confusion in the farming community.

On top of that, the EPA has failed to engage in effective outreach to producers and cooperatives on **SPCC**’s compliance.

The **FUELS** Act is simple. It revises the **SPCC** regulations to be reflective of a producer’s spill risk and their financial resources. The exemption level would be adjusted upward from an unworkable 1,320 gallons of oil storage to an amount that would protect small farms, 10,000 gallons.

The bill would also place a greater degree of responsibility on farmers and ranchers to self-certify compliance if their oil storage facilities exceed their exemption level. To add another layer of environmental protection, the producer must be able to demonstrate that he or she has no history of oil spills.

The University of Arkansas conducted a study, concluding that this bill would exempt over 80 percent of producers from **SPCC** compliance, saving up to \$240 million in costs in Arkansas alone. For the entire country, it could save small farmers up to \$3.36 billion.

The last thing the government should be doing is imposing an expensive regulatory burden on farming families. There is no scientific justification for such action, bolstered by the fact that the EPA cannot provide data or even anecdotal evidence of agricultural spills.

A 2005 USDA report found that more than 99 percent of farms surveyed haven’t experienced a single incident. In fact, one year after this report was published, EPA endorsed the 10,000-gallon exemption threshold I am proposing in this bill. Unfortunately, they moved the goalpost again a few years later.

By the nature of their occupation, family farmers are already very careful stewards of the land and water. No one has more at stake than those who work on the ground from which they derive their livelihood.

I urge support of the **FUELS** Act and our Nation’s small farmers.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. **NORTON**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern on consideration of H.R. 311.

This legislation would inexplicably weaken environmental safeguards against oil spills for one specific sector of our economy, American farms.

Under current law, any facility that stores certain quantities of oil is required to take precautionary steps to prevent the discharge of oil into U.S. waters. These requirements apply across the board based on the quantity of oil stored in the facility, which can range from an industrial facility to a service station to, of course, a farm.

These steps, outlined in the EPA’s implementation regulations, known as the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure—or **SPCC**—rule, require facilities put in place appropriate measures to prevent any spilled oil from entering the water, which can include both the construction of containment systems or more simplistic measures to capture small leaks.

The **SPCC** rule also requires such facilities to have a plan in place in advance that identifies additional measures to clean up any oil that might otherwise escape such containment. These provisions generally have been in place since 1974 and have been in force for farmers since May 2013.

Since that time, all farmers who fall within the guidelines of the **SPCC** rule should now have put in place appropriately scaled countermeasures based on the size of their facility and the likelihood of an oil spill reaching U.S. waters; yet H.R. 311 would modify the existing obligations for farmers to comply with the **SPCC** rule.

In many instances, H.R. 311 would alleviate existing **SPCC** obligations for farmers to develop oil spill contingency plans, especially for those farmers that store less than 10,000 gallons of oil in above-ground containers.

In summary, this bill would tell farmers that currently have these measures in place to stop taking precautionary efforts to prevent spills.

Why does this legislation make this change? Is it because the oil stored on farms is less likely to spill or to pollute U.S. waters than other facilities that store oil? There is no empirical evidence in the committee record that this is the case.

Is it because the oil stored on farms is any different from oil stored at other facilities? Again, the answer is likely no.

The stated reason for this legislation is that these safeguards simply cost too much for American farmers, but the reality is, for many farmers, many of these costs have already taken place, especially any capital costs that might have been required for containment structures.

So, in reality, many of the compliance cost concerns expressed in this bill may well be overstated, as annual compliance costs may now be reduced simply to cover periodic maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, again, I have concerns with this legislation, and I hope that, as we continue to work through this issue, we will come up with a more sensible way of addressing the protection

of our American farms, as well as the protection of our U.S. waters.

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

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2014.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Today, March 11, the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider H.R. 311, under suspension of the rules. This bill would decrease the oversight of oil storage and safeguards against spills at locations around the country for one class of facilities without showing that they are safer than other facilities with the same volume of oil.

H.R. 311 increases the amount of storage capacity that triggers various requirements under the spill prevention, control and countermeasure (SPCC) rules for any "farm," defined as "a facility on a tract of land devoted to the production of crops or raising of animals, including fish, which produced and sold, or normally would have produced and sold, \$1,000 or more of agricultural products during a year." Consequently, more operations will be subject to weaker requirements or will be exempt altogether, as compared to the safeguards currently in place.

Oil is no less harmful to waterways and the people and wildlife that depend on the nation's waters if it happens to be spilled at an agricultural operation. It is common sense that any facility located such that a spill could reasonably reach waterways and cause harm—including agricultural facilities—should take steps to prevent spills and plan to respond to those that occur. Coming so soon after the chemical and coal slurry spills in West Virginia and the coal ash spill in North Carolina, it is nothing short of astonishing that Congress would weaken protections that seek to prevent, plan for, and address spills that could contaminate drinking water supplies or harm aquatic life.

The changes that H.R. 311 would impose would weaken current protections enormously. Take for instance the provisions that exempt facilities from the SPCC requirements; under H.R. 311, agri-businesses with an "aggregate aboveground storage capacity" of oil of 10,000 gallons or less would be exempt, compared with 1,320 gallons under current law. That provision alone is troubling, but the bill is even weaker than it appears at first blush, as it would also change the threshold for storage containers that can be ignored in the calculation of aboveground storage capacity from 55 gallons to 1,320 gallons, so long as a facility has not had a history of spills. That would allow covered operations to avoid the SPCC planning and prevention requirements entirely by having an unlimited number of 1,319-gallon tanks on site.

Agri-business operations already have been given significant flexibility in meeting the SPCC requirements. They have had an extended period of time to comply with changes to the applicable provisions; other facilities have been subject to these requirements since 2010 or 2011, whereas agri-businesses with the requisite oil storage capacity were due to comply in May, 2013. Section 1416 of the March, 2013 continuing resolution, Public Law 113-6, later prohibited the use of funds to enforce this requirement until September, 2013. The rules also provide flexibility in developing plans for certain operations with smaller storage volumes and a good history with respect to spills. And EPA provided for individual extensions of the deadline under some circumstances. Given that the deadline has now passed for farms, it is hard to understand what H.R. 311 would accomplish, aside from allowing newly-ex-

empt operators to ignore the plans and procedures they have already developed, and rewarding those facilities that did not comply with the rules on time.

Congress should not gamble the nation's water resources for the sake of one industry. Please maintain sensible safeguards against oil spills and oppose H.R. 311.

Sincerely,

SCOTT SLESINGER,
Legislative Director,
Natural Resources Defense Council.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady for her comments. I would say that the 10,000-gallon threshold that we have described here is actually taken right from the EPA.

Up to 2005, they were perfectly comfortable with the 10,000-gallon threshold, so we are basically saying that we definitely want to work with the EPA and use the thresholds that they see as viable or that they did see up to that point.

The other thing is that, in agriculture, it is not a one-size-fits-all type of a scenario, where there are different scales of production and different levels of production.

Economies of scale are certainly better equipped and use lots more fuel on their farm, and so we are trying to implement some guidelines that do respect the financial resources as well as the size of the operation.

And, again, there is no empirical evidence that there have been any kind of spills that would warrant this level of regulation for farmers and certainly not to the degree that 1,320 gallons calls for, and that would catch up virtually every farmer in the United States.

What we are trying to do is to implement some common sense into this in a way that even the EPA has already agreed to in past rules; so I just would, again, urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. This will be, I believe, in total, the sixth time that we will have passed this out of the House.

Again, I think this is good common-sense legislation. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting H.R. 311.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 311.

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.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF VÁCLAV HAVEL

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 506) honoring the life and legacy of Václav Havel by directing the House of Representatives Fine Arts Board to provide for the display of a bust of Václav Havel in the United States Capitol.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 506

Whereas Václav Havel, former President of the Czech Republic, passed away on December 18, 2011, at 75 years of age, at his country home in Hrůčec in the Czech Republic;

Whereas Václav Havel is widely recognized and respected throughout the world as a defender of democratic principles and human rights;

Whereas through his extensive writings, Václav Havel courageously challenged the ideology and legitimacy of the authoritarian communist regimes that ruled Central and Eastern Europe during the Cold War;

Whereas Václav Havel, who was imprisoned multiple times by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia for his advocacy of universal human rights and democratic principles, maintained his convictions in the face of repression;

Whereas Václav Havel was one of the founders of Charter 77, a group of 242 individuals who called for the human rights guaranteed under the 1975 Helsinki accords to be realized in Czechoslovakia;

Whereas Václav Havel was a cofounder of the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted, an organization dedicated to supporting dissidents and their families which helped to advance the cause of freedom and justice in Czechoslovakia;

Whereas Václav Havel, as leader of the Civic Forum movement, was a key figure in the 1989 "Velvet Revolution", the peaceful overthrow of the Czechoslovakia communist government;

Whereas, on February 21, 1990, Václav Havel addressed a Joint Session of Congress where he stated, "Thomas Jefferson wrote that 'governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed'. It was a simple and important act of the human spirit. What gave meaning to that act, however, was that the author backed it up with his life. It was not just his words but it was his deeds as well.'";

Whereas following the Velvet Revolution, Václav Havel was democratically elected as President of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic in 1990, and after a peaceful partition forming 2 separate states, democratically elected President of the Czech Republic in 1993;

Whereas under the leadership of Václav Havel, the Czech Republic became a prosperous, democratic country and a respected member of the international community;

Whereas also under his leadership the Czech Republic became a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on March 12, 1999, and continues to be a valued ally of the United States;

Whereas during his lifetime, Václav Havel received praise as one of the world's great democratic leaders and was awarded many international prizes recognizing his commitment to peace and democratic principles;

Whereas, on July 23, 2003, President George W. Bush honored Václav Havel with the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian award of the United States Government, for being "one of liberty's great heroes";

Whereas after leaving office as president of the Czech Republic in February 2003, Václav Havel remained a voice on behalf of democratic dissidents worldwide and against authoritarian regimes; and

Whereas the legacy of Václav Havel inspires those that advocate and work for freedom from tyranny: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That to honor the life and legacy of Václav Havel, the House of Representatives Fine Arts Board shall provide for the display of an appropriate bust of Václav Havel in the House of Representatives wing of the United States Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the House resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 506, directing the House Fine Arts Board to place a bust of Václav Havel in the United States Capitol, which will serve as an honor of his exemplary life and legacy.

Václav Havel was a man of many talents and contributions to the world. He was a Czechoslovakian playwright, essayist, and poet.

Born and raised in Prague, during his formative years, Havel and his family were among the countless who fell under oppression when the Communists came to power and confiscated all their property; yet, still, he carried on, finding his way professionally working in the arts, but he knew he had more to give.

Havel's contributions to society are without measure. Havel used his gifts of the written word to rally his countrymen behind the true meanings of freedom and the need for the human spirit to break free from the clutches of the communist empire.

Within his well-known essay, "The Power of the Powerless," he insightfully pointed out how citizens under communist regimes were forced to "live within a lie." He stood as someone who would not be oppressed and served as a lead negotiator, actually, in what would be the end of more than four decades of communist rule.

Many remember him for his instrumental role in the Velvet Revolution, where he became a dominant figure in the final push for a democratic government.

Havel fought for his home, Czechoslovakia, with words and with ideas, and he aided the fight for the oppressed, and he won. Havel became a leader when his countrymen and women needed him the most.

He was so respected by his peers in Czechoslovakia that he was chosen to lead postcommunist Czechoslovakia first as an interim President and then was voted unanimously to become President of Czechoslovakia in December of 1989 by its Parliament.

□ 1545

In today's environment, it is somewhat awe inspiring that he was so respected that he was unanimously elected to President. You don't find that too often these days.

Six months later, Havel was elected as President at a popular election in July of 1990; and through his leadership and influence, Mr. Havel helped guide states from underneath the Soviet regime to their place in respected democracies in Europe. He helped bring down the Iron Curtain, and he aided his country's transition into a free market economy. He certainly deserves to be honored with his bust in this building that celebrates our own democracy and supports democracy, liberty, and freedom across the globe.

So I urge my colleagues to support the resolution. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 506, and I wish to associate myself with the words of the gentlewoman from Michigan, as well.

Václav Havel was an iconic defender of democracy, a protector of human rights, and an inspiration to people all over the world in their struggle to assert human rights as a universal freedom. His writings and his activism were essential in bringing democracy to a region long plagued by the authoritarianism of a Communist dictatorship.

In 1990, Mr. Havel was elected President of the former Czechoslovakia and later, in 1993, the Czech Republic. Under Mr. Havel's administration, the Czech Republic became and remains to this day a staunch ally of the United States. After his time in elected office, Mr. Havel continued to serve as a voice for the oppressed throughout the world and a champion of freedom until his death in 2011.

This bust of Václav Havel in the United States Capitol is a very fitting tribute because it is a tribute to an international leader and a man whose works helped to reshape the map of the world and the hope for freedom and human rights throughout the world.

I urge all the Members of this body to support H. Res. 506 unanimously, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who is the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as the author of this resolution, I rise today to honor the life of a rather extraordinary man, Václav Havel.

As we watch the crisis unfolding in Ukraine, I think it is important to reflect upon the life of the man who led the people of Czechoslovakia out from under the thumb of the totalitarian system he had grown up under, out from under the Soviet Union, and played a very key role in the founding of not one, but of two vibrant European democracies, one of them the Czech Republic and the other the Slovak Republic.

I remember a young Croatian journalist, with tears in his eyes, saying, if only we had had someone, someone like Václav Havel, when it came to the divisions in the former Yugoslavia. Because, as he stated, the ideals that Václav Havel had enunciated, political pluralism, tolerance, and democratic capitalism, the way forward, the same way forward as was broadcast by Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty—broadcasts, by the way that were never heard in Yugoslavia; we never broadcast there. But he said those themes managed, without the loss of a single human life, for Václav Havel not only to bring independence for the Czechoslovakian people, but then to set up a separate Slovakia and a separate Czech Republic after the referendum.

As a playwright, Václav Havel revealed the absurdity he lived under under communist ideology. He discredited—he discredited—the repressive Czechoslovak Communist regime, and following the brutal Soviet suppression of the 1968 Prague Spring, which was a movement for greater political liberalization, Havel was banned from the theater. Their attempt to silence him was to not allow his words to be heard. But instead, they greatly underestimated his passion for freedom, because instead of succumbing to their intimidation, Václav Havel became the voice and increased—increased—his political activity.

Havel played the central role in drafting the now famous Charter 77 Manifesto and was a founding member of the dissident organization based upon those very principles, and in 1979 he founded the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Persecuted. These and other opposition efforts earned him multiple stays in prison as a so-called guest of the Communist authorities.

But Havel and the cause of freedom prevailed. Following the successful Velvet Revolution of 1989, Václav Havel became President of Czechoslovakia, and that was by a unanimous vote of the Federal Assembly, and that ended 41 years of repressive Communist rule.

The following year, Czechoslovakia held its first free elections in four decades, resulting in overwhelming support for Havel to retain the Presidency. As leader of an independent Czechoslovakia, Havel presided over the peaceful separation of the Czech and Slovak Republics, a momentous and challenging task. As President of the Czech Republic, he paved the way for the country's entrance both into NATO and into the European Union.

A strong supporter of Radio Free Europe, President Havel invited this U.S. international broadcaster to move to Prague, offering the former Czechoslovak Parliament building as a headquarters for them. And when some questioned the broadcaster's role after the fall of communism, Havel stated:

We need your professionalism and your ability to see events from a broad perspective.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he might consume to the gentleman.

Mr. ROYCE. Havel's zeal for liberating oppressed people did not diminish in later years, when he continued to advocate for democratic reforms in places such as Belarus, Burma, Cuba, and Iran.

In reference to his role as a democratic activist, Havel simply wrote:

We never decided to become dissidents. We simply went ahead and did certain things that we felt we ought to do, that seemed decent for us to do, nothing more nor less.

The legacy of this freedom fighter serves as an inspiration for peaceful, democratic activists today. It is fitting, therefore, for us to pass this resolution and provide for a bust of Václav Havel to be displayed in the Capitol Building, the workplace of our great democracy. There alongside similar images of the great champions of freedom—Winston Churchill, Louis Kossuth, Raoul Wallenberg—his statue will remind future generations of the impact one man can have in the advancement and in the protection of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the original cosponsors of this resolution, as well: Majority Leader CANTOR, Minority Leader PELOSI, Majority Whip MCCARTHY, Minority Whip HOYER, Appropriations Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, ELIOT ENGEL, with whom I worked particularly closely in trying to advance the values of Václav Havel.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, we want to thank Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for introducing this resolution and promoting the idea of having a bust of Václav Havel in the U.S. Capitol. We completely agree with his motivation and the words that he has shared with us today.

With that, I urge unanimous support for this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would simply close by saying Václav Havel passed away on December 18, 2011, in the Czech Republic. He was 75 years old. And what an incredible life this man led, and I think certainly displaying his bust in the United States Capitol is certainly an appropriate and fitting tribute. So I would urge my colleagues, as well, to unanimously support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the extraordinary Mr. Václav Havel who died in 2011 at the age of 75.

Mr. Havel will forever be remembered as a defender of democracy and human rights in the former Soviet Union, having fought against communism and repression throughout the Cold War. Mr. Havel played a central role in the 1989 Velvet Revolution that ultimately paved the way toward democratic governance in the Czech Republic.

Mr. Havel went on to serve as the first post-communist President of the Czech Republic. His leadership and vision helped lay the groundwork for the country's prominent standing in our democratic community of nations.

I join my colleagues in support of this bipartisan resolution.

It is time that we honor Mr. Havel's legacy by allowing his bust alongside those of Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King, Jr., Raoul Wallenberg, Sir Winston Churchill, and Sojourner Truth in the U.S. Capitol. Their busts serve as a timeless celebration of some of our most cherished human rights defenders.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your support.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as we stand here today in this chamber as Members of the People's House sworn to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the ideals enshrined therein—freedom and democracy—it would only be fitting that we honor the life and legacy of a man who embodied those ideals.

Authorizing a bust of Václav Havel to be forever memorialized in these hallowed halls of the United States Capitol alongside some of the world's greatest voices for freedom, equal rights, and human dignity would be an apropos testament to a man who was a tireless advocate for liberty, human rights and for the right of self-determination for the people of Czechoslovakia.

It was Václav's unwavering commitment to his country and to democracy that inspired generations to rise up and break free from decades of communist rule.

But the fervor for which he opposed ruthless dictators wasn't limited to just Eastern Europe, but to wherever they may be.

His support of the people of my homeland, Cuba, meant a great deal and revealed Václav's true nature.

Václav advocated for the rights, dignity, and liberation of the Cuban people and created the International Committee for Democracy in Cuba in order to increase the visibility of the plight of the Cuban people and generate global support for freedom and democracy on the island.

I was honored to have authored the House Resolution in 2012 that celebrated the life and legacy of Václav Havel after his passing, and I stand here today to express my utmost support for H. Res. 506.

Every time we will see his bust in the Capitol will serve as a reminder that we must never give up the struggle against tyranny and oppression—and that is how we will forever honor the memory of Václav Havel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 506.

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.

CONDEMNING VIOLATION OF UKRAINIAN SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, AND TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 499) condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 499

Whereas the United States has been strongly committed to the sovereignty, democratic development, and prosperity of Ukraine since it secured its independence from the Soviet Union in 1991;

Whereas on January 29, 2014, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives agreed to House Resolution 447, supporting the democratic and European aspirations of the people of Ukraine and their right to choose their own future free of intimidation and fear, which resolution was agreed to by the House of Representatives on February 10, 2014;

Whereas the Ukrainian people have the right to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other countries and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

Whereas closer relations with Europe hold out the prospect of a more stable and prosperous Ukraine, which would be of benefit to all countries, including Russia;

Whereas the military intervention by the Russian Federation in Crimea is a violation of Ukraine's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity;

Whereas this military intervention is a violation of international law, including the Russian Federation's obligations under the United Nations Charter;

Whereas this military intervention is a violation of the Russian Federation's obligations under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which it pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine;

Whereas by its military intervention in Ukraine, the Russian Federation has violated the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act Declaration of Principles Regarding Relations Between Participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe;

Whereas the Russian Federation's military intervention in Crimea represents a reckless escalation of its long-standing efforts to pressure Ukraine through political, diplomatic, and economic means to reduce its ties to Europe and the West and force it into a closer association with Russia, including through the establishment of a Eurasian Union;

Whereas the Russian Federation has used and is continuing to use coercive economic measures, including the manipulation of energy prices and supplies, and trade restrictions to place political pressure on Ukraine and other countries in the region;

Whereas the Government of Ukraine has exercised extraordinary restraint to date in response to the use of force against it on its territory;

Whereas the instability in Ukraine has forced 230 Peace Corps volunteers to leave Ukraine; and

Whereas the immediate deployment of international monitors from either the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe or the United Nations to Crimea and in other Ukrainian regions would provide transparency and objective reporting regarding threats of violence and military activity, and regarding civil and political rights, and also enhance the security of the Ukrainian people in all regions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation;

(2) states that the military intervention by the Russian Federation—

(A) is in breach of its obligations under the United Nations Charter;

(B) is in violation of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which it pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine and to refrain from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine; and

(C) poses a threat to international peace and security;

(3) calls on the Russian Federation to remove all of its military forces from Ukraine's Crimean peninsula, other than those operating in strict accordance with its 1997 agreement on the Status and Conditions of the Black Sea Fleet Stationing on the Territory of Ukraine, and to refrain from interference in all regions of Ukraine, including by ending its support of separatist and paramilitary forces in Crimea;

(4) declares that the Ukrainian people have the right to determine their own future free from outside interference;

(5) commends the Ukrainian Government for its continued restraint and avoidance of military provocations;

(6) calls on the Ukrainian Government to continue to protect the rights of all minority populations within Ukraine and make clear that it represents all Ukrainian citizens;

(7) calls on all Ukrainians to respect the legitimate government authorities in all parts of Ukraine, including in eastern and southern Ukraine, as well as to respect all Ukrainian laws and the Constitution of Ukraine;

(8) calls for the deployment of independent monitors from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in Crimea and other areas of Ukraine;

(9) calls on NATO allies and European Union member states to immediately suspend military cooperation with Russia, including restricting sales to the Russian government of lethal and non-lethal military equipment that might be used to support further aggression in Ukraine or elsewhere in the region;

(10) calls upon the President and the leaders of other democratic states to boycott the G-8 summit in Sochi, Russia, to convene a G-7 summit in June 2014 outside of Russia that does not include Russia, and to consider expelling Russia from the group, given its record of international aggression, domestic repression, and human rights records that are inconsistent with democratic standards;

(11) calls on the Administration to work with our European allies and other countries to impose visa, financial, trade, and other sanctions on senior Russian Federation officials, Russian and Ukrainian oligarchs and others complicit in Russia's intervention and

interference in Ukraine, majority state-owned banks and commercial organizations, and other state agencies, as appropriate;

(12) states that the United States should participate with its European allies, other countries, and international organizations in a coordinated effort to provide the Ukrainian government with financial, economic, and technical assistance, including asset recovery, to assist a domestic economic recovery program that includes fundamental reforms and effective anti-corruption measures;

(13) calls on the United States, its European allies, and other countries and international organizations to provide assistance to ensure that new elections scheduled for May 2014 are free, fair, and in full accordance with international standards;

(14) calls on the United States and its European allies, other countries, and international organizations to develop a long-term strategy to support economic development and reform in Ukraine, including through enhanced relationships with Western countries, organizations and institutions;

(15) calls on Ukraine and European countries and former Soviet Republics to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy exports, including by promoting energy efficiency and reverse natural gas flows from Western Europe, and calls on the United States to promote increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency;

(16) supports efforts by Ukraine to achieve energy independence;

(17) supports efforts by Ukraine to improve transparency, combat corruption, and protect individual rights through an independent judiciary and strong rule of law; and

(18) affirms the right of all countries in the region to exercise their sovereign rights within their internationally recognized borders free from outside intervention and to conduct their foreign policy in accordance with their determination of the best interests of their peoples.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) 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 in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 499, a very important declaration of support for the people of Ukraine in this time of peril. This measure condemns Russia's unprovoked aggression in clear and in unmistakable terms. The U.S. has a strong interest in a democratic and prosperous Ukraine and a Ukraine with its territorial integrity intact.

I would like to take this time to recognize, also, Ranking Member ENGEL for coauthoring this bipartisan resolution, and I would also like to thank the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for their work to strengthen

this resolution at last week's markup where it passed unanimously.

This resolution is an important part of the larger effort to aid Ukraine and impose real costs on Russia, to give Russia something to weigh in the balance, something to take into account for its unacceptable action in the Crimea section of Ukraine.

Among other resolves, the resolution condemns the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation, and it declares that the Ukrainian people have the right to determine their own future free from outside interference.

Importantly, the resolution calls on the administration to work with our allies to impose visa, financial, and other sanctions, as appropriate. Russia's actions cannot go unchallenged.

To show Moscow how isolated its aggression has made it, world leaders are speaking out. Today, the House of Representatives is joining those voices. Ukraine's new government is confronting an economic and financial crisis brought on by years of mismanagement and corruption by previous government officials, and it is doing this while under military invasion and economic coercion by neighboring Russia.

The new government in Kiev cannot succeed without strong and rapid support by the international community. Last week, the House acted quickly on a loan guarantee provision. This is conditioned on Ukraine's undertaking fundamental economic reforms to stabilize its economy.

Addressing Ukraine's energy security must be part of our response here. While the United States recently became the world's largest producer of natural gas, Russia is still the largest exporter. Moscow freely uses its energy resources to advance its foreign policy goals, including by blackmailing countries which are dependent on Russia.

Russia has repeatedly used its natural gas to pressure Ukraine economically and politically. It recently announced that it will significantly hike its prices, a deliberate effort to squeeze Ukraine in order to worsen its current economic crisis and to control it politically.

Fortunately, we have a readily available option to help counter this threat, namely, reducing the current impediments to exports of American natural gas to Ukraine. While Vladimir Putin is selling oil and gas around the world, we still maintain major restrictions on selling our energy to all but a handful of countries.

We should end these self-imposed sanctions on our energy exports to Ukraine. This would undermine Putin's influence. It would bolster our allies throughout Europe and create jobs at home.

I urge all Members to support this important measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2014.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE, I am writing with respect to H. Res. 499, "Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H. Res. 499 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this resolution that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H. Res. 499 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this resolution or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H. Res. 499, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H. Res. 499.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 499, condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place our letters on H. Res. 499 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Judiciary as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2014.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H. Res. 499, "Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation," which was favorably reported out of your Committee on March 6, 2014.

As you know, H. Res. 499 has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. In order to expedite floor consideration of the resolution, the Committee on Ways and

Means will forgo action on H. Res. 499. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H. Res. 499, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: Thank you for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 499, condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this resolution or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place our letters on H. Res. 499 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the resolution. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on Ways and Means as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

□ 1600

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself whatever time I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support of H. Res. 499, a resolution that condemns the recent violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity by Russia.

I want to begin by thanking Chairman ROYCE for his leadership on this issue, as well as Ranking Member ENGEL, and for their introducing this resolution.

As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, I, along with Leader PELOSI and Whip HOYER and my colleagues on the Ukrainian Caucus and the Foreign Affairs Committee, have watched the developments in Ukraine with concern, particularly over the last 9 months.

Long before the Vilnius Summit and then-President Yanukovich's surprise announcement in November that he would not sign an Association Agreement with the EU, our administration noted with concern the pressure exerted over Ukrainian authorities to act against the interests of their own people.

It began with Russian threats of trade embargo and gas supply cutoffs in Ukraine if they signed the Association Agreement.

After peaceful demonstrators took to the streets in subzero temperatures,

chilling cold, risking their own well-being in Kiev to protest the decision, Russia threatened to withhold billions of dollars in promised financial assistance if Yanukovich did not crack down on it.

In mid-February dozens of peaceful protesters were tragically killed by Ukrainian special police receiving orders from then-President Yanukovich.

Now, under the most disingenuous of pretexts, Russian President Putin has ordered his troops to invade an independent, sovereign country in blatant violation of international law. Enough is enough. We must stand with the people of Ukraine at this critical moment.

The people of Ukraine, and the people of all countries in the region, and throughout the world for that matter, have the right to determine their own future free of pressure, free of threats. As Ukrainians attempt to chart out their own course, they should know that the United States stands with them and that we are committed to helping them build a more democratic, prosperous, secure, and just Ukraine.

Before I go any further, I would like to commend the administration, and in particular Secretary Kerry, Assistant Secretary Nuland, Ambassador Pyatt, and the women and men of our Embassy in Kiev, who have worked so tirelessly throughout this crisis to support the democratic aspirations of Ukrainian people.

I witnessed them work tirelessly during this effort, not letting 2 days go by without imploring the leadership in Ukraine to move forward. I noticed the Vice President interceding virtually 3 times a week in that same effort. So I welcome the administration's initial actions in response to Russia's invasion of Crimea, including the announcement of an executive order authorizing visa bans and sanctions on individuals and entities responsible for activities threatening Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

If Russia continues to refuse to pull back troops to its bases, there must be further consequences. These consequences must be severe, including trade and economic sanctions and expulsion from the G8. This resolution puts President Putin on notice that his reckless actions will have consequences. It calls on him to accept international monitors in Crimea and return his troops to its bases. It makes clear our support for meaningful assistance to Ukraine and to Ukraine's interim government.

Therefore, I call on all my colleagues to support this House resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on this issue in the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The situation in Ukraine continues to be grim. Now is the time to support

those who strive for democracy. Included in H. Res. 499 is an amendment I offered in committee to strengthen the language expressing the support of the House to work with our partners in the Ukraine to improve transparency, combat corruption, and protect individual rights through an independent judiciary and strong rule of law.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is an important first step, but there is more we must do to address Russia's violation of Ukraine's sovereignty.

I hope to work with the chairman and the ranking member to quickly pass a strong package of sanctions that targets those responsible for the invasion of Crimea and lets Russia know that annexation of Crimea or any part of Ukraine is not an option.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a leader and a voice for Ukraine's strong move to democracy, a person who is co-chair of the Ukrainian Caucus and a person who is committed to Ukraine and is one of the strongest voices here in the U.S. for that.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important resolution supporting the people of Ukraine and condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence by Russia.

Unified, bipartisan American support is needed now more than ever as the Ukrainian people and their freedom are under threat from Russian aggression.

Last week, the House spoke with one voice and took a critical step in support of Ukraine by passing a loan guarantee bill. This resolution is another positive step.

Mr. Putin's military incursion into Crimea is a blatant violation of Russian obligations under a number of multilateral agreements. It demands a strong response, and the administration and Congress have responded accordingly.

In addition to condemning Russia's military occupation to Crimea, this resolution supports the Obama administration's efforts to provide U.S. and international financial assistance to Ukraine.

It also supports the administration's work with our European allies to impose targeted financial, travel, and trade sanctions on Russian officials and institutions responsible for violations of international law.

The Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, which I cochair, has always operated in a spirit of bipartisanship with much success. This has been especially true since the crisis in Ukraine began, because supporting fundamental human rights and democracy in Ukraine and opposing illegal efforts by one country to dominate another, all of this should not be partisan issues.

In closing, I urge the House to once again speak with one voice in support of Ukraine and pass this resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his comments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important bipartisan resolution. I want to commend Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for bringing this measure forward.

The United States has been committed to Ukraine's prosperity and sovereignty since it gained independence in 1991. There has never been a more critical time to reaffirm this commitment than right now.

President Putin's unilateral decision to expand Russia's military operations in Ukraine was made with the calculation that the world would respond with words, not deeds. He was wrong. The world must send a clear message to Russia that there will be real consequences for these violations of international laws.

Failure to deter Russia's aggression will embolden President Putin to continue seeking illegitimate power and further threaten stability in this important region of the world. Just as importantly, failure to act would embolden bullies in other areas of the world who are no doubt watching.

This resolution calls for strong action by the United States, such as suspending military cooperation with Russia, boycotting the G8 summit, and imposing sanctions on those involved in this breach of international law. America should also take this opportunity to expand energy production and energy exports to send a clear message to Ukraine, Russia, and our allies that America will not allow Russia to use its energy resources to intimidate the world.

These actions are necessary to show Russia and the rest of the world that the United States will not sit on the sidelines when people are being used as political pawns by so-called leaders seeking to enhance their own power by the use of force.

I urge our colleagues to support this important resolution and demonstrate to friend and foe alike that America still stands for freedom and the ability of people everywhere to determine their own destiny, not have that destiny determined for them by threats, intimidation, and military might.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this is important, not just with what the resolution says; it is important how we say it as a country. We are gathered here today, and it is no surprise in this Chamber that from time to time we do not see eye to eye on issues. This important matter has brought both sides together, Republican House Members standing shoulder to shoulder with Democrats, joining with the other Chamber, the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans alike with one voice with the administration.

It was only a few weeks ago that I was in Munich and had the opportunity to sit down with Vitali Klitschko, who has been in the midst of all this move for democracy, and, tragically, in the midst of all the violence and killing that has occurred. He spoke with sincerity and passion over what his people are going through right now. He spoke about his country's need to be a free people with a rule of law, stamping out corruption and moving forward in a democratic fashion. He asked that the U.S. speak as well. With this resolution, we have the opportunity to speak in one united, loud, determined voice for democracy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the new Prime Minister of Ukraine will visit Capitol Hill tomorrow, and this resolution is a strong show of support in the House. It shows we will support the people of Ukraine as they try to build a democratic country, a country that is more prosperous, a country that is free of illegitimate outside influence. It also sends a clear message to the leaders and elites in Russia that annexation of territory in a neighboring state will not extend Russia's influence but will instead lead to political and economic isolation.

Let me also speak to the issue of Russia's state-controlled gas company, Gazprom.

□ 1615

They have just threatened to cut off supplies to Ukraine. This is not new. In the past, disputes over natural gas supplies and prices and debts have resulted in Russia shutting off the pipelines in Ukraine in January of 2006 and in January of 2009, not surprisingly, in the middle of the winter, when they would inflict the most damage.

These actions also hit several countries in Europe, which are heavily dependent on Russian gas that transits by pipeline through Ukraine. Those countries are Hungary, Poland, the Slovak Republic, and Romania. This shortfall would reverberate throughout Europe.

I believe it is very important that we pass this resolution out today.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentledady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for allowing me this time.

I want to commend the committee of jurisdiction for bringing this bill before our body in a very timely manner. I am very proud of our country, the standard bearer for liberty across this world.

We as a Congress, in this House in particular, are in the leadership role of standing up for people in another sovereign nation who seek to have the same freedoms that we enjoy. These freedoms are hard earned.

This resolution today, H.R. 499, allows Congress to take the next steps to our firm and continued commitment to Ukrainian sovereignty, territorial integrity, and democratic advancement so Ukraine can become the great borderland nation she is destined to be.

Additionally, H.R. 499 accompanies H. Res. 447, which this House passed on January 29 and on which those of us here on the floor today were original cosponsors.

The Russian Federation's military invasion of Crimea is a clear violation of every treaty and agreement to which she is a part, including her membership in the United Nations and its 5-member permanent Security Council.

Russia's action is not only a violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity, but also the 1994 Budapest Accord and a complete breach of obligations under the United Nations charter.

The United States continues to condemn those violations. We call on Russia to immediately withdraw all military forces from Crimea. No two nations should shed bloodshed anymore that have the histories of Ukraine and Russia.

We call on the Obama administration and our European allies to impose financial, trade, and visa sanctions in increasing severity on those in Russia responsible for this travesty.

I urge my colleagues to fully support House Resolution 499, and I wish to thank the Ukrainian Caucus founded by Members here today, especially Congressman SANDER LEVIN of Michigan, who has fought at our side for so many decades in word and deed for the freedom of Ukraine.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. ED ROYCE of California, for his continued leadership and vigilance, and Congressman BILL KEATING of Massachusetts for allowing me the time today.

Most Americans and people in the world don't know the full history of Ukraine, but no place suffered more in the 20th century than that place, through forced starvation of its own people by the then Soviet Union, by the Great Terror of elimination of millions of minority groups in its borders, by then the invasion of the Nazis and the German government a while later.

Over 14 million people were slaughtered or starved to death or assassinated or buried alive inside the boundaries of what we call greater Ukraine and Belarus. There is no greater moral obligation for the world community than to stand at Ukraine's side now in her fateful hour.

I am so very proud of our country for being a positive force to get a diplomatic resolution and a peaceful settlement so the world community can muster full strength to stop any further bloodshed. What a shame that would be in this 21st century, a century that should be one of democratic advancement and liberty for all.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

I also want to mention that it was just a few weeks ago, also, I met with Prime Minister Yatsenyuk, as well. We had time to discuss this issue. We had time to, again, recount the valor and courage of those people who took the streets and risked their lives.

It is worthwhile to note that the Prime Minister is in Washington this week, and we want to commend him for his efforts and stand beside him.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our minority whip, who has taken this action forward, who has spoken so loudly, and has provided great leadership on this issue.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Chairman ROYCE for bringing this bill to the floor and Ranking Member ENGEL, and my good friend from Massachusetts for his great leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this resolution. Hopefully, it will pass unanimously.

Russian forces continue to occupy Crimea in gross violation of international law and binding agreements signed between Ukraine and Russia in 1994 and 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I chaired the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe from 1985 to 1995. It was an extraordinary era, where the Soviet Union crumbled under the weight of its bad economic system and its political terrorism. It is starting to rear its ugly head again.

President Obama and Secretary Kerry have made it very clear—and we need to make it very clear—that Russia cannot interfere in Ukraine without serious costs; and when I say, “serious costs,” I mean exactly that, it cannot be empty words. It cannot be “you ought not to.” It needs to be “you must not,” and “we will not allow.”

Last week, the President proposed sanctions and travel bans against Russian leaders complicit in their military's intrusion into Crimea. If Russia were to annex Crimea, those costs would rise. A referendum has no legitimacy when there are military forces in the streets.

In any event, as I said, I chaired the Helsinki Commission. The Helsinki Final Act, passed in July of 1975 and signed by President Ford, said emphatically and explicitly that borders cannot be changed other than by political and peaceful means. Military incursion is not an option.

This resolution will send a powerful message on behalf of the American people. The people of Ukraine who want to build a future based on democracy and freedom will hear us and be strengthened by our support.

How do I know that? Because Vaclav Havel, the leader of Czechoslovakia, a Helsinki Final Act activist, spoke from that podium where the President of the United States gives the State of the

Union and said the Helsinki Final Act made an extraordinary difference.

Us speaking out will give courage and encouragement.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. Those who undermine that project and who threaten Ukraine's territorial integrity or its economic activity will hear us as well.

As I understand the 1994 agreement, Great Britain and the United States, two of the great powers in this world, said that we would protect and come to the aid of Ukraine when they gave up their nuclear weapons in consideration, in part, of that representation, made by us and made by the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to approve this resolution and send a strong and unmistakable message of solidarity with the people of Ukraine and of unity in defense of democracy in Ukraine and, indeed, throughout the world.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close.

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

In closing, just recounting the fact that so many of us in this Chamber have the opportunity to travel, to go to different countries, I must say that, each time I go, I will look at different countries, and I will look at the fact that there is no strong rule of law, I will look at the fact that there are no human rights protections, no protections against someone's freedom of religion, freedom of association, freedom of speech.

I come back to this country, and I kiss the ground that we walk on and take for granted daily.

I have looked at what has transpired in this region. I have looked at the way that laws were put in place in Ukraine and, fortunately, repealed that denied the right to gather together, that denied the right to speak up, human rights violations that I found to exist, too, in Russia, the country that is moving in such an aggressive manner towards Ukraine.

Since 1991, the United States has strongly supported a democratic, prosperous, sovereign Ukraine. In keeping with this commitment, we supported a peaceful, negotiated resolution of the recent crisis there and as hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian citizens came out in the streets of Kiev and throughout Ukraine to express their desire for a more democratic and just state, many of them risking their lives, too many sacrificing their lives.

The recent selection of a new interim government signaled that Ukraine was back on a path toward stability and political and economic health; but instead of gathering here to welcome this event, sadly, we are gathered, now, dealing with an international crisis in Crimea.

We must support Ukraine's efforts. Their efforts are our efforts. Their move for democracy is the staple of our own government.

I urge the entire membership to join with us, to join with Chairman ROYCE, to join with Ranking Member ENGEL, and the rest of this House on the resolution moving forward.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) for his work on this resolution, as well as our ranking member of the committee, ELIOT ENGEL of New York, and also recognize the long, hard work that Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio and Mr. GERLACH of Pennsylvania have put into their engagement on this issue with Ukraine.

I would also add that, if we do not recognize that Russia is using energy as a weapon, we are missing what is really going on in Eastern Europe and Central Europe. It was, in part, Ukraine's reliance on Russia's energy that pushed the now-deposed Ukraine President Yanukovich to abandon the trade deal with the European Union.

□ 1630

It was that attempt to pressure him, and he was tempted by promises of discounts on natural gas. He was pressured by the threat of turning off the valve on that gas. He was pressured to turn toward Russia instead of to the European Union. We believe that Ukraine should have the right to trade with Russia and with the European Union—to trade east and west and north to Poland and south to Moldova. This should be the decision of the Ukrainian people.

I believe the administration must do far more to isolate Russia diplomatically than it has to date and that the Treasury Department should also make clear that the U.S. is on the lookout for Russian enterprises, especially banks, that are involved in illicit activities such as the transfer of stolen Ukrainian assets.

We must remember that the purpose of our pressure on Russia is not simply to punish aggression and certainly not to escalate the confrontation but, instead, to move Putin toward a resolution that protects the independence and the territorial integrity of Ukraine. That is the goal that all of us share, and I urge all Members to support H. Res. 499 and to stand with the people of Ukraine.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the escalating situation in Ukraine. Russia's military occupation of Crimea is a blatant violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and a breach of international law. The United States and our allies must support the Ukrainian people and use all diplomatic and economic options available to address Russia's dangerous actions and unprovoked aggression. That is why I

strongly support H. Res. 499, a resolution stating that Russia must immediately withdraw its military from Ukraine, adhere to international law and respect Ukrainian sovereignty.

The people of Ukraine must be able to exercise their sovereign, democratic right to decide their own future without interference or intimidation from Russia. As a member of the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, I will continue working with my colleagues to explore options—including banking sanctions, visa bans and freezing assets of officials—to move President Putin toward a peaceful resolution that ends this crisis and protects Ukraine's rights and borders.

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. 499, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EQUITABLE ACCESS TO CARE AND HEALTH ACT

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1814) to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1814

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 "Equitable Access to Care and Health Act" or the "EACH Act".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION TO HEALTH COVERAGE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 5000A(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) ADDITIONAL RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Such term shall not include an individual for any month during a taxable year if such individual files a sworn statement, as part of the return of tax for the taxable year, that the individual was not covered under minimum essential coverage at any time during such taxable year and that the individual's sincerely held religious beliefs would cause the individual to object to medical health care that would be covered under such coverage.

“(ii) NULLIFIED IF RECEIPT OF MEDICAL HEALTH CARE DURING TAXABLE YEAR.—Clause (i) shall not apply to an individual for any month during a taxable year if the individual received medical health care during the taxable year.

“(iii) MEDICAL HEALTH CARE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘medical health care’ means voluntary health treatment by or supervised by a med-

ical doctor that would be covered under minimum essential coverage and—

“(I) includes voluntary acute care treatment at hospital emergency rooms, walk-in clinics, or similar facilities, and

“(II) excludes—

“(aa) treatment not administered or supervised by a medical doctor, such as chiropractic treatment, dental care, midwifery, personal care assistance, or optometry,

“(bb) physical examinations or treatment where required by law or third parties, such as a prospective employer, and

“(cc) vaccinations.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the amendments made by section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Just yesterday, a Washington newspaper headline read: “Worst Congress Ever.”

The thrust of the article was an indictment against Washington partisanship for its failure to move significant legislation on behalf of the American people. Now, to some degree, I suppose we have all felt at times that Congress just isn't making any laws. Of course, there are times, however, when Congress must make no law if we are to honor the oath we have sworn, which is to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Indeed, “Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

Today, we have the opportunity to work together, across the aisle, to reaffirm this founding principle of our democracy. Together, we will reinforce the constitutional protection for sincere believers of all faiths against the unnecessary entanglement of government with their private religious expression. H.R. 1814 slightly expands the religious conscience exemption of the Affordable Care Act to include individuals with “sincerely held religious beliefs” among those eligible for an exemption from the individual mandate penalty.

In order to qualify for the exemption under the EACH Act, an individual must affirm on an annual tax return that he or she cannot purchase coverage due to a sincerely held religious belief. This term, as defined by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and as widely recognized by

the courts, is designed to protect various types of religious believers, not just those who belong to a traditional, organized religion.

Today's bill must become law. Among the many problems with the Affordable Care Act, the current conscience exemption only protects the religious exemptions of a few select faiths. Now, I am fully aware that not every organization purporting to defend religious liberty is in favor of today's measure. I am, nevertheless, thankful that my good friend from the other side of the aisle, Mr. KEATING, joined me in this effort. His home State of Massachusetts incorporated a similar religious liberty exemption in their State law, and it seems to be working out just fine. Since the law passed, only 6,500 Bay Staters have claimed the conscience exemption.

This fact serves to reinforce the very principle of religious liberty we affirm today. The Constitution does not only protect the religious practices and beliefs of majority faith traditions, but, rather, the First Amendment protects even the smallest faith group and even the single individual against laws that infringe upon their sincerely held religious beliefs.

Yet H.R. 1814 isn't only about constitutional jurisprudence and legislative correctness. It is about real people in my district and in yours who feel that their free exercise of religion is encumbered under the current law. One of them is a constituent of mine named Andrew, who lives in Chillicothe, Illinois. Andrew is a sincere believer whose religious commitment leads him to pursue only nonmedical health care options. According to Andrew, under the current law, he will be required to pay a fine once the individual mandate penalty kicks in. Regrettably, Andrew's religious beliefs were not considered when the present conscience exemption was enacted.

Today, the EACH Act gives individuals like Andrew the ability to practice his religious beliefs without coercive government fining him for coverage he does not intend to use nor can he use and remain true to his most sincere religious beliefs. We recognize, however, that the immense unpopularity of ObamaCare among many Americans might entice otherwise law-abiding citizens to claim an exemption under the EACH Act in order to escape the law's penalty. In order to ensure that individuals do not game the system, this bill includes a strong provision that revokes the exemption and requires the individual to pay a stiff penalty if he or she seeks medical treatment at any point during that year.

H.R. 1814 walks that fine line between protecting the First Amendment for every American and safeguarding taxpayers against potential fraud. Congress has long sought to uphold both of these commitments, and, today, this bill affords us a bipartisan opportunity to do it once again. I urge my colleagues to support this important fix

to the Affordable Care Act and to pass H.R. 1814.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to 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. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this legislation carries important significance for some of our colleagues, and I respect that, but I want to express some real concerns about the bill because I feel it is overly broad. It could seriously undermine the Affordable Care Act and would establish a bad precedent for our tax laws.

The bill states that individuals would not be required to obtain health insurance coverage if their "sincerely held religious beliefs" cause them to object to treatments that would be covered. The bill does not narrowly define "sincerely held religious beliefs" as those of Christian Scientists or other groups who rely on a religious method of healing. As a result, the bill would force the IRS to either accept virtually all attestations of exemption or to determine which Americans' religious beliefs meet that standard. This is impossibly difficult to enforce, and, frankly, it is not a role we want the IRS to take on.

If the IRS chose to define "sincerely held religious beliefs" broadly, H.R. 1814 could allow, essentially, anyone opposed to the Affordable Care Act to opt out of coverage. That would lead to an increase in the number of uninsured Americans, and it would shift costs on to other taxpayers. Even if we assume the IRS could set a standard, there are significant problems with the legislation.

The bill claims that individuals receiving "voluntary" medical care would lose their exemptions, but the IRS has no way to monitor individuals' use of voluntary medical care, making this totally unenforceable. Furthermore, individuals receiving "involuntary" care, such as expensive emergency care, would be allowed to remain exempt from the coverage requirement, passing the costs of their care on to hospitals and other taxpayers.

I understand this is a sensitive issue. If religious groups that receive Medicare and Social Security benefits do not want to obtain health insurance, we need to examine that issue carefully. This bill should have been the subject of hearings. It should have been marked up in committee. Unfortunately, it was not.

The Affordable Care Act is about moving our Nation towards universal health insurance coverage. That is the right thing for the health of our Nation. So I believe we need to tread very carefully when opening up new loopholes or exemptions, and we must be very cautious before assigning such sensitive duties to the IRS.

Because of these concerns, I cannot support this legislation at the present time and in its present form. I hope our colleagues in the Senate will take a careful look at it and make substantial changes before considering it further.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend's comments from California. I would just remind the gentleman that this is a near carbon copy of language that was implemented in the State of Massachusetts. It has had a very minimal effect, and it has impacted and has helped a very small number of people. It is why this bill has received such bipartisan support and is on the suspension calendar here tonight.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), my good friend.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my strongest support to my friend Mr. SCHOCK's legislation, the Equitable Access to Care and Health Act.

Even some of the President's most ardent supporters now recognize that ObamaCare is a fundamentally unfair law, and I am happy to see that so many Democrats join us in support of this important bill.

Instead of having Federal bureaucrats decide who and what groups should be allowed religious conscience exemptions from this law's tax penalty, individuals, themselves, should be empowered to affirm their objections to this law's onerous and controversial mandates. That is what this common-sense bill would do, and I urge its swift passage to help protect Americans from the Obama administration's war on religious liberties.

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the distinguished gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1814, the Equitable Access to Care and Health Act.

One of our inalienable rights as American citizens is that we have the right to proscribe in whatever faith we so choose. With this right comes also the freedom from persecution and different treatment under the law. This body has long recognized the freedom of religion and has worked to ensure individuals of all faiths are treated fairly under the law. Even the Affordable Care Act, which imposes the burden of mandating the purchase of insurance, includes a religious conscience exemption from that individual mandate. However, this exemption is not fairly distributed to all Americans.

□ 1645

While covering many faiths, it doesn't cover all who seek protection. What the EACH Act does is to ensure that this exemption equally applies to

every American who wants it. It also protects individuals' First Amendment rights from being placed in jeopardy because of a requirement to purchase health insurance or pay a penalty.

This is commonsense fairness legislation that extends a fundamental right to all Americans that have religious objections to standard medical care. This is a chance for us to right a wrong that I believe was just a drafting oversight.

Of course, we ensure that the government doesn't impose a \$1.5 billion tax on Americans simply because of their religious beliefs.

I thank my good friend and colleague from Illinois on the Committee on Ways and Means (Mr. SCHOCK) for his leadership, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) for introducing this bipartisan legislation.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill and vote "yes" for religious freedom.

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

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend and neighbor from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman and my colleague from the great State of Illinois for introducing this important bill.

As somebody who has the only Christian Science college in the Nation in his district, this is a very important issue for religious freedom and religious rights.

Principia College in Elmhurst, Illinois, has 550 students. They sent me this card. They have much more artistic talent than I do. It says:

Thank you. We are so grateful for your defense of religious freedom and hope that you will continue to advocate for this bill until it passes.

This is the voice of those who need this exemption. This is the voice of those who need their religious rights protected. This is why I am standing here today with my colleague from Illinois to talk about this bill and making sure that it passes.

I would urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to respect the students and the faculty that work and attend this college in my district. I would hope that they would support this bill with us.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I respect very much the specific impetus for this bill. Unfortunately, though, there have been no hearings on this legislation, and it was not marked up in committee.

I would like to provide information on current law, on the scope of this legislation, and its potential consequences on our health care system.

This is why I do not support this bill in its present form.

First, it is important to note that the Affordable Care Act contains a religious exemption incorporating one that has been in the Internal Revenue

code since 1965. This provision permits an exemption to members of religion that join together to provide mutual aid as a community—for example, the Amish and Mennonite faiths—or participate in a health care sharing ministry, which is akin to insurance. These groups do not participate in government-funded social services, including Medicare or Social Security. This is a longstanding, well-defined, easy to implement exemption, and it was carried over to the ACA.

The ACA's minimum essential coverage requirement was challenged in Federal court under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. The court rejected the challenge, concluding that ACA did not impose a substantial burden on plaintiffs' religious exercise, despite claims that the plaintiffs "believe in trusting in God to protect them from illness or injury" and did not "want to be forced to buy health insurance coverage."

Second, a requirement to purchase minimum health insurance is not a burden on one's exercise of their religious beliefs in the medical treatment they seek. The ACA does not preclude coverage for spiritual healing or prayer treatments. Indeed, the Church of Christ, Scientist explains on their Web site that under current law:

Various U.S. Federal, State, and private health insurance plans provide for the reimbursement of Christian Science nursing care and practitioner treatment.

Christian Scientists participate in Medicare, and Medicare covers some Christian Science services.

It is the breadth of the language in the bill and the potential unintended consequences implementing it on a national basis that concerns me.

The language provides an exemption if a person files a sworn statement to the IRS that their "sincerely held religious beliefs" would cause them to object to the "medical health care" that would be covered under ACA's minimum essential health care requirement.

There is no indication as to how the IRS could implement this provision and, as a result, the exemption could essentially be available to anyone opposed to the ACA. While the bill states that individuals receiving "voluntary" medical care would lose their exemption, the IRS has no way to monitor individuals' use of voluntary medical care and to enforce this provision.

Under the legislation, individuals receiving "involuntary" care—such as emergency care—would be allowed to remain exempt from the coverage requirement, passing the cost of such care on to hospitals and other taxpayers.

Because the bill does not define the "sincerely held religious beliefs" an individual would need to cite to avoid purchasing coverage, the IRS would be forced to determine which Americans' beliefs met the standard. Yet just 2 weeks ago, the House considered and passed H.R. 2531, the Protecting Tax-

payers from Intrusive IRS Requests Act, that specifically prevented the IRS from asking taxpayers about their religious, political, or social beliefs.

I regret that normal order has not been followed on H.R. 1814 so that these concerns could be surfaced and further information on the broad and problematic consequences of H.R. 1814 considered.

For example, today, the American Academy of Pediatrics just expressed their concerns about the impact of H.R. 1814 on children. The American Civil Liberties Union also opposes the legislation, and the CBO just indicated today that the bill would increase the deficit by \$1.5 billion over 10 years and increase the uninsured by about 500,000 each year.

Current religious exemptions in the Tax Code are circumscribed and well-defined. This bill would create a broad and difficult to determine exemption in the individual responsibility requirement and force the IRS to take on an inappropriate role. Congress should take a more careful approach to this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would just remind my good friend from Michigan that had regular order been used when ObamaCare was passed, perhaps we would not be attempting to try and fix it now that it is law.

The U.S. Supreme Court upheld ObamaCare in a 5-4 ruling 2 years ago this summer. The Justices did so by affirming that Congress, contrary to the repeated assurance by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, had effectively created a tax that falls under the enumerated powers of article I of the Constitution, and, like a tax, compliance is mandatory, and enforcement is the job of the Internal Revenue Service.

Since the summer of 2012, we have learned some things about the IRS that raise concerns about the agency's ability to do its job fairly. Likewise, we have watched the Obama administration usurp congressional authority and refuse to enforce the law that bears the President's name.

Among the many "executive fixes" that seem to flow from the administration with increasing frequency, none have touched upon one of the most serious problems with ObamaCare, namely, current law will either force millions of Americans to violate their sincerely held religious beliefs or punish them for exercising those beliefs.

We are not likely to agree today—or any day—on the underlying law. ObamaCare is as controversial now—and perhaps even more so—than when it was passed, but we can agree on this:

Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Less than a mile from this Chamber, on the bank of the tidal basin, are inscribed in marble these words:

Almighty God hath created the mind free. All attempts to influence it by temporal

punishments or burdens are a departure from the plan of the Holy author of our religion. No man shall suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but all men shall be free to possess and maintain their opinions in matters of religion.

Those words, written by Thomas Jefferson, the first Democrat to be called “Mr. President,” capture the very essence of today’s bill. It is our duty—even our oath that we take before God—to protect the religious freedoms of every American. ObamaCare does not do that. Today’s bipartisan measure is a small but necessary step if Congress is to honor the great tradition of religious liberty enshrined in our founding documents and extended to succeeding generations of Americans by law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1814, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the EACH Act on behalf of my constituents in Massachusetts that are seeking to continue to take advantage of the religious conscience exemption to the individual mandate that is currently provided to them under the 2006 Massachusetts health reform law.

Since the individual mandate went into effect in Massachusetts, Donna Smiley, a Christian Scientist from Centerville, has taken advantage of the religious exemption provided in the law that prevents her from being penalized for her religious beliefs. Each year on her state tax return, the form has included a section for her to attest that because of her sincerely held religious beliefs she has chosen not to purchase medical health insurance.

With the passage of the Affordable Care Act, Donna would no longer be able to take advantage of the Massachusetts religious conscience exemption and would be penalized by the federal government for not having insurance. The EACH Act, modeled after the process that has been in place in Massachusetts for the past seven years, would ensure that a fair solution is reached so that Donna and other Americans are not penalized for their religious beliefs next year.

The legislation would modestly expand the religious conscience exemption in the Affordable Care Act to certain individuals who have sincere religious beliefs against medical insurance and related medical care. As we saw in Massachusetts, which served as the model for the Affordable Care Act as well as the EACH Act, it is clear that a similar exemption in no way adversely affected the risk pool or generated a rise in abuse or fraud. According to the most recent report from Massachusetts’ health insurance exchange, approximately 0.1% of the population or 6,500 residents apply annually for a religious exemption.

Allowing for this narrow exemption to the Affordable Care Act is the fair and equitable path forward to ensure religious diversity.

I believe there is a bipartisan coalition of support for this measure.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support the Equitable Access to Care and Health (EACH) Act. This bill provides a modest expansion of the religious conscience exemption in the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

This bipartisan legislation has 218 cosponsors. The ACA currently provides for a reli-

gious conscience exemption; however, the exemption gives preference to only a few faiths. This exemption should be expanded to accommodate other religions whose “sincerely-held religious beliefs” would cause them not to purchase insurance.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1814.

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.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2013

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3474) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3474

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 “Hire More Heroes Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. EMPLOYEES WITH HEALTH COVERAGE UNDER TRICARE OR THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM EMPLOYER MANDATE UNDER PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) EXEMPTION FOR HEALTH COVERAGE UNDER TRICARE OR THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION.—Solely for purposes of determining whether an employer is an applicable large employer under this paragraph for any month, an employer may elect not to take into account for a month as an employee any individual who, for such month, has medical coverage under—

“(i) chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, including coverage under the TRICARE program, or

“(ii) under a health care program under chapter 17 or 18 of title 38, United States Code, as determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3474, the Hire More Heroes Act, introduced by Representative RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

The Hire More Heroes Act will help ease the burden on small businesses while incentivizing them to hire veterans who have found themselves out of work as they return home from overseas.

President Obama has repeatedly said:

If you’ve got good ideas, bring them to me—let’s go.

Well, Mr. President, here is a really good idea. So let’s go.

Our veterans have sacrificed for our country, and as they return home they deserve opportunities and they deserve a job.

One thing I routinely hear from my communities back home is that entrepreneurs want to invest in America and they want to grow their businesses. Well, here is an opportunity to do both.

Too often, we use the term that something is a win-win. Well, I can think of no better term. This is a win for businesses who need workers with outstanding skills and ethics, and a win for veterans who just want a job.

The Hire More Heroes Act allows businesses that hire a veteran enrolled in TRICARE or through the VA to not count that veteran towards the 50-employee threshold for triggering the ACA employee mandate. The 50-employee threshold has been a big disincentive for small businesses to grow. If they have more than 50 workers, they fall under that mandate, and their costs go up.

□ 1700

So firms with 45, 46, 47 workers are very reluctant to grow any bigger, but if they hire a veteran, under this legislation, that won’t count for purposes of determining if they have enough workers to trigger the mandate. If that isn’t an incentive to hire more veterans, I don’t know what it is.

These are veterans who already have health care. They just want and deserve a job. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

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

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

This bill, as has been discussed, encourages veteran employment and the growth of midsize businesses.

For post-9/11 veterans, the unemployment rate has continued to decline. However, the rate of unemployment is still higher than the national average.

For February 2014, the unemployment rate for veterans from this period was 9.2 percent higher than the national average of 5.3.

I am so happy that the Republicans, at this moment, are trying to help the ACA work for veterans, for businesses, and for all Americans. I hope we will join in supporting this bill.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), the author of this bill, whose family is a small business-owning family, whose bill came from his own Veterans' Advisory Committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from the great State of Texas for being here tonight to talk about this important piece of legislation, bipartisan piece of legislation.

The Hire More Heroes Act is a jobs bill. It is a jobs bill that will not only encourage the hiring of veterans but also one that will allow us businesses to expand and grow our economy without being penalized.

H.R. 3474 would exempt veterans who have health insurance through the VA or the DOD from being counted toward the 50-employee limit under ObamaCare's employer mandate.

Today, an estimated 8.9 million veterans receive health coverage through the VA, yet they will still be counted as an employee in need of health coverage under the employer mandate.

This is a commonsense bill simply saying that a veteran who already has coverage through TRICARE or the VA cannot be counted twice. You are either someone in need of health insurance or you are not.

I introduced the Hire More Heroes Act last year in response to an issue raised at one of my veterans advisory board meetings by Brad Lavite, the superintendent of the Madison County Veterans' Assistance Commission. That commission does great work by providing services to approximately 35,000 veterans in southwestern Illinois, including helping those veterans find employment.

Although veterans returning from combat have 5 years to sign up for TRICARE, they are returning to an economy full of hiring freezes, layoffs, and unemployment rates above 9 percent. The unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans jumped from 7.9 percent in January to 9.2 percent in February. Our veterans deserve more.

We know that our military members receive some of the best training in the world, and we should do everything we can to encourage businesses to take advantage of those skills by hiring those veterans.

A recently released study by the National Small Business Association found that 91 percent of small businesses saw increases in their health care costs, and two-thirds of their members said it was the reason they have held off new hiring of employees.

It is not a secret that we need to address the true drivers of our skyrocketing health care costs. Families see this every day when they pay their monthly premiums or get a medical bill in the mail.

Placing more and more unnecessary regulations on our small businesses does nothing to address this and only exacerbates the problem by forcing businesses to make up for these costs by cutting hours or preventing pay increases.

Forcing employers to offer health insurance is a much more complicated issue than I think some in Washington thought it was going to be.

With the administration delaying the employer mandate yet again, I think we need to start seriously looking at the issue surrounding the employer mandate, and it starts today with passing H.R. 3474, the Hire More Heroes Act, and the other health care reform bills on the floor today.

I want to thank Brad Lavite again, and all of the workers and volunteers at the Madison County Veterans' Assistance Commission for their assistance they provide to veterans, and encourage my colleagues to vote for this commonsense bill to help veterans find work and assist small businesses in hiring qualified, well-trained employees, while providing much-needed relief from ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the cosponsors, the bipartisan cosponsors of this commonsense piece of legislation, especially a couple today that are with us on the floor, my good friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), a veteran herself, and my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to yield as much time as she shall consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), a veteran who I think is going to relate her own experience.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in strong support of the Hire More Heroes Act introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

When he first came to me with this idea, it was a no-brainer that I would want to support this effort because of the key constituencies that it serves.

I think that everyone would agree that the intent or the goal of the Affordable Care Act is to make sure that all people have access to affordable health care. That is a large piece of legislation. It needs some work. It needs some fixing, and this legislation seeks to do that.

First of all, the Affordable Care Act requires employers with 50 or more full-time employees to provide health insurance, or to pay a per-employee fine. This measure does a very important thing that would encourage these small business owners to do two things: to grow, as well as to hire more veterans by exempting those who receive insurance, either from the VA, or those

reservists, like I was—I was covered under TRICARE for a long period of time after my deployments. It would make it so these employers would not have to count these veterans towards that 50 total.

Secondly, this bill serves veterans. We are facing an unfortunate and unacceptable huge number of unemployed veterans, many people who are young and who are capable and coming back from conflicts overseas, and these are veterans who will serve as a huge asset to businesses of any size because they come with a unique amount of training.

They are highly disciplined. They know what it means to work as a member of a team. They know what it means to put the mission first, and they are servant leaders at their very best.

This bill provides an incentive for businesses to hire veterans. This is a commonsense improvement to the Affordable Care Act that will benefit both of these important groups. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3474.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), another champion for veterans.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I rise in support today of the Hire More Heroes Act sponsored by my friend and colleague from Illinois, Congressman RODNEY DAVIS. I applaud the work of Congressman DAVIS in championing this cause.

I also would like to compliment my friend and colleague from the great State of Hawaii for her service to her country, and also for her bipartisan cooperation on this important piece of legislation.

Unfortunately, too many veterans cannot find work these days as a result of flawed Washington policies like ObamaCare that are hindering job creation. This legislation will give those who have selflessly served our country more employment opportunities by providing American small businesses with the ability to hire more veterans.

Although this administration has delayed the employer mandate, many small businesses in my district in central and eastern Kentucky have expressed deep concern that ObamaCare would discourage them from hiring more workers.

I want to thank, again, Congressman DAVIS for introducing this commonsense legislation that will help our veterans find work without punishing small businesses for hiring these qualified and well-trained employees. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 3474, the Hire More Heroes Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because I think the bill speaks for itself, and those who have spoken on its behalf have spoken so eloquently on behalf, especially of the veterans of this country.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we close, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), the author of this bill.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my colleague from Texas for your support on this bill and for managing it here on the floor tonight. It shows today that bipartisanship does happen in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This is a commonsense bill supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. This is something that comes out from the grass roots in Madison County, Illinois, and now has a chance to become law.

I am humbled by the support that we have seen for this piece of legislation and I, again, urge my colleagues to support the Hire More Heroes Act.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. 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 Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3474.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3979

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 “Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND CERTAIN NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

“(A) EMERGENCY SERVICES VOLUNTEERS.—Qualified services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to an eligible employer shall not

be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms ‘qualified services’, ‘bona fide volunteer’, and ‘eligible employer’ shall have the respective meanings given such terms under section 457(e).

“(B) CERTAIN OTHER GOVERNMENT AND NON-PROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to a specified employer shall not be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee.

“(ii) BONA FIDE VOLUNTEER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘bona fide volunteer’ means an employee of a specified employer whose only compensation from such employer is in the form of—

“(I) reimbursement for (or reasonable allowance for) reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of services by volunteers, or

“(II) reasonable benefits (including length of service awards), and nominal fees, customarily paid by similar entities in connection with the performance of services by volunteers.

“(iii) SPECIFIED EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘specified employer’ means—

“(I) any government entity, and

“(II) any organization described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

“(iv) COORDINATION WITH SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—This subparagraph shall not fail to apply with respect to services merely because such services are qualified services (as defined in section 457(e)(1)(C)).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by first rising in support of this bill, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), the author of this very important bill.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of my bill, H.R. 3979, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

This is a good, bipartisan bill that protects our first responders, our volunteer firefighters, and emergency services personnel by ensuring that they are not considered employees under the employer mandate provision of the Affordable Care Act.

If they were, fire companies would be forced to pay for the volunteers’ health

insurance or pay a fine, driving many fire departments out of business. Simply put, this is a public safety issue.

I first learned about this issue from a volunteer firefighter back home, and I began a crusade to clear this up for volunteer firefighters and localities and the residents of Pennsylvania and every other State.

Here is why this is so important. In my home State of Pennsylvania, 97 percent of fire companies are either entirely or mostly volunteer. Nationally, it is 87 percent.

To be clear, forcing volunteer fire companies to comply with the Affordable Care Act will not extend health insurance to the uninsured. Rather, it will close firehouses, placing people at risk.

Last month, the IRS issued a final rule upholding this bill’s intent. However, this is too important of a public safety issue to be left to the changing positions of Federal bureaucrats. We must pass this bill and encourage our friends in the Senate to do the same.

We owe our emergency service volunteers who risk their lives every day rock-solid certainty. This legislation says, once and for all, that volunteer firefighters are just that, volunteers, and should not be subjected to the employer mandate.

I strongly urge passage of the bill.

□ 1915

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume and rise in support of the bill.

Well, first of all, let me mention that this bill followed regular order. It was brought up in our committee, it was discussed, and it was passed unanimously; and I think that is a plus and, I think, is a good precedent.

Let me also say that this is an important issue, and it was one responded to by Treasury in its regulation. I think there has been a lot of misshaping as to what the regulation process is all about, and there have been times when we essentially have wanted to stop the regulatory process.

I think that has been a serious mistake. It is sometimes used for a purpose, I think, unrelated to the substance of the issue.

In this case, as I said, Treasury listened to the concerns that were expressed—and I think important concerns—and issued their final regulation; and essentially, what we are now doing is to say that what Treasury has decided in its regulation is correct. I think there is no concern about it being changed.

However, this legislation says: let’s put it in the books as legislation. And I think so be it because it is so important for this Congress to join the administration in recognizing that volunteer first responders are absolutely critical to the safety and security of communities across the country.

I think it is sometimes not fully understood that 70 percent of all firefighters across the country are volunteers, and for the communities aided

by volunteer first responders, the services donated annually by these volunteers are estimated to be worth more than \$140 billion.

So I rise in support of this legislation, as I said, and I want to emphasize that it was raised in regular order. It was brought before our committee. It was discussed within our committee. We took a vote. It was unanimous. Treasury had responded appropriately to the concerns expressed by us.

So I now think we should give a further imprimatur to this legislation and support it, I hope, unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This is such a commonsense and important bill, and this challenge was brought to me as well by one of my local firefighters, the fire chief of Magnolia Volunteer Fire Department, Gary Vincent.

The bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) ensures the work our Nation's volunteers, including volunteer firefighters and emergency responders, are honored, protected, and recognized.

The tradition of volunteer firefighting dates back to colonial times, yet remains vital to thousands of communities throughout the country who rely exclusively upon volunteer fire departments for fire protection and emergency medical services.

The problem is the Affordable Care Act is a complicated law, and sometimes, the IRS has treated volunteers as full-time workers for other purposes. This confusion in the law has created uncertainty for local communities and their firefighters and could jeopardize their ability to respond to emergencies.

No one wants to put local governments and nonprofits at a risk of huge cost increases that could result if volunteers were considered employees under the Affordable Care Act.

The White House does not want that, and neither does Congress. This bill is critical to permanently protecting the 780,000 volunteer firefighters and emergency responders and all other volunteers at our Nation's nonprofits and tribal governments.

The bill provides the certainty of congressional action, rather than relying on regulations that could be repealed, changed, or amended.

I call on my colleagues to put a bipartisan stamp on this bill to honor a value we all agree on, volunteerism. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3979, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague how many further requests for time he has, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yielding myself such time as I may consume, I have about 4 or 5 additional speakers to move through on this important bill.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

KELLY), a fellow member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has been a champion on this issue as well.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and also my friend from Pennsylvania.

As you heard Congressman BARLETTA talk about, 90 percent of the 1,800 fire departments in Pennsylvania are all volunteer. These are men and women from the community that just come forward to serve.

When you look at what is going on right now, what we have tried to do is close a gap. This is Treasury guidance, so by no means has it been codified. I think what we are doing with this piece of legislation, with H.R. 3979, we make certain—in a time where there is so much uncertainty—that these folks will be protected, will not be looked at in a way that does not make sense to them.

Now, I have got to tell you that I was at an installation of officers back in my hometown of Butler. Ed Kirkwood, the manager of Butler Township, when asked about what could possibly happen, said:

The township has over 130 volunteer firefighters serving the community. By my calculation, if this is not fixed, the township could go bankrupt. It would require a tax increase of 13.56 mills, or an increase of over two-and-a-half times the current rate to comply.

Basically, if this is not fixed, Butler Township either doubles its taxes or loses their volunteer fire department.

Chief Mike Cadman of Jamestown, when asked about this, said: that would be political suicide.

I would venture that it is worse than political suicide. It is putting our citizens at risk when we don't have to.

Now, at a time when it is so hard and the public looks and says you guys don't get along on anything, this is something, I think, where we have come together and say let's just do something that makes sense. Let's just do something that puts into effect now—it eliminates all the guesswork that these folks are not going to be looked at in a different way under the Affordable Care Act.

And a piece of legislation, the Affordable Care Act, which is so hard to understand and so many are wondering what exactly is covered and what is not covered and how would I comply and how would I not comply, this is just commonsense legislation out of this body that makes sense for all of those volunteers that spend countless hours and time serving the needs of our communities all over our country.

But in Pennsylvania, as I said, 90 percent of our 1,800 fire departments are all volunteer—all volunteer. These folks give up their time and their hours to train, so that they can serve others.

I thank the gentleman for his legislation.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), another one of the new, young leaders on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

Each day, we continue to learn more about just how broken the government-run health care system is and how it continues to negatively impact families and small businesses.

Now, it is clear that the employer mandate, a key provision within the law, will not only cost jobs, but it could force fire companies to close their doors which would jeopardize public safety.

As a former volunteer firefighter and former mayor of a small town in Ohio, I know that our volunteer fire companies and emergency responders rely primarily on donations to fund their operations.

Throughout the country, nearly 90 percent of all fire departments are volunteers. If these volunteers are forced to comply with the employer mandate, it is undeniable that our local communities will be devastated, as we witness fire companies forced to close their doors because they simply cannot afford to continue operations. This is truly unacceptable.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative BARLETTA, for introducing this important legislation, of which I am a proud cosponsor. I urge all of my colleagues in the House to join us in standing up for our hard-working local heroes by supporting the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), another champion of firefighters and emergency responders.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, there is uncertainty in volunteer fire departments across the country, including in my home State of New Jersey, about the negative consequences of ObamaCare's harmful employer mandate. That is why I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3685, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

Designating volunteer firefighters as paid employees under ObamaCare is bad public policy. It threatens public safety. The passage of this legislation will provide a permanent statutory solution that will ensure our Nation's volunteer first responders are protected from ObamaCare's employer mandate.

I urge passage of H.R. 3685.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Congressman BRADY.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere across America, right now or later tonight, a tone is going to go off. That tone is going to go off, and a husband or a wife, a son or a daughter is going to respond. They are going to get out of their beds. They are going to get out of their workplaces. They are going to respond.

They are going to go to a place of danger, a place to help, a place, from their heart, to do something they want to do.

I remember that tone, for I used to answer that tone at Hollingsworth Volunteer Fire Department in Banks County. When you hear the tone go off, you go out not knowing what you may face or whether you will come home or not.

I am so pleased to stand in support, Mr. Speaker, of H.R. 3979, sponsored by Congressman BARLETTA, because it takes at least part of the uncertainty out of other things in life, when all these men and women want to do is to serve the community.

By taking this uncertainty out and not counting them as full-time employees, it gives those volunteer personnel and their chiefs less to worry about. Instead, they are able to spend more time making sure they are doing what all these great Americans want to be doing, and that is to serve their communities.

The West Jackson Fire Department in my district is really frightfully scared of this rule because it is going to cost them more than they can afford.

So all I ask is for the bipartisanship that has been shown here today. And, for those watching, when the tone goes off, the brave men and women of our country respond. What they don't need is to have a tone go off from Washington that puts them in further jeopardy.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today, the House has the chance to more permanently establish in law a provision that firefighters across Kentucky's 6th District have told me is vital to their ability to continue protecting our communities.

The Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act will simply ensure, once and for all, that these departments will not fall victim to the costly employer mandate in ObamaCare.

Over 90 percent of Kentucky's fire departments are either fully or mostly volunteer. Fire chiefs have told me that they do not have the resources to provide the health benefits mandated by ObamaCare's employer mandates to these brave and selfless volunteers who have no expectation of receiving such benefits or receive their benefits through other lines of work.

I remain committed to replacing ObamaCare with reforms that will ac-

tually lower the cost of health care without jeopardizing the safety of our communities. As an original cosponsor, I am pleased to help introduce this critical legislation.

I commend Congressman BARLETTA for introducing it, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this critical legislation.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague LOU BARLETTA from Pennsylvania for introducing this commonsense piece of legislation.

□ 1730

As we see, this is another unintended consequence of ObamaCare. I have received a letter from one of my volunteer fire departments just a few months ago that talked about this bill, and it said that the provision that is hurting our firefighters could be devastating to fire departments. Many volunteer fire departments rely upon local donations and fundraisers to fund their basic operations. The addition of a requirement to provide health insurance would present a serious financial challenge to them. Some departments have taken steps to reduce staffing levels and shifts in order to fall under the 50 FTE and 30-hours-worked threshold, which reduces the fire department's baseline emergency response capabilities.

I would like to thank Staunton, Illinois' fire chief for the fire protection district in Staunton, Rick Haase, for sending me this letter, and I would urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. I just want to close by stating—it can be done very briefly—the importance of this legislation. I think we have heard eloquent testimony to it, and I hope we can proceed on a bipartisan basis, as has been true before.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. In closing, I would like to reference the title of this bill, Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders. Democrats and Republicans coming together today are here to make sure that is the law of the land. We are protecting our volunteer firefighters and emergency responders. This bill deserves our support, and I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. LARSON, for being such a champion for our volunteer firefighters and first responders.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

I'm proud to cosponsor this bipartisan bill with Mr. BARLETTA.

This bill makes a sensible fix to the Affordable Care Act that protects volunteer firefighters and first responders in Connecticut and across the country.

I heard concerns from fire chiefs in my district—including Chief Jack Casner from my hometown of Cheshire—that the IRS may incorrectly count volunteers as employees.

We rely on hundreds of volunteer firefighters to keep our community safe.

These men and women are proud to volunteer—and do a terrific job.

And so, with my colleagues, I immediately expressed their concerns to the Obama Administration.

This bipartisan bill codifies important clarifications. . .

and shows that we can work together—as Democrats and Republicans—to make the Affordable Care Act work better for the American people.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 3979.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3979, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE CHAKA FATTAH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CHAKA FATTAH, Member of Congress:

MARCH 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker,
Washington, DC.

MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for certain documents from my Congressional Offices.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined under Rule VIII that the subpoena seeks some information that is not material and relevant, and that is not "consistent with the privileges and rights of the House." Accordingly, I intend to move to quash the subpoena to that extent, but to otherwise comply with the subpoena to the extent that it is material and relevant, and to the extent that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CHAKA FATTAH,
Member of Congress.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 3675) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3675

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 “Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. FCC PROCESS REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 12 the following new section:

“SEC. 13. TRANSPARENCY AND EFFICIENCY.

“(a) INITIAL RULEMAKING AND INQUIRY.—

“(1) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act of 2013, the Commission shall complete a rulemaking proceeding and adopt procedural changes to its rules to maximize opportunities for public participation and efficient decisionmaking.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR RULEMAKING.—The rules adopted under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) set minimum comment periods for comment and reply comment, subject to a determination by the Commission that good cause exists for departing from such minimum comment periods, for—

“(i) significant regulatory actions, as defined in Executive Order 12866; and

“(ii) all other rulemaking proceedings;

“(B) establish policies concerning the submission of extensive new comments, data, or reports towards the end of the comment period;

“(C) establish policies regarding treatment of comments, ex parte communications, and data or reports (including statistical reports and reports to Congress) submitted after the comment period to ensure that the public has adequate notice of and opportunity to respond to such submissions before the Commission relies on such submissions in any order, decision, report, or action;

“(D) establish procedures for publishing the status of open rulemaking proceedings and proposed orders, decisions, reports, or actions on circulation for review by the Commissioners, including which Commissioners have not cast a vote on an order, decision, report, or action that has been on circulation for more than 60 days;

“(E) establish deadlines (relative to the date of filing) for—

“(i) in the case of a petition for a declaratory ruling under section 1.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, issuing a public notice of such petition;

“(ii) in the case of a petition for rulemaking under section 1.401 of such title, issuing a public notice of such petition; and

“(iii) in the case of a petition for reconsideration under section 1.106 or 1.429 of such title or an application for review under section 1.115 of such title, issuing a public notice of a decision on the petition or application by the Commission or under delegated authority (as the case may be);

“(F) establish guidelines (relative to the date of filing) for the disposition of petitions filed under section 1.2 of such title;

“(G) establish procedures for the inclusion of the specific language of the proposed rule or the proposed amendment of an existing rule in a notice of proposed rulemaking; and

“(H) require notices of proposed rulemaking and orders adopting a rule or amending an existing rule that—

“(i) create (or propose to create) a program activity to contain performance measures for evaluating the effectiveness of the program activity; and

“(ii) substantially change (or propose to substantially change) a program activity to contain—

“(I) performance measures for evaluating the effectiveness of the program activity as changed (or proposed to be changed); or

“(II) a finding that existing performance measures will effectively evaluate the program activity as changed (or proposed to be changed).

“(3) INQUIRY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act of 2013, the Commission shall complete an inquiry to seek public comment on whether and how the Commission should—

“(A) establish procedures for allowing a bipartisan majority of Commissioners to place an order, decision, report, or action on the agenda of an open meeting;

“(B) establish procedures for informing all Commissioners of a reasonable number of options available to the Commission for resolving a petition, complaint, application, rulemaking, or other proceeding;

“(C) establish procedures for ensuring that all Commissioners have adequate time, prior to being required to decide a petition, complaint, application, rulemaking, or other proceeding (including at a meeting held pursuant to section 5(d)), to review the proposed Commission decision document, including the specific language of any proposed rule or any proposed amendment of an existing rule;

“(D) establish procedures for publishing the text of agenda items to be voted on at an open meeting in advance of such meeting so that the public has the opportunity to read the text before a vote is taken;

“(E) establish deadlines (relative to the date of filing) for disposition of applications for a license under section 1.913 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(F) assign resources needed in order to meet the deadlines described in subparagraph (E), including whether the Commission’s ability to meet such deadlines would be enhanced by assessing a fee from applicants for such a license; and

“(G) publish each order, decision, report, or action not later than 30 days after the date of the adoption of such order, decision, report, or action.

“(4) DATA FOR PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—The Commission shall develop a performance measure or proposed performance measure required by this subsection to rely, where possible, on data already collected by the Commission.

“(b) PERIODIC REVIEW.—On the date that is 5 years after the completion of the rulemaking proceeding under subsection (a)(1), and every 5 years thereafter, the Commission shall initiate a new rulemaking proceeding to continue to consider such procedural changes to its rules as may be in the public interest to maximize opportunities for public participation and efficient decisionmaking.

“(c) NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 552b of title 5, United States Code, a bipartisan majority of Commissioners may hold a meeting that is closed to the public to discuss official business if—

“(A) a vote or any other agency action is not taken at such meeting;

“(B) each person present at such meeting is a Commissioner, an employee of the Commission, a member of a joint board or conference established under section 410, or a person on the staff of such a joint board or conference or of a member of such a joint board or conference; and

“(C) an attorney from the Office of General Counsel of the Commission is present at such meeting.

“(2) DISCLOSURE OF NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.—Not later than 2 business days after the conclusion of a meeting held under paragraph (1), the Commission shall publish a disclosure of such meeting, including—

“(A) a list of the persons who attended such meeting; and

“(B) a summary of the matters discussed at such meeting, except for such matters as the Commission determines may be withheld under section 552b(c) of title 5, United States Code.

“(3) PRESERVATION OF OPEN MEETINGS REQUIREMENTS FOR AGENCY ACTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the applicability of section 552b of title 5, United States Code, with respect to a meeting of Commissioners other than that described in paragraph (1).

“(d) ACCESS TO CERTAIN INFORMATION ON COMMISSION’S WEBSITE.—The Commission shall provide direct access from the homepage of its website to—

“(1) detailed information regarding—

“(A) the budget of the Commission for the current fiscal year;

“(B) the appropriations for the Commission for such fiscal year; and

“(C) the total number of full-time equivalent employees of the Commission; and

“(2) the performance plan most recently made available by the Commission under section 1115(b) of title 31, United States Code.

“(e) FEDERAL REGISTER PUBLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any document adopted by the Commission that the Commission is required, under any provision of law, to publish in the Federal Register, the Commission shall, not later than the date described in paragraph (2), complete all Commission actions necessary for such document to be so published.

“(2) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this paragraph is the earlier of—

“(A) the day that is 45 days after the date of the release of the document; or

“(B) the day by which such actions must be completed to comply with any deadline under any other provision of law.

“(3) NO EFFECT ON DEADLINES FOR PUBLICATION IN OTHER FORM.—In the case of a deadline that does not specify that the form of publication is publication in the Federal Register, the Commission may comply with such deadline by publishing the document in another form. Such other form of publication does not relieve the Commission of any Federal Register publication requirement applicable to such document, including the requirement of paragraph (1).

“(f) CONSUMER COMPLAINT DATABASE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating and processing consumer complaints, the Commission shall present information about such complaints in a publicly available, searchable database on its website that—

“(A) facilitates easy use by consumers; and

“(B) to the extent practicable, is sortable and accessible by—

“(i) the date of the filing of the complaint;

“(ii) the topic of the complaint;

“(iii) the party complained of; and

“(iv) other elements that the Commission considers in the public interest.

“(2) DUPLICATIVE COMPLAINTS.—In the case of multiple complaints arising from the same alleged misconduct, the Commission shall be required to include only information concerning one such complaint in the database described in paragraph (1).

“(g) FORM OF PUBLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In complying with a requirement of this section to publish a document, the Commission shall publish such

document on its website, in addition to publishing such document in any other form that the Commission is required to use or is permitted to and chooses to use.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The Commission shall by rule establish procedures for redacting documents required to be published by this section so that the published versions of such documents do not contain—

“(A) information the publication of which would be detrimental to national security, homeland security, law enforcement, or public safety; or

“(B) information that is proprietary or confidential.

“(h) TRANSPARENCY RELATING TO PERFORMANCE IN MEETING FOIA REQUIREMENTS.—The Commission shall take additional steps to inform the public about its performance and efficiency in meeting the disclosure and other requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), including by doing the following:

“(1) Publishing on the Commission’s website the Commission’s logs for tracking, responding to, and managing requests submitted under such section, including the Commission’s fee estimates, fee categories, and fee request determinations.

“(2) Releasing to the public all decisions made by the Commission (including decisions made by the Commission’s Bureaus and Offices) granting or denying requests filed under such section, including any such decisions pertaining to the estimate and application of fees assessed under such section.

“(3) Publishing on the Commission’s website electronic copies of documents released under such section.

“(4) Presenting information about the Commission’s handling of requests under such section in the Commission’s annual budget estimates submitted to Congress and the Commission’s annual performance and financial reports. Such information shall include the number of requests under such section the Commission received in the most recent fiscal year, the number of such requests granted and denied, a comparison of the Commission’s processing of such requests over at least the previous 3 fiscal years, and a comparison of the Commission’s results with the most recent average for the United States Government as published on www.foia.gov.

“(i) PROMPT RELEASE OF STATISTICAL REPORTS AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than January 15th of each year, the Commission shall identify, catalog, and publish an anticipated release schedule for all statistical reports and reports to Congress that are regularly or intermittently released by the Commission and will be released during such year.

“(j) ANNUAL SCORECARD REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the 1-year period beginning on January 1st of each year, the Commission shall prepare a report on the performance of the Commission in conducting its proceedings and meeting the deadlines established under subsection (a)(2)(E) and the guidelines established under subsection (a)(2)(F).

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall contain detailed statistics on such performance, including, with respect to each Bureau of the Commission—

“(A) with respect to each type of filing specified in subsection (a)(2)(E) or (a)(2)(F)—

“(i) the number of filings that were pending on the last day of the period covered by such report;

“(ii) the number of filings described in clause (i) for which each applicable deadline or guideline established under such subsection was not met and the average length of time such filings have been pending; and

“(iii) for filings that were resolved during such period, the average time between initiation and resolution and the percentage for which each applicable deadline or guideline established under such subsection was met;

“(B) with respect to proceedings before an administrative law judge—

“(i) the number of such proceedings completed during such period; and

“(ii) the number of such proceedings pending on the last day of such period; and

“(C) the number of independent studies or analyses published by the Commission during such period.

“(3) PUBLICATION AND SUBMISSION.—The Commission shall publish and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate each report required by paragraph (1) not later than the date that is 30 days after the last day of the period covered by such report.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AMENDMENT.—The term ‘amendment’ includes, when used with respect to an existing rule, the deletion of such rule.

“(2) BIPARTISAN MAJORITY.—The term ‘bipartisan majority’ means, when used with respect to a group of Commissioners, that such group—

“(A) is a group of 3 or more Commissioners; and

“(B) includes, for each political party of which any Commissioner is a member, at least 1 Commissioner who is a member of such political party, and, if any Commissioner has no political party affiliation, at least one unaffiliated Commissioner.

“(3) PERFORMANCE MEASURE.—The term ‘performance measure’ means an objective and quantifiable outcome measure or output measure (as such terms are defined in section 1115 of title 31, United States Code).

“(4) PROGRAM ACTIVITY.—The term ‘program activity’ has the meaning given such term in section 1115 of title 31, United States Code, except that such term also includes any annual collection or distribution or related series of collections or distributions by the Commission of an amount that is greater than or equal to \$100,000,000.

“(5) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—The terms ‘agency action’, ‘ex parte communication’, and ‘rule’ have the meanings given such terms in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES AND IMPLEMENTING RULES.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(A) NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.—Subsection (c) of section 13 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by subsection (a), shall apply beginning on the first date on which all of the procedural changes to the rules of the Federal Communications Commission required by subsection (a)(1) of such section have taken effect.

(B) SCHEDULES AND REPORTS.—Subsections (i) and (j) of such section 13 shall apply with respect to 2014 and any year thereafter.

(2) RULES.—Except as otherwise provided in such section 13, the Federal Communications Commission shall promulgate any rules necessary to carry out such section not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. CATEGORIZATION OF TCPA INQUIRIES AND COMPLAINTS IN QUARTERLY REPORT.

In compiling its quarterly report with respect to informal consumer inquiries and complaints, the Federal Communications Commission may not categorize an inquiry or complaint with respect to section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) as being a wireline inquiry or complaint or a wireless inquiry or complaint unless the party whose conduct is the subject of the in-

quiry or complaint is a wireline carrier or a wireless carrier, respectively.

SEC. 4. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall relieve the Federal Communications Commission from any obligations under title 5, United States Code, except where otherwise expressly provided.

SEC. 5. APPLICATION OF ANTIINEFFICIENCY ACT TO UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM.

Section 302 of Public Law 108–494 (118 Stat. 3998) is amended by striking “December 31, 2015” each place it appears and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the communications sector is one of the most innovative, competitive, and robust sectors of our economy. But for innovation and investment in communications to continue, we must not weigh industry down with needless red tape and delay.

Now, despite the lackluster overall economy, the communications and technology market continues to grow at a very rapid pace. In fact, in 2012, Mr. Speaker, the industry invested \$68 billion in broadband infrastructure alone. That totals \$1.2 trillion invested in upgrading broadband infrastructure networks since just 1996—\$1.2 trillion.

Communications and technology companies, as well as the consumers that enjoy their products and benefit from their services, deserve a transparent and responsive government agency. While agency process has improved under recent chairmen, this legislation will ensure that reforms remain in place from one administration to the next.

Even with the positive changes at the Commission, recent examples of bad processes have resulted in what I would say are dangerous outcomes at the Commission. To wit, late last year, the Federal Communications Commission issued a notice for a study that would call into question the editorial decisions of journalists in their own newsrooms, which I think threatens their First Amendment rights. Somehow, an item as controversial as this study made it all the way through the FCC without so much as a Commission vote. Americans deserve greater accountability and transparency from their government.

So this bill is the result of a multiyear process, ending with bipartisan agreement that takes important

steps towards improving this very important agency. This legislation will produce a joint effort where the Commission establishes procedures to achieve the goals established by Congress.

The Commission is charged with setting its own deadlines and timelines. While the legislation allows the Commission a good deal of flexibility in meeting the goals we have set, the bill includes backstops to ensure accountability. The annual scorecard we call for in the bill requires the Federal Communications Commission to report to Congress on the agency's success in meeting its own self-imposed metrics.

The bill requires the FCC to undertake two separate proceedings, Mr. Speaker. The first requires a notice and comment rulemaking, resulting in the FCC's adopting rules to address several different reforms. Setting a minimum time period for comments in an FCC rulemaking will allow for certainty for those who wish to comment—the public.

In addition, adopted rules must address issues like data dumps at the end of a comment period, transparency as to items pending before the Commissioners, and publication of the language of proposed rules. All those are very important parts of a more open and transparent government and a process that taxpayers can rely upon.

The rulemaking also requires the Federal Communications Commission to adopt deadlines for action on several types of filings before the agency. As I know all too well from my own experience, having been regulated by the Federal Communications Commission when my wife and I were in the radio industry, items can sit at the agencies for literally years without any action, and then they are acted upon and the person bringing the action may have 30 days on something that sat there for 10 years.

Now, the second proceeding is an inquiry that deals with more complex issues, giving the Federal Communications Commission flexibility in deciding whether and how to implement those reforms. Now, by giving the FCC flexibility when setting procedures and deadlines, we are not constraining the agency; rather, we are providing them with goals to meet and allowing them, the professionals there at the FCC, to determine the best way to meet those goals.

Now, many of the reforms in the bill are things that the Commission itself already has the authority to do under existing law; however, the bill also changes the existing Sunshine Act to allow for greater collaboration among the Commissioners themselves. I think that will bring about better government—all of these reforms combined will.

The FCC has started its own review of agency processes, and in a report released earlier this year, many of the areas the agency itself found needing reform mirror provisions of our legislation, H.R. 3675.

The American public expects and deserves a transparent and accountable Federal Government no matter who is in charge in the White House. So let's start this reform with this agency that oversees one of our most innovative and robust sectors of the economy.

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

Mr. DOYLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my friend and colleague Mr. WALDEN, in support of H.R. 3675, the FCC Process Reform Act of 2013.

The Federal Communications Commission is charged with overseeing industries that make up one-sixth of our national economy. The communications and technology sectors are driving economic growth across the Nation, connecting businesses to markets large and small and delivering innovative, new products and services to consumers. Perhaps more importantly, communications networks are part of the very fabric of our democracy, providing the news and information that makes us informed citizens and voters.

With a mission this critical, both Democrats and Republicans believe that the FCC must be efficient, transparent, and accountable.

We started this debate in the Energy and Commerce Committee with different perspectives about how to achieve these goals. Last Congress, our work on this issue, unfortunately, devolved into a partisan process and a vote on a bill that was dead on arrival in the Senate. But this Congress, thanks to Chairman WALDEN's leadership and consultation with Ranking Members WAXMAN and ESHOO, we were able to come to an agreement on a set of bipartisan reform proposals that were unanimously supported by the committee.

I want to highlight several key provisions in this bill that we believe will improve the functioning of the FCC.

The first reform is the Sunshine Act, to allow FCC Commissioners to collaborate more closely while preserving the transparency of agency decision-making. I introduced this legislation along with Representatives ESHOO and SHIMKUS, and I am pleased to see it incorporated in the bill we are considering today.

The second area that I am particularly pleased with is the incorporation of a provision to provide an exemption to the Antideficiency Act for the Universal Service Fund. Today, the FCC relies on temporary exemptions from the Antideficiency Act to be able to administer the Universal Service program that supports connectivity to schools and libraries, known as E-Rate.

The bill we reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee would have permanently exempted the Universal Service Fund from the Antideficiency Act, but, unfortunately, we were unable to reach agreement with CBO about the impact of this provision.

I want to thank my colleagues in the majority for working with us to come up with an alternative that provides a longer—if not permanent—exemption. I believe it demonstrates our committee's bipartisan support for providing the FCC with the flexibility it needs to administer the E-Rate program.

I also want to compliment FCC Chairman Wheeler for his actions to address transparency and efficiency of FCC decisionmaking. From his very first day at the helm of the agency, he has focused on remedying the concerns identified in the bill that we are considering today.

I urge the FCC to continue to move forward on reforms they can make under their own initiative while we continue to work on this legislation.

Finally, I want to close by saying that I think the manner in which the FCC Process Reform Act was developed should be a model for the entire House going forward. Working together, members of the Energy and Commerce Committee crafted legislation that addressed the concerns from both sides of the aisle. I am proud to have been a part of this effort.

I want to thank my colleague, Chairman WALDEN, for his work. I urge all my colleagues to support this important legislation to make the FCC more efficient, transparent, and accountable. I look forward to working with our colleagues in the Senate and continuing to help this bill become law.

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

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments and his diligent work on this effort and that of his colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle.

I think when it comes to reforming the FCC and getting something that really worked for the public, we are joined at the hip. So I appreciate their input and the work we did together. Our subcommittee has actually done quite a bit of bipartisan work over the last couple of years moving forward with an incentive auction program to free up more spectrum for all of these new wireless devices that are out there and new technology and innovation. We are really at the center of the ability of the country to grow, innovate, and produce really good-paying jobs. So I appreciate Mr. DOYLE's comments.

I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, who has been an extraordinary member of our team in working on this and other major communications policy going forward. He will play a key role tomorrow when we have our hearing on the reauthorization of the Satellite Viewer Act.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the hard work that you have done on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3675, the Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act of 2013.

The communications industry represents a promising sector of our economy that has fostered widespread investment, innovation, job creation, and greater consumer choice. As the industry evolves and makes unprecedented technological advancements, the possibilities for future innovation and modernization are endless. As Members of Congress, we have to ensure that businesses and entrepreneurs are equipped with the opportunity and flexibility to continue making that sustained progress.

□ 1745

The FCC Process Reform Act would facilitate this effort.

This legislation would initiate much-needed regulatory reforms to the Federal Communications Commission and bring additional transparency and accountability to the agency. I applaud Chairman WALDEN for his efforts and leadership in developing this bipartisan piece of legislation, and I look forward to working with him and other members of the subcommittee as we work forward on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, we have no other speakers, and so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I conclude by again thanking my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle for their good work on this legislation, and their partnership on this. This is good government. This is how we get things done on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and it is how we are going to improve the activities and procedures of these agencies to restore a little confidence in at least this sector of government.

The Federal Communications Commission has a lot of work to do. It is very important work for the future of our country.

Tomorrow, as I said, our committee will take up draft legislation to make sure that those who watch television over satellite will be able to continue that process, and we will do some other reforms along the way. Throughout this year, Mr. Speaker, our Subcommittee on Communications and Technology plans to solicit all kinds of information from individuals around the country on how to update the antiquated Telecommunications Act that dates back to either 1934 or 1992 or 1996, depending upon which law. So we have a lot of work to do, Mr. Speaker, and this bill moves an important piece forward. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3675, the Federal Communications Commission Process Reform Act of 2013, a bipartisan bill aimed at giving the FCC flexibility while promoting openness, transparency and accountability.

Two years ago, the House of Representatives considered a very different version of the legislation, one which I opposed and that passed largely on partisan lines. I support the

bill before us today because it gives the FCC flexibility to evaluate and adopt procedural changes to its rules, rather than putting rigid requirements in statute. The bill enhances transparency by establishing a publicly available, searchable consumer complaint database and provides the Universal Service Fund (USF) with a short term exemption from the Antideficiency Act.

I'm also pleased that the bill includes the FCC Collaboration Act of 2013, a bipartisan bill I introduced last year with Reps. SHIMKUS and DOYLE. For years, current and former FCC Commissioners have called on Congress to pass 'sunshine reform,' so that three or more Commissioners can hold non-public collaborative discussions, as long as no agency action is taken. While I'm disappointed that this provision will not take effect immediately upon enactment, I'm hopeful that the Senate will modify this provision before passing similar legislation. A delay in implementation is the unnecessary delay of a much needed reform.

I thank Chairman WALDEN for working with me and my staff to put forward a bipartisan bill and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3675.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3675, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 3474, H.R. 3979, and H. Res. 499, in each case by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3474) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—406

Aderholt	Connolly	Gowdy
Amash	Conyers	Granger
Bachmann	Cook	Graves (GA)
Barber	Cooper	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Cotton	Grayson
Barr	Courtney	Green, Al
Barrow (GA)	Cramer	Green, Gene
Barton	Crawford	Griffin (AR)
Bass	Crenshaw	Griffith (VA)
Beatty	Crowley	Grijalva
Benishek	Cuellar	Grimm
Bentivolio	Culberson	Guthrie
Bera (CA)	Cummings	Hahn
Billirakis	Daines	Hall
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Danny	Hanna
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Black	DeFazio	Harris
Blackburn	DeGette	Hartzler
Blumenauer	Delaney	Hastings (FL)
Bonamici	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Boustany	DelBene	Heck (NV)
Brady (PA)	Denham	Heck (WA)
Brady (TX)	Dent	Hensarling
Braley (IA)	DeSantis	Herrera Beutler
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Higgins
Brooks (AL)	Deutch	Himes
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa
Broun (GA)	Doggett	Holding
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Holt
Brownley (CA)	Duckworth	Honda
Buchanan	Duffy	Horsford
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Bustos	Edwards	Huffman
Byrne	Ellison	Huizenga (MI)
Calvert	Ellmers	Hultgren
Camp	Enyart	Hunter
Campbell	Eshoo	Hurt
Cantor	Esty	Israel
Capito	Farenthold	Issa
Capps	Farr	Jackson Lee
Capuano	Fincher	Jeffries
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins
Carney	Fleischmann	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Carter	Flores	Johnson, E. B.
Cartwright	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Jones
Castor (FL)	Foster	Jordan
Castro (TX)	Fox	Joyce
Chabot	Frankel (FL)	Kaptur
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Keating
Chu	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (IL)
Cicilline	Fudge	Kelly (PA)
Clark (MA)	Gabbard	Kennedy
Clarke (NY)	Gallego	Kildee
Clay	Garamendi	Kilmer
Cleaver	Garcia	Kind
Clyburn	Gardner	King (IA)
Coble	Garrett	King (NY)
Coffman	Gerlach	Kingston
Cohen	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Cole	Gibson	Kirkpatrick
Collins (GA)	Gingrey (GA)	Kline
Collins (NY)	Gohmert	Kuster
Conaway	Goodlatte	Labrador

LaMalfa Olson
Lamborn Owens
Lance Palazzo
Langevin Pallone
Lankford Pastor (AZ)
Larsen (WA) Paulsen
Larson (CT) Payne
Latham Pearce
Latta Pelosi
Lee (CA) Perlmutter
Levin Perry
Lipinski Peters (CA)
LoBiondo Peters (MI)
Loeb sack Peterson
Lofgren Petri
Long Pingree (ME)
Lowenthal Pittenger
Lowey Pitts
Lucas Pocan
Luetkemeyer Poe (TX)
Lujan Grisham Polis
(NM) Pompeo
Luján, Ben Ray Posey
(NM) Price (GA)
Lummis Price (NC)
Lynch Quigley
Maffei Rahall
Maloney, Rangel
Caroly Reed
Maloney, Sean Reichert
Marchant Renacci
Marino Ribble
Massie Rice (SC)
Matheson Richmond
Matsui Rigell
McCarthy (CA) Roby
McCarthy (NY) Roe (TN)
McClintock Rogers (AL)
McCollum Rogers (KY)
McDermott Rogers (MI)
McGovern Rohrabacher
McHenry Rokita
McKinley Rooney
McMorris Ros-Lehtinen
Rodgers Roskam
McNerney Ross
Meadows Rothfus
Meehan Roybal-Allard
Meeks Royce
Meng Ruiz
Messer Runyan
Mica Ruppertsberger
Michaud Ryan (WI)
Miller (MI) Salmon
Miller, George Sánchez, Linda
Moore T.
Moran Sanchez, Loretta
Mullin Sanford
Mulvaney Sarbanes
Murphy (FL) Scalise
Murphy (PA) Schakowsky
Napolitano Schiff
Neal Schneider
Negrete McLeod Schock
Neugebauer Schrader
Noem Schweikert
Nolan Scott (VA)
Nugent Scott, Austin
Nunes Scott, David
Nunnelee Sensenbrenner
O'Rourke Serrano

NAYS—1

Nadler
NOT VOTING—23

Amodei Gosar
Bachus Gutiérrez
Becerra Hoyer
Butterfield Lewis
Costa McAllister
Dingell McCaul
Engel McIntyre
Fattah McKeon

□ 1854

Messrs. NUGENT, ROHRABACHER and CASSIDY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—410

Aderholt Cohen
Amash Cole
Bachmann Collins (GA)
Bachus Collins (NY)
Barber Conaway
Barletta Connolly
Barr Conyers
Barrow (GA) Cook
Barton Cooper
Bass Cotton
Beatty Courtney
Becerra Cramer
Benishek Crawford
Bentivolio Crenshaw
Bera (CA) Crowley
Bilirakis Cuellar
Bishop (GA) Culberson
Bishop (NY) Cummings
Bishop (UT) Daines
Black Davis (CA)
Blackburn Davis, Danny
Bonamici Davis, Rodney
Whitfield DeFazio
Brady (PA) DeGette
Brady (TX) Delaney
Braley (IA) DeLauro
Bridenstine DelBene
Brooks (AL) Denham
Brooks (IN) Dent
Broun (GA) DeSantis
Brown (FL) DesJarlais
Brownley (CA) Deutch
Buchanan Diaz-Balart
Bucshon Doggett
Burgess Herrera
Bustos Duckworth
Byrne Duffy
Calvert Duncan (SC)
Camp Duncan (TN)
Campbell Edwards
Cantor Ellison
Capito Ellmers
Capps Enyart
Rush Eshoo
Cárdenas Esty
Carney Farenthold
Carson (IN) Farr
Carter Fattah
Cartwright Fincher
Cassidy Fitzpatrick
Castor (FL) Fleischmann
Castro (TX) Fleming
Chabot Flores
Chaffetz Forbes
Chu Fortenberry
Cicilline Foster
Clark (MA) Foy
Clarke (NY) Frankel (FL)
Clay Franks (AZ)
Clever Frelinghuysen
Clyburn Fudge
Coble Gabbard
Coffman Gallego

Kelly (IL) Napolitano
Kelly (PA) Neal
Kennedy Negrete McLeod
Kildee Neugebauer
Kilmer Noem
Kind Nolan
King (IA) Nugent
King (NY) Nunes
Kingston Nunnelee
Kinzinger (IL) O'Rourke
Kirkpatrick Olson
Kline Owens
Kuster Palazzo
Labrador Pallone
LaMalfa Pastor (AZ)
Lamborn Paulsen
Lance Payne
Langevin Pearce
Lankford Pelosi
Larsen (WA) Perlmutter
Larson (CT) Perry
Latham Peters (CA)
Latta Peters (MI)
Lee (CA) Peterson
Levin Petri
Lipinski Pingree (ME)
LoBiondo Pittenger
Loeb sack Pitts
Lofgren Pocan
Long Poe (TX)
Lowenthal Lowey
Lucas Lucas
Luetkemeyer Lujan Grisham
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis Lynch
Lynch Maffei
Maloney, Maloney, Sean
Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA) McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke

NOT VOTING—20

Amodei Gutiérrez
Blumenauer Huffman
Butterfield Lewis
Costa McAllister
Dingell McCaul
Engel McIntyre
Gosar McKeon

□ 1902

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING VIOLATION OF UKRAINIAN SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, AND TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 499) condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 7, answered “present” 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]
YEAS—402

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Billrakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buchson
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline

Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann

Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartgering
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman

Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
King
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks

Duncan (TN)
Hastings (FL)
Jones

Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford

Massie
Moore
Stockman

Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souterland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—7

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1
Rohrabacher

NOT VOTING—20

Amodei
Butterfield
Costa
Dingell
Engel
Gosar
Gutiérrez

Lewis
McAllister
McCaul
McIntyre
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary

□ 1911

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to travel arrangements, I missed the following rollcall votes: Nos. 115–117 on March 11, 2014 (today).

If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 115—H.R. 3474—Hire More Heroes Act of 2013, On Passage, “aye”; rollcall vote No. 116—H.R. 3979—Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act of 2014, as amended, On Passage, “aye”; rollcall vote No. 117—H. Res. 499—Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation, as amended, On Passage, “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the record that today, March 11th, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed several rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted: “aye”—rollcall vote 115—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 3474—Hire More Heroes Act of 2013; “aye”—rollcall vote 116—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 3979—Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act of 2014, as amended; “aye”—rollcall vote 117—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H. Res. 499—Condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation, as amended.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4138, EXECUTIVE NEEDS TO FAITHFULLY OBSERVE AND RESPECT CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENTS OF THE LAW ACT OF 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3973, FAITHFUL EXECUTION OF THE LAW ACT OF 2014

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–378) on the resolution (H. Res. 511) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4138) to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3973) to amend section 530D of title 28, United States Code, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CELEBRATING BRAIN SCIENCE AWARENESS WEEK

(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, I rise today to commemorate Brain Science Awareness Week and to highlight amazing advances made by south Florida's neuroscience community to unravel the mysteries of the mind.

At the University of Miami's Miller School of Medicine, research is yielding new insights for the treatment of devastating neurological disease, like Alzheimer's. My mother died from complications of Alzheimer's, so I know how terrible this disorder is.

Investigators at The Miami Project to Cure Paralysis are translating progress into hope for understanding traumatic brain and spinal cord injuries that are impacting thousands of our bravest warriors returning home from Afghanistan and Iraq.

On Saturday, March 22, scientists will introduce students to the wonders of the human brain at the Miami Brain Science Fair in hopes of inspiring young people to pursue the educational and professional fields that will fuel the next significant scientific discoveries.

□ 1915

CONGRATULATING MICHAEL C. HOFFMAN FOR WINNING THE FLAME OF HOPE AWARD

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize Michael C. Hoffman of Saratoga Springs for receiving the prestigious Flame of Hope Award from the Epilepsy Foundation of Northeastern New York. This award highlights Mike's outstanding dedication and commitment to the Epilepsy Foundation, raising awareness and funds to support the organization's mission of overcoming the challenges created by epilepsy and curing the disease.

Mike is a successful businessowner and has worked for almost four decades to improve the community around him in the capital region of New York. Through his many impressive years as an active member of the Epilepsy Foundation, I am very pleased to see him receive this award.

Again, I thank Michael C. Hoffman for his tireless efforts to improve our communities and congratulate him upon winning the Flame of Hope Award from the Epilepsy Foundation of Northeastern New York.

OBAMACARE IDEOLOGY AND RURAL REALITY

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the importance of rural health care providers.

Once again, we see President Obama standing on ideological grounds rather

than actually taking the time to understand who provides medical care to seniors and how they do it. At the same time he is giving stump speeches and trying to convince us that ObamaCare is working, he is taking \$422 billion out of Medicare.

Now, part of these cuts come from critical access hospitals, and I am referring to the cuts that he is making to Medicare in his fiscal year 2015 budget. It is similar to what he did each of the past 2 years. He targets the critical access hospitals. In order to pay for ObamaCare, he is proposing to cut Medicare payments to the providers who are providing such an important service—our rural health care providers.

These patients have an extremely difficult time with access to medical care. They are poorer and are less likely to have employer-provided insurance or prescription drug coverage.

Critical access hospitals are the safety net for many Americans. They provide exceptional care. I see it in my district every day. I commend the rural providers.

USE ALL WE CAN AND SELL THE REST

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "We eat all we can and we sell the rest." That is the slogan for the Blue Bell Creameries in Brenham, Texas, that makes the best ice cream in the world. With the U.S. overabundance of natural gas, especially in Texas, that should be America's foreign energy policy: "Use all we can and sell the rest." In fact, we have so much natural gas in the Dakotas, they are flaring off gas wells.

Mr. Speaker, Ukraine has been invaded by the bully bear Putin. Ukraine buys 60 percent of its natural gas from Russia. In fact, numerous former Soviet republics in Europe are held hostage and rely on Russia for natural gas. We should give these nations an option to buy our gas, but we can't even start the process until our government speeds up the approval of exporting gas.

Russian aggression can be responded to with an energy policy that helps Ukraine and the United States. Meanwhile, the roar of the Russian bear threatens to devour more sovereign territory in Ukraine.

And that's just the way it is.

THE NEIL SIMPSON COAL-FIRED POWER PLANT

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, the Neil Simpson coal-fired power plant unit in Gillette, Wyoming,

is going to shut down 10 years before its useful life is up. And it is shutting down because the EPA created this rule called Boiler MACT. That stands for "maximum attainable control technology."

If it was attainable control technology, the company wouldn't shut it down 10 years before its useful life is up. It is being shut down because it is not attainable. The EPA did not tell the truth when they told people this can be attained. And now that plant will be disassembled, taken to another country and put back up and be burning coal there.

This is not wise policy, Mr. Speaker.

PROPOSED DEACTIVATION OF THE 440TH AIRLIFT WING

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have grave concerns about the proposed deactivation of the 440th Airlift Wing located at Pope Army Airfield contained in the President's budget. The 440th is absolutely critical to conducting the kind of training that both airborne and special operations forces located at the epicenter of the universe in Fort Bragg, North Carolina, rely on to conduct the high-risk missions they are charged with in combat.

Beyond the immediate hit on readiness, the retirement will have an impact on over 1,200 servicemembers and their families directly associated with the unit.

While I understand we face challenging fiscal times, I expect the Department to take a broad approach when it comes to finding savings. While retiring a particular airframe may make sense on paper, it is incredibly important that we take into account the value of a joint force structure. I find it hard to believe that out-of-State units can provide the same quality of training and operations as the local units that have the long-term relationship with the commanders on the ground.

Additionally, cutting Fort Bragg's airborne operations by an estimated 23 percent could further erode our readiness at a time when the United States simply cannot afford it, eliminating the ability to rapidly mobilize, train, and deploy our most in-demand forces, namely the airborne and special operators.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to prevent these devastating cuts to our forces.

CONGRATULATING EDINA HIGH SCHOOL HOCKEY CHAMPS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Edina High School hockey team for becoming repeat State champions.

This weekend, the Edina Hornets won the State high school hockey championship when they cruised to an 8-2 victory in the tournament finals against the tough Lakeville North squad. The Curt Giles-coached team became the very first AA high school hockey team to win back-to-back State championships in 20 years.

Led by senior captain and Minnesota Mr. Hockey finalist Tyler Nanne, the Hornets rolled through the three-game State tournament winning by a combined score of 17-4.

It is certainly a testament to the hard work of these young men that they spend countless hours on the ice honing their craft while still balancing their schoolwork, family time, and other endeavors. Becoming State champs does not happen overnight but through years of dedication.

Mr. Speaker, the teachers, the parents, the students, and the entire school district are tremendously proud of these young student athletes.

Congratulations again to the high school hockey champions in Edina.

THE MANVEL LADY MAVERICKS— TEXAS 5A STATE CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago, I stood in the parking lot of Manvel High School waiting. A few minutes before 4 p.m., the Texas women's 5A State champs came home.

To win State, the Manvel Lady Mavericks had to go through a door blocked by the two-time defending State champion, the Duncanville Panthers. In November, the Lady Mavs knocked on the Panthers' door. It didn't open. For three quarters in the State championships, they banged on the Panthers' door. It didn't budge. But in the last quarter, the Lady Mavs kicked that son of a gun opened and walked through to become the State 5A champs.

As we say in Manvel: Hoka hey, champs, hoka hey.

HONORING FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE'S 92ND AFW FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take time to recognize the men and women of Fairchild Air Force Base in my home, eastern Washington.

Last week, the 92nd Air Refueling Wing welcomed home the last plane from Manas Transit Center in Kyrgyzstan. For nearly a decade, the Manas Transit Center was home away from home for these men and women. And every day, Fairchild's tankers would launch out of Manas and then re-

fuel the warplanes supporting coalition troops on the ground.

Day in and day out, these gas stations in the sky gave fighters more time over their enemy targets and saved American lives. These crews provided lifesaving fuel for fighters when Osama bin Laden was found.

As the KC-135s and the airmen are returned to Fairchild, we must not forget those we lost. Last spring, Captains Mark Voss, Tori Pinckney, and Tech Sergeant Tre Mackey died in a tanker crash in Kyrgyzstan. I pray for peace for these families and give gratitude to these incredible airmen who gave the ultimate sacrifice.

Thank you to all the leaders and community members at Fairchild Air Force Base for their dedication to our country over the last 9 years. God bless you.

OBAMACARE IMPLEMENTATION FAILS MOTHERS

(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, recently, I received a heart-breaking email from Connie in Irmo, South Carolina. Because of ObamaCare, Connie's health care policy premiums have increased \$100 a month, and her deductible has grown to over \$2,500 a year. She explains the truth, despite Senate smears. These unexpected costs have created significant financial burdens for her family. Connie is the mother of a child who suffers with mental health issues. It is shameful that government regulations are making her choose between seeking medical assistance and feeding her family. Connie writes:

It is heart wrenching that as a mother I now have to second-guess myself any time I think about taking my children to the doctors. I may have coverage, but after I pay my premiums, I don't have enough left to pay for the doctor visit itself.

ObamaCare is threatening the middle class and destroying American families and jobs. On behalf of mothers and fathers across this Nation who are suffering at ObamaCare's expense, it is time for the President to work with Congress to repeal this unworkable law and replace it with commonsense solutions.

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

THE EQUITABLE ACCESS TO CARE AND HEALTH ACT

(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, today the House acted on an important piece of legislation that strikes at the very heart of our democracy—the Equitable Access to Care and Health Act, or EACH Act.

The individual mandate of the 2010 health care law included a very narrow exemption for religious groups, meaning that members of certain recognized religious sects could be exempted from the requirement to purchase health care or face a penalty of a tax for non-compliance.

To qualify for the current exemption, individuals must waive all public and private insurance benefits, including Social Security and Medicare. Individuals who participate in Social Security and Medicare but whose religious beliefs cause them to object to medical health care are not eligible for the existing exemption.

The EACH Act, which had bipartisan support, expands this exemption for individuals whose sincerely held religious beliefs would cause them to object to medical health care provided under such coverage.

Mr. Speaker, religious freedom must be protected for all Americans. Passage of the EACH Act is a step forward in safeguarding this fundamental and enduring principle.

□ 1930

UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). 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, my remarks this evening will focus on the crisis facing Ukraine and our world, the most significant test of the will of liberty-loving people since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War.

The events halfway around the world remind us how precious our own liberties are and how important it is for the world community of liberty-loving nations, those that respect human life and those that believe in democratic advancement. We have common cause with those who stood in the streets in the subzero temperatures of Ukraine, whose futures are uncertain as I deliver my remarks this evening.

The world community of liberty-loving nations and those that respect treaty obligations and their roles as members of the United Nations Security Council cannot let the kind of illegal invasion of another country stand. Russia, one of the permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations, has invaded a sovereign country, violating her territorial integrity and putting off the day that Ukraine can handle its own internal affairs in order to get rid of the corruption of the former regime and allow the voices of people who so very much want to live in a free society to fully develop.

Our Nation and the world have to stand up for freedom, democracy, and human rights in Ukraine. These precious values will be diminished everywhere if we fail to raise our voices in

support of those whose lives are at risk. The West, involving our allies from around the world, has to exert strong diplomatic initiatives, economic reform, including a financing package that the International Monetary Fund and other nations are putting together, humanitarian relief, if requested, and military assistance to strengthen our NATO alliance and the protection of borders.

Recently, the Ambassador from Ukraine to the United States, Ambassador Motsyk, wrote a letter to Members of Congress, and tonight I am going to read it into the RECORD so every American can hear it:

Dear Members of the United States Congress:

I would like to begin by thanking the United States of America, and specifically the United States Congress, for the unwavering support of Ukraine at these challenging times.

For the past couple of months, Ukraine has been in the world's headlines. The whole world saw the determination of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians who took to the streets to stand for a better life—for freedom, democracy, and the end of blatant corruption that stifled our country for far too long. Yet the Yanukovich regime tried to silence the protesters with guns. Peaceful and unarmed demonstrators were met by special forces with snipers who shot dead almost a hundred people and wounded hundreds more.

In an attempt to prevent further bloodshed and resolve the crisis, on February 21, 2014, leaders of the opposition Vitali Klychko, Oleh Tyahnybok, and Arsenii Yatsenyuk on one side, and the corrupt regime of Viktor Yanukovich on the other, signed an agreement that had been negotiated with the help of foreign ministers of Poland, Germany, and France. Russia's Special Envoy, Vladimir Lukin, was present, but refused to sign it. Therefore, the suggestion by the Russian side that the opposition failed to implement the agreement is groundless.

The agreement called for an end of violence, restoration of the Ukrainian Constitution of 2004 and early presidential elections. However, on February 22, 2014, President Viktor Yanukovich fled the capitol and de facto removed himself from his constitutional authority. Therefore, on February 27, 2014, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine was the only legitimate authority in Ukraine at that time, given the resignation of the government and the President's self-removal from exercising his functions, and restored the 2004 Constitution (approved by 386 votes out of 450), recognized that Viktor Yanukovich removed himself from his constitutional duties through unconstitutional means by 386 votes, including 140 votes from the pro-Yanukovich Party of Regions, and set the early elections of the President of Ukraine on May 25, 2014 (328 votes).

That was 328, a vast majority of members of their Congress, of their Rada, voted for that.

According to Article 112 of the Constitution of Ukraine of 2004, in case of early termination of powers of the President of Ukraine, the functions of the President of Ukraine shall be carried out by the speaker of the Parliament until a new President is elected and inaugurated, the only legitimate supreme authority in Ukraine is the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine.

The Verkhovna Rada is their Congress.

The Rada elected its new speaker, Mr. Oleksandr Turchynov (by 288 votes), who

acts as the President of Ukraine until the elections, and appointed Mr. Yatsenyuk as the Prime Minister (by 371 votes). These actions were made in full compliance with Ukrainian laws.

That is over three-quarters of the membership. As the American people listen to what is happening there, you are watching a country trying to hold its government together. It was like at the beginning of our Republic when we weren't quite sure exactly how it was all going to be put together, but we were trying mightily to create a republic. However, even after the Ukrainian Congress did that, Russia did not recognize these changes and considers the former President, Viktor Yanukovich, its legitimate President, despite the votes of the Parliament, the highest standing body in the Nation of Ukraine.

Producing a piece of paper purporting to be Mr. Yanukovich's letter asking Mr. Putin to send Russian troops to Ukraine, the Federation Council of Russia, upon Mr. Putin's request, approved such a decision.

Some of us who are old enough to remember, remember what it was like living with the Soviet Union, a Soviet Union that invaded its neighbors, a Soviet Union that moved its tanks across Europe, a Soviet Union that killed over 14 million of its own people. There are some Americans old enough to remember that.

Now, the former President of Ukraine, Mr. Yanukovich, who stole from his own people—those are my words, not the Ambassador's—

Mr. Yanukovich is no longer the President of Ukraine, particularly after his escape from Kyiv on February 22, 2014. Therefore, none of his statements have any significance under either Ukrainian or international law. But in any way, even if the legitimate President of Ukraine called upon a foreign country to intervene with its armed forces in Ukraine, such a statement would also be worth nothing, because under the Constitution of Ukraine, Article 85, only the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, its Congress, can approve decisions on admitting units of armed forces of other states to the territory of Ukraine. The Rada clearly stated it had not made any such decisions.

Seeing that Ukraine is determined to pursue its European course, Russia, under the completely trumped up pretext, invaded Crimea with its armed forces.

People of Hungarian-American ancestry understand what it is like to be invaded. People of Polish-American heritage understand what it is like to be invaded. People of Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian heritage understand what it is like to be invaded by the Big Bear. There are plenty of American people who understand what the Ukrainian people are facing right now.

The Russian forces are seeking to establish complete control over Ukraine's military facilities in Crimea, trying to block and disarm Ukrainian military garrisons and border guard bases, blocking airports and ships. The Russian troops and armored vehicles are moving uncontrollably around Crimea, one of Ukraine's states, and numerous Russian military planes and helicopters violated Ukrainian airspace.

Russia's power far outweighs Ukraine, which is nearly defenseless

facing this massive force, and yet, Ukrainian soldiers have hunkered down in army bases, in air control stations, trying to stand up as they are surrounded; what courage. What courage.

By countless provocations, Russian military is seeking to instigate an armed conflict and replicate in Ukraine the Abkhazia and South Ossetia scenario. However, Ukrainian servicemen act with utmost restraint and don't react to such provocations, but there's a threat that Russia may engineer provocations against its own troops, and blame them on Ukraine.

Don't forget, Russia's President was head of the KGB, their secret police. He knows these techniques well.

There is also an ongoing accumulation of Russian equipment on the Russian territory in close proximity to the border of Ukraine in the Kharkiv, Luhansk, Donetsk and Chernihiv oblasts.

What does that mean?

These actions may indicate preparedness of the Russian side for possible intervention into the Ukrainian territory across the land border.

The military intervention is accompanied by a huge outburst of fabrications. I can assure you that Russian-speaking citizens of Ukraine enjoy the same rights and freedoms as other citizens of my country. Nobody has ever forbidden, forbids, or will forbid the use of the Russian language, as the Russian propaganda tries to demonstrate.

In fact, if you go to Ukraine, people speak many languages. They speak Ukrainian, they speak Russian, some speak a combination. Some speak Polish as well. Some speak German. There are many languages spoken in the nation of Ukraine.

As of today, there is no proof of any violations of Russian minority rights in Ukraine; there were no appeals to the relevant Ukrainian authorities, neither from those allegedly affected nor from Russia's officials. In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding between the Parliamentary Commissioner on Human Rights of Ukraine and the Ombudsman of the Russian Federation in case of such appeals to the Russian side, they are transferred to the Ukrainian Ombudsman.

The actions by the Russian Federation constitute an act of aggression against the state of Ukraine. Russian Federation brutally violated the basic principles of Charter of the United Nations obliging all member states to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

What has happened is serious.

Ukraine in the strongest possible terms protested such actions, but Russia officially rejected Ukrainian proposals to hold immediate bilateral consultation (under article 7 of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Partnership between Ukraine and the Russian Federation of 1997).

Again, another treaty violation.

Russia's actions pose a serious threat not only to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, but also to the peace and stability in the whole region. Moreover, Russian's action provoke a disbalance in the international security system, and can lead to violations of the regime of international nuclear nonproliferation on a global scale.

When in 1994, Ukraine became a party to the Nonproliferation Treaty and voluntarily surrendered the third-largest nuclear arsenal

in the world, it did so exclusively under certain conditions. These conditions envisaged granting security assurances to Ukraine by the five nuclear states. On December 5, 1994, the United States, the Russian Federation, and the United Kingdom signed the Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances to Ukraine. The French Republic and the People's Republic of China support the memorandum by signing separate declarations.

Ukraine has thoroughly implemented its commitments under the Nonproliferation Treaty and has taken and fulfilled additional obligations by getting rid of all of its stockpiles of highly enriched uranium.

□ 1945

Today, we witness the situation when the Russian Federation attempts to undermine the NPT regime not only by violating the Budapest Memorandum, but also by violating the Nonproliferation Treaty, which clearly states in its preamble that "States must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner."

Nonadherence by one guarantor state—the Russian Federation—to its commitments under the Budapest Memorandum by the military invasion in Ukraine creates a situation when the threshold states may consider international legal instruments insufficient to ensure security, territorial integrity and inviolability of their borders.

We rely on the commitments contained in the Budapest Memorandum of 1994 and the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO in Ukraine, as well as the U.S.-Ukraine Charter on Strategic Partnership and other bilateral documents.

Ukraine is asking the world community to pay attention.

We need help from the guarantor states, the United Nations, NATO, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe—

Who, by the way, have been denied access on repeated attempts to enter Crimea unarmed to observe, Russia has denied them entry.

—the European Union, all civilized nations to protect our sovereignty and territorial integrity by all available means and to prevent a war which would shatter peace in Europe and will have grave and irrevocable consequences for peace and security on a global scale.

Ambassador Motsyk goes on:

The aggression must be stopped, and we rely on the strong and unified position of the global community.

Military units deployed from Russia must leave the territory of Ukraine immediately, and those belonging to the Russian Black Sea Fleet must return to their barracks. Armed gangs that came from Russia must also immediately leave Ukraine.

Crimea is an inalienable part of Ukraine, with citizens of all ethnic backgrounds.

All issues should be resolved through negotiations. There is no alternative to a peaceful and diplomatic solution of the crisis. We hope that wisdom will prevail.

We need America's help, and we count on it.

Sincerely yours,

Olexandr Motsyk

Ambassador of Ukraine to the United States

I also want to say that there has been some conjecture in the news that we have heard the President of Russia say that Crimea really doesn't belong in Ukraine because, back in the 1950s,

when there was a Russian leader by the name of Nikita Khrushchev, that he got drunk one night and he kind of consigned Crimea to Ukraine by accident—by accident—because he wasn't thinking.

There are also very interesting facts contained in a book published in Moscow in 2003 entitled "Ukraine is not Russia." Do you know who it was written by? It was written by the former President of Ukraine, President Leonid Kuchma.

In chapter 14 of that book, President Kuchma devoted 13 pages to trace the history of Crimea and Ukraine. He called it the "Crimean knot."

The former President said—when he discusses the politics around the transfer of Crimea to Ukraine in 1954, he says the then-transition to Ukrainian administration after Ukraine became independent and how he dealt with separatist forces during his tenure as President.

Kuchma maintains that the transfer of Crimea from Russia to Ukraine came in response to petitions from the Crimeans themselves, who felt Moscow was too far away and insufficiently responsive to their everyday concerns, where their own country, their own capital of Kiev, was likely to be more attentive, particularly on issues of water and other utilities; so they could provide for Crimea better than Moscow, located far, far away.

Crimea then, Kuchma writes, was a desert and frontier land. He is referring back to the post-World War II period, particularly after the devastation of World War II.

That area was just violated and leveled to such an extent. It is hard for people in the West who have never experienced that to fully accommodate what happened there.

The residents believe Ukraine would be a better fit administratively, so he says—President Kuchma who had headed that country—the story of a drunken Nikita Khrushchev ceding Crimea to Ukraine as a gift is a fairytale. Those are his own words.

In 1954, right after Stalin's death—and what a butcher he was—Khrushchev hardly had the unbridled authority to make such unilateral decisions. At the time, he was vying for power inside his own country.

The actual act of transferring Crimea to Ukraine was signed by the head of what was called the Presidium, Kliment Voroshilov, not Khrushchev.

So the President of Russia maybe didn't read history, I don't know; but the point was the transfer to Ukraine came in 1954. It was a consequential date, and it has remained in Ukraine as part of that region for the entire second half of the 20th century and the first decade of this century. I thought it was important to put that on the RECORD.

I also wanted to say, as a Member of Congress, I am so very, very proud of the work that has been done by the Verkhovna Rada, the legal authority in

Ukraine that is holding that Nation together. They are our counterpart. They are a legislative branch of their government, just as we are here.

We for many years now, since 1999, have had a parliamentary exchange with Ukraine, founded and signed by all of our Members, with the former speaker of their Parliament, Mr. Oleksandr Tkachenko, and our Speaker here for many congresses back, Speaker Dennis Hastert. That agreement lives today.

Over the last decade and a half, we have had many parliamentary exchanges. We have had teleconferences. We have had journeys by Ukrainian parliamentarians here and American Members of Congress there.

We believe that the collective intelligence of Ukraine is contained in that Rada. We are very proud of the work they are doing, and we want to continue working with them.

Our agreement says that we want to build upon the strategic partnership between the United States and Ukraine, first established in 1996, and that our parliamentary exchange would serve as a conduit in further developing and continuing economic and political cooperation between our two countries.

The types of discussions that we have held—and will continue to do in the future—will encompass economic relations, trade, space exploration, health care, the environment, agriculture, natural resources, and any other matter important to the promotion of close ties between the United States and Ukraine.

This is a moment for more robust engagement with the Parliament of Ukraine and our own Congress. The idea is that we can learn from one another, we can be mutually supportive, and we know how important legislative bodies are to nations that actually expand freedoms, rights of free speech, rights of assembly, rights of free press, rights of free expression of religion, and we are very proud to be partnered with the Verkhovna Rada.

I would also like to read this evening from an excellent article that was written for The New Republic by Yale scholar Dr. Timothy Snyder, the author of a recent bestseller called "Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin," during World War II. It is incredible work.

But in this particular article, he talks about where Putin is vulnerable, where his soft spots are. He states at the beginning of the article:

In dispatching troops to Ukraine, Russia has violated international law, flouted multiple treaty commitments, and set the stage for a European war.

It is right that the American people are paying attention; it is right that we are using our power to try to put the bear back where it belongs and to try to move the situation to stability. The price of poor diplomacy, I think, would be catastrophic.

In this article, Dr. Snyder ends by saying:

Russian propaganda derides Europeans as fey and helpless, and we too often tend to agree. But the European Union does have instruments of influence. Its greatest power, of course, is its attractiveness to societies on its borders, such as Ukraine. But even where membership is not an option, and the European Union faces unambiguous hostility, it can act. Russia's very contempt for the European Union might force Europeans to undertake a more active foreign policy and to take responsibility for their neighborhood.

The United States has to use our power to help push the situation in that direction.

I just wanted to ask if our dear colleague from Iowa, does he have his own Special Order, or does he wish to join in this Special Order? Congressman KING of Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I very much appreciate the gentledady for yielding to me. I have a few topics I intend to bring up in the subsequent hour.

I want to thank the gentledady for raising this topic and for the significant information that has been delivered here with regard to Ukraine, the Russians, and the political scenario that we are in.

I am contemplating what this means to the world. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I am more troubled than many about the circumstances that have unfolded off of the Black Sea.

I have watched as Putin set up the Olympics. It looked like part of it was for self-glorification. When I think about what this means politically, much of the world is looking at Putin, thinking, well, look at all of the \$50-plus billion you invested in the Olympics, and now, you see the world opinion now has turned against you when you had all of that good will that was garnered at the Sochi Olympics.

I think it is a little bit different perspective from where I sit, that is that the component of this is true, but I don't think Putin cares about world opinion. I think he cares about how much hegemony he can deliver from the seat that he has. I think that the good will that came among the Russian people, his popularity numbers had to go up.

Remember, this is a man who went through a difficult contentious election in 2012. There were demonstrations in the streets in multiple places around Russia. The tension that was there, as any leader, his hold on power can't just be by force and fear alone, there has to be some support that is there.

I believe that the Olympics actually helped Putin and gave him the support base at home that would allow him to pull off an invasion—an illegal invasion of the Crimea.

I don't think he cares about what we think. I don't think he cares what the President thinks, Mr. Speaker. I don't think he cares so much even what the European Union thinks, as long as they continue to buy gas from him and keep his economy going, but I think that was a component.

The next thing is that I have watched him for a good number of years, and

perhaps not with the attention to detail the gentledady from Ohio has delivered here tonight, but I have long concluded that Vladimir Putin is committed to restoring, to the extent that he can in his time, the old Soviet Union.

I think he sees this as a giant geopolitical chess game. I would think back at the time in 1984 when then Ronald Reagan's ambassador to the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick stepped down as ambassador to move on with her career.

I remember picking up on page 3 or 4 of the newspaper a little tiny article there that mentioned it. It wasn't any examination, but it said a little quote that I think she was very well known for, Jeane Kirkpatrick.

□ 2000

We were in the depths of the cold war at the time, I would add, and she said: What is going on in this cold war between the United States of America and the Soviet Union is the equivalent of playing chess and Monopoly on the same board. The question is: Will the United States of America break the Soviet Union economically in the Monopoly component of the game before the Soviet Union checkmates the United States militarily?

That was the contest. That was a contest as Reagan and Thatcher saw it. That was the contest as far as Pope John Paul II saw it, I believe. We know how that turned out at least in the temporary. The strength of the economy of the United States and our ability to continue to develop more and more technology—to put SDI up in order to restore our national defenses—became the deciding factor. The Soviet Union could no longer keep up with the United States, and the Soviet Union couldn't keep up with the free world. The juggernaut of our economy overwhelmed the managed economy of the Soviets. Of course, Gorbachev was a player in this, and we had glasnost and perestroika. So I think he saw that he couldn't hold it together anymore, and to the extent that he cooperated with Lady Thatcher and President Reagan, we saw the worm turn of history.

I hold in my office a piece of the Berlin Wall. That is framed in my office, and I have had it since 1989. Excuse me. Actually, it was on September 12 of 1990 that that piece was chiseled out of the wall for me. I didn't get to do that myself. That piece of the Berlin Wall represents a piece of the Iron Curtain, itself. The Berlin Wall was the physical structure of the Iron Curtain that Winston Churchill described at Fulton, Missouri, in 1948. The Iron Curtain was drawn by, I believe, the finger of Winston Churchill, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Joseph Stalin, whom the gentledady has mentioned, at Yalta, on February 11, 1945, when we didn't know how World War II was going to turn out.

The Allies got together when we were allied with the Russians, and they drew

a line across the map. On the east side of that line, they were going to live under the Soviet Union, under the iron fist of communism. On the west side of that line, people were going to live and be free, and the destinies of hundreds of millions of people were determined at Yalta. It is curious to me that Putin has invaded and occupied Crimea, which includes Yalta.

One day, I hope to stand on that real estate and look out across the bay where that decision was made. It was a momentous time in history, and it began the domino effect of the military invasion and occupation of free country after free country. It spilled over to the east—into Korea, Southeast Asia. I have long believed that, had we held a different position—a stronger negotiating position—and if we had insisted with Stalin that we were not going to hand the Eastern Bloc countries over to him, we might have ended up with the map that we see today rather than the map that was so hard fought through the cold war. Think how different it is.

Now I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that when people think about this—and the gentledady from Ohio and I discussed this in some of the very engaging conversations we have had—think about how the Iron Curtain was constructed, defined at Yalta on February 11 and 12 of 1945, and how that line moved when the Berlin Wall came down in November 1989 as each of the Eastern Bloc countries stepped up and grasped their freedom. I think of the people by the tens of thousands standing in the square in Prague, rattling their keys in the square in Prague. Over time, they rattled their keys into, essentially, a bloodless revolution that brought about the freedom of the Czechs for the first time in decades. That kind of desire—that heart for freedom—washed across Eastern Europe. It actually washed across Russia for a time. There was a time that I said that freedom echoed all across Europe and all the way to the Pacific Ocean. I believed that for a while, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, we don't believe this today because the Russia that is ruled under Putin isn't the Russia that the Russian people believed they were going to get when the Soviet Union melted down and imploded, and that became what we thought for a time—hoped for a time—was the end of the cold war. Now I fear that it has relaunched and restarted. Yet we should look at this map of where the new Iron Curtain is. It is at the border of Russia. It doesn't go west of the border of Russia, and it should not be allowed to creep west of the border of Russia.

That is what I believe the gentledady and I are committed to working towards—to restoring the strength and the prosperity of the people who live free and who give the inspiration to those who do not to live as we do, as a free people.

I very much appreciate the gentledady.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KING for being here this evening, also for attending the briefing this afternoon and for participating fully in that effort.

As you were speaking, I have a piece of the Berlin Wall in my office. I knocked it off with a hammer in 1989, and I have it framed, and it will be there for the people of my region forever. It is all framed, and it is labeled in memory of that incredible moment.

What we learned during that period of time, post World War II, was that we have to maintain our resolve. I say this to the people of Ukraine that we will not forget you, and if liberty-loving nations use their collective power, change is possible, that change for the better is possible. So, for those who have fear and trepidation, know that there have been models of states before.

Take Hungary, which was invaded in 1956. I can remember Cardinal Mindszenty, from my own denomination, being locked up. When the Russian tanks came into Budapest, Cardinal Mindszenty became a symbol of freedom for the whole world. He was held in the U.S. Embassy. They gave him a closet there, and I actually saw it when I was traveling in Budapest. He became a symbol in the West for defiance against the regime, and our government played a role in that. Cardinal Mindszenty was not an American. He was a Hungarian. He was a Roman Catholic prelate. He risked his life, and he never came out of that Embassy. He became a symbol.

If we look at what happened in the fifties and the sixties in Poland, as labor union members began to demonstrate and be killed, Father Jerzy Popieluszko lost his life in standing up for their right to have a better way of life, and, ultimately, Pope John Paul II became a Pope from inside the Iron Curtain. We saw how religious leaders struggled with the people to give them full voice. It is just so historically compelling and from another realm, from an advanced realm of where the human soul seeks to bring a better way of life to people who seem to be fighting against the odds. They don't have a lot of guns and weapons and nuclear weapons and battleships at their behest, but there is a spirit that attends to those who want to build a better way of life. In standing with the people and in thinking with the people of Ukraine, we hope we embody that spirit.

We were graced with the presence at the National Prayer Breakfast recently with the head of the Orthodox Christian congregations of Ukraine's Patriarch Filaret. We also had other leaders from the Greek Catholic, the Baptist, the Jewish denominations in Ukraine. I have this hope that as the Easter and Passover season approaches that the religious leaders will find a way to invite the world community that wants so very much for the people of Ukraine to be free, that we will find a way to pray for their future together. We hope

the religious leaders of Ukraine invite us. I would love to be in that procession. What a place for the world community to be in this Easter-Passover season.

There were Muslims and imams who stood in the square in Kiev; there were Orthodox; there were Baptists; there were Catholics; there were Christian leaders; there were union leaders. What courage. They had no weapons. The weapons were all around them, but they stood their ground. The power of that message is not lost on the people of Ukraine. It is not lost on her neighbors. Frankly, it is not lost on Russia. It is a great power to stand with the spirit of those who want to be free and to find a way to do that, to find a peaceful way to do that.

The Russian Government has never known freedom. They have never had a free election. They have no concept of how to run a free society. I first traveled into that region in 1973, trying to find the shattered remnants of our family, and the further I got—the further we drove—we ended up, I remember, going through then-Czechoslovakia as we entered. We were the only civilian car on the road. Every single vehicle on the road was either a little, white delivery truck or a military truck. I can remember our beloved mother, Anastasia, and I were sitting there in the car, and I was driving.

The further we got as we headed toward Prague, the military soldiers would lift the tarp up on the back of the trucks and look at us—these two women, driving in this orange car with a Western license plate. We must have been a real curiosity, and completely unarmed as they checked you before you went over the border. I remember going over that border—and the gun turrets and the barbed wire—as we proceeded east and how our luggage and our car was examined at every border. The further we got, the more lonely it became until we were the only vehicle on the road as we entered Ukraine for the first time, crossing the border at a place called Uzhhorod, and the Soviets making us wait 5 hours at the border so they could take our car apart. It was just a little car. We had just two suitcases. They couldn't believe we were Americans. They thought we would have brought seven trunks. They looked under the car. They held us at the border until it was night. There were no streetlights, and there were no traffic signs.

We had to find our way from Poland to Lviv, the major city on the western side of Ukraine. In riding over the roads, which had huge rocks, I thought, boy, we are going to get a flat. There were no gas stations. I mean, there was nothing. There was no electricity. We just drove into the wilderness in trying to find that town. When we finally got there, which was very late at night, I saw this little sign called "In-Tourist." That was where they allowed guests or foreigners to stay.

I said to Mom: This must be the place.

It was dusty. There was nobody. There was nobody on the streets, and there were no vehicles. There was just this tiny, little sign in the window.

I went in. There was one desk clerk and one gentleman who was dressed in an elevator operator outfit. He didn't speak any English, and I didn't speak his language. He signaled to me that he wanted me to take the car. He was in the car, and we drove it to the Lviv Opera House, which was in complete disarray. I mean it wasn't fixed up like it is today. The car was then seized. It was put behind those closed gates, and I never saw it again until we left the country. So we had to go everywhere on foot, and we were watched everywhere. We were trying to find the pieces of our family. Our grandparents had come to America 100 years before.

I remember how grim it was. I remember people didn't laugh a lot. They didn't have a lot to eat. We tried to find our relatives. We had, through relatives in Poland, tried to notify the village from which our grandparents came. We stayed in the hotel for 3 days, and we thought, well, nobody is coming. Then our mother, who spoke Polish and who could understand Ukrainian and Russian, heard our name on the third day. Here people had been trying to find us for 3 days. We were the only people in the hotel, and they were told that we weren't there. I can remember how awful that was. Of course, the room we stayed in was up on the second floor of a building now that they call the St. George Hotel, but then it was just the In-Tourist Hotel. They stationed a very large woman outside our hotel door there, with a table and a water bottle, and she knew whether we were coming or going or who came in, and there was a listening device in the wall. There were no curtains on the windows, and there was no hot water. I just remember how sparse it was.

□ 2015

I am probably in Congress today because of what I experienced back then and the understanding I came to have of what life was like there and how difficult it was. I can't go into it all this evening, but I learned about the suffering of the people firsthand.

I think one of the shocking experiences I had was how poorly the Soviet government treated its veterans. They asked me for wheelchairs, they asked me for crutches. I couldn't believe how little respect they had for their own people.

So when I see Vladimir Putin invade Ukraine and invade Crimea, he has no respect for the people there.

We got into the villages. You could only go to certain approved villages in those days. I found that in the village of our grandparents they had to build an outhouse for us to visit, with this little tiny set of stones going back to the outhouse. Americans say, What? I said, Yes. Their life was so basic.

I thought I would never eat a potato again in my life because all we ate was

potatoes with lard on top for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, and tomatoes that had been canned. They gave us the best they had.

I thought, So this is communism.

The life of the ordinary person is so pitiful. They had no fresh water. I got deathly ill. There were no doctors. You couldn't get medicine. I learned what dysentery was. I learned what unsafe food was. I learned how the relatives, including one of my great uncles, had been tortured and sent to work camps. They called them gulags. His brother died there. I began to understand the full price that families pay who live under those kinds of systems.

So President Putin has no clue to what a free society really means. So much unneeded suffering.

We have this moment in history to make a difference. I know the American people are considering how to make that difference. Freedom-loving people around the world are as well.

I find the judicious and firm acts of President Obama and Secretary Kerry to be very constructive. America can't be the babysitter for the world. On the other hand, there is a conscience that rises in freedom-lovers, and, thinking together, America will make the right decisions, with her allies around the world, to right this situation and to allow those who want their liberty, after paying such an egregious price, to have that moment in their own history.

I see our dear colleague from New York, Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, who is appropriately attired this evening in full Ukrainian spirit, has joined us.

Welcome.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Thank you so much, Congresswoman KAPTUR, for your leadership and for organizing a briefing earlier today for Members of Congress with head leaders from the State Department on the actions that are happening, and for your leadership in passing H. Res. 499 today, which condemned the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation. We appreciate very much your making that happen and helping us to pass that resolution.

Once again, the Russians have rattled their sabers and tightened their grip on the Ukraine. In the past 24 hours they have seized a Ukrainian naval base. Even though the Constitution declares Crimea to be an integral part of Ukraine, the pro-Russian regional authorities in Crimea continue to sever links to Ukraine's capital today, canceling incoming flights from Kiev. They have also run out of town any of the monitors that have come from the United Nations or the independent free world. Flights to and from Turkey also have been suspended.

The Russians have threatened to confiscate Western assets and refuse to even speak to the Ukraine's interim prime minister on the phone. The in-

terim prime minister has found \$80 billion missing—even loan guarantee money. This Congress needs to work together to find that money and return it rightfully to the Ukrainian people.

Yanukovych, the disgraced former President, did the Russians' bidding and appealed to Ukrainian military units to refuse to follow the orders of the new interim authorities.

Once again, today, the Russians ignored international norms, calls for restraint, and all the cries for justice for all those who were gunned down in Independence Square.

Congresswoman, are you aware that there has been no action to punish the people who killed community leaders and others in Independence Square? Eighty-two people were murdered.

My constituents have held vigils. They have memorials that they have constructed. In their churches they have pictures of every single martyred hero and heroine, with their stories. Yet no one has been held accountable for that crime against decency and humanity of killing innocent people.

They have ignored Ukrainian sovereignty, treaties, and the rule of law, all in an effort to reestablish a disgraced petty tyrant whose secret life of obscene opulence included—this is hard to say—gold-plated toilets—that is what they are saying on the Internet—along with pictures of all of his zoos and his house and all kinds of things where he wasted the money of the Ukrainian people on wasteful things.

On the other hand, the Ukrainians have already done the right thing for the world around them. In 1994, they signed the Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances and willingly gave up the third-largest stockpile of nuclear weapons. They are a peace-loving people. With the peaceful stroke of a pen this eliminated a far greater threat to world peace than North Korea and Iran combined.

The key thing the Ukrainians were promised in return was security assurances against threats or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine. The U.S. and Russia, Congresswoman, were signatories to that statement.

President Obama has made it clear that America will stand with the Ukrainian people. We are all watching everyday on television what is happening, and what has struck me the most was the scene where the Russians were shooting in the air and shouting at the Ukrainians, and they marched peacefully towards them. One general called out: America stands with us.

That is true. America stands with peace-loving people around the world and for democracy. We so often take for granted the freedoms, the liberties, the democracy that we have that others are struggling for around the world.

Tomorrow, the Ukraine's interim prime minister is scheduled to meet President Obama at the White House here in our country. The White House has announced visa restrictions on

Russians and Crimeans who are threatening the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine. The President is working with America's allies to craft economic sanctions that will punish and isolate the architects of this aggression.

Secretary of State John Kerry has traveled to Kiev to mourn for the fallen in Independence Square and to bring \$1 billion in American loan guarantees and pledges of technical assistance. We overwhelmingly passed the \$1 billion loan guarantee without a cap here in our Congress. It was an important vote. We all stood with the Ukrainians.

Now it is time for Congress to make it clear that we stand with the Ukrainian people. The resolution we passed today is a good start—condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation.

To paraphrase the Ukrainian anthem: Their persistence and toils should be rewarded. Let freedom's song resound.

We should be asking our friends in Russia, What is their word worth? What is their signature worth on any document, on any treaty, or on any contract? What is their word worth?

I would like to invite the distinguished Congresswoman to join me this Saturday with the Ukrainian community on Roosevelt Island, named after FDR, who went to Crimea for Yalta and spoke of the four freedoms: freedom of want, freedom of religion, freedom of democracy, freedom of speech. These freedoms are what the people in the Ukraine are fighting for, longing for, working for.

We are going to gather at the Four Freedoms Park in Manhattan to pray with, to be with, and to stand with the Ukrainian people who are bravely fighting as we speak for their freedoms, for their independence, for American values that they want as their values. America stands with them. The American people are standing with the Ukrainians.

I thank the gentlelady for having found the Ukrainian Caucus here in Congress, of which I am a member, and also for having crafted resolutions and so many statements in their support and helping to organize in a bipartisan way. Because this country is united. We are speaking with one voice, Republicans and Democrats, in support of the Ukrainian people.

I thank the gentlelady for her magnificent leadership.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY of New York for taking time out of a very busy day to work way over time tonight and to be here and to join our plea for the people of Ukraine. Thank you for your leadership in the Ukrainian Caucus, and thank you for wearing a peasant blouse, which has a long, deep history in Ukraine.

Ukraine breadbasket to Europe breadbasket to the world—now the

third largest exporter of grain, despite all of the hardship that the corrupt government of that country has placed on their farmers, who simply want to earn a living from the soil and share their great gifts with the world. They have faced so many roadblocks.

Thank you for appreciating the artistry and magnificent beauty of that country and for your steadfast support of liberty both here and abroad. You have just been a magnificent member. We thank you so much for coming down here this evening.

As she was speaking about New Yorkers who are going to gather in Four Freedoms Park in New York City, a home to people from throughout the world, I wanted to say that there are more Ukrainians living outside Ukraine than inside its borders because of the tragedies that have occurred there over the last century and more, particularly because of the Stalin and Soviet period.

Ukrainians live in Canada, Portugal, Italy, Argentina, and Australia. The pieces of humanity are strewn across the globe, and as I mentioned in earlier remarks this evening, millions of her own people were either starved to death or murdered. They were killed by their own government, the government of the Soviet Union, which tried to eliminate Ukrainian culture, Polish culture, the Jewish religion.

Now we are worried about the Tatars in Crimea because they don't share the majority religion. They are a minority. The history of tyrannical leaders in that part of the world has, unfortunately, been to kill those who don't agree with them rather than to create a civil society in which all views can be expressed, even though we might not agree with them.

So we worry about the people there. We are trying to be a voice for them here in our own country—a voice for freedom, not for brutality or repression. A voice for encouragement, not force alone.

I want to thank Congresswoman MALONEY and Congressman KING for joining us this evening.

May God bless America, and may God bless the people and the legitimate government of Ukraine as she seeks to build a freedom of liberty and justice for all her people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2030

HISTORICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE SITUATION IN UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized by you and to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I would first like to say I appreciate the gentleladies—and that is plural—

presentation and the breadth of their attention to the part of the world that has been the center of our discussion here tonight and that should be the center of our American discussion, and will be, for some time to come.

As I watch this unfold, and think of the time in 2008 when I found myself in the Nation of Georgia within a little more than a week after the Russians invaded two provinces or states of Georgia, one of them South Ossetia, and having arrived there and met with the leadership in Georgia, including President Saakashvili and his cabinet that were young people, and a minister of defense that was still awaiting his 30th birthday, I heard the narrative from inside Tbilisi on what the Russians had planned and what the Russians had done.

Now, history is little bit undecided, Mr. Speaker, about who fired the first shot in Georgia. It may have been the Russians baited the Georgians into it. It may have been that the Russians actually fired on the Georgians and the Georgians fired back.

In any case, the narrative that I received there that was part of a briefing that was synced with our State Department and with the representatives of the Nation State of Georgia brought together information that there was a single underpass, there was a two-lane underpass; that within a 24-hour period of time, some 2,200 Russian vehicles, tanks, armor and other equipment went under that underpass.

They had to have staged that invasion of Georgia. It could not have been a spontaneous response on the part of the Georgians firing on the Russians or the Russians who may well have fired the first shots at Georgia.

In any case, when the Russians went in and occupied those parts of Georgia, that began a movement, a strong movement of hegemony, and I think that it was passed off that the Georgian circumstances were somehow an anomaly, that somehow it was regional tensions that were brought up, and that the eye to the sea wasn't necessarily what Putin was thinking about.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that he was. I believe it was the first piece on the giant geopolitical chessboard, the chessboard that our President doesn't seem to think actually is in play any longer, that Cold War chessboard.

But when I look at the map of that part of the world and look at the flow of energy that goes back and forth, Ukraine and Georgia have similarities. One is, they have ports.

The second one is that they are a nexus for energy, transmitting energy through their countries with pipelines and, in the case of Georgia, rail lines. It is important that if you can control Georgia you can control a lot of the energy that comes through from the east, and if you can control Yugoslavia, you can control a lot of the energy that comes through from the east.

Those two things, plus the historical involvement of the Russians in the Cri-

mea. I take us back to the gentlelady from Ohio who laid out the case of the 1994 treaty that the Russians signed and the interested parties signed that all would respect the territorial and sovereign borders of the Ukraine, and of course the Russians violated that.

I don't expect much of anything else to happen. I don't think they are bound by their honor in any way. I think they are only bound by the limitations of the static tension that comes from power, and that power can be economic, it can be political. It is probably not very much cultural, but it also is, in the highest degree it is military.

When there is no military deterrent in place, then Putin is going to be determined to move forward and reconstitute the old Soviet Union. He lamented years ago that the worst thing that happened in the 20th century was the implosion of the Soviet Union, or the disintegration of the Soviet union.

I would also point out that the world is not going to tolerate a lone superpower, which the United States of America is, the unchallenged greatest nation in the world, the strongest superpower there has been, with global reach everywhere.

When the United States pulls back—first, Mr. Speaker, we project power. We project power in the ways that I said, economically, culturally, militarily and strategically, and when the United States pulls back from that, when we decide that we are not going to exert influence in parts of the world, then the lust for power that comes in the embodiment of someone like Putin fills that vacuum. In fact, it is pushing constantly. It doesn't need a vacuum to push in.

Russian pushed into Georgia in 2008. They gave us a preview of what was to come.

Now, here we are, these few years later, these six or so years later, and we are watching now, as Putin finished up with his Olympics, his 50-plus billion dollar endeavor, I think a lot of it had to do with raising the spirits of the Russian people and their sense of support for him so that he could get away with this cold tactic of a military invasion and conquest of the Crimea.

I don't have any doubt that he has got his eyes on the balance of the Ukraine, that he has got his eyes on the balance of the Soviet Union in whatever order that he can pull this off.

If we show weakness, if we don't stand strong, if we don't stare him down, if we don't put the kind of equipment and resources in place to block his move, then Putin is going to march through these countries, one after another.

It is a fairly long hiatus between Georgia and the component of the Ukraine that has now been invaded and occupied that we call now the Crimea, but I think it is interesting and I think it is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Crimea that has been grabbed as part

of the Ukraine, and now they are seeking, the Russians have already annexed it, Mr. Speaker, and now they are about forcing a referendum this Sunday.

When they talk about how the Duma has to operate and what the legal structure is in Russia, it is all a matter of what does Putin command. Whatever the sequential order of the Duma is, and whatever we might think they have to jump through for hoops, I think it is just this: if Putin commands, then they will jump through the hoops at his command.

We should think about this. Georgia, and now the Crimea and the eyes of the Russians and Putin, in particular, looking into the Ukraine, and think about what happened the last time we had a dictator who had such a desire for conquest and occupation.

I would take us back to this piece of history where, as I saw this happen, when the Russians went into the Crimea, Mr. Speaker, immediately, I began to rethink the sequence of history, when Adolf Hitler demanded that they receive the Sudetenland, a component and the western perimeter of at the time Czechoslovakia. The pretense that he used was identical to the pretense that Putin has used to go into the Crimea.

It was Hitler that said there are German-speaking people and they deserve German representation, and someone has got to protect them and represent them, and I need to do that, as the leader, the Fuhrer of Germany. They are German-speaking people, they are German people, they need to be under German rule. That was the pretense that he used that forced the negotiations that took place in Munich in 1938.

Before we go to that spot, there was a peaceful march into and invasion of the Nation of Austria, and pulling us back in that history, Mr. Speaker, there was significant pressure that was put on the Austrians that began back prior to 1938, and Hitler made the arguments too.

Austria, still, to this day, is a German-speaking country. They identify very closely with the German people. They flow back and forth. The difference between an Austrian and a German isn't a particularly distinct one, although they are separate nation states today.

But Hitler put pressure on the Chancellor of Austria, and as he brought them to an agreement and got the Chancellor of Austria to make some appointments of Austrian Nazi officers, he weakened the resistance of the leadership by doing so.

On March 12 of 1938, essentially the day—March 11, the Chancellor of Austria resigned. March 12 Nazi troops flowed into Austria. By the 13th of March they had declared Austria to be a protectorate, a separate protectorate of the German empire that had begun.

Now, this is a recovery of a nation that was defeated in World War I. They had gone through tremendous eco-

omic crisis and chaos, as had Austria, and they were vulnerable, and Austria was powerless to stand in the way of the Nazi military machine, and the Wehrmacht. So March 12 was essentially the date that the flow of the Nazis marched into, went into Austria and Vienna, March 12 of 1938, Mr. Speaker.

Now, think of this. In the spring of 1938, Nazi troops flow into Austria, essentially annex the country without firing a shot. Pretty similar to the Russians going into the Crimea.

Now, they did fire some shots in Georgia, a lot of shots in Georgia, and people were killed, and a number of Russian planes were shot down by the Georgian military, but we are back in 1938. Spring of 1938, Austria taken over by the Nazis. In September of 1938, Hitler has been spending the whole summer agitating that the Sudetenland needs to also come into the German sphere of influence in a similar fashion that Austria had been brought into the German sphere of influence.

Neville Chamberlain, the now infamous failed peacekeeper, peacemaker then flew to Munich to meet with Hitler and made an agreement called the Munich Agreement with Hitler and signed off on it and got a letter that Adolf Hitler signed which said, we are going to have peace now in Europe if you just give me the Sudetenland, the German-speaking area which was the western perimeter of Czechoslovakia.

The date was September 29, 1938, when Neville Chamberlain met with Hitler in Munich. He flew back to England and landed, had a press conference on the airstrip on September 30 of 1938 and waved the letter in his hand that said, peace for our time.

We remember it as peace in our time, but he actually said peace for our time and waved the letter, did the press conference, and let all of England and the free world know that Hitler didn't have any further designs on any kind of real estate; he didn't intend to take over any other part of Europe, that he was going to be happy with what he had achieved, which was Austria and the Sudetenland, the western perimeter of Czechoslovakia. Peace for our time.

So after that press conference, I am sure that Neville Chamberlain went to bed thinking that he had accomplished something, and the very following day the Nazis then flowed into Sudetenland, and they stayed there and occupied throughout the winter.

That takes us through the winter of 1938 and the spring of 1939. By March 16, the Nazi troops had flowed throughout the balance of Czechoslovakia, occupied it.

Now, you would think that we were going to have peace for our time at that time because, after all, Hitler didn't announce his planned operations to go in and invade and occupy any other part of Europe. He had been announcing that he was peaceful. He signed the letter. He just didn't keep his word.

Sound a little curious, doesn't it, Mr. Speaker. The Russians signed the agreement with the Ukrainians in 1994 that they would respect the territorial boundaries of the Ukraine. They kept that deal as long as it was suitable to the Russians.

The Russian signature, of course, means nothing to Putin if they have territorial aspirations, if they have territorial greed. So Putin, in a very similar fashion to Adolf Hitler, went into the Crimea and took the Crimea over.

He had it planned. He had it strategized. He should have been able to see it coming. I would like to think that our intel predicted this as a strategic move, rather than just a response to a military move. I don't know that and probably will never know that, if that was ever the dialogue of the people who were watching very closely in that part of the world.

When Hitler went in and occupied the balance of Czechoslovakia, and we had the summer then of 1939 wondering, but not very intensively, we have got peace in Europe again. Land for peace. Worked out pretty well, Neville Chamberlain thought.

Yet, September 1, 1939, Hitler invaded Poland. He had already cut a deal with the Russians that they were going to carve Poland up. It took the Russians another 12 days to get mobilized to go in and start carving up their part of Poland, but the Nazi divisions were prepared to go, and they launched a blitzkrieg invasion of Poland and invaded and occupied and penetrated to the predetermined line that he and Stalin had agreed to, and Poland was carved up.

□ 2045

Now that crossed the line for the rest of Western Europe. That did launch World War II in a formal fashion. So as the Western World began to mobilize for a war that they hoped to never see fought and were not very well prepared for, the following spring, in April of 1940, the Nazis invaded Norway. April 13, they invaded Greece and Yugoslavia.

Think how fast this took place. They had been planning for a long time. They had mobilized for a long time. They had the strategy put in place, and by April 13 of 1940, in a short 2-year period of time, they had gone through Austria, the Sudetenland, the balance of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Greece, and Yugoslavia by April 13, 1940.

Mr. Speaker, this was a dramatic takeover of real estate and property. At some point, Hitler no longer needed to put up the pretense because the war was declared then, and it was declared on September 1 of 1939, shortly after September 1 of 1939, Mr. Speaker.

These are dramatic changes that took place across Europe. They were ideological clashes, economic clashes, geographic clashes, and cultural clashes that came to a head in that part of the world. We think it can't happen

again or it won't happen again. We fought the cold war for 45 years, and, finally, the Berlin Wall went down, and MARCY KAPTUR went over and chiseled a piece out with her own hand. I learned that tonight on the floor. I am impressed, and I am proud of her for having the conviction to go and do that, knowing and understanding what that meant then and what it means today.

Mr. Speaker, we are watching a Russia push back on this. We have seen the character and the culture under Stalin; we have seen it under Brezhnev; we have seen it under Khrushchev; and we have seen it under Lenin, the territorial hegemony attitude of the Russians and a Putin who would like to reconstruct the old Soviet Union and do so by military conquest. That is what we have in the Crimea. I don't have any doubt he is looking again at Ukraine.

Now I will go through some of the rest of these countries that fell at the beginning of World War I. I have taken you through Austria, the Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, and Poland carved up by Russia and the Nazis. They made a deal, a cold and cruel agreement to carve Poland up, and they executed a lot of Jews, and they executed a lot of Poles just for being Jews and Poles.

History marks that kind of brutality on both sides of that line that came into Poland. I recall meeting in Cologne, Germany, a few years ago with some leaders in that part of the world. The gentleman who was sitting next to me at a dinner table and I got into a conversation—about the same age—what did our parents do during the Second World War? Mr. Speaker, I listened as he told me that his father fought at Auschwitz. I said: Did he fight to liberate Auschwitz? He said that he fought in the Russian invasion of Auschwitz in September of 1939 when the Russians went in and invaded Poland from the east and invaded and occupied, and Auschwitz was part of that territory that the Russians carved out.

It is quite a thing to listen to that kind of a narrative. Clear over on the east side of the line that we didn't think about enough throughout that course of history, there were people that were invading armies that were launched in September of 1939 to go and take the free country of Poland and carve it up in a cold-blooded and greedy way to latch on to the property of Poland.

So the pattern is there. And they are on this together, and they are staring each other down across this line. But it takes us through 1939 and into 1940, when Norway and Greece, in the spring, were occupied along with Yugoslavia. And then on the 10th of May, the Nazi panzer divisions rolled through Belgium and into France. Belgium lasted about 18 days and ended about May 28, 1940, when they fully surrendered. And France lasted until about the 22nd of June. Paris capitulated and surrendered June 14,

and the balance of France was handed over under Nazi control with Vichy cooperation as late as June 22 of 1940.

Then the Battle of Britain began—and that was fought over the English Channel, much of it, and over the land area of Great Britain. That essentially ended. You don't know when it ends, but looking back on the calendar, it ended in the late fall of 1940. And we are still not in this war, Mr. Speaker. This country is still sitting here watching the lot of the rest of the world engage in the conflict—not that I wanted to be in that conflict any earlier than that—but we were neutral, although we were trying to help out our Allies and help out the British. And I am thinking, what are the Russians looking at at the time? They are wondering, their ally, Hitler, was not very reliable, but they went through 1940 and through all of the spring of 1941 believing that they had made an agreement to carve up Poland, and somehow they were going to have the static border between Germany and the Russians. They probably believed that Hitler didn't have any further land aspirations either.

Now, I bring this up because we should not believe that Putin doesn't have further aspirations. Hitler did have. On June 22, 1941, he launched Operation Barbarossa and invaded Russia itself, from a treaty to carve up Poland to an all-out assault and offensive on Russia, to invade and occupy Russia, and nearly got it done.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a very long and complex history that can be read in a book entitled "Absolute War," written by Chris Bellamy. It is about 750 pages. It goes through the details, in great detail, of that Operation Barbarossa and the German invasion of Russia. It was, of course, turned back at Stalingrad.

While that went on, it was easy to see that Hitler was planning the invasion of Russia for a long, long time. He was retrofitting his railcars to be able to go on the different gauge rails as they were sending men and equipment into Russia. He had an agreement with the Russians that they were going to send him the things he needed, raw materials and feed grains and the raw materials that they could use and that they needed badly in Germany in exchange for German engineers going to Russia. He had his German engineers that were helping the Russians develop and build military equipment and munitions, except the German engineers were ordered to slow-walk the Russians and do very little to help move them along in their progression of developing their military capability, all the while raw materials—food and supplies that Hitler needed from Russia—were pouring into Germany and becoming part of the resources for the war effort that was about to come.

That launched June 22. It would have been earlier by about 6 weeks if it hadn't been for an uprising revolution in Yugoslavia that took five German divisions to go down there to put the

uprising down, the revolution down in Yugoslavia. That delayed the planned invasion of Russia for Hitler from May 12 up until June 22. It likely was the difference in whether the Nazi troops would have been successful in Stalingrad and in Moscow.

But if one, today, Mr. Speaker, travels to Moscow and you land at the airport and take ground travel from the airport, that long high traffic area on into Moscow, you will see just outside of Moscow a large tank barrier that is sitting there which marks the furthest most easterly advance of a German tank that was part of the invasion attempts in Moscow.

We don't think about how close that came. It came within perhaps weeks of being successful, that difference between the delay of that invasion which would have been scheduled for May 12 that turned out to be June 22, 1941. We don't study this in our history very much, Mr. Speaker, because we turn our focus to Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, and then the need and the necessity for us to launch a two-front war almost immediately.

That conflict set the borders for today, a conflict of the Second World War. I take you through this piece of history, and I will be naming some of the countries that may well be targets of Putin. But I take you through this history to get, Mr. Speaker, people that are paying attention to this discussion, to get you to Yalta on February 11, 1945. I briefly mentioned it while the gentlelady from Ohio had the floor.

I think about that meeting between Franklin Delano Roosevelt, between Josef Stalin and Winston Churchill, the three leaders that were the central players in the Second World War European theater—not the Japanese or Pacific theater, but the European theater. They met at Yalta. It is ironic to me that Yalta is in the Crimea. Putin has annexed, not only annexed the Crimea, he annexed Yalta itself, the very place where those three leaders took a map of the world, of Asia and Europe, and drew a line on that map.

West of the line—after the war was over, they planned that they would defeat this Nazi Germany that has marched through all these countries that I have described. They planned that they were going to defeat Nazi Germany, that they were going to invade and occupy all of the countries from the east on the Russian side and from the west the Allied side. By that time, it was just post the Battle of the Bulge, which ended near the end of January in 1945.

So they decided they were going to carve up Europe. If the war ended in victory for them, then the Russians were going to take a half of Germany. We know where that line was. It became the Iron Curtain wall, and in Berlin it became the Berlin Wall. And they were going to take the Eastern Bloc countries that we know of, and that was Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania,

and Bulgaria, the list goes on, Yugoslavia, those countries, parts of them.

So that agreement was made at Yalta. The agreement was agreed to by Churchill, by Roosevelt, and by Stalin. And then they collapsed in on Germany and carved that part of the world up according to the plan at Yalta.

Now, can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, sitting at Yalta in the Crimea with a map of the world and drawing on that map, this is the line east of which people will live under the Soviet influence—which hadn't technically formed yet—west of this line people will live under Western influence and, by the way, even carved up Berlin itself so that we had a U.S. sector, we had a French sector, a British sector, and a Russian sector of Berlin itself.

That set the destiny for a lot of history that was to come after that. What we saw happen over the course of, then, 45 years of cold war, Mr. Speaker, was that these countries that had been taken over by Russia, and some of them were closely within the sphere, but I will say the countries that are Eastern Bloc satellites of the Soviet Union, occupied and influenced by them, Hungary, Georgia, I mentioned the Crimea, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Baltics, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, the Czech Republic and now the Slovak Republic, Croatia, Austria, Belarus, to name some, to leave some out, but to get most of them, these are countries that are now on Putin's list. He puts Crimea in his little pocket and says, I have got that, I am going to hold it, and not many people in this country can devise a plan to get it back. He has got parts of Georgia in his hand.

If we don't step up our resources so that there is a deterrent in place, this man, Putin, will march on down the line. I believe he will march into eastern Ukraine. I believe that some of those operations could be going on now. I think he will be looking very closely at Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, members of NATO, member countries that we are pledged to defend. But I think that Putin looks in the eyes of our Commander in Chief and wonders how much resolve is actually there, and I think he concluded that the resolve wasn't there. That is one of the contributing factors that Putin went into the Crimea.

I don't suggest that he would not have done it if we had had a different President; although, I suspect that if this had been a stronger President, I will just say, Mr. Speaker, it is less likely if we had had a stronger President.

Now, the countries that are along that perimeter, that see Russia on their border and they see what has happened with troops marching into the Crimea and they see the threats that the balance of Ukraine is under, they see what has happened in Georgia—and, by the way, the amount of Georgia that remains as sovereign is a fairly large share of their original real estate.

They are the furthest, most easterly outpost of Western civilization in the nation of Georgia.

They have a strong spirit. They love freedom, they love free enterprise, and they love Americans. That is the case for a lot of countries up and down through that part of the world. We need a stronger presence in each one of them. We need to have a stronger force lined up. I would say one of the first moves that we need to make, and I recall the Poles and the Czechs, but under the Bush administration, we had negotiated the placement of missiles and radar in Poland and Czechoslovakia, respectively, and shortly after our President was elected, Mr. Speaker, he canceled the agreement to place the missiles and the radar in those two countries.

□ 2100

The headlines in the Warsaw paper—and they found out about this in the news. It wasn't the President calling them up saying, I'm not going to follow through on this; they found out about it in the news. The headlines in the Warsaw paper read: "Betrayed." The United States agreement with Poles and the Czechs was a betrayal of our word, and it was because Putin influenced Barack Obama into canceling the agreement that established the missiles and the radar in Poland and Czechoslovakia. The headlines said "Betrayed" in Poland. They were betrayed.

I have had some conversations with Poles since the invasion of Crimea, and I am convinced that they would accept the missiles again even though we haven't been very reliable in our partnership. They are taking a lot of heat. They are right there. Russia is next door, and the Poles have stood in the middle of invasions going two directions in the memory of many of the Poles yet today. They have enjoyed a long period of peace, fairly long considering their history, but the Poles, I believe, would accept the missiles today, and we ought to place them there. The Czechs, I don't have as good a measure on, but I would be hopeful we could place a radar there and start to build up the missile defense shield.

We did operations on the ground in Poland last August. We need to ramp them up again and do more ground operations, more joint military exercises. We need to expand those exercises along that part of the world, working in conjunction with the NATO troops and the troops of the sovereign countries along that border that is now on the west side of the new Iron Curtain that Putin has essentially announced by his invasion into the Crimea. We need to put whatever kind of advisory support the Ukrainians need right into Ukraine so that their people are trained and their people are ready to step up and defend themselves. If Putin decides to move into the balance of Ukraine, how could they do anything but defend themselves. I think they

must. I would like to see that they are ready.

Mr. Speaker, I am known as a fiscal conservative in this House. I supported the resolution that advanced the \$1 billion in loan guarantees to the Ukrainians. I don't think that is enough. I think we should be prepared in this Congress to go down the line and match Putin dollar per dollar with loan guarantees, provided we could condition them in such a way that Putin himself doesn't get his hands on those resources. We need to demonstrate our commitment to the Ukrainians and let them know that we will be there.

We need to invite Georgia into NATO. We should have done that back in 2008. We should have brought Ukraine into NATO during that same period of time. Those kind of things could well have been a deterrent to Putin, and we didn't take advantage of the opportunity to bring them in the NATO sphere of influence.

So I would offer again to Georgia, come on into NATO. Ukraine, get stabilized a little bit so we can see what kind of government is going to emerge, but we ought to consider a stabilized government of Ukraine being an eligible candidate for NATO. We need to build our defenses up along those borders. We need to understand that, back to that static nature, that this is the renewal of the cold war launched by Putin, and we can't continue to back up thinking that he is not going to push.

I have read through and delivered the history of the Nazi regime from 1938, March of 1938 on until the invasion of Russia by the Germans, by the Nazi regime, because there is a distinct difference, on June 22, 1941, when the Second World War was launched in a large way. This is not going to happen in a way that Putin is going to put it out on the calendar and tell us that he has his eye on some of the eastern regions of the Ukraine and then maybe he thinks he is going to put a little pressure on some of the other countries, maybe back to Georgia again or Belarus, but they are so closely aligned there, it is hard to draw a distinction. Maybe it is one of the other countries along the way. Maybe it is Estonia. Maybe it is Latvia. Maybe it is Lithuania; maybe it is all of them. I have gone through this history of what happened at the beginning of World War II, and I think we understand how quickly it can happen and how little is the time to get ready and how important it is to be prepared.

Mr. Speaker, we must be a strong military Nation. We must be prepared. About the same time that Secretary Hagel announced drastic military cuts is about the same time that Putin went into the Crimea. It is possible it is a coincidence, but the military cuts information was already out. I think we should suspend those cuts now. I think we should be prepared to match Putin dollar per dollar in the Ukraine. I think we need to put the missiles up

and the radar up in Poland and Czechoslovakia. I think we need to sail a few more operational ships into the Black Sea. I think we need to have more presence in that part of the world, and we need to get our military back to ready. If they are cutting our military down to pre-World War II levels, and I look at some of the troop levels that we have for all of our arenas of operation, and I see what can be mustered by the Russians in one location, and I see how weak the military is in Western Europe, and how weak their resolve is, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned that this second cold war has been relaunched, and you never know if it is going to turn into a shooting war, but trading land for peace has no successful precedent in history that I can think of.

Neville Chamberlain tried to trade off the Sudetenland for peace. What did it get us? That gave up the rest of Czechoslovakia and the invasion of Poland. I recall the Gaza Strip being traded off, land for peace, and what does that get? That gets tunnels, and it gets rockets shot out of the Gaza Strip into the balance of Israel. Land for peace, Mr. Speaker: if someone can show me a successful trade of land for peace, I do not know what it is throughout the course of history.

It isn't that this is something—the Second World War that happened a long, long time ago in a different place and a different time. A lot of Americans are buried in that soil in Europe, and they gave their lives so that freedom could live.

We are going to commemorate and celebrate the successful landing at Normandy this upcoming June 6. That should be enough to bring our focus to what transpired then in that period of history, and it should bring our focus into the prevention of anything like that happening again. It should bring our focus into having peace through strength, being strong militarily, being strong economically, and being strong spiritually and strong culturally. Those are the credentials of the United States of America, to live free and be strong.

Each time we have been involved in wars that were, some would say as critics, foreign interventionism, then we have decided there was a peace dividend, chopped our military down. We don't need them so much anymore; we will have a core group of our military because, after all, we are Americans. Just being Americans is a deterrent.

Obviously, it is not. Putin thumbs his nose at us. I will take us through the cycles. We were late getting into World War I. We went over there very highly mobilized, and made a significant difference to help close out the end of World War I. It was a travesty in that part of the world, and World War I did not end it. It did not end decisively and conclusively, and it set the stage for World War II.

We instead cut our troops back down going into 1940. We were weak. The

Japanese knew it. That is why they had the audacity to attack us in Pearl Harbor in 1941. The Nazis didn't respect us or they would have been more hesitant in their part of the world they were invading and occupying.

A strong America has always been successful. Ronald Reagan came onto the scene, and recognized that we were weak. He recognized, Mr. Speaker, that there was a cold war and a geopolitical chess game taking place. As Jeane Kirkpatrick described it, chess and monopoly on the same board. The only question was, during the cold war—and this was in 1984 when she said this, and 5 years later, we found the answer. In 1984, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Ambassador to the United Nations, appointed under Ronald Reagan, as she stepped down, she said chess and monopoly on the same board in this cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union, and the question is whether we bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before they checkmate us militarily.

We know the answer to that. We bankrupted the Soviet Union before they checkmated us militarily. They could not keep up with our investment and America's innovativeness. They couldn't keep up with our missile defense system that we were putting place, either, the Strategic Defense Initiative that was announced by President Reagan, and should I say demagogued here on the floor of the House of Representatives by Democrats calling it Star Wars. I thought it was a tactical and a messaging error on the part of President Reagan not to embrace it and say that's right, it is Star Wars. We are going to build a missile defense system, and that seemed a long reach at the time. It doesn't seem like such a long reach today, and that defense system should have deployed in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

There is a defense system that is deployed in other places around the world, and a defense system, of course, that is deployed to protect Israel today. That is a product of SDI, that is the vision of SDI; but the vision of Putin, Vladimir Putin, is hegemony. That means if you were once a Soviet state, he wants you back as a Soviet state. If he can get it militarily, he will get it militarily. If he can get it politically, he will get it politically, but we should understand that these countries that I have named off are countries that he looks at, that he would like to have back as part of the Russia Federation, to re-create the old Soviet Union. I will name these countries again: Georgia. He invaded and occupied Crimea, that is part of it. Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Croatia, Austria on the edges, and Belarus. That is some of them, not all of them. We have a big challenge in front of us.

Mr. Speaker, I would challenge and encourage the Members of this Congress to get better informed, to get up

to speed on what is taking place in foreign relations.

For about the last six months, I have been very concerned that I don't hear a foreign policy discussion or debate here on the floor of the House. I don't see much for legislation come through. I don't hear it in the dialogue among my colleagues. I hear a handful of Senators on the other side of the Rotunda that will go out and engage in foreign policy and have those kinds of discussions.

Yes, I agree, the President sets the foreign policy and he is the Commander in Chief, but he is not the sole source of knowledge and input. He needs good advisers. I think he needs to make better decisions than he has made. He needs to be strong and he needs to be bold. He needs to be able to look Putin in the eye and see the KGB that JOHN MCCAIN identified, and understand that there is an agenda there, and Putin can be deterred if the price is high, but the price has to be high enough to deter Putin.

I want to challenge and encourage the Members of the House, Members of the Senate, get engaged in foreign policy. Travel and meet the leaders of these countries and build relationships in those countries. When it is time that things must be done, it is too late to start building a relationship; then it is time to act. Build a relationship first, build an understanding first, and we need far, far more expertise on foreign policy than we have today.

We have a Presidential election that is starting to emerge, and among the Presidential candidates, I strongly encourage them, get your foreign policy credentials up. Travel now while you can. As the campaign gets closer, there is less time available to do it, and it will look more and more like you are trying to burnish your foreign policy credentials. From my standpoint, you need to go to those countries and you need to see the leaders. You need to know them face to face and eye to eye. They need to recognize you when you walk into the room.

This Congress needs to get more focused on foreign policy. This country needs more focus on foreign policy. When something like that happens, then we can have a more open discussion. I was encouraged to hear the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) talk in depth on the relationship with Ukraine, and as chair of the Ukrainian Caucus, MARCY KAPTUR has been very good on these issues. There are not enough of us engaged in a similar fashion.

Here is what I would do if I were moving the pieces around on this chess board, rather than having my voice and my vote here in the House of Representatives. I would put the missiles and the radar back up in Poland and Czechoslovakia. I would amp up our energy production here in our part of the world. I would release it so we could ship liquefied natural gas out of the United States over to Europe, to help give them, back them up in the event that Putin decides to shut their gas off.

□ 2115

Having that supply stream would be very useful. Putting more energy out on the market does go into Russia's economy and it makes it harder and harder for Putin to have the resources to be able to do the things he wants to do militarily. I think that is all delayed reaction, however, and in the short-term offer NATO membership to Georgia. Take a look at doing that as soon as the government could be established by and for the people of Ukraine by bringing them into NATO. I would encourage the EU to take a look at broadening their membership also, because I think it is easier to support a NATO membership if they are also a member of the EU, although I am only slightly thrilled about that particular proposal.

Special trainers in operations and forces to help support the Ukrainians in any place up along the border of the countries that border on Russia, and land operations up and down through that entire theater. Build then a military shield of deterrent, and start building it so that he knows that any aggressive move that he makes is going to be met by a countermove, strategic countermove. And the Ukrainians need to be prepared to fight for their land.

At this point, I haven't heard very much about what they might do if Putin decides to go forward and invade. You may not be the military that can stand up to the Russian military, but if you don't defend your own country, no one else is going to be able to step in and help. I say that, Mr. Speaker, to the Ukrainians, and encourage them: love freedom; love liberty.

Let's strengthen our relationships with the Ukrainians so that the growing economy of the West, the freedom that comes with free enterprise and liberty-loving people, strengthens the Ukrainian people and all the people up and down along that border.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see a replay of what happened at the beginning of World War II. I don't want to see countries on the Eastern Bloc side eventually taken over, some without firing a shot, some by a brutal invasion.

But I will just go through the march that took place from Hitler again, and it started in 1938. Austria, then the Sudetenland, then the balance of Czechoslovakia, then Poland invaded by the Nazis and by the Russians in September of '39, then Norway in the spring of 1940 by the Nazis, and then Greece and Yugoslavia by the Nazis, then on into France essentially the same day. France capitulated June 22. A year later, Hitler invaded Russia in Operation Barbarossa and nearly succeeded in his invasion of Russia.

That is the march that went through by a country that essentially was fighting a two-front war—Germany. The Russians don't have that problem. They are a one-front situation. But the hegemony of Putin needs to be recognized. He will take the old Soviet bloc

countries when he thinks he can get away with it. He will only be restrained by that. If he thinks he can't achieve, then he can be restrained. The ways that we make him do that are: respect economic power and respect the military deterrent.

We need to call upon our European allies to remember these lessons of the Second World War that I have described. I know that some of them announced that they have had a vote that declares them to be neutral in every conflict. I recall sitting in Vienna not that long ago with some of the leaders of their country and they announced they are a neutral country, and their policy is they will be neutral in any conflict and they will never fight another war and that nothing good comes from war. That was a discussion.

I happen to have been to the site that overlooks the Battle of Vienna that took place in September 11 and 12 of 1683 when the Polish King Jan Sobieski launched a cavalry charge down into the Turks that had Vienna surrounded, and they were a matter of days before they would have succeeded. The Turks would have succeeded in invading and occupying Vienna, and if they were successful, nothing likely would have stopped them in a march all the way across Europe.

I pointed out to the Austrians: it is a good thing that your ancestors didn't have such a resolution in September of 1683, because we would all have been occupied by the Ottoman Empire if it hadn't been for the courageous battle that took place right there in Vienna where we sat, and it was the West versus the East.

So history does turn on battles; it does turn on wars. They are enabled by or sometimes stifled by a successful or a failed economy. They are promoted by people who believe in themselves, and the overreach of brinkmanship brings about war.

I am opposed, of course, to war. I don't want to see our American troops go overseas. I don't want to deploy our military in a place like that. But we have got to provide support. We need to provide that support in a nonkinetic way now. If we do that, we might be able to deter what otherwise likely could come, which could very well be Putin deciding that in his lifetime he is going to reconstruct the entire Soviet Union.

That is what I fear, Mr. Speaker. That has to be our caution and our byword. If we act as if it is not a threat, as if it is not going to happen, if we turn our policy to let's make sure that—and this seems to be the policy that is emanating from the White House, Mr. Speaker. Give Putin an off-ramp. Don't close the gate on the off-ramp. Let's push a little bit, give him a little pressure, but give him room to pull back out of Crimea.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you it is not about an off-ramp for Putin. He pulled in there, he is not pulling out. He wants Crimea. He is going to hang on

to it, and his eyes are on the balance of Ukraine right now.

The idea that we are going to coalesce our foreign policy around not pushing on Putin too hard because otherwise there isn't a way for him to get on an off-ramp, I would mark the times it was mentioned by our administration on my hand, and I have, in Sarah Palin-style, eight different marks on my hand the times that they mentioned "off-ramp."

It isn't about an off-ramp, Mr. Speaker. We can't be obsessing about an off-ramp. Putin doesn't want an off-ramp. If he wanted an off-ramp, he never would have gone up the in-ramp that he took to go into the Crimea.

This is about deterring him from going into the balance of the satellite states, in particular, in Eastern Europe. It is necessary that we put the deterrents in place. It is necessary that we go through these steps that I have described, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate your attention and urge all those that have listened to my words to follow them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCINTYRE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel difficulties.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1917. An act to provide for additional enhancements of the sexual assault prevention and response activities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services; in addition, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2019. An act to eliminate taxpayer financing of political party conventions and reprogram savings to provide for a 10-year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4940. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0074; FV13-905-3 FR] received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4941. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Decreased Assessment Rate for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0072; FV13-948-2 FR] received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4942. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Softwood Lumber Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Industry Information Order; Changes to the Membership of the Softwood Lumber Board [Document Number: AMS-FV-13-0038] received February 26, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4943. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cotton Futures Classification: Optional Classification Procedure [AMS-CN-12-0043] (RIN: 0581-AD33) received February 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4944. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Paper and Paper-Based Packaging Promotion, Research and Information Order [Document Number: AMS-FV-11-0069 FR] (RIN: 0581-AD21) received February 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4945. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Office of the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2014 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4946. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Seventeenth Report on the Progress Made in Licensing and Constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 16523 Public Law 109-58, section 1810; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4947. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's 2013 Annual Report on the Food and Drug Administration Advisory Committee Vacancies and Public Disclosures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4948. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on the Medicare and Medicaid Integrity Programs for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4949. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit State Implementation Plans Required for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0032; FRL-9906-80-OAR] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4950. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Alaska; Anchorage Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan and State Implementation Plan Revisions [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0421; FRL-9902-22-Region 10] received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4951. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluxapyroxad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0638; FRL-9906-70] received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4952. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Group IV Polymers and Resins; Pesticide Active Ingredient Production; and Polyether Polyols Production [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0435; FRL-9906-34-OA] (RIN: 2060-AR02) received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4953. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Minor Corrections to the Revisions to the Total Coliform Rule [EPA-HQ-OW-2008-0878; FRL-9906-89-OW] received February 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4954. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the March 2014 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2291(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4955. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4956. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4957. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4958. A letter from the HR Specialist, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4959. A letter from the HR Specialist, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 511. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4138) to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the

President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3973) to amend section 530D of title 28, United States Code (Rept. 113-378). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the development and use of new antimicrobial drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr.

HECK of Nevada, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 4188. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 4189. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon and Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 4190. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. WALZ (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 4191. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of medical evidence provided by non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals in support of claims for disability compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia" to clarify the rules of the District of Columbia regarding human occupancy of penthouses above the top story of the building upon which the penthouse is placed; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 4193. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 4194. A bill to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 4195. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Federal Register Act), to modernize the Federal Register, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 4196. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to eliminate Exchange cost-sharing subsidies, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a Medicare Advantage Improvement Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 4198. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate the requirement for an annual report on the capacity of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide for specialized treatment and rehabilitative needs of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 4199. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Waco, Texas, as the "Doris Miller Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4200. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 4201. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require Medicare Advantage organizations to disclose certain information on the changes made to the MA plan offered by such organization pursuant to changes required by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 4202. A bill to provide for cost-of-living increases for certain Federal benefits programs based on increases in the Consumer Price Index for the elderly; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4203. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with communication frequencies used by emergency response providers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 4204. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for job training expenses of employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 4205. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a loan repayment program for certain architects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 4206. A bill to authorize a State or a portion of a State to conduct a demonstration project designed to test methods of program integration and coordination of services with the goals of moving individuals and families towards self-sufficiency, reducing welfare dependence, and increasing work and earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Financial Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 4207. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow the Secretary of Education to award job training Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H. Res. 510. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Institutes of Health should develop a pilot program to improve medical trial participation, retention, efficiency, effectiveness, and diversity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H. Res. 512. A resolution recognizing linemen, the profession of linemen, the contributions of these brave men and women who protect public safety, and expressing support for the designation of March 31, 2014, as National Lineman Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H. Res. 513. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the week of May 3, 2014, through May 10, 2014, as "National Osteogenesis Imperfecta Awareness Week"

to celebrate the progress made, and recognize the work yet to be done toward educating our communities, promoting research programs and raising vital resources for doctors, nurses, and healthcare providers and everyone touched by the Osteogenesis Imperfecta community; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"; and (c) Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states that "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."

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 4188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 the general welfare clause.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 4189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 4190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 4191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

“To make all Law which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers . . .”

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 4195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

“To make all Law which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers . . .”

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 4196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 4197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 4198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 4199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article I Section 8

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 4201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 4202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 4204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 4205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article IV, Section 1

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 4207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of March 10, 2014]

[The following action occurred on March 7, 2014]

H.R. 3973: Mr. SESSIONS and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 4138: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. SESSIONS.

[Submitted March 11, 2014]

H.R. 20: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 36: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 38: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 118: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 164: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 494: Mr. ENYART and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 543: Mr. DENT and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 679: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 702: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 710: Ms. TITUS and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 792: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 794: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 831: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 855: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 920: Mr. RUSH, Mr. LONG, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 921: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1020: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1078: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1084: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1141: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1148: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1150: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1173: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1176: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1250: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1252: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1286: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1310: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1312: Mr. HONDA and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1354: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. YOHO, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1385: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1386: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1429: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1518: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1573: Mr. HOLT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1591: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1701: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 1710: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1775: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1812: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1814: Mr. KLINE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ENYART, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 1852: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1854: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1921: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1945: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1998: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2005: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2020: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2027: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2028: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 2110: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2116: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2171: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2172: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2288: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2315: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2328: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 2350: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2377: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2413: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 2428: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2429: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 2553: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2591: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2652: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2672: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 2690: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2692: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2785: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2791: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2807: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2917: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2969: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 2983: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2994: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3040: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 3047: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3118: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3367: Mr. ENYART, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 3377: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3403: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3408: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 3461: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 3463: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 3470: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3474: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 3481: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 3485: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 3490: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3494: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ENYART, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3548: Mr. COHEN and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 3556: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3560: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3571: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 3579: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 3600: Mr. POSEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H. R. 3620: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H. R. 3658: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3660: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3665: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3673: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 3676: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3698: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 3708: Ms. JENKINS and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 3712: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3717: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 3776: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 3833: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3840: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3854: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3857: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 3867: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JONES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 3939: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 3954: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 3969: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3978: Mr. DOYLE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 4008: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 4015: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 4016: Ms. NORTON and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 4026: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
 H.R. 4031: Mr. FORBES, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 4036: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 4040: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 4049: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 4075: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 4101: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 4148: Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. GRIMM.
 H.R. 4156: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4157: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 4160: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 4162: Mr. POCAN and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4165: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.J. Res. 50: Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.J. Res. 104: Mr. LUCAS.
 H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H. Con. Res. 86: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. DENHAM.
 H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H. Res. 94: Ms. KUSTER.
 H. Res. 188: Mr. FOSTER.
 H. Res. 231: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Ms. DELAURO.
 H. Res. 365: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. BASS.
 H. Res. 422: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 425: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H. Res. 440: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H. Res. 456: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 476: Mr. POSEY.
 H. Res. 479: Ms. WATERS.
 H. Res. 494: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PERRY, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Res. 499: Mr. SHUSTER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 4015, "SGR Repeal and Medicare Provider Payment Modernization Act of 2014," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 4015 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 4015 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative CONYERS, JR., or a designee, to H.R. 4138, the Enforce Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.