



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 22, 2014

No. 78

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

As the Members disperse to their various districts and our Nation enters a week which celebrates Memorial Day, may we all retreat from the busyness of life to remember our citizen ancestors who served our Nation in the armed services.

Grant that their sacrifice of self, and for so many, of life, would inspire all of America's citizens to step forward, in whatever their path of life, to make a positive contribution to the strength of our democracy.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed halls be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POMPEO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

AMERICA'S VETERANS DESERVE QUALITY HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, what is taking place today in America's Veterans Administration may be the most egregious case of friendly fire in the history of the United States of America.

This harm to our veterans from our team is coming not from firearms, but from an enormous bureaucracy that is incapable of dealing with providing health care to our Nation's warriors. It is unacceptable.

Words alone, Mr. President, I have to say, are not enough. We need action, not anger. We need results. We need delivery of health care to our warriors now, and whether that health care comes from inside the Veterans Administration or from outside, we need to get folks off our waiting lists, out of lines, and in to see doctors and folks who are prepared to take care of them.

The sacrifices these men and women made are enormous. As a veteran, I certainly understand that.

As a Member of Congress, I understand that it is my responsibility to make sure we fix this challenge, this bureaucratic mess that our Nation has put these veterans in now for years and years.

As we approach Memorial Day, we need to all take this seriously. I would urge this House to continue to work to perform its function of oversight and

to correct this most egregious situation and get these veterans the care that they need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great concern for the safety of over 200 kidnapped Nigerian girls that I urge my colleagues to vote for the National Defense Authorization Act.

This bill includes an en bloc amendment I offered requiring the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Department of State, to report on the efforts to assist in the search and rescue of the young women who were abducted in Nigeria last month.

There is more that our government can do to address the threat that Boko Haram poses to international security. By Congress knowing more about this terrorist group, their movements, the safety of the girls, and what the U.S. and Nigerian Governments can do to protect these girls and others like them, we will be in a better position to end Boko Haram's reign of terror.

Families weep in Nigeria. The global community holds vigil for these children.

I thank the chairman for including my amendment in the en bloc package and urge my colleagues to vote to help "bring back our girls."

In regard to Memorial Day, I want to thank those who gave up their tomorrow, so we could have today.

JOB WELL DONE

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

☐ 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.

H4787

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, today we will take up the NSA reform bill.

I rise today to thank Chairman ROGERS, Chairman GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, and all, in a bipartisan way, who have come to address this very critical reform at a time when America still is under the threat of terrorism.

There is another group of people that I think it is appropriate to thank today, and that is the tens of thousands of Federal employees who work for these agencies that go out there every single day to help make America secure and Americans secure elsewhere around the world.

Job well done.

P5+1 NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the United States is currently in negotiations with our P5+1 partners and Iran over the fate of Tehran's illicit nuclear program. I support the President's efforts to negotiate an agreement to end Iran's nuclear weapons question, and I am hopeful, but I am also concerned, that this goal may or may not be achieved.

As the initial 6-month period for negotiations comes to an end on July 20 and as we debate the NDAA, it is crucial for Congress to speak out on what a good deal with Iran would look like.

Congress must insist that final agreement ensures that Tehran has no pathway to a nuclear weapon. As the President and Secretary Kerry have repeatedly said, no deal is better than a bad deal.

Any agreement must include an inspection and verification regime that provides for anytime, anywhere inspections to ensure that Iran is complying with a deal.

OUR VETERANS DESERVE THE BEST MEDICAL TREATMENT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the number of veterans has declined by several millions in recent years, due to deaths and decreases in the numbers of our military, yet the problems in the VA and complaints by veterans about poor treatment and long delays have grown by leaps and bounds.

It is definitely not a money problem because no department or agency has received the megabillions and high percentage increases that the Congress has given to the VA; yet, despite years of criticism for Members of Congress and the media, the problems have grown worse.

The only effective solution is competition. I said in a speech to a veterans group many years ago that eligi-

ble veterans should be given a card and allowed to go to any hospital they choose, including those considered to be the best in the Nation. In this way, VA hospitals would be forced to provide better service, or Congress could and should close the ones with rapidly declining and/or very low occupancy rates.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans deserve the very best medical treatment possible.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES ESCAPE AND EVASION SOCIETY

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in advance of Memorial Day weekend, to recognize the brave men and women of the U.S. Air Forces Escape and Evasion Society, or AFEES, whose bravery and ingenuity in the face of danger is surpassed only by their dedication to this country.

Formed in 1964, AFEES is an organization created by aircrew members who evaded capture by enemy forces during foreign wars, with the assistance of resistance organizations and patriotic nationals of foreign countries. This organization includes downed aircrew members and people who directly aided them in escape and evasion.

In recognition of these heroic efforts, I introduced the U.S. Air Forces Escape and Evasion Society Recognition Act of 2014 this week to award this deserving organization the Congressional Gold Medal. Awarding this medal will serve to recognize a group of veterans whose names are synonymous with service, selflessness, and fortitude.

I invite every Member of this Chamber to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

NIGERIA AND BOKO HARAM

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, last night, the House passed an amendment encouraging our regional partners and allies to develop an inter-agency strategy to counter the vicious terror attacks perpetrated by Boko Haram.

Boko Haram is the terrorist group that recently kidnapped over 300 innocent young Nigerian girls.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for any of us to imagine the fear and heartbreak these children and their families are experiencing.

For some time, it has been known that these groups have extensive links between Boko Haram and al Qaeda affiliates; yet, despite my multiple pleas 2 years ago to former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, she would not even consider acknowledging Boko Haram's religious ideology and list them as a foreign terrorist organization.

Consequently, Boko Haram is stronger today than ever before. This Islamist group continues their rampage of terror because the administration—this administration—as they have so many times before, refused to look at the facts as they were.

I hope now we will face Boko Haram for the terrorist group that it is and defeat it and, somehow, bring these innocent young girls home.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act, which we will vote on today. The act supports a strong national defense and gives our men and women in uniform the tools and resources that they need to do the often-dangerous jobs that we ask them to take on.

Southern Arizona is home to Fort Huachuca, the 162nd Wing of the Air National Guard, and a strong defense industry, all of which are vital to our Nation's security.

We are also the proud home of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and the A-10 Thunderbolt. This heavily armed plane we call the Warthog may be ugly, but it flies slow and low and provides close air support and protection to our troops like no other aircraft we have today.

This bill includes a provision I offered with my Republican colleagues, Representatives HARTZLER and SCOTT, to keep the A-10 flying. It passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in the Armed Services Committee.

Today, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this critical legislation for our servicemembers and their families and the security of our Nation.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY AND SNOOPING ON AMERICA

(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, the NSA is out of control. It seizes massive amounts of data on Americans without their consent, without their knowledge. This action violates the Fourth Amendment and the PATRIOT Act.

The USA FREEDOM Act is supposed to halt these literally unwarranted intrusions. The bill, in which I am a cosponsor, passed the Judiciary Committee unanimously.

However, this bill that deals with secret surveillance and mischief by the NSA was recently changed at the Rules Committee. These changes appear to allow multiple interpretations as to what the NSA can and cannot do. The bill now confuses what it intended to make clear. It seems we are back where we started.

The NSA has shown it will misinterpret the law in a manner most favorable to the seizure by the NSA, seizure of information without a warrant.

These new changes, unfortunately, may not adequately solve the problems of spying, snooping, and surveillance by the NSA on Americans.

And that's just the way it is.

NATIONAL MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Military Appreciation Month and to honor the service and sacrifice of the men and women of our military.

I am proud to represent countless inspiring veterans who have served our country and continue to serve in our communities—veterans like Carlos Cruz, who served in the Army during Vietnam and regularly volunteers with disabled veterans whenever he is able; Dr. Anthony Atwood, who served in the Navy for over 20 years and, today, works to preserve the history of Miami veterans as executive director of the Miami Military Museum and Memorial; Clifton Riley, an Army veteran who served during Desert Storm and started his own business, where he strives to hire veterans.

Carlos, Anthony, and Clifton are just three examples of the many veterans who remind us of the responsibility to uphold promises we made to our veterans as they have upheld their promises to us.

□ 0915

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 590, I call up the bill (H.R. 3361) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 590, in lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence printed in the bill, the amendment printed in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of House Report 113-460 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3361

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “USA FREEDOM Act”.

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

Sec. 1. *Short title; table of contents.*

Sec. 2. *Amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.*

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS REFORMS

Sec. 101. *Additional requirements for call detail records.*

Sec. 102. *Emergency authority.*

Sec. 103. *Prohibition on bulk collection of tangible things.*

Sec. 104. *Judicial review of minimization procedures for the production of tangible things.*

Sec. 105. *Liability protection.*

Sec. 106. *Compensation for assistance.*

Sec. 107. *Definitions.*

Sec. 108. *Inspector general reports on business records orders.*

Sec. 109. *Effective date.*

Sec. 110. *Rule of construction.*

TITLE II—FISA PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE REFORM

Sec. 201. *Prohibition on bulk collection.*

Sec. 202. *Privacy procedures.*

TITLE III—FISA ACQUISITIONS TARGETING PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES REFORMS

Sec. 301. *Minimization procedures.*

Sec. 302. *Limits on use of unlawfully obtained information.*

TITLE IV—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT REFORMS

Sec. 401. *Appointment of amicus curiae.*

Sec. 402. *Declassification of decisions, orders, and opinions.*

TITLE V—NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER REFORM

Sec. 501. *Prohibition on bulk collection.*

TITLE VI—FISA TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 601. *Additional reporting on orders requiring production of business records.*

Sec. 602. *Business records compliance reports to Congress.*

Sec. 603. *Annual reports by the Government on orders entered.*

Sec. 604. *Public reporting by persons subject to FISA orders.*

Sec. 605. *Reporting requirements for decisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.*

Sec. 606. *Submission of reports under FISA.*

TITLE VII—SUNSETS

Sec. 701. *Sunsets.*

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS REFORMS

SEC. 101. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CALL DETAIL RECORDS.

(a) *APPLICATION.*—Section 501(b)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “a statement” and inserting “in the case of an application other than an application described in subparagraph (C) (including an application for the production of call detail records other than in the manner described in subparagraph (C)), a statement”; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (D), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) in the case of an application for the production on a daily basis of call detail records created before, on, or after the date of the application relating to an authorized investigation (other than a threat assessment) conducted in accordance with subsection (a)(2) to protect against international terrorism, a statement of facts showing that—

“(i) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the call detail records sought to be produced based on the specific selection term required under subparagraph (A) are relevant to such investigation; and

“(ii) there are facts giving rise to a reasonable, articulable suspicion that such specific selection term is associated with a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power; and”.

(b) *ORDER.*—Section 501(c)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) in the case of an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C), shall—

“(i) authorize the production on a daily basis of call detail records for a period not to exceed 180 days;

“(ii) provide that an order for such production may be extended upon application under subsection (b) and the judicial finding under paragraph (1);

“(iii) provide that the Government may require the prompt production of call detail records—

“(I) using the specific selection term that satisfies the standard required under subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii) as the basis for production; and

“(II) using call detail records with a direct connection to such specific selection term as the basis for production of a second set of call detail records;

“(iv) provide that, when produced, such records be in a form that will be useful to the Government;

“(v) direct each person the Government directs to produce call detail records under the order to furnish the Government forthwith all information, facilities, or technical assistance necessary to accomplish the production in such a manner as will protect the secrecy of the production and produce a minimum of interference with the services that such person is providing to each subject of the production; and

“(vi) direct the Government to—

“(I) adopt minimization procedures that require the prompt destruction of all call detail records produced under the order that the Government determines are not foreign intelligence information; and

“(II) destroy all call detail records produced under the order as prescribed by such procedures.”.

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.

(a) *AUTHORITY.*—Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) *EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR PRODUCTION OF TANGIBLE THINGS.*—

“(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Attorney General may require the emergency production of tangible things if the Attorney General—

“(A) reasonably determines that an emergency situation requires the production of tangible things before an order authorizing such production can with due diligence be obtained;

“(B) reasonably determines that the factual basis for the issuance of an order under this section to approve such production of tangible things exists;

“(C) informs, either personally or through a designee, a judge having jurisdiction under this section at the time the Attorney General requires the emergency production of tangible things that the decision has been made to employ the authority under this subsection; and

“(D) makes an application in accordance with this section to a judge having jurisdiction under this section as soon as practicable, but not later than 7 days after the Attorney General requires the emergency production of tangible things under this subsection.

“(2) If the Attorney General authorizes the emergency production of tangible things under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall require that the minimization procedures required by this section for the issuance of a judicial order be followed.

“(3) In the absence of a judicial order approving the production of tangible things under this subsection, the production shall terminate when the information sought is obtained, when the application for the order is denied, or after the expiration of 7 days from the time the Attorney General begins requiring the emergency production of such tangible things, whichever is earliest.

“(4) A denial of the application made under this subsection may be reviewed as provided in section 103.

“(5) If such application for approval is denied, or in any other case where the production of tangible things is terminated and no order is issued approving the production, no information obtained or evidence derived from such production shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired from such production shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

“(6) The Attorney General shall assess compliance with the requirements of paragraph (5).”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 501(d) (50 U.S.C. 1861(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “pursuant to an order” and inserting “pursuant to an order issued or an emergency production required”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “such order” and inserting “such order or such emergency production”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the order” and inserting “the order or the emergency production”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “an order” and inserting “an order or emergency production”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “an order” and inserting “an order or emergency production”.

SEC. 103. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION OF TANGIBLE THINGS.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Section 501(b)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1861(b)(2)), as amended by section 101(a) of this Act, is further amended by inserting before subparagraph (B), as redesignated by such section 101(a) of this Act, the following new subparagraph:

“(A) a specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production of the tangible things sought;”.

(b) **ORDER.**—Section 501(c) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking the semi-colon and inserting “, including each specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production;”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) No order issued under this subsection may authorize the collection of tangible things without the use of a specific selection term that meets the requirements of subsection (b)(2).”.

SEC. 104. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES FOR THE PRODUCTION OF TANGIBLE THINGS.

Section 501(c)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)(1)) is amended by inserting after “subsections (a) and (b)” the following: “and that the minimization procedures submitted in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(D) meet the definition of minimization procedures under subsection (g)”.

SEC. 105. LIABILITY PROTECTION.

Section 501(e) (50 U.S.C. 1861(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(e)(1) No cause of action shall lie in any court against a person who—

“(A) produces tangible things or provides information, facilities, or technical assistance pursuant to an order issued or an emergency production required under this section; or

“(B) otherwise provides technical assistance to the Government under this section or to implement the amendments made to this section by the USA FREEDOM Act.

“(2) A production or provision of information, facilities, or technical assistance described in paragraph (1) shall not be deemed to constitute a waiver of any privilege in any other proceeding or context.”.

SEC. 106. COMPENSATION FOR ASSISTANCE.

Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 102 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) **COMPENSATION.**—The Government shall compensate a person for reasonable expenses incurred for—

“(1) producing tangible things or providing information, facilities, or assistance in accordance with an order issued with respect to an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C) or an emergency production under subsection (i) that, to comply with subsection (i)(1)(D), requires an application described in subsection (b)(2)(C); or

“(2) otherwise providing technical assistance to the Government under this section or to implement the amendments made to this section by the USA FREEDOM Act.”.

SEC. 107. DEFINITIONS.

Section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 106 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **CALL DETAIL RECORD.**—The term ‘call detail record’—

“(A) means session identifying information (including originating or terminating telephone number, International Mobile Subscriber Identity number, or International Mobile Station Equipment Identity number), a telephone calling card number, or the time or duration of a call; and

“(B) does not include—

“(i) the contents of any communication (as defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code);

“(ii) the name, address, or financial information of a subscriber or customer; or

“(iii) cell site location information.

“(2) **SPECIFIC SELECTION TERM.**—The term ‘specific selection term’ means a discrete term, such as a term specifically identifying a person, entity, account, address, or device, used by the Government to limit the scope of the information or tangible things sought pursuant to the statute authorizing the provision of such information or tangible things to the Government.”.

SEC. 108. INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS ON BUSINESS RECORDS ORDERS.

Section 106A of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 120 Stat. 200) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and calendar years 2012 through 2014” after “2006”;;

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(C) with respect to calendar years 2012 through 2014, an examination of the minimization procedures used in relation to orders under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons;”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “(as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)))”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **CALENDAR YEARS 2012 THROUGH 2014.**—Not later than December 31, 2015, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2012 through 2014.”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) **INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For the period beginning on January 1, 2012, and ending on December 31, 2014, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall assess—

“(A) the importance of the information acquired under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) to the activities of the intelligence community;

“(B) the manner in which that information was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the intelligence community;

“(C) the minimization procedures used by elements of the intelligence community under such title and whether the minimization procedures adequately protect the constitutional rights of United States persons; and

“(D) any minimization procedures proposed by an element of the intelligence community under such title that were modified or denied by the court established under section 103(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)).

“(2) **SUBMISSION DATE FOR ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Inspector General of the Department of Justice submits the report required under subsection (c)(3), the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2012 through 2014.”;

(5) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “a report under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “any report under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(ii) by striking “Inspector General of the Department of Justice” and inserting “Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, and any Inspector General of an element of the intelligence community that prepares a report to assist the Inspector General of the Department of Justice or the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community in complying with the requirements of this section”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) and

(c)(2)” and inserting “any report submitted under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(6) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “The reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) and (c)(2)” and inserting “Each report submitted under subsection (c)”;

and

(B) by striking “subsection (d)(2)” and inserting “subsection (e)(2)”;

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

“(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”

SEC. 109. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 101 through 103 shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter or eliminate the authority of the Government to obtain an order under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) as in effect prior to the effective date described in subsection (a) during the period ending on such effective date.

SEC. 110. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the production of the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication from an electronic communication service provider (as such term is defined in section 701(b)(4) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881(b)(4)) under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.).

TITLE II—FISA PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE REFORM

SEC. 201. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 402(c) (50 U.S.C. 1842(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) a specific selection term to be used as the basis for selecting the telephone line or other facility to which the pen register or trap and trace device is to be attached or applied; and”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 401 (50 U.S.C. 1841) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The term ‘specific selection term’ has the meaning given the term in section 501.”.

SEC. 202. PRIVACY PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 (50 U.S.C. 1842) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) The Attorney General shall ensure that appropriate policies and procedures are in place to safeguard nonpublicly available information concerning United States persons that is collected through the use of a pen register or trap and trace device installed under this section. Such policies and procedures shall, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the need to protect national security, include protections for the collection, retention, and use of information concerning United States persons.”.

(b) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—Section 403 (50 U.S.C. 1843) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) Information collected through the use of a pen register or trap and device installed under

this section shall be subject to the policies and procedures required under section 402(h).”.

TITLE III—FISA ACQUISITIONS TARGETING PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES REFORMS

SEC. 301. MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.

Section 702(e)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1881a(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “that meet” and inserting the following: “that—

“(A) meet”;

(2) in subparagraph (A) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) consistent with such definition—

“(i) minimize the acquisition, and prohibit the retention and dissemination, of any communication as to which the sender and all intended recipients are determined to be located in the United States at the time of acquisition, consistent with the need of the United States to obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information; and

“(ii) prohibit the use of any discrete communication that is not to, from, or about the target of an acquisition and is to or from an identifiable United States person or a person reasonably believed to be located in the United States, except to protect against an immediate threat to human life.”.

SEC. 302. LIMITS ON USE OF UNLAWFULLY OBTAINED INFORMATION.

Section 702(i)(3) (50 U.S.C. 1881a(i)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), to the extent the Court orders a correction of a deficiency in a certification or procedures under subparagraph (B), no information obtained or evidence derived pursuant to the part of the certification or procedures that has been identified by the Court as deficient concerning any United States person shall be received in evidence or otherwise disclosed in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, and no information concerning any United States person acquired pursuant to such part of such certification shall subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of the United States person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—If the Government corrects any deficiency identified by the order of the Court under subparagraph (B), the Court may permit the use or disclosure of information obtained before the date of the correction under such minimization procedures as the Court shall establish for purposes of this clause.”.

TITLE IV—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT REFORMS

SEC. 401. APPOINTMENT OF AMICUS CURIAE.

Section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) AMICUS CURIAE.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b), consistent with the requirement of subsection (c) and any other statutory requirement that the court act expeditiously or within a stated time—

“(A) shall appoint an individual to serve as amicus curiae to assist such court in the consideration of any application for an order or review that, in the opinion of the court, presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law, unless the court issues a written finding that such appointment is not appropriate; and

“(B) may appoint an individual to serve as amicus curiae in any other instance as such court deems appropriate.

“(2) DESIGNATION.—The presiding judges of the courts established under subsections (a) and (b) shall jointly designate not less than 5 individuals to be eligible to serve as amicus curiae. Such individuals shall be persons who possess expertise in privacy and civil liberties, intelligence collection, telecommunications, or any other area that may lend legal or technical expertise to the courts and who have been determined by appropriate executive branch officials to be eligible for access to classified information.

“(3) DUTIES.—An individual appointed to serve as amicus curiae under paragraph (1) shall carry out the duties assigned by the appointing court. Such court may authorize the individual appointed to serve as amicus curiae to review any application, certification, petition, motion, or other submission that the court determines is relevant to the duties assigned by the court.

“(4) NOTIFICATION.—The presiding judges of the courts established under subsections (a) and (b) shall notify the Attorney General of each exercise of the authority to appoint an individual to serve as amicus curiae under paragraph (1).

“(5) ASSISTANCE.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b) may request and receive (including on a non-reimbursable basis) the assistance of the executive branch in the implementation of this subsection.

“(6) ADMINISTRATION.—A court established under subsection (a) or (b) may provide for the designation, appointment, removal, training, or other support for an individual appointed to serve as amicus curiae under paragraph (1) in a manner that is not inconsistent with this subsection.”.

SEC. 402. DECLASSIFICATION OF DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS.

(a) DECLASSIFICATION.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “REPORTING REQUIREMENT” and inserting “OVERSIGHT”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 602. DECLASSIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANT DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS.

“(a) DECLASSIFICATION REQUIRED.—Subject to subsection (b), the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review (as defined in section 601(e)) that includes a significant construction or interpretation of any provision of this Act, including a construction or interpretation of the term ‘specific selection term’, and, consistent with that review, make publicly available to the greatest extent practicable each such decision, order, or opinion.

“(b) REDACTED FORM.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, may satisfy the requirement under subsection (a) to make a decision, order, or opinion described in such subsection publicly available to the greatest extent practicable by making such decision, order, or opinion publicly available in redacted form.

“(c) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, may waive the requirement to declassify and make publicly available a particular decision, order, or opinion under subsection (a) if—

“(1) the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, determines that a waiver of such requirement is necessary to protect the national security of the United States or properly classified intelligence sources or methods; and

“(2) the Director of National Intelligence makes publicly available an unclassified statement prepared by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence—

“(A) summarizing the significant construction or interpretation of a provision under this Act; and

“(B) that specifies that the statement has been prepared by the Attorney General and constitutes no part of the opinion of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to title VI and inserting the following new item:

“TITLE VI—OVERSIGHT”; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 601 the following new item:

“Sec. 602. Declassification of significant declassifications, orders, and opinions.”.

TITLE V—NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER REFORM

SEC. 501. PROHIBITION ON BULK COLLECTION.

(a) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “may” and inserting “may, using a specific selection term as the basis for a request”.

(b) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114(a)(2) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(2)) is amended by striking the period and inserting “and a specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production and disclosure of financial records.”.

(c) DISCLOSURES TO FBI OF CERTAIN CONSUMER RECORDS FOR COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PURPOSES.—Section 626(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(a)) is amended by striking “that information,” and inserting “that information that includes a specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production of that information.”.

(d) DISCLOSURES TO GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR COUNTERTERRORISM PURPOSES OF CONSUMER REPORTS.—Section 627(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(a)) is amended by striking “analysis.” and inserting “analysis and a specific selection term to be used as the basis for the production of such information.”.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SPECIFIC SELECTION TERM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘specific selection term’ has the meaning given the term in section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861).”.

(2) ACCESS TO FINANCIAL RECORDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AND PROTECTIVE PURPOSES.—Section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) In this section, the term ‘specific selection term’ has the meaning given the term in section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861).”.

(3) DISCLOSURES TO FBI OF CERTAIN CONSUMER RECORDS FOR COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PURPOSES.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(n) SPECIFIC SELECTION TERM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘specific selection term’ has the meaning given the term in section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861).”.

(4) DISCLOSURES TO GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR COUNTERTERRORISM PURPOSES OF CONSUMER REPORTS.—Section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SPECIFIC SELECTION TERM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘specific selection term’ has the meaning given the term in section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861).”.

TITLE VI—FISA TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 601. ADDITIONAL REPORTING ON ORDERS REQUIRING PRODUCTION OF BUSINESS RECORDS.

Section 502(b) (50 U.S.C. 1862(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraphs:

“(1) the total number of applications described in section 501(b)(2)(B) made for orders approving requests for the production of tangible things;

“(2) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied;

“(3) the total number of applications described in section 501(b)(2)(C) made for orders approving requests for the production of call detail records;

“(4) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied.”.

SEC. 602. BUSINESS RECORDS COMPLIANCE REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 502(b) (50 U.S.C. 1862(b)), as amended by section 601 of this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (7) as paragraphs (2) through (8), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as so redesignated) the following new paragraph:

“(1) a summary of all compliance reviews conducted by the Federal Government of the production of tangible things under section 501.”.

SEC. 603. ANNUAL REPORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT ON ORDERS ENTERED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.), as amended by section 402 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 603. ANNUAL REPORT ON ORDERS ENTERED.

“(a) REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall annually submit to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and, subject to a declassification review by the Attorney General and Director of National Intelligence, make publicly available on an Internet website—

“(1) the number of orders entered under each of sections 105, 304, 402, 501, 702, 703, and 704;

“(2) the number of orders modified under each of those sections;

“(3) the number of orders denied under each of those sections; and

“(4) the number of appointments of an individual to serve as amicus curiae under section 103, including the name of each individual appointed to serve as amicus curiae.

“(b) REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The Director of National Intelligence shall annually make publicly available a report that identifies, for the preceding 12-month period—

“(1) the total number of orders issued pursuant to titles I and III and sections 703 and 704 and the estimated number of targets affected by such orders;

“(2) the total number of orders issued pursuant to section 702 and the estimated number of targets affected by such orders;

“(3) the total number of orders issued pursuant to title IV and the estimated number of targets affected by such orders;

“(4) the total number of orders issued pursuant to applications made under section

501(b)(2)(B) and the estimated number of targets affected by such orders;

“(5) the total number of orders issued pursuant to applications made under section 501(b)(2)(C) and the estimated number of targets affected by such orders; and

“(6) the total number of national Security letters issued and the number of requests for information contained within such national security letters.

“(c) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER DEFINED.—The term ‘national security letter’ means any of the following provisions:

“(1) Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code.

“(2) Section 1114(a)(5)(A) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(A)).

“(3) Subsection (a) or (b) of section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(a), 1681u(b)).

“(4) Section 627(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(a)).”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section, as amended by section 402 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 602, as added by such section 402, the following new item:

“Sec. 603. Annual report on orders entered.”.

SEC. 604. PUBLIC REPORTING BY PERSONS SUBJECT TO FISA ORDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.), as amended by section 603 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 604. PUBLIC REPORTING BY PERSONS SUBJECT TO ORDERS.

“(a) REPORTING.—A person may semiannually publicly report the following information with respect to the preceding half year using one of the following structures:

“(1) Subject to subsection (b), a report that aggregates the number of orders or national security letters the person was required to comply with in the following separate categories:

“(A) The number of national security letters received, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0-999.

“(B) The number of customer accounts affected by national security letters, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0-999.

“(C) The number of orders under this Act for content, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0-999.

“(D) With respect to content orders under this Act, in bands of 1000 starting with 0-999, the number of customer accounts affected under orders under title I;

“(E) The number of orders under this Act for non-content, reported in bands of 1000 starting with 0-999.

“(F) With respect to non-content orders under this Act, in bands of 1000 starting with 0-999, the number of customer accounts affected under orders under—

“(i) title IV;

“(ii) title V with respect to applications described in section 501(b)(2)(B); and

“(iii) title V with respect to applications described in section 501(b)(2)(C).

“(2) A report that aggregates the number of orders, directives, or national security letters the person was required to comply with in the following separate categories:

“(A) The total number of all national security process received, including all national security letters and orders or directives under this Act, reported as a single number in a band of 0-249 and thereafter in bands of 250.

“(B) The total number of customer selectors targeted under all national security process received, including all national security letters

and orders or directives under this Act, reported as a single number in a band of 0-249 and thereafter in bands of 250.

“(3) Subject to subsection (b), a report that aggregates the number of orders or national security letters the person was required to comply with in the following separate categories:

“(A) The number of national security letters received, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0-499.

“(B) The number of customer accounts affected by national security letters, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0-499.

“(C) The number of orders under this Act for content, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0-499.

“(D) The number of customer selectors targeted under such orders, in bands of 500 starting with 0-499.

“(E) The number of orders under this Act for non-content, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0-499.

“(F) The number of customer selectors targeted under such orders, reported in bands of 500 starting with 0-499.

“(b) PERIOD OF TIME COVERED BY REPORTS.—With respect to a report described in paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a), such report shall only include information—

“(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), for the period of time ending on the date that is at least 180 days before the date of the publication of such report; and

“(2) with respect to an order under this Act or national security letter received with respect to a platform, product, or service for which a person did not previously receive such an order or national security letter (not including an enhancement to or iteration of an existing publicly available platform, product, or service), for the period of time ending on the date that is at least 2 years before the date of the publication of such report.

“(c) OTHER FORMS OF AGREED TO PUBLICATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Government and any person from jointly agreeing to the publication of information referred to in this subsection in a time, form, or manner other than as described in this section.

“(d) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER DEFINED.—The term ‘national security letter’ has the meaning given the term in section 603.”

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section, as amended by section 603 of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 603, as added by section 603 of this Act, the following new item:

“Sec. 604. Public reporting by persons subject to orders.”

SEC. 605. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR DECISIONS OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.

Section 601(c)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1871(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) not later than 45 days after the date on which the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review issues a decision, order, or opinion, including any denial or modification of an application under this Act, that includes a significant construction or interpretation of any provision of this Act or results in a change of application of any provision of this Act or a new application of any provision of this Act, a copy of such decision, order, or opinion and any pleadings, applications, or memoranda of law associated with such decision, order, or opinion; and”

SEC. 606. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS UNDER FISA.

(a) ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE.—Section 108(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1808(a)(1)) is amended by striking “the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate,” and inserting “the Perma-

nent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate”.

(b) PHYSICAL SEARCHES.—Section 306 (50 U.S.C. 1826) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate,” and inserting “Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives”.

(c) PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.—Section 406(b) (50 U.S.C. 1846(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) each department or agency on behalf of which the Government has made application for orders approving the use of pen registers or trap and trace devices under this title; and

“(5) for each department or agency described in paragraph (4), a breakdown of the numbers required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).”

(d) ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS AND OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS.—Section 502(a) (50 U.S.C. 1862(a)) is amended by striking “Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate” and inserting “Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate”.

TITLE VII—SUNSETS

SEC. 701. SUNSETS.

(a) USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note) is amended by striking “June 1, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2004.—Section 6001(b)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking “June 1, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3361.

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

There was no objection.

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

From the founding of the American Republic, this country has been engaged in a profound debate about the limits of government. In the Federalist Papers, the Founders argued passionately for a Federal Government that would protect the American people from foreign threats.

At the same time, the Founders struggled to create a structure to contain and control that government in order to protect the God-given rights of the American people. They carefully crafted the Constitution and Bill of Rights to accomplish these two different, yet complementary, goals.

In essence, this debate has illuminated the exceptionalism of the United States. The ceaseless effort to restrain the reach of government is in our DNA as Americans. And for 225 years, we have refused to accept the idea that in order to have national security, we must sacrifice our personal freedoms.

Some, however, think these goals are in conflict with one another following last year’s unauthorized disclosure of the National Security Agency’s data collection programs operated under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA.

Today, the House will consider legislation that once again proves that American liberty and security are not mutually exclusive. We can protect both Americans’ civil liberties and our national security without compromising either one.

For nearly a year, the House Judiciary Committee has studied this issue in detail. We have held multiple hearings, consulted the Obama administration, and worked across party lines to produce bipartisan legislation to ensure these programs protect our national security and our individual freedoms.

This bill, the USA FREEDOM Act, was unanimously approved by both the House Judiciary Committee and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The USA FREEDOM Act makes clear that the government cannot indiscriminately acquire Americans’ call detail records and creates a new, narrowly tailored process for the collection of these records.

Specifically, the USA FREEDOM Act ends bulk collection by keeping Americans’ phone records in the hands of providers and requiring the government to get the permission of the court to request information from providers, using a specific selection term in their request to the court. That limits the scope of information collected. For example, the government would have to

identify a specific person or account as part of any request for information or tangible things.

Furthermore, the USA FREEDOM Act bans bulk collection not just for the controversial telephone metadata program, but for all of section 215 authorities, as well as NSL letters and pen register, trap and trace devices. These limitations will protect Americans' records of all types, including medical records, email records, telephone records, and firearms purchase records, among many others.

At the same time, the USA FREEDOM Act ensures that the Federal Government will continue to have the tools it needs to identify and intercept terrorist attacks. The bill preserves the traditional operational use of these important authorities by the FBI and other intelligence agencies. It provides needed emergency authority to national security officials if there is an immediate national security threat, but still requires the government to obtain Court approval of an application within 7 days.

The USA FREEDOM Act increases the transparency of our intelligence-gathering programs by creating an amicus curiae in the FISA Court. This amicus will be chosen from a panel of legal experts to help ensure the court adequately considers privacy concerns and the constitutional rights of Americans when reviewing the government's request for records.

It also requires the Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion of the court that includes a significant construction or interpretation of the law and mandates that the government report the number of orders issued, modified, or denied by the court annually.

Last year's national security leaks have also had a commercial and financial impact on American technology companies that have provided these records. They have experienced backlash from both American and foreign consumers and have had their competitive standing in the global marketplace damaged. In January of this year, the Justice Department entered into a settlement with several companies to permit new ways to report data concerning requests for customer information under FISA. The USA FREEDOM Act builds on upon this settlement, allowing tech companies to publicly report national security requests from the government to inform their American and foreign customers.

From beginning to end, this is a carefully crafted, bipartisan bill.

I would like to thank the sponsor of this legislation, Crime Subcommittee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER, full committee Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Intellectual Property Subcommittee Ranking Member JERRY NADLER, and Crime Subcommittee Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT for working together with me on this im-

portant bipartisan legislation. I also want to thank the staff of these Members for the many hours, weeks, and months of hard work they put into this effort.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my staff—Caroline Lynch, the chief counsel of the Crime Subcommittee, and Sam Ramer—for their long hours and steadfast dedication to this legislation. And I might add that Sam Ramer is going to be missed by the committee as he moves on to take a new responsibility in the private sector, but he wanted to be sure that he could be present today for the completion of the passage of this legislation through the House. I thank Sam and Caroline for their long and dedicated hours put into making sure that this was a finely crafted piece of legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of the USA FREEDOM Act. The version of the bill pending before us today is not a perfect vehicle. There is more that we can do and must do to ensure, as the Fourth Amendment requires, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures."

But let me be clear. The compromise bill before us today is a significant improvement over the status quo. It is a good bill. Now, with this legislation, we stand poised to end domestic bulk collection across the board—in section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, in the pen register authority, and in the national security letter statutes—by requiring the use of a "specific selection term" before the government may obtain information or tangible things.

This legislation will create a panel of experts from which the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court can draw expertise and questions involving privacy, civil liberties, and technology. It will also require the court to disclose every significant opinion it issues, because in this country there should be no such thing as secret law. And we have accomplished all these things while providing President Obama with his requested authority for the limited, prospective collection of call detail records.

Any bill we might have offered on this subject would have been imperfect, but we have been careful to include the critical safeguards in this legislation. With the additional reporting, declassification, and transparency requirements laid out in the measure before us, we believe the government would be hard-pressed to attempt to expand its surveillance authorities beyond the narrow intent of this legislation.

As the administration stated yesterday in a formal statement of policy, the USA FREEDOM Act "prohibits bulk collection." This is our intent, and we will hold the current and future administrations to this intent.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER of New York, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia for their tireless leadership on this issue. I also want to express appreciation to Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their willingness to work with us to reach this point.

The House is poised to approve the first significant rollback of any aspect of government surveillance since the passage of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in 1978. We must seize this opportunity, and so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3361.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I neglected to add another key member of the committee, Congressman RANDY FORBES of Virginia, a member of the Judiciary Committee who has also been a key bipartisan member of this negotiation.

At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House for bringing the USA FREEDOM Act to the floor today.

I was the chairman of the Judiciary Committee on September 11, 2001. In the wake of that tragedy, the committee passed the PATRIOT Act with unanimous, bipartisan support. The bill easily passed in both the House and the Senate, and President George W. Bush signed it into law.

I believe the PATRIOT Act made America safer by enhancing the government's ability to find and stop terrorist attacks. We were careful to maintain the civil liberties that distinguish us from our enemies. We are here today because the government misapplied the law and upset the balance between privacy and security that we had fought to preserve 13 years ago.

In a feat of legal gymnastics, the administration convinced the FISA Court that, because some records in the universe of every phone call Americans made might be relevant to counterterrorism, the entire universe of calls must be relevant. That decision opened the floodgates to a practice of bulk collection that Congress never intended when the PATRIOT Act was passed.

□ 0930

Senator LEAHY and I introduced the USA FREEDOM Act to end bulk collection, increase transparency, and to reestablish a proper balance between privacy and security. After months of input and negotiations—in a historic echo of its vote on the PATRIOT Act—the Judiciary Committee unanimously passed the FREEDOM Act.

The challenge we faced was to draft legislation that was tight enough to avoid abuse without infringing on the

core functions of law enforcement and intelligence collection. Perfect is rarely possible in politics, and this bill is no exception.

In order to preserve core operations of the intelligence and law enforcement agencies, the administration insisted on broadening certain authorities and lessening certain restrictions. Some of the changes raise justifiable concerns, and I don't blame people for losing trust in their government, because the government has violated their trust.

Let me be clear: I wish this bill did more. To my colleagues who lament the changes, I agree with you. To privacy groups who are upset about lost provisions, I share your disappointment. The negotiations for this bill were intense, and we have to make compromises, but this bill still does deserve support. Don't let the perfect become the enemy of the good. Today, we have the opportunity to make a powerful statement: Congress does not support bulk collection.

The days of the NSA indiscriminately vacuuming up more data than it can store will end with the USA FREEDOM Act. After the FREEDOM Act passes, we will have a law that expresses Congress' unambiguous intent to end bulk collection of Americans' data across all surveillance authorities.

The bill requires that, in addition to existing restrictions, the government must use a specific selection term as the basis for collecting foreign intelligence information. And maybe more importantly, after this bill becomes law, we will have critical transparency provisions to ensure that, if the government again violates our trust, Congress and the public will know about it and will be able to do something about it.

The FREEDOM Act gives private companies greater discretion to disclose their cooperation with the government. These disclosures give the companies increased autonomy and will alert the public to the extent of data collection. The bill also requires public notification of any FISC decision that contains a significant construction of law—expressly including interpretations of the “specific selection term.” This is the end of secret laws. If the administration abuses the intent of the bill, everyone will know.

That is why the FREEDOM Act will succeed. It bans bulk collection and ensures disclosure of attempts to dilute it. Today's vote is a first vote in the first step—and not a final step—in our efforts to reform surveillance. It gives us the tools to ensure that Congress and the public can provide an adequate check on the government. In a post-FREEDOM Act world, we have turned the tables on the NSA and can say to them: “We are watching you.” And we will.

I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS and Congressmen SCOTT, NADLER and

FORBES of Virginia for all their hard work. I also want to thank the staff for so many long hours. I cannot overstate the amount of collective sweat and tears that my chief of staff, Bart Forsyth, Caroline Lynch, Sam Ramer, Aaron Hiller, Heather Sawyer, and Joe Graupensperger put into this bill.

But most of all, I want to thank my wife. Cheryl has always been the world's largest and loudest advocate for the preservation of civil rights. She encouraged, supported—and some might say demanded—that I lead this effort. There is no question that we would not be here today for this historic vote on the USA FREEDOM Act if it weren't for her.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the first chance in more than a decade to finally place some real limits on the sweeping, unwarranted—and at times unlawful—government surveillance that many of us have fought against for years.

First and foremost—and as the administration acknowledges in its Statement of Administration Policy—this bill will end bulk collection under section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act, and will ensure that the government is also prohibited from using its National Security Letter authority, or pen registers and trap-and-trace devices, for bulk collection. It does so by requiring the government to identify a specific selection term—something like a person's name, or an account or telephone number—as the basis for obtaining information. This term must limit the scope of records collected to those that are “relevant” to an authorized investigation, which requires a reasonable relationship between the particular records and the subjects of a terrorism investigation.

I share the concerns that the current definition of “specific selection term” may still allow overbroad collection. But given the “presumptively relevant” categories that Congress has already identified in section 215—and because the bill will now require participation of an amicus in the FISA Court who can argue against an overly broad reading of the law—the government would not be permitted to, for example, use an entire telephone area code or an Internet router to collect and warehouse records just because a terrorist suspect might be using a phone in that area code or sending communications that might traverse that router.

Moreover, to the extent the FISA Court ever construes a specific selection term too broadly, other reforms in the bill ensure that Congress and the American people would know about it immediately and could rein them in.

These changes are quite significant, as are the new restrictions to the use

of FISA section 702, which allows the NSA to target persons located outside the United States.

The USA FREEDOM Act on the floor today certainly does not give us everything we want or need. It is the product of heated negotiations across party and committee lines and with the intelligence community. It is far from perfect, but it is an important step forward, and we will work to fix remaining problems and strengthen the bill as it moves through the Senate. But a “no” vote on this bill today may mean no reform at all, thus leaving in place the framework that could lead to the continued dragnet surveillance of our citizens. This must end. This still makes critically important changes that we should all support. That is why I will vote for it and why I urge everyone else to vote for it.

With that, I want to thank Congressmen SENSENBRENNER, GOODLATTE, CONYERS, SCOTT, and FORBES, and all the staff members who worked on this bill.

This is a signal occasion. It is the first real progress we will have made—not enough—but a really good first step.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) who has worked so hard on this.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I join the author of the bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin and chair of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime, Mr. SENSENBRENNER; my colleague from Virginia, the chair of the full committee, Mr. GOODLATTE; the gentleman from Michigan and ranking member, Mr. CONYERS; Mr. NADLER; and my colleague from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) for proposing this amended version of the USA FREEDOM Act. I commend my colleagues for working together to develop a bipartisan approach to addressing some of the shortcomings in our foreign intelligence surveillance statutes.

As recent revelations about the way that some of these statutes have been used have come to light, members of the Judiciary Committee, which has primary jurisdiction over the statutes, studied the issues, proposed solutions, and worked together to find a way forward. We have also worked with our colleagues from the Intelligence Committee to find common ground in order to bring meaningful surveillance reform to the floor today.

The bill, as amended, addresses abuses, enhances privacy protections, provides more rigorous review of critical questions of legal interpretation, and increases transparency so our citizens will know what is being decided and done in their name.

While the administration has already indicated that it will change its procedures, to paraphrase President Reagan, I think the best course is to “trust but codify.”

While this version of the USA FREEDOM Act does not accomplish all that we had hoped for, it is, in fact, a significant step in the right direction. I therefore urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect the role that Mr. SENSENBRENNER has played in this and honor him and his wife, Cheryl, for their commitment to freedom. But I must oppose the FREEDOM Act that is on the floor today.

This is not the bill that was reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously. I voted for that bill not because it was perfect but because it was a step in the right direction. After the bill was reported out, changes were made without the knowledge of the committee members, and I think the result is a bill that actually will not end bulk collections, regrettably.

As Mr. SCOTT has said, our job is not to trust, but to codify. And if you take a look at the selection changes made in the bill, it would allow for bulk collection should the NSA do so. Further, I would note that the transparency provisions have also been weakened. The 702 section would no longer be reportable by companies who receive orders, and instead of the Attorney General noting decisions that change the law, it is now sent over to the Director of National Intelligence.

Regrettably, we have learned that if we leave any ambiguity in the law, the intelligence agency will run a truck right through that ambiguity. And I think that is why all the civil liberties groups have withdrawn their support from this bill: the ACLU, the Electronic Frontier Foundation, CDT, Open Technology. I would add that FreedomWorks and other libertarian groups have also pulled their support. Companies like Facebook and Google have also pulled their support of the bill.

Now, I hope that we will defeat this bill and come back together—because we do work together well here in the Judiciary Committee—and fix the problems that were created, I think, at the insistence of the administration and give honor to Mr. SENSENBRENNER's original bill that had 151 members cosponsoring it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds simply to point out two things. First of all, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has noted, this legislation is an effort to bring together widely disparate points of view about how to both maximize our national security and our civil liberties. And there are those outside groups that were just referenced who would like to see more than the language that they were able to obtain in this bill. But I think it is very important

for everyone to know that while those groups—some groups—have withdrawn their support for the bill, they do not oppose the bill, and that is a very important distinction for Members to understand.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for yielding to me, and I want to also thank the efforts of the Judiciary Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence for the broad and intense work they have done on this bill.

The USA FREEDOM Act starts with the right concept, and that is that the civil liberties of Americans were at risk. Even though we have very few examples of people being victimized by it, there is not a level of comfort in this country. And so the move to block the Federal Government from storing metadata and still allow for them to be able to set up under a FISA warrant a query through privately held data is the right way to go. It is a conclusion that I drew early on in the many hearings that I have been to, both classified and unclassified hearings.

I quizzed the witnesses, and I put my mark down on those committee hearings, but what happened was the process moved quickly, and over a weekend there was an intense job to write a bill that turned into a substitute amendment, and a debate in the Judiciary Committee referred over to the Select Committee on Intel. Both committees acted quickly. I offered an amendment before the Judiciary Committee. It was voted on. But I have to say that, in my opinion, it was not considered in a fashion that would have allowed for the full judgment of the Judiciary Committee to weigh in.

My amendment is set up so it allows for the intelligence community to negotiate with the telecoms—the telecommunications providers—for a period of time longer than is today required by the FCC.

□ 0945

I think it is not possible for anyone who supports this bill to argue that it makes us safer. It protects our civil liberties more, but there is a window beyond the FCC requirements that I would like to see be available on something other than a voluntary basis.

I wanted to come here to this floor and put my marker down on that concern, that we should not sacrifice the security in America and we should protect the civil liberties of Americans. We can do that at the same time. I think this bill falls somewhat short; although the underlying concept of the bill, I do support.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a very active member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the ranking member and the chairman for this work.

I also thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER, who we have worked with from the first stages of the PATRIOT Act, when the Judiciary Committee passed it out on a bipartisan basis after that terrible and heinous act of terror. Unfortunately, it was changed.

Today, I want to announce that megadata collection as we know it has ended. That is a major tribute to the American people, and the Judiciary Committee and the Intelligence Committee heard them.

More importantly, the Intelligence Committee and the Judiciary Committee stand united. Can we do more? Should there have been an open rule or a number of other amendments that Members wanted? Yes. I believe in participatory democracy.

Today, we end bulk collection under the PATRIOT Act section 215. We can always do better. Today, we prevent the bulk collection under FISA pen register and National Security Letter authorities and vow to the American people that we increase the transparency.

Let me make it very clear, when we first discussed and debated the PATRIOT Act, reverse targeting, to me, was heinous. It means that it captured an innocent American person as we were looking for someone who happened to be a terrorist.

Today, in this bill, we have any communications as to which the sender and all intended recipients are determined to be located in the United States and prohibit the use of any discrete, non-target communication that is determined to be to or from a United States person or a person who appears to be located in the United States, except to protect against an immediate threat to harm. It is eliminated. Reverse targeting is no longer.

In addition, I introduced a bill some time ago called the FISA Court and Sunshine Act of 2013. In that bill, it required the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of the FISA Court, allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT Act and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct surveillance needed to keep Americans safe.

I am pleased that, in section 402 and 604 of the USA FREEDOM Act, it requires the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion. It opens it up to the American people. That includes a significant construction of interpretation of the law and to submit to Congress within 45 days.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

As indicated, the bill specifically contains an explicit prohibition on bulk collection of tangible things pursuant to section 215. The FREEDOM Act provides that section 215 may be used only where specific selection term is provided as the basis for the production of tangible things.

Clearly, we worked very hard to contain what was an amoeba that would not end. Finally, I believe section 301 of the bill, as I indicated, was included, as it was in my amendment in H.R. 3773.

Let me conclude by simply saying that the Bill of Rights lives. The Bill of Rights is for the American people, both the right to freedom, both the right in essence to privacy, and our respect for the gathering of intelligence to protect us from terrorists.

This bill, the USA FREEDOM Act, is indeed an enormous step forward. Let us work together to move us even more, but today, we end megadata collecting as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have made a giant step forward for civil liberties, respect for the integrity of the American people, and their right to freedom, as well as for the protecting of all of us from terror.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and a co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3361, the "USA Freedom Act," which is short for "Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet-collection, and Online Monitoring Act."

The USA Freedom Act is the House's unified response to the unauthorized disclosures and subsequent publication in the media in June 2013 regarding the National Security Agency's collection from Verizon of the phone records of all of its American customers, which was authorized by the FISA Court pursuant to Section 215 of the Patriot Act.

Public reaction to the news of this massive and secret data gathering operation was swift and negative.

There was justifiable concern on the part of the public and a large percentage of the Members of this body that the extent and scale of this NSA data collection operation, which exceeded by orders of magnitude anything previously authorized or contemplated, may constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy and threat to the civil liberties of American citizens.

To quell the growing controversy, the Director of National Intelligence declassified and released limited information about this program. According to the DNI, the information acquired under this program did not include the content of any communications or the identity of any subscriber.

The DNI stated that "the only type of information acquired under the Court's order is telephony metadata, such as telephone numbers dialed and length of calls."

The assurance given by the DNI, to put it mildly, was not very reassuring.

In response, many Members of Congress, including the Ranking Member CONYERS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and myself, introduced legislation in response to the disclosures to ensure that the law and the practices of the executive branch reflect the intent of Congress in passing the USA Patriot Act and subsequent amendments.

For example, I introduced H.R. 2440, the "FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013," bipartisan legislation, that much needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or "FISA Court."

Specifically, my bill would require the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT Act and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct the surveillance needed to keep Americans safe.

I am pleased that these requirements are incorporated in substantial part as Sections 402 and 604 of the USA Freedom Act, which requires the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion of the FISA court that includes a significant construction or interpretation of law and to submit a report to Congress within 45 days.

I also am pleased that the bill before us contains an explicit prohibition on bulk collection of tangible things pursuant to Section 215 authority. Instead, the USA Freedom Act provides that Section 215 may only be used where a specific selection term is provided as the basis for the production of tangible things.

Another important improvement is that the bill's prohibition on domestic bulk collection, as well as its criteria for specifying the information to be collected, applies not only to Section 215 surveillance activities but also to other law enforcement communications interception authorities, such as national security letters.

Finally, I strongly support the USA Freedom Act because Section 301 of the bill continues the prohibition against "reverse targeting," which became law when an earlier Jackson Lee Amendment was included in H.R. 3773, the RESTORE Act of 2007.

"Reverse targeting," a concept well known to members of this Committee but not so well understood by those less steeped in the arcana of electronic surveillance, is the practice where the government targets foreigners without a warrant while its actual purpose is to collect information on certain U.S. persons.

One of the main concerns of libertarians and classical conservatives, as well as progressives and civil liberties organizations, in giving expanded authority to the executive branch was the temptation of national security agencies to engage in reverse targeting may be difficult to resist in the absence of strong safeguards to prevent it.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, codified in Section 301 of the USA Freedom Act, reduces even further any such temptation to resort to reverse targeting by requiring the Administration to obtain a regular, individualized FISA warrant whenever the "real" target of the surveillance is a person in the United States.

In retaining the prohibition on reverse targeting, Section 301 achieves honors the Constitution by requiring the government to obtain a regular FISA warrant whenever a "significant purpose of an acquisition is to acquire the communications of a specific person reasonably believed to be located in the United States."

I should that nothing in Section 301 requires the Government to obtain a FISA order for every overseas target on the off chance that

they might pick up a call into or from the United States.

Rather, a FISA order is required only where there is a particular, known person in the United States at the other end of the foreign target's calls in whom the Government has a significant interest such that a significant purpose of the surveillance has become to acquire that person's communications.

Mr. Speaker, while the bill before is a good bill, it is not perfect. No legislation ever is.

In particular, my preference would have been to retain the provision in the bill as originally introduced establishing an Office of the Special Advocate to vigorously advocate in support of legal interpretations that protect individual privacy and civil liberties.

As initially contemplated, the Office of the Special Advocate would be authorized to participate in proceedings before the FISA Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, and to request reconsiderations of FISA Court decisions and participate in appeals and reviews.

Regrettably, the provision establishing the Office of the Special Advocate fell victim to a compromise and replaced with a provision authorizing both the FISA court and the FISA Court of Review, if they deem it necessary, to appoint an individual to serve as amicus curiae in a case involving a novel or significant interpretation of law.

Under this arrangement, the presiding judges of the courts must designate five individuals eligible to serve in that position who possess expertise in privacy and civil liberties, intelligence collection, telecommunications or any other area that may lend legal or technical expertise to the courts.

The Office of the Special Advocate arrangement in my opinion is superior because it provides for mandatory participation of the public advocate rather than the discretionary involvement of court designated amicus curiae provided in the bill before us.

Mr. Speaker, as I noted in an op-ed published way back in October 2007, nearly two centuries ago, Alexis DeTocqueville, who remains the most astute student of American democracy, observed that the reason democracies invariably prevail in any military conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to success: initiative, innovation, courage, and a love of justice.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a copy of that op-ed.

I support the USA Freedom Act because it will help keep us true to the Bill of Rights and strikes the proper balance between our cherished liberty and smart security.

I urge my colleagues to support the USA Freedom Act.

NSA REFORM TAKES ITS FIRST STEPS

The USA FREEDOM Act takes steps to:

End bulk collection under Patriot Act Section 215. The bill requires the government to show the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that the specific records it seeks from phone companies pertain to a specific email address, account number or other "selection term" before it can demand a customer's personal information. It creates a new collection authority for call records but takes meaningful steps to ensure that such records are not vacuumed up wholesale, as was happening under the secret programs revealed by Edward Snowden.

Prevent bulk collection under FISA pen register and National Security Letter authorities. The bill also requires the government to use a "selection term" that uniquely describes its surveillance target and serves as the basis for collecting information from a telephone line, facility, or other account. This would help ensure that the government won't use pen registers and National Security Letters as convenient substitutes for the 215 program.

Increase transparency. Finally, the bill requires the government to provide to Congress and to the public additional reporting on its surveillance programs, while enabling companies who receive national security informational requests to more fully inform customers about the extent to which the government is collecting their data. Additional governmental reporting requirements and more particularized third party reporting authorities, however, are needed in order to ensure that Congress and the public have the information they need to perform truly robust oversight.

While the bill makes significant reforms to U.S. surveillance law, Congress clearly chose not to let the perfect be the enemy of the good. And, to be clear, more work needs to be done. Some of the additional reforms we are calling for, which were in the original USA FREEDOM Act, include:

Ensuring that judges in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) have the authority to determine whether an application passes legal muster and do not return to being mere rubber stamps.

Limiting the circumstances under which the government can gather records more than one "hop" out from a target to help ensure Americans' information is not unnecessarily swept up.

Closing the "back door" search loophole in the FISA Amendments Act to prevent the government from searching information collected under Section 702 of FISA for the U.S. persons' communications content.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the State Department acknowledged that terrorist attacks worldwide have increased by more than 43 percent last year, killing nearly 18,000 people. The odds are rising that we will be hit here in the United States. That is why balanced legislation that protects civil liberties and keeps Americans safe is so important, and the USA FREEDOM Act does just that.

I rise in support of the passage of the USA FREEDOM Act, bipartisan legislation that reforms our intelligence-gathering programs while, importantly, preserving operational capabilities that protect national security.

This legislation will make sure that Americans are protected at a time when the world is a more dangerous place than when the PATRIOT Act itself was enacted into law.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my thanks to the work that has been done up to now. I became an original cosponsor of the USA FREEDOM Act because I was disturbed about the revelations of surveillance programs.

The bill was a good step toward balancing security and privacy, but this amendment does not. It leaves open the possibility that bulk surveillance could still continue, and it no longer protects the public through a special advocate in the FISA Court.

I am disappointed that this popular, bipartisan bill has been so drastically weakened. I can no longer support it.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I recognize the work that Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SCOTT, and others have put into this, but it still falls woefully short.

This legislation still allows the government to collect everything they want against Americans, to treat Americans as suspects first and citizens second.

It still allows decisions about whom to target and how aggressively to go after acquaintances of acquaintances of targets, to be made by mid-level employees, not Federal judges.

Most important, the fundamental decisions under this will be made against a weak, inferior standard that does not reach probable cause, so that the government can spy on people based on weak suspicions and not on legally established probable cause. Now, my friends say: don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

The perfect? How can anyone here vote for legislation that doesn't uphold the constitutional standard of probable cause? Probable cause has been well-established in law for two centuries, to keep Americans secure by keeping intelligence and enforcement officers focused on real threats, not on vague suspicions or wild-goose chases.

A decade ago, there was a major change in the relationship between Americans and their government. This bill does not correct it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentleman from New Jersey.

A number of the things the gentleman has stated are simply not accurate. First of all, the selectors all have to be approved by court order.

Secondly, it is important for everyone to understand that the information gathered is targeted to foreign nationals, not to American citizens.

Thirdly, the increased transparency that is created by this legislation, both in the FISA Court itself and with the fact that the data is now going to be required to be retained by the companies that own the data and not held by the government, provides extra assurance that, if some kind of massive data collection grab were attempted by the government, it would be exposed, as Mr. NADLER pointed out earlier.

Finally, the special selectors language that was carefully worked out in a bipartisan manner carefully limits

the ability of people to gather data. It has to be based upon discrete requests, and discretion has a meaning in the law.

It has to be limited to identifiable persons or things, and it has to be done in such a way that the court approves it.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I would be happy to yield.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself 30 seconds and yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. Is it not correct that this bill does not invoke the probable cause standard?

Mr. GOODLATTE. This is not a search under the Fourth Amendment, and probable cause has never applied. It has never applied. The gentleman is attempting to change the law if he thinks that.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. Is there any American who doesn't think that this is a search, when it comes to gathering, by any common understanding?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to gathering information about foreign nationals who are deemed to pose a national security threat to the United States, the Fourth Amendment does not apply, and a court must still order the particular selectors that are used.

The gentleman's characterization is inaccurate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member of the committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard arguments against this bill, and all of them amount to one argument: the bill doesn't go far enough.

I agree. It doesn't, but it is rarely a good argument against a bill to say it doesn't go far enough, if it goes a long way towards solving a real problem.

This bill will end bulk collection. It will end it under section 215. It will end it under trace and trap, and it will end it under NSLs. Without this bill—and I hope it is strengthened in the Senate—we will have no chance to end bulk collection, and the current framework which allows the dragnet surveillance of our citizens will continue.

I wish this bill were stronger, but it is what we are able to get now. It is a major step forward, and not to pass this bill now would be to say to the NSA: Continue what you are doing, we are placing no restrictions on you beyond what the law already has.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank staff on both sides of the aisle for the hard work that went into drafting the bill and the many compromises

that were reached when we went into the final product.

In addition to Caroline Lynch and Sam Ramer with Chairman GOODLATTE, Bart Forsyth with Mr. SENSENBRENNER, our own staff, Aaron Hiller, Joe Graupensperger, Heather Sawyer, all deserve appropriate credit and praise for the many late nights and long weekends that they spent working on the public's behalf on this critical legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I have only one speaker remaining, and I am prepared to close our portion of the remarks if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute, and it is to clarify the term "specific selection term" because the definition of specific selection term that appears in the compromise bill is imperfect, but the USA FREEDOM Act still ends bulk collection. That is why we are here.

Under the act, the government may not obtain information or tangible things under section 215, the FISA pen register authority, or the National Security Letter statutes without using a "specific selection term" as the basis for production.

□ 1000

Critics are correct. This is not as clean or straightforward as the definition approved by both the Intelligence Committee and Judiciary Committee. Nothing in the definition explicitly prohibits the government from using a very broad selection term like "area code 202" or "the entire eastern seaboard." But that concern is largely theoretical; the type of collection is not likely to be of use to the government.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the definition of "specific selection term" includes a phrase pursuant to the statute authorizing the provision of information, and that is intended to keep the definition within the four corners of the statute.

There will now be an amicus in the court to argue that expansive readings of this text—like the reading that took "relevance" in section 215 to mean "all call detail records"—are inconsistent with the plain meaning of the law.

Under this bill, any FISA Court opinion that interprets this definition must be declassified and released to the public within 45 days. If the government tries to expand this authority, the public will know it in short order.

The House is poised to approve the first significant rollback of any aspect

of government surveillance since the passage of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in 1978. We must seize this opportunity. If this bill is not approved today, we are giving our intelligence people and NSA a green light to go ahead, and I cannot imagine that happening in this body.

I support H.R. 3361 and yield back the balance of my time.

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

Eighty-six years ago, Justice Louis Brandeis wrote, in his dissent in *Olmstead v. United States*: "The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

After the horrific attacks on September 11, 2001, the country was determined not to allow such an attack to occur again. The changes we made then to our intelligence laws helped keep us safe from implacable enemies. Today, we renew our commitment to our Nation's security and to the safety of the American people.

We also make this pledge: that the United States of America will remain a nation whose government answers to the will of the people. This country must be what it always has been: a beacon of freedom to the world; a place where the principles of the Founders, including the commitment to individual liberties, will continue to live, protected and nourished for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

I would like to begin by recognizing Chairman GOODLATTE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, the other judiciary committee sponsors, and Leader CANTOR for all their hard work and continuing to forge a compromise with the Intelligence Committee that enacts meaningful change to FISA while preserving operational capabilities.

It is commendable that we have found a responsible legislative solution to address concerns about the bulk telephone metadata program so that we may move forward on other national security legislative priorities. Our obligation to protect this country should not be held hostage by the actions of a traitor or traitors who leaked classified information that puts our troops in the field at risk or those who fearmonger and spread mistruth and misinformation to further their own misguided agenda.

Following the criminal disclosures of intelligence information last June, the section 215 telephone metadata program has been the subject of intense and often inaccurate criticism. The bulk telephone metadata program is legal, overseen, and effective at saving American lives. No review has found anything other than that. All three branches of government oversee this program, including Congress, the FISC, inspectors general and internal compliance and privacy and civil liberties offices in the executive branch agencies.

Despite the effectiveness of the program and immense safeguards on the data, many Americans and many Members of this body still have concerns about a potential for abuse. Remember, the whole debate here has been about the potential for abuse, not that abuse had occurred. The legislation we are considering today is designed to address those concerns and reflect hundreds of hours of Member and staff work to negotiate a workable compromise.

In March, the Intelligence Committee ranking member, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and I introduced legislation that was designed to accomplish these main priorities. We committed to ending bulk metadata collection for communications and other types of records. We committed to providing more targeted, narrow authorities so as not to put America at risk. We committed to provide an even more robust judicial review than exists today and process for that program. We committed to providing more transparency into the FISA process and the decisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. The revised USA FREEDOM Act accomplishes the same goals as well.

The USA FREEDOM Act provides the meaningful change to the telephone metadata that Members of the House have been seeking. If we had the fortune of having a Commander in Chief firmly dedicated to the preservation of this program, we may have been able to protect it in its entirety. With that not being the case, and I believe this is a workable compromise that protects the core function of a counterterrorism program we know has saved lives around the world, I urge Members to support this legislation.

I want to thank all of those who came together to forge something that has been certainly a difficult process along the way. At the end of the day, something important happened here: a better understanding of the threats by, I think, more Members of Congress that pose every single day to the lives of American citizens by terror groups around the world. That rise in threat level is getting worse. The matrix for that threat level is getting worse.

It was important as we forged and, I think, met the concerns of so many and educated, I think, many on the misinformation that was out there, that we protect the core capability to detect if a foreign terrorist on foreign

soil is making a call to the United States to further advance their goals of killing Americans. I think we accomplished that today. It is not the bill I would have written completely, but I think we protected those operational concerns and met the concerns for those who had a mistrust of that metadata being locked away with the National Security Agency.

With that, I look forward to a thoughtful debate and reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the USA FREEDOM Act, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

On May 8, the House Intelligence Committee passed out of the committee the bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act, the identical bill that the Judiciary Committee passed out of committee on May 7.

I especially want to thank Chairman ROGERS for his years of leadership on the House Intelligence Committee. I also want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, and also Congressman SENSENBRENNER and the staff of our Intelligence and Judiciary Committees for the hard work they did on this bill. We have worked together in a bipartisan manner, and we have come a long way.

After our committee markups, Chairman ROGERS and I have continued to work with the Judiciary Committee and the administration to iron out some remaining issues, which we have done and which is represented in the current bill.

The bill represents the productive efforts of bipartisanship and working together for the American people. Just yesterday, the administration stated that it “strongly supports” passage of our bill. Again, the administration said that it “strongly supports” passage of our bill. It also stated that the USA FREEDOM Act “ensures our intelligence and law enforcement professionals have the authorities they need to protect the Nation, while further ensuring that individuals’ privacy is appropriately protected.”

The USA FREEDOM Act contains important measures to increase transparency and enhance privacy while maintaining an important national security tool.

First, we have ended bulk collection of telephone metadata and ensured the court reviews each and every search application. The big database up at the National Security Agency that contains phone numbers of millions of Americans will go away. It will be replaced with a tailored, narrow process that allows the government to search only for specific connections to suspected terrorists to keep us safe here at home. There is an important emergency exception when there isn’t time to get prior approval from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, also known as FISC.

Second, we have required expanded reporting for court decisions to improve transparency without threatening sources and methods.

Third, we are creating an advocate to provide outside expertise for significant matters before the FISA Court.

Fourth, we have established a declassification review process of court opinions to ensure the public has access to our national security legal rulings in a manner that still protects our sources and methods.

The USA FREEDOM Act is critical to our country’s safety and our intelligence community. It is a focused, logical bill that will let us protect our citizens from terrorist attacks through important legal tools while strengthening civil liberties.

I was opposed to the original USA FREEDOM Act because it set too high a standard for intelligence collection. In short, it would have threatened America’s safety by cutting off the building blocks of foreign intelligence investigations. We have worked together in a bipartisan manner and created a solid bill.

Now, it ends bulk collection of all metadata by the government. Those that say this bill will legalize bulk collection are wrong. They are trying to scare you by making you think there are monsters under the bed. There aren’t. We end all collection of metadata records. I am again saying read the bill. That is what the bill says. There is nothing else in the bill. It is direct, and it states that we will end all bulk collection by the government.

The USA FREEDOM Act includes the necessary checks and balances across all three branches of government. It protects our Nation while also protecting Americans’ privacy and civil liberties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the USA FREEDOM Act. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

On May 8th, the House Intelligence Committee favorably reported the bipartisan USA FREEDOM Act—the same bill that the Judiciary Committee favorably reported on May 7th.

I especially want to thank Chairman ROGERS for his years of leadership here on the House Intelligence Committee. I also want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, and the staff of our Intelligence and Judiciary Committees. We have worked together in a bipartisan manner, and we have come a long way.

After our Committee markups, Chairman ROGERS and I have continued to work with the Judiciary Committee and the Administration to iron out some remaining issues, which we have done, and which is represented in the current bill. This bill represents the productive efforts of bipartisanship and working together for the American people.

Just yesterday, the Administration stated that it “strongly supports” passage of our bill. As the Administration further stated, our bill “ensures our intelligence and law enforcement professionals have the authorities they need to protect the Nation, while further ensuring that individuals’ privacy is appropriately protected when these authorities are employed.”

The USA FREEDOM Act contains important measures to increase transparency and enhance privacy while maintaining an important national security tool.

First, we have ended bulk collection of telephone metadata. “Bulk” collection means the/ indiscriminate acquisition of information or tan-

gible things. It does not mean the acquisition of a large number of communications records or other tangible things. Rather, the prohibition applies to the use of these authorities to engage in indiscriminate or “bulk” data collection.

There is also an emergency exception when there isn’t time to get prior approval from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court—also known as the FISC.

Second, we have required expanded reporting for FISC decisions to improve transparency to the Intelligence and Judiciary Committees without threatening sources and methods.

Third, we are creating an advocate to provide the FISC with outside expertise for matters before the FISA Court. Importantly, we are doing this without infringing on any constitutional provisions or operational processes.

Fourth, we have established a declassification review process of FISC opinions, to ensure that the public has access to our national security legal rulings, while having procedures in place to ensure that our sources and methods continue to be protected.

The USA FREEDOM Act is critical to our Intelligence Community and to our country’s safety.

It is a focused, logical bill that will let us protect our citizens from terrorist attacks and protect their civil liberties while maintaining important legal tools.

For instance, our bill is not intended to impact the current scope or use of FISA or National Security Letters, outside the context of bulk data collection, that are traditionally used for national security investigations. Notably, the introduction of the term “specific selection term” is not intended to limit the types of information and tangible things that the government is currently able to collect under FISA or National Security Letter statutes. These changes are prophylactic and intended to respond to concerns that these authorities could be used to permit bulk data collection.

Furthermore, the legislation is not intended to limit the government to use a single “specific selection term” in an application under FISA or a National Security Letter. The government may use multiple “specific selection terms” in a single FISA application or a National Security Letter. For example, the government may request in a single FISA application or National Security Letter information or tangible things relating to multiple persons, entities, accounts, addresses or devices that are relevant to a pending investigation. Similarly, the government may, in a single FISA application or National Security Letter, use multiple “specific selection terms”—such a date and premises—to further narrow the scope of production by a provider.

Our bill also ensures that America can protect Americans’ privacy interests while at the same time being able to adapt to evolving national security threats and terrorists’ use of ever-changing technology and capabilities to evade detection.

In particular, Section 501(c)(2)(F)(iii) provides for two hops—in other words, the Government will be able to obtain the call detail records in direct contact with a reasonable, articulable suspicion (or, RAS)-approved seed—this is the first hop—and then, using those call detail records or ones the Government identifies itself, obtain the second hop call detail records.

The legislation also creates a new mechanism for obtaining call detail records on a continuing basis for up to 180 days when there

are reasonable grounds to believe that the records are relevant to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism and there is a reasonable and articulable suspicion that the records are associated with a foreign power or the agent of a foreign power. The legislation is not intended to affect any current uses of Section 501 outside the bulk collection context, including the use of Section 501 to obtain specified call detail records related to foreign intelligence information not concerning a U.S. person, clandestine intelligence activities, or international terrorism.

I believe that our bill has made real improvements in the way our intelligence collection operates and in improving FISA to achieve even greater privacy and civil liberties protections.

I was opposed to the original USA FREEDOM Act because it put up too many legal hurdles that would have impeded our national security. In short, it would have threatened America's safety by effectively cutting off the building blocks of foreign intelligence investigations.

But we have worked together in a bipartisan manner, and we have come a long way. Additionally, since our Committee markups, Chairman ROGERS and I have continued to work with the Judiciary Committee and the Administration to iron out some remaining issues, which we have done, and which is represented in the current bill.

The USA FREEDOM Act includes the necessary checks and balances across all three branches of government and strikes the correct balance that is so critical to protecting our nation, while also protecting Americans' privacy and civil liberties.

□ 1015

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), who has been incredibly important, not only on forming this piece of legislation to find the right balance, but his work across North Africa on Boko Haram before it was even popular in bringing attention and resources to important intelligence problems around the world in difficult places, a good friend, a great Member, and a great patriot.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, let me start out by thanking my colleagues for bringing together an incredibly complicated, difficult issue that probably as recently as a couple of months ago no one thought possible. Tremendous, tremendous accolades to Chairman ROGERS, to Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, to Mr. SENSENBRENNER, to Mr. CONYERS on a whole host of issues that, again, are critically important to our Nation.

You have heard the chairman and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER outline some of the key portions of this, but I think it is critically important to stress that the protection of Americans civil liberties must always be a top priority and always will be a top priority. This bipartisan bill underscores the importance of that while keeping our Nation safe.

The USA FREEDOM Act increases transparency. That is something that

people have demanded: increased transparency to the American people, and it allows for greater oversight, something else that we listened to that people wanted to see.

It firmly, as Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. ROGERS have stated, ends bulk collection of records. This is critically important.

It reforms the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, or FISC, to ensure greater checks and balances are placed in such sensitive national security programs.

But as we discuss this, let's not miss the bigger picture. I have had the opportunity to see firsthand in some pretty dark and remote places on the Earth how our enemies are plotting not just on a daily basis, but on a minute-by-minute basis of how to find a chink in our armor, how can they find some gap which will allow them to attack our homeland, to attack our citizens. This is a constant and ongoing threat.

This bill strikes a balance to allow that transparency for civil liberties while it underscores the ability of our intelligence community to be able to do their job. And having been, as Mr. ROGERS indicated, firsthand in some very remote places on the Earth, we have got some incredibly dedicated people who are putting their lives at risk every day to protect this country.

This is a good bill. Let's pass it.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois, Ms. JAN SCHAKOWSKY, a very important member of our Intelligence Committee, who focuses very strongly on issues of privacy and constitutional rights and people's rights.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the USA FREEDOM Act and a member of Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have been committed to reforming these laws.

No bill is perfect, including this one. The USA FREEDOM Act we are voting on today is quite different from the original bill I cosponsored. It has changed significantly from the version recently passed by the House Intelligence and Judiciary Committees.

On its path to the floor, several of the bills' proposed reforms have been watered down and many of us would like to see stronger more meaningful change.

However, we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good, and I want to congratulate all those who have been part of this bipartisan compromise.

The bill we are considering today includes real reforms, and the intent of Congress is clear: we are putting an end to the bulk collection of metadata, establishing meaningful prior judicial review, and ensuring that important FISA Court decisions are declassified for public consumption. These reforms are important, and future interpretations of FISA must reflect our intentions here today.

I support the act, and I look forward to the opportunity to continue to work with my colleagues to make even more improvements in the future.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend your efforts, along with those of the Judiciary Committee, in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House. As you and I have met and discussed on numerous occasions, along with my good friend from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), this issue is important to not only many of my constituents back in western New York, but also to our country.

Provisions in this bill, such as the reforms made to bulk data collection and enhanced declassification requirements, are specific ideas that were shared with me by constituents in western New York and brought to here, Washington, D.C.

As you know, I am happy to report, through our work with you, these provisions were incorporated into this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as this bill moves forward, I hope I have your commitment to continue to work together to assure that a balance between national security and the protection of our personal freedoms is achieved.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for his diligent work on this issue since last summer. Mr. REED's work, along with that of Mr. STUTZMAN from Indiana, was critical to ensuring that we struck the right balance on this legislation. We would not have been able to find that sweet spot that got us to such a strong bipartisan agreement without input from these and other Members interested in finding a solution. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his interest, his time, and his effort to help be a part of the forging of this important piece of legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), an expert in cybersecurity. For the years I have been in Congress, I have worked with Mr. LANGEVIN on this issue.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the USA FREEDOM Act.

I want to thank and congratulate all those who had a hand in crafting the legislation before us, particularly Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER.

Changes to our national security program should not be taken lightly, and this compromise legislation is the result of vigorous debate and careful consideration. As Chairman ROGERS pointed out, with all the reviews and investigations that have taken place with respect to the bulk collection program, no violations of law were found. But

there was concern that there could be abuses in the future, and the American people wanted a better balance to be struck between national security and protecting privacy and civil liberties and more accountability. Many of my constituents have expressed concerns about the sanctity of their civil liberties, and I share their concern. I firmly believe that this legislation protects that privacy by ending bulk metadata collection while still safeguarding our national security.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes provisions very similar to those that I championed in the Intelligence Committee which allow the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to appoint an independent advocate with legal or technical expertise in the field, such as privacy and civil liberties, intelligence collection, telecommunication, cyber, or any other area of law necessary in order to ensure independent checks on government surveillance within the court's process.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly thank Mr. LANGEVIN, who has done not only incredible work on this particular bill, but his work on cybersecurity should make Americans proud of his effort to move that ball down the field. Without his expertise on these matters, the United States would be a little worse off when it comes to national security. I want to thank the gentleman for his work on this bill and his work on cyber and other national security issues.

I continue I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a very important member of our committee who does his homework and has really helped me a lot and advised me on a lot of issues that are important to our committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the USA FREEDOM Act. This bill ends the bulk collection of American's telephone records and puts in place reforms to surveillance authorities to protect privacy and increased transparency.

I have long advocated that the telephone metadata program should end in favor of a system in which telecommunications providers retain their own records so they can be queried based on a court-approved, reasonable, articulable suspicion standard. That is precisely what this bill puts in place. It allows us to keep the capabilities that we need to protect the Nation from terrorist plots while protecting privacy and civil liberties.

There are remaining ways that the bill can be improved, and I hope as it heads to the Senate there will be opportunities to do so. In particular, I would like to see provisions to intro-

duce an adversarial process in the FISA Court. The FISA Court and the public trust would benefit from an independent advocate in the limited number of cases that call for significant statutory interpretation or novel legal issues. I hope that the Senate will include such provisions, which would be both wise and constitutionally sound.

With that, I urge a "yes" vote, and I compliment my chair and ranking member on the extraordinary job they have done.

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGRO).

Mr. GALLEGRO. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the House Armed Services Committee, and through that assignment I have had the opportunity to spend a lot of time with soldiers, airmen, marines, sailors, and their families.

Like all Americans, I certainly want our sons and daughters to be safe when we send them into harm's way. We want to take as much care of them as we possibly can.

The media has talked some about some of the documents that were released by Mr. Snowden, but there were at one point 7 million documents that were released. Many of these documents didn't even relate to the NSA. When those files are disclosed in the press and they are disclosed to our adversaries that naturally puts our sons and daughters in harm's way. It should say something that the first place you go is China and the second place you go is Russia. That should say something to the American people.

This Memorial Day, I want the American people to focus on those men and women, our country's sons and daughters, who have honorably served our Nation and have stood by their brothers in arms and protected one another as we have asked them to fight for us.

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, thank you for your work on this legislation.

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The USA FREEDOM Act is a bipartisan compromise that is strongly supported by the administration.

Our bill protects privacy and civil liberties while also protecting national security.

I urge members to support the USA FREEDOM Act. Nothing in this bill will legalize bulk collection. Unfortunately, there are those Members that are saying this will legalize bulk collection. It is clear that this bill—read the bill—states: there will be no more bulk collection by the government. That is what the bill says, end of story.

This bill balances the issue of taking care and protecting our country from

people and individuals who want to kill us and attack us and our allies. But yet it also does what is so important to Americans: to make sure that we protect our constitutional rights and our privacy. It is a balance—it is Republicans, Democrats, left, right, in the middle—coming together and doing what is right for this country. This is what this body should do. We are asking for a "yes" vote on the USA FREEDOM Act.

Also, in closing, I want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and his important leadership that has allowed us to get to this level, the Judiciary Committee, Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, and also Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In the comity of the moment, with all the love extended and the group hugs and the high fives, I think it is important to America to understand how much effort—how proud I think they should be about the intensity of the debate and discussion over what this bill looks like because I believe everybody involved in this cares about civil liberties and privacy; they do, wherever you fall on it. And I do believe that everybody who is involved in this cares about our national security.

□ 1030

This debate—this fierce, intense debate—that happened off of this floor in committees, in negotiations over every word and every paragraph and every period, resulted in the bill that you see before us today that did get bipartisan support and buy-in for a very critical issue: at the end of the day, the national security of the United States and the public's trust in the intelligence agencies, which have the responsibility each and every day, in some very dangerous places around the world, to collect the information that keeps America safe.

At the end of this, I hope that people take away from this debate that those who believed that the first round of negotiations meant that our national security was in peril and those who believed in the first round of negotiations that our civil liberties and privacy were in peril found that right balance today. It is that important for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I only bring that up, and I thank all of those involved—the Republicans and Democrats on the Judiciary, the Republicans and Democrats on the Intel Committee, and all of those who were involved in this negotiation.

I think they have done America a favor today, and they have brought back the institutional notion of negotiation and intensity of debate that brings us to a better place today. I think this bill is a result of that. America should be proud.

Now, we can move forward on other national security priorities that will

serve to protect Americans' and our allies' lives around the world.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly vote for H.R. 3361. I do so because I recognize that important authorities which help keep our people safe expire next year and that there is a significant chance that those authorities may not be renewed. I also recognize that the abuse of government power by the Obama Administration has damaged the trust that the American people have even in the military and civilian professionals at the National Security Agency. An orchestrated campaign of distortions and half-truths has called NSA's trustworthiness into question for too many Americans.

That is unfortunate and unfair. The men and women at NSA have had more than a decade of remarkable success, not only in protecting our country from another 9/11-type attack, but supporting our warfighters on the ground in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world. While few Americans will ever learn the details of their accomplishments, we all benefit from their hard work, dedication to their mission, and professionalism.

We should be clear-eyed about the effects of this bill. It makes it harder to gather the information necessary to stop terrorism; it means that it will take longer to find the essential connections of terrorist networks; and this bill makes it less likely, hopefully only slightly less likely, that we will stop future terrorist attacks. But there is no doubt that America will be less safe from terrorist attack after this bill takes effect than it is today.

Apparently, that result is inevitable if we are to prevent even worse damage to our country's security and our people's safety. So, I vote today to minimize the damage to our national security while maintaining respect and gratitude for the men and women in the military, intelligence community, and law enforcement who dedicate their lives to keeping us all safe.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, government should protect our liberties, not violate them. Individuals and businesses alike must be able to trust their government to work for them—not spy on them. The NSA's bulk collection of Americans' phone records threatens our constitutional liberties.

We have the opportunity to pass legislation that both limits the reach of the NSA and provides the transparency to lawmakers and the American people necessary to prevent abusive practices from happening again. We have the opportunity to begin to restore the trust of the American people.

The original and Committee-passed versions of the USA FREEDOM Act struck a careful balance between our liberty and our security, providing the reforms necessary to restore trust. I was proud to be an original co-sponsor of this bill, and commend Representative Jim Sensenbrenner and Chairman Bob Goodlatte for their work to protect our civil liberties.

Unfortunately, the floor-version of the USA FREEDOM Act falls short of our goal.

This legislation would still allow for the mass collection of information. The Committee-passed legislation required court orders to be based on "specific-selection terms"—which was defined as a "person, entity or account." The floor version broadens the scope of "spe-

cific-selection term" by defining it as a "discrete term." This ambiguous legal phrase does not have defined limitations, and could capture millions of individuals' information.

The existing data collection programs that were revealed to the American people within the last year are unacceptable, and we must not only legislate stronger safeguards for intelligence gathering but must vigorously conduct oversight to prevent constitutional intrusions by big government. Of the few transparency requirements left in the bill, significant construction of law made by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) would be reviewed for declassification to the American people. However, the floor version of the bill transfers the authority to conduct declassification to the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper. Last year, Director Clapper lied under oath to Congress when asked about the existence of programs that collect data on millions of Americans. I cannot in good conscious support legislation that would place the responsibility of transparency with a government official who has already violated the trust of the American people.

For these reasons, I will not support the floor version of the USA FREEDOM Act. I hope that my colleagues and I will be able to come together to enact reforms the American people deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 590, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 303, nays 121, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

YEAS—303

Aderholt	Byrne	Cooper
Amodei	Calvert	Costa
Bachmann	Camp	Cotton
Bachus	Cantor	Courtney
Barber	Capito	Cramer
Barletta	Capps	Crawford
Barr	Carney	Crenshaw
Barrow (GA)	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Beatty	Carter	Culberson
Benishek	Cassidy	Davis (CA)
Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Castro (TX)	Delaney
Bishop (GA)	Chabot	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Chaffetz	Denham
Bishop (UT)	Chu	Dent
Black	Cicilline	DeSantis
Blackburn	Clay	Deuth
Boustany	Cleaver	Diaz-Balart
Brady (TX)	Clyburn	Dingell
Braley (IA)	Coble	Duckworth
Bridenstine	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Cohen	Ellmers
Brooks (IN)	Cole	Engel
Brown (FL)	Collins (GA)	Enyart
Brownley (CA)	Collins (NY)	Esty
Buchanan	Conaway	Farenthold
Bucshon	Connolly	Fincher
Bustos	Conyers	Fleischmann
Butterfield	Cook	Flores

Forbes	Long	Rogers (AL)
Fortenberry	Lowey	Rogers (KY)
Fox	Lucas	Rogers (MI)
Frankel (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Rooney
Franks (AZ)	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Ros-Lehtinen
Frelinghuysen	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Roskam
Fudge	Lynch	Ross
Gallego	Maloney, Carolyn	Roybal-Allard
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Royce
Garcia	Marino	Ruiz
Gerlach	Matheson	Runyan
Gibbs	McAllister	Ruppersberger
Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Gowdy	McCaul	Sarbanes
Granger	McDermott	Scalise
Graves (MO)	McHenry	Schakowsky
Green, Al	McIntyre	Schiff
Green, Gene	McKeon	Schneider
Griffin (AR)	McKinley	Schock
Grimm	McMorris	Schrader
Guthrie	Rodgers	Scott (VA)
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Scott, Austin
Hall	Meehan	Scott, David
Harper	Meeks	Sensenbrenner
Hartzler	Meng	Sessions
Hastings (WA)	Messer	Sewell (AL)
Heck (NV)	Mica	Sherman
Heck (WA)	Michaud	Shimkus
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Higgins	Moore	Sinema
Himes	Moran	Sires
Holding	Mullan	Smith (MO)
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NE)
Hudson	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Huffman	Nadler	Smith (TX)
Huizenga (MI)	Napolitano	Southerland
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Stewart
Hunter	Noem	Stivers
Hurt	Nugent	Thompson (CA)
Israel	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Jackson Lee	Nunnelee	Thornberry
Jenkins	Olson	Tiberi
Johnson (GA)	Palazzo	Titus
Johnson (OH)	Pascrell	Tsongas
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)	Turner
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Upton
Jolly	Payne	Valadao
Joyce	Pearce	Van Hollen
Kelly (IL)	Pelosi	Vargas
Kelly (PA)	Perlmutter	Veasey
Kennedy	Peters (CA)	Vela
Kildee	Peters (MI)	Wagner
Kilmer	Petersen	Walberg
Kind	Petri	Walden
King (NY)	Pittenger	Wasserman
Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Schultz
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Waters
Kline	Pompeo	Webster (FL)
Kuster	Price (GA)	Westmire
LaMalfa	Price (NC)	Whitfield
Lamborn	Quigley	Williams
Lance	Rahall	Wilson (FL)
Langevin	Rangel	Wilson (SC)
Lankford	Reed	Wittman
Larsen (WA)	Reichert	Wolf
Larson (CT)	Renacci	Womack
Latham	Rice (SC)	Woodall
Latta	Rigell	Yoder
Levin	Roby	Young (AK)
Lipinski		Young (IN)
LoBiondo		
Loeb sack		

NAYS—121

Amash	Doggett	Hanna
Barton	Doyle	Harris
Becerra	Duncan (SC)	Hastings (FL)
Bentivolio	Edwards	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Ellison	Holt
Bonamici	Eshoo	Honda
Brady (PA)	Farr	Horsford
Broun (GA)	Fattah	Huelskamp
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Campbell	Fleming	Jeffries
Capuano	Foster	Jones
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Jordan
Cartwright	Gardner	Kaptur
Clark (MA)	Garrett	Keating
Clarke (NY)	Gibson	King (IA)
Crowley	Gohmert	Kingston
Cummings	Gosar	Labrador
Daines	Graves (GA)	Lee (CA)
Davis, Danny	Grayson	Lewis
DeFazio	Griffith (VA)	Logren
DeGette	Grijalva	Lowenthal
DelBene	Hahn	Lummis
DesJarlais	Hanabusa	Maffei

Marchant	Polis	Swalwell (CA)
Massie	Posey	Takano
Matsui	Ribble	Terry
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Tierney
McGovern	Rokita	Tipton
Meadows	Rothfus	Tonko
Miller, George	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
Mulvaney	Salmon	Visclosky
Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Walorski
Negrete McLeod	Sanford	Walz
Nolan	Schweikert	Waxman
O'Rourke	Serrano	Weber (TX)
Owens	Shea-Porter	Weber (TX)
Pallone	Smith (WA)	Welch
Perry	Speier	Yarmuth
Pingree (ME)	Stockman	Yoho
Poe (TX)	Stutzman	

NOT VOTING—7

Bass	Richmond	Slaughter
Duffy	Rush	
Miller, Gary	Schwartz	

□ 1103

Messrs. DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, ROHRABACHER, ISSA, BRADY of Pennsylvania, WELCH, TONKO, FITZPATRICK, SERRANO, CUMMINGS, MAFFEI, ELLISON, and LOWENTHAL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. HIMES, COLE, LYNCH, Ms. MOORE, Messrs. LAMALFA and DeSANTIS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1036. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 Center Street West in Eatonville, Washington, as the "National Park Ranger Margaret Anderson Post Office".

H.R. 1228. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South 9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, as the "Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building".

H.R. 1451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Main Street in Brockport, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Nicholas J. Reid Post Office Building".

H.R. 2391. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5323 Highway N in Cottleville, Missouri as the "Lance Corporal Phillip Vinnedge Post Office".

H.R. 3060. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 232 Southwest Johnson Avenue in Burleson, Texas, as the "Sergeant William Moody Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2086. An act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 590 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4435.

Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1105

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Mr. WOMACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 21, 2014, the seventh set of en bloc amendments, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 113-460 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. SMITH of Washington.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. SMITH of Washington.

Amendment No. 15 by Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

AYES—231

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

NOES—192

Barber	Cárdenas	Cooper
Beatty	Carney	Costa
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Bera (CA)	Cartwright	Crowley
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Bishop (NY)	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Blumenauer	Chu	Davis, Danny
Bonamici	Cicilline	DeFazio
Brady (PA)	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Braley (IA)	Clarke (NY)	Delaney
Brown (FL)	Clay	DeLauro
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	DeBene
Bustos	Clyburn	Deutch
Butterfield	Cohen	Dingell
Capps	Connolly	Doggett
Capuano	Conyers	Doyle

Duckworth	Larson (CT)	Pocan	Bentivolio	Grimm	Pitts	Eshoo	Lofgren	Quigley
Edwards	Lee (CA)	Polis	Bilirakis	Guthrie	Poe (TX)	Esty	Lowenthal	Rangel
Ellison	Levin	Price (NC)	Bishop (UT)	Hall	Pompeo	Farr	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Lewis	Quigley	Black	Hanna	Posey	Fattah	Lujan Grisham	Ruiz
Enyart	Lipinski	Rangel	Blackburn	Harper	Price (GA)	Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Ruppersberger
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard	Boustany	Harris	Rahall	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)
Esty	Loeb sack	Ruiz	Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Reed	Gallego	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Farr	Lofgren	Ruppersberger	Bridenstine	Hastings (WA)	Reichert	Garamendi	Lynch	Sarbanes
Fattah	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)	Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Renacci	Green, Al	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Foster	Lowe y	Sánchez, Linda	Brooks (IN)	Hensarling	Ribble	Grijalva	Carolyn	Schiff
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham	T.	Broun (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
Fudge	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta	Buchanan	Holding	Rigell	Hahn	Matheson	Schrader
Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray	Sarbanes	Bucshon	Hudson	Roby	Hanabusa	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Gallego	(NM)	Schakowsky	Burgess	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)	Scott, David
Garamendi	Lynch	Schiff	Byrne	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Heck (WA)	McCollum	Serrano
Garcia	Maffei	Schneider	Calvert	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)	Higgins	McDermott	Sewell (AL)
Garrett	Maloney,	Schrader	Camp	Hunter	Rogers (MI)	Himes	McGovern	Shea-Porter
Gibson	Carolyn	Scott (VA)	Campbell	Hurt	Rohrabacher	Hinojosa	McNerney	Sherman
Grayson	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David	Cantor	Issa	Rokita	Holt	Meeks	Sires
Green, Al	Matheson	Serrano	Capito	Jenkins	Rooney	Honda	Meng	Smith (WA)
Green, Gene	Matsui	Sewell (AL)	Capuano	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen	Horsford	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Shea-Porter	Carter	Johnson, Sam	Roskam	Hoyer	Miller, George	Speier
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Sherman	Cassidy	Jolly	Ross	Huffman	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Hahn	McDermott	Sinema	Chabot	Jones	Rothfus	Israel	Moran	Takano
Hanabusa	McGovern	Sires	Chaffetz	Jordan	Royce	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Smith (WA)	Coble	Joyce	Runyan	Jeffries	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Heck (WA)	Meeks	Speier	Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Johnston (GA)	Napolitano	Titus
Higgins	Meng	Swalwell (CA)	Cole	King (IA)	Salmon	Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Tonko
Himes	Michaud	Takano	Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Sánchez, Linda	Kaptur	Negrete McLeod	Tsongas
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)	Collins (NY)	Kingston	T.	Keating	Nolan	Van Hollen
Holt	Moore	Thompson (MS)	Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford	Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Vargas
Honda	Moran	Tierney	Cook	Kline	Scalise	Kennedy	Owens	Veasey
Horsford	Murphy (FL)	Titus	Cotton	Labrador	Schock	Kildee	Pallone	Vela
Hoyer	Nadler	Tonko	Cramer	Lamborn	Schweikert	Kilmer	Pascrell	Velázquez
Huffman	Napolitano	Tsongas	Lance	Lance	Scott, Austin	Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Visclosky
Israel	Neal	Van Hollen	Crenshaw	Lankford	Sensenbrenner	Kirkpatrick	Payne	Walz
Jeffries	Negrete McLeod	Vargas	Cuellar	Latham	Sessions	Kuster	Pelosi	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Veasey	Culberson	Latta	Shimkus	Langevin	Perlmutter	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke	Vela	Daines	Lipinski	Shuster	Larsen (WA)	Peters (CA)	Waters
Kaptur	Owens	Velázquez	Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Simpson	Larson (CT)	Peters (MI)	Waxman
Keating	Pallone	Visclosky	Denham	Long	Sinema	Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Welch
Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Walz	Dent	Lucas	Smith (MO)	Levin	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman	DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)	Lewis		Yarmuth
Kildee	Payne	Schultz	DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NJ)	Loeb sack		
Kilmer	Pelosi	Waters	Diaz-Balart	Maffei	Smith (TX)			
Kind	Perlmutter	Waxman	Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Southerland			
Kirkpatrick	Peters (CA)	Welch	Duncan (TN)	Marino	Stewart			
Kuster	Peters (MI)	Wilson (FL)	Elm ers	Massie	Stivers			
Langevin	Peterson	Yarmuth	Enyart	McAllister	Stockman			
Larsen (WA)	Pingree (ME)		Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Stutzman			
			Fincher	McCaul	Terry			
			Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Thompson (PA)			
			Fleischmann	McHenry	Thornberry			
			Fleming	McIntyre	Tiberi			
			Flores	McKeon	Tierney			
			Forbes	McKinley	Tipton			
			Fortenberry	McMorris	Turner			
			Foster	Rodgers	Upton			
			Fox	Meadows	Valadao			
			Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Wagner			
			Frelinghuysen	Messer	Walberg			
			Gabbard	Mica	Walden			
			Garcia	Miller (FL)	Walorski			
			Gardner	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)			
			Garrett	Mullin	Webster (FL)			
			Gerlach	Mulvaney	Wenstrup			
			Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland			
			Gibson	Neugebauer	Whitfield			
			Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Williams			
			Gohmert	Nugent	Wilson (SC)			
			Goodlatte	Nunes	Wittman			
			Gosar	Nunnelee	Wolf			
			Gowdy	Olson	Womack			
			Granger	Palazzo	Woodall			
			Graves (GA)	Paulsen	Yoder			
			Graves (MO)	Pearce	Yoho			
			Grayson	Perry	Young (AK)			
			Green, Gene	Peterson	Young (IN)			
			Griffin (AR)	Petri				
			Griffith (VA)	Pittenger				

NOT VOTING—9

Bachus	LaMalfa	Rush
Bass	Miller, Gary	Schwartz
Duffy	Richmond	Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1116

Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. HALL and COFFMAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF WASHINGTON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 247, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—177

Bass	Miller, Gary	Schwartz
Duffy	Richmond	Slaughter
Jackson Lee	Rush	

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1111

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 177, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

AYES—245

Aderholt	Bachmann	Barrow (GA)
Amash	Barletta	Barton
Amodei	Barr	Benishek

NOES—177

Barber	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Beatty	Cartwright	Cummings
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Castro (FL)
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	Castro (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Chu	Chu
Bishop (NY)	Cielline	Cielline
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Clark (MA)
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	Clarke (NY)
Brady (PA)	Clay	Clay
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	Cleaver
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Clyburn
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Cohen
Bustos	Connolly	Connolly
Butterfield	Conyers	Conyers
Capps	Cooper	Cooper
Cárdenas	Costa	Costa
Carney	Courtney	Courtney

Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Beatty	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)
Becerra	Blumenauer	Brown (FL)
Bera (CA)	Bonamici	Brownley (CA)

Lance	Olson	Sensenbrenner	Franks (AZ)	Long	Rokita	Meng	Rahall	Swalwell (CA)
Lankford	Owens	Sessions	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Rooney	Michaud	Rangel	Takano
Latham	Palazzo	Sewell (AL)	Gardner	Lummis	Roskam	Miller, George	Reed	Thompson (CA)
Latta	Paulsen	Shimkus	Garrett	Marchant	Ross	Moore	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Pearce	Shuster	Moss	Massie	Rothfus	Moran	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Lipinski	Perry	Simpson	Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)	Royce	Mullin	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
LoBiondo	Peterson	Smith (MO)	Gringrey (GA)	McCaul	Ryunan	Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Tipton
Long	Pittenger	Smith (NE)	Goodlatte	McClintock	Ryan (WI)	Murphy (PA)	Ruppersberger	Titus
Lucas	Pitts	Smith (NJ)	Gosar	McHenry	Salmon	Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)	Gowdy	McKeon	Sanford	Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas
Lummis	Pompeo	Southerland	Granger	McMorris	Scalise	Neal	T.	Turner
Lynch	Posey	Stewart	Graves (GA)	Rodgers	Schock	Negrete McLeod	Sanchez, Loretta	Valadao
Maloney, Sean	Price (GA)	Stivers	Graves (MO)	Meadows	Schweikert	Nolan	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Marchant	Reed	Stutzman	Griffin (AR)	Messer	Sensenbrenner	O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Vargas
Marino	Reichert	Terry	Griffith (VA)	Mica	Sessions	Owens	Schiff	Veasey
Matheson	Renacci	Thompson (PA)	Guthrie	Miller (FL)	Shimkus	Pallone	Schneider	Vela
McAllister	Rice (SC)	Thornberry	Harper	Miller (MI)	Shuster	Pascrell	Schrader	Velázquez
McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Tiberi	Harris	Mulvaney	Simpson	Pastor (AZ)	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
McCaul	Roby	Turner	Hartzler	Neugebauer	Smith (MO)	Payne	Scott, Austin	Walz
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Upton	Hastings (WA)	Noem	Smith (NE)	Pearce	Scott, David	Wasserman
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Valadao	Heck (NV)	Nugent	Smith (TX)	Pelosi	Serrano	Schultz
McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Wagner	Henlarling	Nunes	Southerland	Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Waters
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Walberg	Herrera Beutler	Nunnelee	Stivers	Peters (CA)	Shea-Porter	Waxman
McKinley	Rohrabacher	Walden	Holding	Olson	Stockman	Peters (MI)	Sherman	Welch
McMorris	Rokita	Walorski	Hudson	Palazzo	Stutzman	Peterson	Sinema	Westmoreland
Rodgers	Rooney	Weber (TX)	Huelskamp	Paulsen	Terry	Pingree (ME)	Sires	Wilson (FL)
Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)	Perry	Huizenga (MI)	Thornberry	Pocan	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Meehan	Roskam	Wenstrup	Petri	Hultgren	Tiberi	Polis	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Messer	Ross	Westmoreland	Pittenger	Hunter	Upton	Price (NC)	Speier	Yarmuth
Mica	Rothfus	Whitfield	Hurt	Hurt	Wagner	Quigley	Stewart	Young (AK)
Miller (FL)	Royce	Williams	Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Walberg			
Miller (MI)	Runyan	Wilson (SC)	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo	Walden			
Mullin	Ruppersberger	Wittman	Johnson, Sam	Posey	Walorski			
Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Wolf	Jolly	Price (GA)	Weber (TX)	Bass	Miller, Gary	Schwartz
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Womack	Jordan	Reichert	Webster (FL)	Duffy	Richmond	Slaughter
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Loretta	Woodall	Kelly (PA)	Renacci	Wenstrup	Gohmert	Rush	
Noem	Scalise	Yoder	Kingston	Ribble	Whitfield			
Nugent	Schock	Yoho	Kline	Rice (SC)	Williams			
Nunes	Schweikert	Young (AK)	Labrador	Rigell	Wilson (SC)			
Nunnelee	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)	LaMalfa	Roby	Womack			
			Lamborn	Roe (TN)	Woodall			
			Lance	Rogers (KY)	Yoder			
			Latham	Rogers (MI)	Yoho			
			Latta	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—8

Bass
Duffy
Gohmert
Miller, Gary
Richmond
Rush
Schwartz
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1128

Mr. HALL changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]
AYES—233

NOT VOTING—10

Bass	Miller, Gary	Sires
Duffy	Richmond	Slaughter
Garamendi	Rush	
Gingrey (GA)	Schwartz	

□ 1124

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. JENKINS
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 244, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]
AYES—179

Amash	Buchanan	Cramer
Amodei	Bucshon	Crawford
Bachmann	Burgess	Cuellar
Bachus	Byrne	Culberson
Barr	Calvert	Daines
Barton	Camp	Denham
Benishek	Campbell	DeSantis
Bentivolio	Cantor	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Carter	Duncan (SC)
Black	Cassidy	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Chabot	Ellmers
Boustany	Coble	Fincher
Brady (TX)	Coffman	Fleischmann
Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)	Fleming
Brooks (IN)	Conaway	Flores
Broun (GA)	Cotton	Fox

NOES—244

Aderholt	Delaney	Jeffries
Barber	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Barletta	DelBene	Johnson, E. B.
Barrow (GA)	Dent	Jones
Beatty	Deutch	Joyce
Becerra	Diaz-Balart	Kaptur
Bera (CA)	Dingell	Keating
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Kennedy
Bishop (UT)	Duckworth	Kildee
Blumenauer	Edwards	Kilmer
Bonamici	Ellison	Kind
Brady (PA)	Engel	King (IA)
Bralley (IA)	Enyart	King (NY)
Bridenstine	Eshoo	Kinzinger (IL)
Brown (FL)	Esty	Kirkpatrick
Brownley (CA)	Farenthold	Kuster
Bustos	Farr	Langevin
Butterfield	Fattah	Lankford
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Capps	Forbes	Larson (CT)
Capuano	Fortenberry	Lee (CA)
Cárdenas	Foster	Levin
Carney	Frankel (FL)	Lewis
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Lipinski
Cartwright	Gabbard	LoBiondo
Castor (FL)	Gallego	Loeb
Castro (TX)	Garamendi	Lofgren
Chaffetz	Garcia	Lowenthal
Chu	Gibson	Lowe
Cicilline	Grayson	Lucas
Clark (MA)	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham
Clarke (NY)	Green, Gene	(NM)
Clay	Grijalva	Luján, Ben Ray
Cleaver	Grimm	(NM)
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	Lynch
Cohen	Hahn	Maffei
Cole	Hall	Maloney
Collins (GA)	Hanabusa	Carolyn
Connolly	Hanna	Maloney, Sean
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Marino
Cook	Heck (WA)	Matheson
Cooper	Higgins	Matsui
Costa	Himes	McAllister
Hinojosa	Holt	McCarthy (NY)
Holt	Honda	McCollum
Crowley	Horsford	McDermott
Cummings	Hoyer	McGovern
Davis (CA)	Huffman	McIntyre
Davis, Danny	Issa	McKinley
Davis, Rodney	Israel	McNerney
DeFazio	Jackson Lee	Meehan
DeGette		Meeks

Price (GA)	Schock	Upton	Garcia	Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Peterson	Royce	Thornberry
Reed	Schrader	Valadao	Garrett	Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Pittenger	Ryunan	Tipton
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Vela	Gerlach	Lowey	Ruiz	Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Renacci	Sessions	Wagner	Gibson	Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Pompeo	Sanford	Valadao
Ribble	Sewell (AL)	Walberg	Gohmert	(NM)	Ryan (OH)	Posey	Scalise	Wagner
Rice (SC)	Sherman	Walden	Gosar	Luján, Ben Ray	Salmon	Price (GA)	Schock	Walberg
Rigell	Shimkus	Walorski	Grayson	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Reed	Schweikert	Walorski
Roby	Shuster	Wasserman	Green, Al	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta	Reichert	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Schultz	Green, Gene	Maffei	Sarbanes	Ribble	Sensenbrenner	Webster (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Weber (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	Rice (SC)	Sessions	Wenstrup
Rogers (KY)	Smith (MO)	Webster (FL)	Grijalva	Massie	Schiff	Rigell	Shimkus	Westmoreland
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup	Gutiérrez	Matheson	Schneider	Roby	Shuster	Williams
Rokita	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland	Hahn	Matsui	Schrader	Roe (TN)	Simpson	Williams (SC)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Whitfield	Hanabusa	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)	Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Wittman
Roskam	Smith (WA)	Williams	Hanna	McCollum	Scott, David	Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Wolf
Ross	Southerland	Wilson (SC)	Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Serrano	Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Womack
Rothfus	Stewart	Wittman	Heck (WA)	McGovern	Sewell (AL)	Rokita	Southerland	Woodall
Royce	Stivers	Wolf	Higgins	McNerney	Shea-Porter	Rooney	Stewart	Yoder
Ryunan	Stutzman	Womack	Himes	Meeks	Sherman	Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Yoho
Ruppersberger	Terry	Yoder	Hinojosa	Meng	Sinema	Roskam	Stutzman	Young (AK)
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)	Yoho	Holt	Messer	Smith (NJ)	Ross	Terry	Young (IN)
Salmon	Thornberry	Young (IN)	Honda	Michaud	Smith (WA)	Rothfus	Thompson (PA)	
Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi		Horsford	Miller, George	Speier			
Scalise	Tipton		Hoyer	Moore	Stockman			
Schneider	Turner		Huelskamp	Moran	Swalwell (CA)			
			Huffman	Mulvaney	Takano			
			Israel	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)			
			Jackson Lee	Nadler	Thompson (MS)			
			Jeffries	Napolitano	Tiberi			
			Johnson (GA)	Neal	Tierney			
			Johnson, E. B.	Negrete McLeod	Titus			
			Jones	Nolan	Tonko			
			Joyce	O'Rourke	Tsongas			
			Kaptur	Owens	Upton			
			Keating	Pallone	Van Hollen			
			Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Vargas			
			Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)	Veasey			
			Kildee	Payne	Vela			
			Kilmer	Pelosi	Velázquez			
			Kind	Perlmutter	Visclosky			
			Kirkpatrick	Peters (CA)	Walden			
			Kuster	Peters (MI)	Walz			
			Labrador	Petri	Wasserman			
			Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Schultz			
			Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Waters			
			Larson (CT)	Poe (TX)	Waxman			
			Lee (CA)	Polis	Welch			
			Levin	Price (NC)	Whitfield			
			Lewis	Quigley	Wilson (FL)			
			Lipinski	Rahall	Yarmuth			
			LoBiondo	Rangel				
			Loeb	Renacci				

NOT VOTING—7

Bass Richmond Slaughter
 Duffy Rush
 Miller, Gary Schwartz

□ 1136

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 237, I inadvertently voted in the affirmative when I intended to vote in the negative. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 199, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—224

Amash Carson (IN) Delaney
 Barber Cartwright DeLauro
 Barrow (GA) Castor (FL) DelBene
 Beatty Castro (TX) Dent
 Becerra Chu Deutch
 Bera (CA) Cicilline Dingell
 Bishop (GA) Clark (MA) Doggett
 Bishop (NY) Clarke (NY) Doyle
 Blumenauer Clay Duckworth
 Bonamici Cleaver Duncan (TN)
 Brady (PA) Clyburn Edwards
 Braley (IA) Cohen Ellison
 Bridenstine Connolly Engel
 Broun (GA) Conyers Enyart
 Brown (FL) Cooper Eshoo
 Brownley (CA) Costa Esty
 Burgess Courtney Farr
 Bustos Crowley Fattah
 Butterfield Cuellar Foster
 Campbell Cummings Frankel (FL)
 Capps Davis (CA) Fudge
 Capuano Davis, Danny Gabbard
 Cárdenas DeFazio Gallego
 Carney DeGette Garamendi

Aderholt
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais

NOES—199

Diaz-Balart
 Duncan (SC)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Fox
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA)
 Goodlatte
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzer
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jordan

NOT VOTING—8

Bass
 Duffy
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Miller, Gary
 Richmond
 Rush
 Schwartz

□ 1140

Mr. MULVANEY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 238, Blumenauer Amendment No. 24 to H.R. 4435, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

The Acting CHAIR. No further amendments being in order, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOMACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 590, he reported the bill, as amended by House Resolution 585, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. PETERS of California. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4435 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At end of title X, add the following new section:

SEC. 1082. PROVISIONS RELATING TO WAGES, DISCRIMINATION, OUTSOURCING JOBS, STUDENT LOANS, AND BAGGAGE FEES.

(a) **PAYING A FAIR WAGE.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to enter into any contract with any entity if such contract would violate Executive Order No. 13658 (relating to payment of the minimum wage by contractors).

(b) **PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that women service members do not face gender discrimination in combat or in any other form of military service.

(c) **PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH COMPANIES THAT DENY EQUAL PAY OR THAT OUTSOURCE AMERICAN JOBS.**—

(1) **PROHIBITION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used to enter into any contract with an entity if the entity—

(A) does not provide equal pay for equal work for women employees; or

(B) has outsourced work previously performed in the United States.

(2) **OUTSOURCED DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “outsourced”, with respect to an entity with employees performing work in the United States, means having fewer full-time equivalent employees in the United States and a larger number of such employees outside the United States on the last day of the calendar year compared to the first day of such calendar year.

(3) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in paragraph (1) if necessary for national security purposes.

(d) **PROTECTING STUDENT LOANS.**—

(1) **INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATION.**—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall investigate the factors surrounding the deceptive practices and excessive interest and fees charged on student loans made to members of the Armed Forces.

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to better inform such members of their rights as borrowers and the proper documentation required to qualify for student loans under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.).

(e) **NO BAGGAGE FEES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.**—

(1) No air carrier may charge any fee for the transport of 4 or fewer items of baggage checked by a member of the Armed Forces who is—

(A) traveling in scheduled air transportation on official military orders; and

(B) being deployed on or returning from an overseas contingency operation.

(2) For purposes of this section, the term “baggage” does not include an item whose weight exceeds 80 pounds.

Mr. McKEON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1145

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 4435, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am proud of the bipartisan work we did this year to craft the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act, and I want to thank Chairman MCKEON, in his last year leading the committee, for his leadership and commitment to bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, in San Diego, Coronado, and Poway, we are proud of the role our region plays in national security. My district alone is home to seven military installations, including MCAS Miramar, the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Navy Region Southwest, Naval Base Coronado, and Naval Base Point Loma.

San Diego County is home to more than 235,000 veterans, and this year, we launched the national model Military Transition Support Project, which will provide nonprofit and volunteer help for servicemembers transitioning to the workplace and private sector. San Diego is a military town, and we are proud of it.

Defense is also a big part of our economy, responsible for more than 300,000 jobs in the region, accounting for almost \$25 billion in direct spending last year, and we were the home port of 53 ships, with an economic impact of \$4 billion.

It is fair to say, when the government makes investments in our military or sharp cuts like sequestration, we feel it locally.

This amendment would ensure that, as we make our investments in national security of nearly \$600 billion, in San Diego and across the country, we use that money to foster economic opportunity and equality here at home.

My amendment ensures that the jobs we are creating are good jobs and pay the same minimum wage standard of \$10.10 an hour as we are moving to statewide in California.

Those working full time to support our national security mission shouldn't be in poverty, struggling with the choice of food for their children, or keeping the lights on in the house.

My amendment would also ensure pay equity. It is not news, Mr. Speaker, that women across the country continue to face pay inequity. In San Diego, women still make 75 cents for every dollar earned by their male counterparts on average.

This amendment would prohibit defense contracts to companies that don't provide equal pay for equal work. That is not a women's issue; it is a family issue. Families in San Diego and across the country increasingly rely on women's wages to pay bills,

educate their children, and save for retirement.

Along with working to close the wage gap for women, this amendment codifies into law a Department of Defense policy that is already in effect to allow women in combat, and this amendment keeps our promise to servicemembers through the GI Bill.

Recently, Sallie Mae agreed to pay \$97 million to settle allegations that military servicemembers were charged excessive interest and fees on their student loans. That is absolutely appalling and unacceptable.

The amendment would require an investigation of these deceptive scam practices, ensure that they are stopped, and would require in the future that borrowers are informed of their rights.

Our men and women in uniform and our veterans deserve our protection against fraud and to see that their GI Bill supports a high-quality education that leads to a high-quality job and nothing less.

Finally, with the drawdown in Afghanistan and the rebalance to the Pacific, many of our servicemembers are traveling extensive distances to and from deployments.

During this travel, many in uniform are being charged excessive baggage fees by commercial airlines. The amendment would prohibit airlines from collecting these fees, much of which is being charged on lifesaving equipment that servicemembers are buying and bringing in on their own because the Department doesn't supply what is necessary.

While it may seem like a small change, it will ease the burden on servicemembers. Charging baggage fees is not the way we should be sending off or welcoming home our troops.

In today's bill, we are authorizing nearly \$600 billion. As we support our national security and defense abroad, we have the chance to promote economic opportunity and equal rights here at home. Our warfighters and all Americans who work to support them deserve nothing less.

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

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

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their warm round of applause. It was great to hear their feelings.

We, on the Armed Services Committee and here in Congress, have the responsibility to provide for our national defense for our interests around the world and the commitments we have made to our friends and allies. We do not have a defense to provide jobs.

We have a defense to provide for our national security. Fortunately, the jobs that are provided through defense are good jobs. With the cuts that we have had in our defense, a lot of those jobs have gone away, and our defense has been weakened.

Colleagues, we have had a vigorous debate on this measure. This bill was marked up by six different subcommittees, then the full Armed Services Committee considered the legislation. One hundred ninety-five amendments were offered during our markup alone, 95 by Democrats and 100 by Republicans. We adopted 154 of those, and the bill passed out of committee with unanimous support, 61–0.

Then we moved the bill to the floor following regular order. One hundred sixty-nine more amendments were made in order, 39 bipartisan amendments, 57 by Democrats, and 73 by Republicans.

Nobody can say we haven't had ample opportunity to consider everybody's ideas, discuss them, and vote. To everyone, I say thank you for your help, your support. It is important to get this 53rd consecutive NDAA passed because of the important authorities that are in the bill. Let's oppose this motion to recommit and pass the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 227, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

AYES—194

Barber	Cooper	Grayson
Barrow (GA)	Costa	Green, Al
Beatty	Courtney	Green, Gene
Becerra	Crowley	Grijalva
Bera (CA)	Cuellar	Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hahn
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Blumenauer	Davis, Danny	Hastings (FL)
Bonamici	DeFazio	Heck (WA)
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Higgins
Bralley (IA)	Delaney	Himes
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Holt
Bustos	Deutch	Honda
Butterfield	Dingell	Horsford
Capps	Doggett	Hoyer
Capuano	Doyle	Huffman
Cárdenas	Duckworth	Israel
Carney	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Jeffries
Cartwright	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Castor (FL)	Enyart	Johnson, E. B.
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Kaptur
Chu	Esty	Keating
Cicilline	Farr	Kelly (IL)
Clark (MA)	Fattah	Kennedy
Clarke (NY)	Foster	Kildee
Clay	Frankel (FL)	Kilmer
Cleaver	Fudge	Kind
Clyburn	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Cohen	Galleo	Kuster
Connolly	Garamendi	Langevin
Conyers	Garcia	Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)	Napolitano	Scott (VA)
Lee (CA)	Neal	Scott, David
Levin	Negrete McLeod	Serrano
Lewis	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Lipinski	O'Rourke	Shea-Porter
Loeb sack	Owens	Sherman
Lofgren	Pallone	Upton
Lowenthal	Pascrell	Sinema
Lowe y	Pastor (AZ)	Sires
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Payne	Smith (WA)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pelosi	Speier
Lynch	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Maffei	Peters (CA)	Takano
Maloney,	Peters (MI)	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Sean	Pingree (ME)	Tierney
Matheson	Pocan	Titus
Matsui	Polis	Tonko
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Tsongas
McCollum	Quigley	Van Hollen
McDermott	Rahall	Vargas
McGovern	Rangel	Veasey
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Vela
McNerney	Ruiz	Velázquez
Meeks	Ruppertsberger	Visclosky
Meng	Ryan (OH)	Walz
Michaud	Sánchez, Linda T.	Wasserman
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Schultz
Moore	Sarbanes	Waters
Moran	Schakowsky	Waxman
Murphy (FL)	Schiff	Welch
Nadler	Schneider	Wilson (FL)
	Schrader	Yarmuth

NOES—227

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Massie
Amash	Frelinghuysen	McAllister
Amodei	Gardner	McCarthy (CA)
Bachmann	Garrett	McCauley
Bachus	Gerlach	McClintock
Barletta	Gibbs	McHenry
Barr	Gibson	McKeon
Barton	Gingrey (GA)	McKinley
Benishek	Gohmert	McMorris
Bentivolio	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Bilirakis	Gosar	Meadows
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	Meehan
Black	Granger	Messer
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	Mica
Boustany	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Griffith (VA)	Mullin
Brooks (AL)	Grimm	Mulvaney
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Broun (GA)	Hall	Neugebauer
Buchanan	Hanna	Noem
Bucshon	Harper	Nugent
Burgess	Harris	Nunes
Byrne	Hartzler	Nunnelee
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Olson
Camp	Heck (NV)	Palazzo
Campbell	Hensarling	Paulsen
Cantor	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Capito	Holding	Perry
Carter	Hudson	Petri
Cassidy	Huelskamp	Pittenger
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Chaffetz	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Coffman	Hunter	Pompeo
Cole	Hurt	Posey
Collins (GA)	Issa	Price (GA)
Collins (NY)	Jenkins	Reed
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Cotton	Jolly	Ribble
Cramer	Jones	Rice (SC)
Crawford	Jordan	Rigell
Crenshaw	Joyce	Roby
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Daines	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Denham	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
DeSantis	Kline	Rooney
DesJarlais	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Roskam
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Ross
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rothfus
Ellmers	Lankford	Royce
Farenthold	Latham	Runyan
Fincher	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Salmon
Fleischmann	Long	Sanford
Kind	Lucas	Scalise
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Flores	Lummis	Schweikert
Forbes	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Fox x		

Sessions	Terry	Webster (FL)
Shimkus	Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup
Shuster	Thornberry	Westmoreland
Simpson	Tiberi	Whitfield
Smith (MO)	Tipton	Williams
Smith (NE)	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Upton	Wittman
Smith (TX)	Valadao	Womack
Southerland	Wagner	Woodall
Stewart	Walberg	Yoder
Stivers	Walden	Yoho
Stockman	Walorski	Young (AK)
Stutzman	Weber (TX)	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bass	Richmond	Slaughter
Coble	Roe (TN)	Wolf
Duffy	Rush	
Miller, Gary	Schwartz	

□ 1158

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 325, noes 98, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

AYES—325

Aderholt	Cleaver	Galleo
Amodei	Clyburn	Garamendi
Bachmann	Coffman	Garcia
Bachus	Cole	Gardner
Barber	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Gerlach
Barr	Conaway	Gibbs
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Gibson
Barton	Cook	Gingrey (GA)
Beatty	Cooper	Goodlatte
Benishek	Costa	Gowdy
Bentivolio	Cotton	Granger
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Graves (GA)
Bilirakis	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Griffin (AR)
Black	Culberson	Grimm
Blackburn	Daines	Guthrie
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Hall
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Bralley (IA)	Delaney	Harper
Bridenstine	DeLauro	Harris
Brooks (AL)	DelBene	Hartzler
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Hastings (VA)
Broun (GA)	Dent	Heck (NV)
Brown (FL)	DeSantis	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Bucshon	Dingell	Higgins
Burgess	Doggett	Holding
Bustos	Duckworth	Horsford
Butterfield	Duncan (SC)	Hoyer
Byrne	Ellmers	Hudson
Calvert	Enyart	Huelskamp
Cárdenas	Fleming	Huizenga (MI)
Carney	Flores	Hultgren
Carson (IN)	Forbes	Hunter
Cartwright	Fortenberry	Hurt
Cassidy	Foster	Israel
Castor (FL)	Fox x	Issa
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Jackson Lee
Chu	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins
Cicilline	Galleo	Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA)	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Johnson, E. B.
Clay		Johnson, Sam
Cleaver		Jolly
Clyburn		Jordan
Cohen		Joyce
Connolly		
Conyers		

Kaptur
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kilmer
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Long
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Matheson
 McAllister
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)

Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Price (GA)
 Rahall
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schweikert

Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Waters
 Waxman
 Webster (FL)
 Westrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Bass
 Coble
 Duffy
 Miller, Gary
 Richmond
 Rush
 Schwartz
 Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1216

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 4435, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings, and that the amendatory instructions for amendment No. 35 be changed from "after line 21" to "after line 9."

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND CLASSIFIED ANNEX ACCOMPANYING INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 AND 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has ordered the bill H.R. 4681, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015, reported favorably to the House today with an amendment, and will file its report on the bill in the House next week. The bill is currently expected to be considered in the House next week.

Mr. Speaker, the classified schedules of authorizations and the classified annexes accompanying the bill are available for review by Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in Room HVC-304 of the Capitol Visitors Center. The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the conven-

ience of any Member who wishes to review this material prior to its consideration of the House.

I recommend that Members wishing to review the classified annex contact the committee's director of security to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will assure the availability of committee staff to assist Members who desire assistance during their review of these classified materials.

I urge interested Members to review these materials in order to better understand the committee's recommendations. The classified annexes to the committee's report contain the committee's recommendations on the intelligence budget for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 and related classified information that cannot be disclosed publicly.

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of clause 13 of House rule XXIII, which only permits access to classified information by those Members of the House who have signed the oath provided for in the rules.

If a Member has not yet signed that oath but wishes to review the classified annexes and schedules of authorizations, the committee staff can administer the oath and see to it that the executed form is sent to the Clerk's office. In addition, the committee's rules require that Members agree in writing to a nondisclosure agreement. The agreement indicates that the Member has been granted access to the classified annexes and that they are familiar with the rules of the House and the committee with respect to the classified nature of that information and the limitations on the disclosure of that information.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule of the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session in observation of Memorial Day.

On Tuesday, the House will meet in pro forma session at noon and no votes are expected.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced at the close of business tomorrow.

NOES—98

Amash
 Becerra
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Capps
 Capuano
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Crowley
 Cummings
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Deutch
 Doyle
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fudge
 Gohmert
 Gosar
 Grayson
 Griffith (VA)
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings (FL)

Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Honda
 Huffman
 Jeffries
 Jones
 Keating
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kind
 Labrador
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lummis
 Massie
 Matsui
 McColllum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 Meng
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Pallone
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne

Pelosi
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rohrabacher
 Roybal-Allard
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Serrano
 Sires
 Speier
 Stockman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Thompson (CA)
 Tierney
 Tonko
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Weber (TX)
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 4660, the Fiscal Year 2015 Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Act, sponsored by subcommittee Chairman FRANK WOLF. Members are advised that general and amendment debate to the bill is expected after the 6 p.m. vote series on Wednesday night.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 4661, the Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015 Intelligence Authorization Act authored by Chairman MIKE ROGERS. Providing the tools and the oversight of the intelligence community is a vital role of Congress, as we have shown earlier today. We should remember the intelligence community serves a vital role in warning senior policymakers about looming threats, and is absolutely essential to meeting the needs of our military. Sustaining our military and intelligence capabilities are core interests of the United States. I look forward to swift passage of this bill in the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I note that an appropriations bill and the CJS bill will be on the floor next week.

Let me pursue, if I can, Mr. Speaker, the progress that the Appropriations Committee will be making.

Am I correct, Mr. Leader, that this will be an open rule on the CJS bill?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the Rules Committee has already done its work and the House has already passed the bill, the rule bill, which provides for an open rule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I understand, in addition, that the Appropriations Committee continues to mark up bills this week to pass their fourth bill, the Transportation-HUD bill, out of committee.

The question I would propound to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not we anticipate completing the markup of the 12 appropriation bills before the August break?

I yield to the majority Leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the committee certainly has expressed its desire, as our conference has, as the Speaker has, to move all 12 appropriations bills, and we will move towards that goal in an expeditious nature as much as we can.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for the information.

Obviously, one of the bills that I am particularly concerned about is the Labor, Health, and Education investments that we have been making. There is a substantial cut proposed in the 302(b) allocations, which is the allocations of the larger number to the 12 subcommittees, a substantial cut in the Labor-Health bill, well below historic levels. I hope that as we continue to work through the appropriations process, we can address that issue and not double down on the cuts that have already occurred in what I think the

Leader and I both believe is a very critical bill, which includes funding for the National Institutes of Health.

We have 31 days left to go before the August break, legislative days, 43 days until our break in October, so time is essence. I would hope that we could address these bills and debate the priorities that these bills represent before we leave for the August break.

I yield to my friend if he wants to comment on that.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman just briefly, there is a \$1 billion cut to a \$155 billion bill. That represents a 0.9 percent decrease, according to what the committee has set forth as far as the 302(b)s are concerned.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the \$155 billion, of course, is a gross figure and includes items beyond discretionary figures in that bill.

The fact of the matter is that NIH has been cut by a very substantially higher percentage than that, somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 percent, maybe 5 percent. So it is a substantial decrease in the ability to pursue grants, both external grants and internal research by the NIH, on the afflictions that confront our people, whether it be heart disease, cancer, pediatric research, diabetes, Alzheimer's. All of those will be affected to a much larger extent than would be projected by the gross figure of \$155 billion to which the Leader responds.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I certainly will yield.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Just to clarify, the amount of the \$155 billion is the 302(b). That is the discretionary amount. So I would just underscore the fact that the \$1 billion cut applies to the \$155 billion discretionary amount.

But the gentleman knows—he has worked on issues of NIH funding—he knows that I am very committed to making a priority out of funding medical research at NIH. We have been successful in the House. The President signed into law the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act, which is just the first step towards making a priority out of medical research, in this instance, for pediatrics, and to doing away with spending in other areas that are not as much of a priority.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that leadership is about assessing priorities and making sure taxpayer dollars are being allocated as such.

We also passed bills out of the House having to do with graduate medical education and making sure that pediatrics and the need for more pediatricians to deal with children is there.

I share the gentleman's overall concern that we make a commitment long term to finding cures so that we can ultimately save lives, but also save taxpayer dollars, as we would like to arrest the increase in health care costs.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for his remarks, and I will

look forward to debating what he says is an important responsibility of this House, and that is to set priorities. When the Labor-Health bill comes before us—and the \$155 billion is the gross number that goes to that committee; the \$30 billion-plus is what NIH has, and the \$1.5 billion that I am talking about is a cut to NIH, not to the gross figure of \$155 billion, so I understand the figures. But we will have an opportunity to debate that when we come to the floor on the Labor-Health bill, if, in fact, we ever come to the floor on the Labor-Health bill. We didn't come to it last year or the year before. Hopefully, we will come to it this year.

Two additional things I would like to ask the leader, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1230

Earlier this week, I had an opportunity to meet with a number of DREAMers who want to join the Armed Forces of the United States. There is a bill called the ENLIST Act, introduced by one of our Republican Members, that essentially says that we are going to allow DREAMers to enlist, and through their service, they could establish their paths to citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, that is an important bill for me because my father came from Denmark. He came here in 1934, at the age of 32. He served in the Armed Forces of the United States, and he became a citizen through his service during World War II in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The sponsor of the ENLIST Act wanted to offer it to the defense authorization bill that we just passed. Last year, when the House considered the defense authorization bill, an amendment similar to the ENLIST Act was made in order.

Unfortunately, it was not made in order this time, so we didn't get an opportunity to vote on that one way or the other. The majority leader knows, Mr. Speaker, that I have been asking in almost every colloquy when we are going to consider legislation that will deal with the broken immigration system that confronts us. This was one opportunity. It was, again, rejected. It was not missed—rejected.

So many colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle—Mr. SCHOCK—said that we need a clear path to citizenship for workers who are already here. ADAM KINZINGER said that, through commonsense policies, we have the opportunity to grow our economy, and we must work hard to come to an agreement on how to bring undocumented workers out of the shadows.

JOHN SHIMKUS said that we have to address the 12 million undocumented immigrants who are already here by moving them legally into the workforce. The Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, growers, farmworkers, and faith groups across the spectrum are all urging us to pass immigration reform; yet, frankly, we are not addressing it in any way even on this. I think,

surely, we could have gotten a consensus on the ENLIST Act, but it was itself rejected.

I would urge the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, to perhaps give us some sense beyond “we don’t trust the President.” We know that hardly anybody on that side of the aisle trusts the President.

If the issue is simply trusting the President, let’s shut down. Let’s not do anything, which, essentially, is what we have done, as a matter of fact, as I say that. Let’s not do anything. Let’s not pass any new laws. That is not what the American people expect, but that seems to be the premise.

Now, presumably, we passed the Defense Authorization Act because we expect the President to pass it; but if we simply don’t trust him, why pass the bill?

That is not an excuse. That is not a reason. In fact, it is a derogation of our responsibility, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the majority leader would tell me when, if ever, we are going to address the broken system that he and I agree is a broken system.

I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman knows that I am one who consistently says that the system of immigration is broken. I have also said that I am mindful and support the fact that, if a kid who is brought here by his or her parents—unbeknownst to that child—has never lived anywhere else or remembers living anywhere else and wants to serve in our military, he should be able to do so. It is my position that that child should have a path to citizenship after such service.

However, the NDAA bill was not the appropriate place for the discussion on that issue. I have been consistent with that position over the last several weeks and months. I remain committed to what the intent of the ENLIST Act is trying to achieve. There are Members involved who are working on the necessary language to see whether it is possible for us to move forward on that measure.

Beyond that, on the issue of the comprehensive bill that the gentleman refers to, he knows—we have stood here many times before—we are opposed to the Senate bill. I have had discussions with the White House, and I continue to say we are opposed to a comprehensive bill.

Whether the gentleman likes or doesn’t like the fact that there is not a lot of trust on the part of this House or of this majority in the President, frankly, it is about the American people. What they have seen is unilateral action being taken by this White House and the President on bills passed by Congress.

It is, at a minimum, frustrating for us in the House to watch what goes on and the flouting of Congress—the ignoring of Congress—when it comes to decisions made to implement a law according to what the White House thinks it is, not according to the stat-

ute. This is the fundamental problem, and I have expressed that myself to the President.

If we could see our way towards discrete, incremental steps toward strengthening law enforcement at the border and toward doing things like the green card on the diploma or the ENLIST Act without the introduction of the insistence of a comprehensive attempt, then I believe we may be able to make progress, but to this day, it has been my way or the highway, all or nothing. That is not going to work.

I have told that to the gentleman publicly and privately, Mr. Speaker, and I would just say so again.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Very frankly, we can’t impose my way or the highway in this House, Mr. Speaker, as you well know. The Republicans are in the majority. We can’t impose any way. We can simply ask for some way for it to be brought to the floor. It can be brought forth individually, the ENLIST Act.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the majority leader believes the ENLIST Act is going to be brought to the floor. I would ask him whether any of the bills that are passed out of the Republican Judiciary Committee are going to be brought to the floor. They passed out over 6 months ago.

A bill out of the Homeland Security Committee to deal with border security passed out of the committee some 4-plus months ago, and it has not been brought to this floor.

We are not looking for my way. We are looking for any way—some way. We are looking for a path—a way—to get to addressing this issue, and there has been no way. He is correct, but it is not we who are imposing no way.

It is the failure to bring a bill to the floor, Mr. Speaker, that we can consider. In a transparent way, the House can work its will, which, of course, was the commitment that Speaker BOEHNER made when he became the Speaker of this House.

That is the problem. It is not what the President does, and it is not what the Senate does, but it is what we are not doing on this House floor, and that is bringing options to the floor, so that we can vote up or down, and maybe we will lose.

There were four bills out of the Judiciary Committee that we didn’t largely support, but the Republican leadership on the committee supported those bills, and the majority of the Republicans supported those bills. They are not to the floor. So it is a question of not doing it your way. We are doing it no way.

I continue to be frustrated when the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, responds to me that, somehow, they don’t trust the President. Presumably, they trust their committee chairs. Presumably, you trust yourselves, and presumably, if you bring something to the floor, you trust that you will vote the way you believe as we will do on this side of the aisle.

Maybe some on our side of the aisle will agree with you, and maybe some on your side will agree with us, but if we don’t bring it to the floor, it is no way, and we are not going to get much progress there.

There are two other issues I will discuss briefly, unless the majority leader wants to respond to that. The Voting Rights Act, he and I have had brief discussions about that. I know he has expressed himself publicly.

Mr. Leader, is there any possibility of our making progress on the Voting Rights Act between now and the August break?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I am committed and remain committed to upholding the very sacred right to vote for all American citizens, and I see the Voting Rights Act as something that has historically afforded that ability.

The recent actions of the Supreme Court have raised some issues, obviously, in the minds of some in the House. We have been working with our Members on our side of the aisle, as well as on the gentleman’s.

I know the Senate is undertaking hearings across the way, and it is still my hope to try and resolve this in an acceptable manner. I do know that there are still a lot of differences and that the gentleman knows as well, but I remain committed, again, to making sure that we uphold that sacred right to vote for all American citizens.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the majority leader for his continuing positive comments with respect to assuring that every American not only has the right to vote, but has the access to vote and that we facilitate one’s casting of that vote.

I look forward and my office looks forward to continuing to work with him towards that objective. Time, of course, is of the essence on this, so I am hopeful that we can move forward sooner, rather than later.

The last subject I would bring up—and we have also had brief discussions on this, Mr. Speaker, with the majority leader—is that the Export-Import Bank authority will expire in the not too distant future.

We believe on this side of the aisle that this is a very, very important piece of legislation. We have an agenda called Make It In America. One of the things that is important for the Make It in America agenda is to encourage and to facilitate the exporting of goods overseas. We think the Export-Import Bank does exactly that.

I would ask the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, if there is any prospect of bringing that to the floor. I might observe that the majority leader and I worked very, very closely and effectively, in a bipartisan way, when we authorized the Export-Import Bank the last time. I am hopeful that we can continue to do the same.

I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I have said to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. HENSARLING, that I will look to him and his leadership on that issue as the committee works its way through the varying issues and the Member positions that are out there, and I will look to see what the Financial Services Committee does.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that comment. I also understand that the chairman of the Financial Services Committee is opposed to the Export-Import Bank. He has said that publicly.

So I would hope, at some point in time, again, that the majority of the House could work its will because I do not believe that the chairman of the Financial Services Committee represents the majority of this House in this instance.

Therefore, I am hopeful that we can move forward and that I can work with the majority leader's office, as we did with the last authorization, to reach that objective.

Mr. Speaker, unless the majority leader asks me to yield, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. tomorrow; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, May 27, 2014; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, May 28, 2014, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SULLIVAN CUP ARMOR COMPETITION

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate four members of the Pennsylvania National Guard who placed among the top four teams in the national Sullivan Cup armor competition, held on May 11-15 of this year, in Fort Benning, Georgia.

Sergeant First Class Bryan Bailey, Sergeant Michael Schultz, Specialist Timothy Humpal, and Specialist Zachary Zondry represented the 3-103rd Armor Battalion, 55th Armored Brigade, 28th Infantry Division, who came in fourth out of only 17 U.S. Army, Marine Corps, and Canadian tank crews.

The toughness, skill level, and experience demonstrated by our Guard soldiers is further proof that the 55th Armored Brigade not only is one of the elite brigades in the entire U.S. Army, but that the Guard is—absolutely is—ready, trained, and capable.

□ 1245

REBUILDING THE VA

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue to call for action to address problems we face at VA clinics all across the country. This issue hits home for the folks I represent in Georgia, where three veterans have died and many more have seen their condition worsen because of inadequate health care.

This isn't going to go anywhere until we get serious about holding someone accountable. Regrettably, that should start with Secretary Eric Shinseki. General Shinseki has done a tremendous service for this country, and while he has tried to do some good things at the VA during his time, other veterans aren't getting the most basic benefits they have earned.

Literally, months have passed, and to this day no one has been held responsible, no solution has been found, and getting information from the VA is like pulling teeth.

The folks I represent want answers, and Secretary Shinseki stepping down should be the start of a nationwide effort to rebuild the VA, because that is what our veterans deserve.

HOUSE PASSAGE OF MEPS 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, I am proud to say that last night, the language that Representative TIM RYAN of Ohio and I introduced in March, H.R. 4305, the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act, or MEPS Act, was included as an amendment in the National Defense Authorization Act. This bipartisan legislation passed the full House this morning.

While our military has made great strides to address issues of mental illness, large gaps exist in this response that we must fill. Given these challenges and in light of the tragic events such as those at Fort Hood, we must and can do more.

Today, military recruits must undergo comprehensive physical evaluations. But what some are surprised or even shocked to hear is that currently no similar exam exists for mental competency.

The MEPS Act institutes a preliminary mental health assessment for all incoming recruits. This bill will offer our military an important tool and move us to a more comprehensive and effective approach to suicide prevention and detection.

I applaud my colleagues for joining us in support of this bill and encourage the Senate to take action on this important reform.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Maritime Day, an opportunity for us to celebrate and salute our mariners who have protected this great Nation.

Since the early days of this Nation, the United States Merchant Marine has been the foundation of our economic security, serving as our "fourth arm of defense" in both peace and war. They have been essential in bringing food to the world's hungry and delivering supplies to our brave men and women overseas in times of war. They have done so much for our Nation.

Today, on National Maritime Day, we take this opportunity to honor their service and sacrifice.

Over 200,000 Merchant Mariners served in World War II, and more than 8,000 lost their lives in enemy waters, a rate higher than any uniformed service. Unfortunately, these brave men were not eligible for the GI Bill that helped millions of veterans go to college and buy a home.

That is why I have introduced the Honoring our World War II Merchant Mariners Act of 2013. This bill would provide just \$1,000 in monthly benefits to the nearly 10,000 surviving World War II Mariners.

I would like to give a shout out to the American Merchant Marine Veterans Memorial Committee in San Pedro that is honoring our Merchant Mariners.

DOTCOM ACT

(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 to thank Chairman MCKEON for supporting Congressmen SHIMKUS, ROKITA, and me, in support of adding the DOTCOM Act as an amendment to our National Defense Authorization Act.

I support a free market multistakeholder model of Internet governance. In a perfect world, ICANN AND IANA would be free of government control and fully privatized. However, we don't live in a perfect world, and we know full well that China and Russia have a different view of perfection and are willing to aggressively pursue it. Their end goal is to have ICANN and IANA functions migrate to the U.N.'s ITU.

Passage of today's NDAA and inclusion of DOTCOM gives the multistakeholder model a chance to succeed, but it does so with congressional oversight. However, if we begin to sense—even for a minute—that that model isn't working, I will be the first Member to call on this body to taken stronger actions.

Again, I thank the chairman and my colleagues for bringing this about today.

ENDING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, after more than a decade of war, the loss of 2,178 American heroes, thousands seriously injured, and the expenditure of nearly \$2 trillion, we must end our military presence in Afghanistan now, safely bring our troops home, and begin to focus on the urgent challenges we face here in America.

A sustainable, long-term peace can only be accomplished when the people of Afghanistan assume responsibility for their own security.

Yesterday, our colleague JIM MCGOVERN offered an amendment that directed the President to rapidly accelerate the transition of U.S. combat operations in Afghanistan to the Afghan government by December, and would have required congressional approval if the President sought to keep U.S. military forces in Afghanistan after that. Unfortunately, we were denied the right to have a debate and vote on this amendment.

We owe the brave men and women in uniform a clear plan to bring them home safely and soon and to end this war now.

After more than 12 years of war and the killing of Osama bin Laden, it is time to end the war in Afghanistan and instead focus our attention on creating jobs, rebuilding our infrastructure, providing care for our veterans, and focusing on the serious fiscal challenges facing our Nation.

HONORING DOUGLAS H. CAREY

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my deepest condolences—and those of Florida's 13th Congressional District—to the family, friends, and fellow police officers of Mr. Douglas H. Carey, who tragically lost his life earlier this week.

Officer Carey began his service with the Clearwater Police Department as a patrolman on December 9, 1968. For nearly two decades, he assisted the people of Clearwater as a patrolman, a field training officer, and eventually as a detective. But his retirement from police work in 1987 was hardly the end of service.

Following his retirement, Officer Carey served on the security staff of Morton Plant Hospital. In 2010, he rejoined his brothers and sisters within the police department as a school crossing guard.

Officer Carey lost his life while doing what he loved and what he did best: protecting and serving his community. He was 70 years old.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor the life and service today of Officer Carey, who

is survived by his loving wife of 42 years, Jean; his son, Brian; his daughter, Toni; and his young grandson, Dylan.

Officer Carey will be greatly missed, but his spirit lives on through the many, many lives he has touched in our community of Pinellas County, Florida.

TOURETTE SYNDROME AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the opportunity to meet with a bright young boy who was diagnosed with Tourette syndrome and is working to bring attention to this disorder. His passion is an inspiration, and I want to share his own words about the importance of raising awareness.

Dear Congressman Luján. My name is Alexander Dennis. I live in Rio Rancho, New Mexico, and am 14 years old.

I grew up with a neurological disorder called Tourette syndrome. It causes me and about 200,000 others in the United States to make sudden movements and uncontrollable sounds. This disorder affects me daily and is a lifelong condition. There is no cure for Tourette syndrome.

I have to live daily with painful neck and full-body jerks. Others with this disorder have different severity levels and different types of movement. It is noticeable to others, but I do not know I am doing the movements sometimes.

There are not many doctors that are experienced with Tourette syndrome, and it took me 4 years to be properly diagnosed.

May 15 through June 15 is Tourette Syndrome Awareness Month, and I am writing to you because I am working to raise awareness to the challenges people face that have this syndrome. Any help that you can give will be greatly appreciated to me and all that suffer from this disorder.

Thank you, Alexander, for your voice and your efforts. I look forward to working with you on this issue.

BUDGET IMPACTS ON OUR MILITARY

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, the most important function of our government is to provide for the common defense. That is why I am pleased that the National Defense Authorization Act blocks the administration's end strength reduction proposal, as well as redistribution of important National Guard aviation assets. But I do have some specific concerns.

Of specific concern of this misguided and shortsighted proposal is the impact on the Mississippi National Guard's 155th Heavy Brigade Combat Team. This unit has a proven history of defending freedom abroad. But recently, when our State was hit by devastating tornados, these were the first respond-

ers. They provided vital security and search and rescue. I commend these men and women that make up the 155th and express my concern for the support of their mission.

Congress cannot balance our budget on the backs of the men and women voluntarily serving our country, nor expect their families, who already give so much, to make further sacrifices.

To find areas within our Federal Government to responsibly cut, we must look at all forms of Federal spending, not just the discretionary spending alone.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

(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, our veterans risked their lives in service of our Nation. When they come home, they deserve to be treated with dignity and respect, especially by those they count on to provide them with essential medical care.

The disturbing reports about the unethical treatment of our military men and women by the VA is not only an affront to those that we count on to protect our freedoms and our liberties, it highlights a systemic lack of accountability, starting at the top and permeating throughout the agency.

Mr. Speaker, no veteran should pass away waiting for the care they need or the benefits that they deserve. The ineptitude of the VA is an affront to the sacrifice of the veterans who are turning to this agency for assistance and the taxpayers whose hard-earned dollars should be funding this worthy cause.

While this week the House took action to empower the VA to rid itself of those who fail to meet their responsibilities with the passage of the Department of Veterans Affairs Management Accountability Act, there is still much work to be done.

I firmly believe that sunlight is the best disinfectant, and I will continue to work to shine a bright light on the situation until we can assure that the VA provides the service and respect that our veterans deserve.

HISTORIC PRAYER SERVICE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the inspiring prayer service between Pope Francis and Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew this Sunday at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem.

These two spiritual leaders of 1.5 billion Christians worldwide are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the first historic meeting in Jerusalem between their predecessors: Pope Paul VI and Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras in 1964.

Sunday's meeting in the Holy Land serves to recognize mutual respect and admiration between the two churches that was reignited 50 years ago. It is fitting that it takes place at the birthplace of Christianity: Jerusalem.

I commend the leadership of Pope Francis and Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, who both glorify God and demonstrate that Christianity is characterized by love, peace, and compassion.

HONORING OUR VETERANS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, all that we do and all that America does is owed to the greatness of our Constitution and to men and women whom we will honor this coming Monday, Memorial Day.

I call today upon Americans, wherever they may be, to stop for a moment to honor them.

A few years ago, I passed unanimous legislation on this floor to honor all of those who had ever served in combat. But we honor those who fell in the line of duty. This coming week, we will remember them, as we should every year.

As I go home, I will be visiting one of my veterans hospitals to be reminded of those who still stand, and to commit that we will fix every problem that denies or undermines the health care system of our veterans.

I have introduced the Heroes Act to ensure that veterans who have gained many good skills in service can equate those skills to civilian work, that they are treated with respect and dignity as managers and leaders, because that is what they were when they served in the United States military.

And so we honor our fallen soldiers and their families. We will gather today as Americans this weekend. We will stand united under the flag, saying thank you, for you have told all of us that freedom is not free.

□ 1300

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT AND CURRENT EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to comment about the work done on the National Defense Authorization Act. I know Chairman MCKEON has done a tremendous amount of work. I know, from dealing with him during this work on the defense budget, it has been extremely difficult for him.

I remain concerned where we have an administration that has kept our people in Afghanistan with less than favorable rules of engagement, where we

have people in harm's way and constantly being called on to be alert, be in positions where they may be in harm's way; and, yet, the authorization ends up being \$45 billion less than the President's own projection for fiscal year 2014 budget request, and \$30.7 billion less than that, that was enacted for fiscal year 2014 in the NDAA Public Law 113-66.

Back in the summer of 2011, I told our leadership that the deficit was a major problem, of course, as all of our conference realizes, as those on the other side of the aisle used to talk about until they got into the majority and blew the lid off the deficit.

To raise the debt ceiling, set up a supercommittee that I knew was going to fail, said it was going to fail because the Senate Democrats would never allow an agreement because they wanted to be able to blame Republicans for not getting a deal.

The mainstream media always buys whatever they said, even when they shut down the government, as HARRY REID did last September 30th, by refusing to take up even the most extreme compromises that this House was willing to make.

So they know they will get coverage from the mainstream media, and even some amazing examples of complete abandonment of any type of journalistic integrity. They knew they would be protected.

So they did refuse to allow an agreement. Even when Senators—Republican Senators reached out, indications were they thought they could get a deal, but I knew they were not going to allow the supercommittee to reach an agreement, no matter how far they bent over backwards, and that is what happened.

That meant the sequestration would occur. I had no problem with the amount of cuts in the sequestration. I had a problem with the number one job of the Federal Government, being to provide for the common defense, taking the biggest devastating hit in the sequestration. That was the problem.

So, because of that, I am still very concerned about the massive cuts to our defense when we are more hated than ever, trusted less than ever. Our previous friends are now reaching out to China and Russia because they can't trust us.

In trips abroad—I know the administration doesn't like Members of Congress to go abroad because we end up talking directly to people and finding out what they really think, so we don't get indirect misrepresentation, and you find out around the world, people don't trust this administration.

Our allies are saying: Are we going to be the next ally that you throw away, as you have been doing in recent years under this administration?

As I have said before, the elderly African in West Africa who told me how excited they were when we elected our first African American President, but ever since he had been President, he

said, the United States keeps getting weaker and weaker, and you have got to stop. Please tell the people in Washington to stop allowing the United States to get weaker.

As Christians, they knew, they said, where they would go when this life was over, but their hope, he said, for a more safe and free life here, even for a West African, would be when the United States does not get weaker, but stands against tyranny and stands against any threat.

Like Boko Haram, that threatens innocent Christians anywhere, it will ultimately be a threat to Christians everywhere.

I am also very concerned, as one who believes, as Abraham Lincoln says, as is inscribed in the north wall of the Lincoln Memorial, as part of his second inaugural address, that, as he quoted from scripture:

The judgments of the Lord are just and righteous altogether.

I am very concerned that, when our Nation is the most powerful Nation in the world, at the time when Christian persecutions, by number—not necessarily by percentage, but by number—are probably the greatest they have ever been in the history of the world, since Jesus was on earth, and we do nothing except watch the persecutions grow and grow, there will ultimately be some accountability if, as Abraham Lincoln said, as he and I believe, the judgments of the Lord are just and righteous altogether.

When someone is given much, of them, much is expected. We have an obligation. We have been put in a position where we can stand up for righteousness.

It did take a while for this Nation to get to the point where the Constitution meant exactly what it said, but what helped us get there was what was originally in the Declaration of Independence, a belief that we are endowed by our Creator, not endowed by government, not endowed by a monarch, but we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights.

When we fail to acknowledge that Creator, when we fail to stand up for those who acknowledge the Creator, when we fail to stand up and provide for the common defense, then there will be a price to pay.

Israel is feeling it. The mainstream media doesn't talk about it. Israel doesn't want to be considered a whiner, but they are being constantly under attack from rockets. Why? Because they are Jews and because they are in the Middle East, in the same location that was called the Promised Land where, around 1,600 years or so before Muhammad lived, King David was ruling in the land where they now are, and in the location, in Hebron, for example, where he ruled the first 7 years as King of Israel.

Some say, well, clearly, that is not Israeli land. People that worship Muhammad that came along 1,600 years after Christ—I'm sorry—after King

David was ruling in that town or 600 years or so after Christ, then, surely, they have a better claim; yet we tell Israel that they have to constantly be giving up and even to have our Secretary of State saying that they are guilty of apartheid, they are risking that guilt if they don't do everything that our Secretary of State says, where he has previously warned that, if they don't do what Secretary Kerry said, they may bring another wave of murder upon themselves. It sounded like a threat.

There are consequences for leaders who put our friends in jeopardy, and for those that think, well, just because we have leaders making bad statements, making bad decisions, doesn't mean it will reflect on us in the country, but for those who believe what is in the Bible, as the huge majority did, of our Founders, those who wrote translations of the Bible, those who taught Sunday school—one of the Founders started the Sunday school movement in America.

It is amazing the strength of ties. Even though some teach today that Ben Franklin was a Deist, his statements make clear that was not the case. As he, himself, said and then recorded in his own handwriting of the speech he gave, he said:

I have lived, sir, a long time, but the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth. God governs in the affairs of men, and if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it possible an empire could rise without His aid?

Franklin said to the Constitutional Convention, as he went on:

We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writing that, unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.

He said:

I also firmly believe that without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel.

When God was telling Hosea why he was mad at the Children of Israel, I looked at different translations. One basically had him saying: because they have chosen leaders who are not my choice.

A Nation is responsible for the leaders they select, and it doesn't matter that John Kerry was rejected by the Nation to be the national spokesperson and national President because, when he is Secretary of State and he makes statements that hurt our dearest allies, then we, as a Nation, will be accountable for his missteps and mistakes in judgment.

We have an obligation to demand better from our leaders. It is a scandal with regard to the Veterans Administration, and for anyone to stand up and say, wow, I had no idea that these problems were going on, stretches the bounds of credibility when that same person said, back in 2008, in condemnation of the Bush administration, that they were not doing enough for our veterans, and condemned the Bush administration and made clear that: when I get in office, I will clear up

these problems, I will take care of our veterans.

So as a former judge, those statements—prior statements against interest—would be allowed into evidence to show that something that was said yesterday was not truthful because the mental awareness was shown in 2008, was also shown by statements in 2009, 2010, and then we find out there was a document reflecting that there were these problems with the Veterans Administration.

Our veterans deserve better. I was in the Army for 4 years. I don't deserve better. I never saw combat.

I still think we should have, in 1979—I still feel guilty that, because we were not sent to respond at all to an act of war, in 1979, that thousands of Americans have died because we didn't take a stand in '79, so they got stronger and stronger and stronger until they have gotten to the place that the Taliban takes over Afghanistan.

□ 1315

You have a renegade regime in Iran that President Carter welcomed in, the Ayatollah Khomeini, as a man of peace. And, of course, it makes sense that the policies of this administration are as they are, when you have someone who is a featured speaker at the great tribute to Ayatollah Khomeini as the man of vision and peace.

Well, he is one of the top advisers, even as I speak, at the Department of Homeland Security. He is giving advice, as are others who were named as being members of the Muslim Brotherhood by a periodical in Egypt in December of 2012 in which they were bragging about the top officials in the Obama administration who are members of the Muslim Brotherhood.

Perhaps that explains why this administration has remained so loyal to the Muslim Brotherhood abroad, such that moderate Muslims, as you travel abroad, ask you: Why are you supporting your enemy? The Muslim Brotherhood wants to eliminate everything but radical Islam in America and in the world. Why are you helping them? They are your enemy. They are behind the attacks that have been made on the United States. Why are you helping them?

Mr. Speaker, in Libya, where a former terrorist supporter had reigned since 2003—and, as some Israelis had said: He was the best help you had, besides us, on identifying and eliminating radical Islam and terrorism, but yet you took him out. And we did that with our air cover and the provision of weapons to rebels that we knew had al Qaeda in them. It turns out that they were far stronger than we knew, which was why some of us were saying don't be helping the rebels in Libya. We know they have got al Qaeda in them. Yet we helped them.

As you travel abroad, you find people saying: You are still helping your enemy. We are worried you are going to turn on us next. You turn on your

allies. You punish your allies, and you reward your enemies. What kind of foreign policy is that? It never works. You will not win over people that hate you by giving them money and arms. They don't think you are a wonderful country because you have given them money and arms. They know you are crazy and you need to be wiped off the planet because you don't deserve to be a superpower. You are too stupid. And you give your people too much freedom, which allows them to choose some other religion than radical Islam.

Moderate Muslims around the world do not want radical Islam reigning over them, and that is why the people of Egypt rose up. And if this administration would do anything to show a powerful support for the nearly double the millions of people that allegedly voted for Morsi to be President, that came out and signed a petition, the two or three times as many millions came to the street demanding his removal as he said voted for him. There were fraud allegations. But from talking to the Egyptians, apparently Morsi had made it clear that if anybody objected to his win of the election, they would, as they said, "burn Egypt down."

The people who are in charge in Egypt don't want radical Islam's return. But when you talk to them, you find out that one of their biggest problems—well, two of their biggest problems—is on their west, in the eastern area of Libya, since this administration made sure Qadhafi was eliminated. Now terrorist training camps, like the Taliban had in Afghanistan, are now in Libya. And they come in and out of Egypt. And because of this administration's support for Morsi, he was able to militarize and weaponize the Sinai like it had never been weaponized before, making it more of a threat to Israel and making it more of a threat to the lovers of peace in Egypt.

There are consequences, even for those in this country who object to what the administration has done when they don't rise up and use their voices to make clear to this administration, through elections and through vocal objections, that they are making a huge mistake, and if they don't support lovers of liberty and Christian allies and Jewish allies that there will be a great amount to pay in the next election. And when that is made clear, I find my friends across the aisle get very responsive to the American people because—apparently, something that is a truth in America, as in other places—when someone is elected to a position they pursued, they like to stay in that position.

Some of us wonder at times if it is worth it. But as I have been told before: You have got to stay; this is where the fight is.

Well, I would also submit the fight is across America, for people to wake up, stop the apathy, and make it clear to those in this administration, to those in charge, that you are not going to stand for the kind of things that are

going on. And when it is made clear that we will not, as a Nation, tolerate what this administration has been allowing and looking the other way on, in the Veterans Administration, then things will change. But not until then. And when it is made clear to this administration that ObamaCare is a threat to seniors—it did cut \$716 billion from Medicare, which means they are not going to get the health care they need—when you are spending billions of dollars to hire IRS agents and navigators, more bureaucrats, then that is billions of dollars that will not be saving the lives of people that need life-saving medications, need lifesaving procedures. Americans have got to wake up and demand better; and when they do, they will get it.

But I also want to touch on the USA FREEDOM Act, as it was labeled. I had an amendment. Though I applauded the work that was done by my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) to negotiate an agreement, I still had the same concern I had back in 2005 and 2006 as a freshman. At that time, I brought it to the attention of the Gonzales Justice Department. I brought it to the attention of the Bush administration that I am concerned about this part in the PATRIOT Act where it says, like in section 215, that you can go after anybody in “an investigation to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person or to protect against international terrorism.”

So in both of those cases, they have to involve a foreign entity, a foreign agent, a foreign country, a foreign group of some kind, international terrorism. Those have to be involved for the PATRIOT Act to apply because as, apparently, Congress was told when the PATRIOT Act was passed back in desperation after 9/11/2001, we have got to protect against international terrorism, foreign agents, people who are dealing with foreign agents. That is what it was for.

So this third part concerned me because it says, or to protect against “clandestine intelligence activities.” “Clandestine intelligence activities,” what does that mean? It is very vague. And it doesn’t say “foreign.” It doesn’t say “international.” And since we were told that we are not allowed to just go gather information about American citizens, then this should have the word “foreign” or “international” in there.

So my amendment to the USA FREEDOM Act that would amend this part that in there. It dealt with that, the amendment that was fought against by my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER). They had too perfect of a cake that they had baked, and they, as MacArthur Park says, “may never have the recipe again. Oh, no.” They couldn’t allow a change to their recipe. So they didn’t allow any reference to “foreign” or “international.”

And the other references within the PATRIOT Act and the other references,

like in 18 U.S.C. 1842 talks about to obtain “foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person” or “to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.” So it needed the word “foreign” or “international” somehow in there. I provided that, but the proponents of the USA FREEDOM Act did not want it in.

Although my amendment originally passed in committee, it was revoted on a voice vote quickly after we were coming back from a vote on the floor and taken out. And although a majority of those in the Rules Committee said that my amendment needed to be in the law to protect it and to protect American citizens, when the rule came out, the rule said that my amendment was not going to be allowed to have a vote.

So I had to vote against the USA FREEDOM Act because this is a gaping hole that allows the Federal Government to go after and spy on American citizens who have no contact with any foreign government, any foreign agent, have no ties at all to international terrorism, haven’t necessarily ever even thought about terrorism. But with this, if they can be alleged to have engaged in any type of clandestine intelligence activities, you can go after them and spy on them.

And what does that mean? Well, I have asked the question, and I have not gotten any satisfactory answer—any answer, really. Well, does that mean, if somebody looks over a fence into a Federal enclave, that that is trying to get intelligence and that might invoke this provision of the PATRIOT Act? Or how about if someone mistakenly goes to a Web site, does that invoke this provision that allows you to go after them? And I haven’t gotten a good answer, and I haven’t been told how this has been applied. I was hoping to get an answer that it has never been used, but I haven’t gotten that either.

As a result, I had to vote against the USA FREEDOM Act because I didn’t want my name on a bill that leaves a hole this large, allowing the Federal Government to go after American citizens who have never even thought about terrorism and have never had any contact with a foreign agent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to reiterate again that I think we will suffer if, having been given so much more freedom, more assets than any nation in the history of the world, we do not stand up for Jews and Christians being persecuted around the world.

We have clearly gone to war and lost human life and limb on behalf of protecting Muslims in the world. It is time that we also stood for Christians and Jews around the world.

I never thought I would see anti-Semitism arise in my lifetime like it has. On our college campuses in the name of open-mindedness, they have become anti-Semitic and racist, anti-Israeli. We have got to demand better from this administration, and we have

got to stand up for those Jews and Christians who are being persecuted and oppressed in greater numbers than ever before.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

VETERANS’ BENEFITS SCANDAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) is recognized for the balance of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this is a conversation that has been a long time coming. I am in my first term here in the House of Representatives, and soon after becoming a Federal Representative, it became very apparent to me that our veterans in California, in our districts, and all across the country really need a lot more of our help, as Members of Congress, as our staff both in our districts and even in D.C. can do for us for the veterans.

You have seen the revelations here lately that have finally gotten the attention of the American public, with what has been going on in Arizona, previously Pittsburgh with Legionnaires’ disease, and the many other revelations about how poorly our veterans are being treated in this country once they have served for us and have come home, expecting the things that they were promised before they made that service for us.

□ 1330

For example, revelations about secret waiting lists in the Veterans Administration as we have seen in Arizona. They have shocked most Americans here in recent weeks.

Today, I speak out on an even bigger crisis within the VA system, and that is the monumental failure of the Oakland, California, Veterans Benefits Administration.

Most of our veterans must run through this nightmarish gauntlet before they can even hope to be added to the secret waiting list at a Veterans Administration medical facility.

Here on the floor we talk a lot about claims backlogs often, and we have seen mountains of paper files. Our inevitable solution always seems to be to give them more money to fix the problem. Well, the Congress, with the American taxpayers’ dollars, has funded VA pretty adequately. We have made an effort here recently to try to help catch up with the backlog with the funding required. We were then issued cheerful responses of decreases in processing times that are systematically manipulated by upper level officials at VA in order to show progress to make us go away.

Right now, the Oakland office boasts that they have no claims over 125 days old. In reality, tens of thousands of the Oakland VA are trapped in a cycle many veterans call “delay, deny and wait until they die.”

One main trick is to omit key information that would help the veteran in his or her claim, whether it be the exams, timelines, what have you, then deny the claim, ship it off for 2 or 3 years' worth of review and appeal process. In the meantime, we will deem it processed.

The management is more interested in the open number of claims stats on the reports than processing them accurately or in a timely fashion, and then reaping bonuses by posting a savings to the government—to the taxpayers—by denying these claims and these payments.

How many veterans are homeless because their claims for benefits have been sitting on a cart or in a janitor's closet or in the hallway by the director's office for years—or even decades? Benefits that would help them to not be homeless, to have shelter, to have better health, to even be in a place where they could then seek employment and be in a much better way?

How many veterans have suffered and died waiting years for their claim to be handled so they could seek medical treatment? Some of it needs to be very timely to have exams and treatment.

How many of our veterans have given up hope and committed suicide out of desperation and despair that comes with years of waiting, because they don't feel like anybody cares about them anymore and that they don't have any value to our society?

Yet, on weekends like we have coming up, we glorify them—as we should, those that have fallen—on Memorial Day and later in the year on Veterans Day. Yet this is what our government does to them. We know that we have veterans that take this ultimate step of suicide. We know they exist.

I submit that many of our Nation's veterans are part of a backlog that exceeds the most extraordinary numbers we currently have on file. For example, for this past year, my own office has been assisting for a full year a veteran with a 36-year-old claim. Due to management practices—if you call them practices—at the Oakland Regional Office, this veteran still suffers this day from not having his claim properly handled. Remember, he is not even eligible yet after 36 years to make it on to the secret waiting list for medical care, as in Arizona, to then finally graduate to the real list. Hasn't even made that in 36 years yet.

The Veterans Affairs Department's mission declares:

Our values are more than just words—they affect outcomes in our daily interactions with veterans and eligible beneficiaries and with each other. Taking the first letter of each word—integrity, commitment, advocacy, respect, excellence—creates a powerful acronym, “I CARE,” that reminds each VA employee of the importance of their role in this Department. These core values come together as five promises we make as individuals and as an organization to those we serve.

Now, let me underscore we know there are many, many very hard-

working and caring VA employees out there that want to get results for the veterans. Many of them have been veterans themselves. So this isn't to impugn all of them. This is about upper management—on a topic that has been even one the President has focused on this week—not getting the job done and trying to snow us here in the Congress and the American people about the results they have been claiming.

Thanks to a growing group of employees who understands these core values I just mentioned and now feel empowered to step forward because they see there are people who really want to get behind them, I have been given a number of multiple signed, sworn statements by employees on what is happening behind the curtain at the Oakland Veterans Benefits Administration office.

Right here on this easel is a statement I received from one of them in the letter. It is just one of the few examples that I will read for you:

I am an employee of the Veterans Administration Regional Office in Oakland. I took a photo on May 19, 2014, showing stacks of paper piled on a cart. This paper is actually informal claims going back to the late '90s and 2000s. These claims were not reviewed until November of 2012. These claims continue, to this day, to be a pile of paper on a cart that no one wants to deal with. I was part of the initial project reviewing these claims. My initials are on them from November, 2012.

Again, this is an employee from the Oakland center.

Congressman LaMalfa, I want you to know that I am a proud Navy veteran of 10-plus years and looked at the opportunity to work at the Veterans Administration as a chance to really help veterans. In the 5 years I have worked there, I know I have helped people, but there is so much more that could be done. The management at the Oakland Regional Office is concerned about the numbers and not the veterans. Terminal and homeless veterans wait for too long for the help that they need. I believe that there are a lot of wonderful employees that truly want to help but are being directed by management to worry about number control.

What I don't understand is why they can't be more transparent about the number of claims and the need for more resources. We need more employees to do the job; we don't need new carpet and desks like they just gave us when veterans die waiting for us to do our job. This job is literally made me sick. I go to work knowing that during my day, I will have to help the veterans in a low-key way and not what I am being told is needed to get the veterans numbers down. This makes me physically ill. I think about all the letters begging for help and we seem to do so little.

I believe Oakland needs new eyes. I believe we need more oversight. I believe far too many veterans die each day while we worry about what our numbers look like. These veterans go home with me each night in my thoughts and regrets of the day because we seem to do so little.

This is a small sample of what is happening here, and we have additional statements, as well, about what is going on inside the Oakland VA, and maybe an example of many of them across the country.

In this photograph is an example of the files. Right now these are waiting in the hallway, and before that, they were found in a broom closet where they had been stashed for years. Some of these claims go back to the mid-1990s, untouched, only recently discovered, yet they still get walked past and not handled. Stacks of them, the filing cabinet.

The next letter is from an Oakland VA employee—a real employee. We are keeping their names back for now because we want people to know that we are going to help them if they come forward with this information:

In November 2012, myself and several other individuals were given a special project to work. The project consisted of approximately 14,000 claims dating back to 1994 that had never been worked. These claims are considered informal claims because they did not come in on a prescribed form. Informal claims are worked differently. A letter is sent with the correct form later for the veteran to fill out, and when the form is returned, the claim is actually opened to work. If the form is returned within 1 year, if the veteran receives compensation, their benefits then would go back to the date of his first correspondence, the informal.

We were given these claims to analyze, and very quickly we began to realize that these were not all informal claims but actionable ones, not to mention how old some of them were. So many of the letters that came in were from veterans, or their surviving spouses, who were begging for help at the end of their life, and they never got a reply because they had died by the time we got them. I went home so many nights crying because a veteran or widow had begged for help, and we stuck the request in a four-drawer lateral cabinet—kind of like so—with 14,000 other ones. Each day we were required to report back to our supervisor on the numbers and how they were broken down. If the veteran had already died, it is considered non-actionable and put aside. Whether it actually made it to the veteran's folder is unknown to me.

Again, this is an Oakland employee:

If it was an informal claim and the claimant was still alive, those were put in another pile to eventually review again and maybe do the letters. If the document received came from a veteran who had already filed a formal claim, then these would be considered actual claims and be reviewed by another person before being acted upon. So each day we would report our numbers and separate out the documents. We began to speak up about how old these were and why hadn't we acted sooner on them, and we were very quickly removed from the project for speaking out.

These claims were within feet of the assistant service center manager; she literally walked by them each day, and yet they remained untouched until November 2012. Word was that a staff member from VA headquarters had actually been the one to find them while she was there doing an onsite inspection. And yet several long-term employees have told me that management knew they were there. Either way, most were very old.

I don't know how many veterans or spouses died before we responded, but, I personally know of several hundreds that got nothing, and the thought of us doing nothing to help these men and women in their most desperate times is haunting to me.

Again, signed by an Oakland VA employee.

A third letter addressed to me states:

Dear Congressman LaMalfa: I cannot thank you enough for the work you and your staff have done—

a big credit to my staff who worked very hard on this—

for the veterans in the northern California area. One particular case should have been decided with the evidence on hand last year. I read the examination today and found that the exams have been in the system, and there has been no action on that claim for what the system states is waiting for the examinations. The information is there, and the rating should be completed based on the evidence on hand. Please keep advocating for the veterans. I cannot thank you enough. I am a veteran myself who served honorably for over 9 years and was not provided the benefits from the VA per the law until I—the veteran who is now an Oakland employee—started working for the DVA myself and found out everything I was not informed on.

□ 1345

I left the U.S. Marine Corps, after serving honorably as a military police K-9 officer and member of the SWAT team. I worked hard and, as a result of my disabilities, required several surgeries and, recently, due to the hostile work environment at work, have become progressively worse.

I have tried to report this to management, but they did not like hearing the truth and started to make my life at work miserable 2 years ago. The news is starting to pick up on what I have tried, myself, to report regarding unethical conduct in the VA. Prior to the news picking up on the real problems at the VA, I have been reporting this information to the Senate and Congress Members in the Bay Area's district.

I have reported this to the VA Office of Inspector General on two different occasions. I have reported this to the GAO. I have reported problems at the Oakland VA to the Federal Labor Relations Office of the General Counsel for 2 years, with no assistance.

I have three EEO claims, with one more in the works, that have not been processed by the VA ethically or morally, according to the applicable laws, up to and including the OEDCA in Washington, D.C.

I am begging you to please open a formal investigation into the unethical conduct of the VA Oakland regional office.

The unethical conduct I know of is the fact that the Oakland VA management has not been held accountable for the misconduct or several felony violations that has been recently reported by me.

Since coming out as a whistleblower, I have had many employees discretely discuss some extremely disturbing information with me regarding what is actually going on in the VA and why the management is trying to stop me at all costs.

The unethical conduct goes far beyond my employment difficulties at the VA Oakland regional office. I have come to find out that the Oakland regional office is not only lying to Congress about their numbers, but the Oakland office is hiding claims that were received in 1999.

I have seen these claims in the office as late as May 20, 2014. These claims should be in the claims files if there is not action because the veteran has died in the process, not still sitting around the office for over 15 years.

There are a number of claims that are over a year old. There are many more that have been "lost in transit" to the scan sites, often in some other State. The VA is ethically challenged, but this is unacceptable, to lose a veteran's claim and not tell them or try to

make the situation right, just ignore them and hope they go away or to not process a claim properly for over 15 years.

This is a real letter from a real Oakland VA employee. It continues:

The claims have been sitting for over a year, after having been screened last by a group of VSRs and no action taken because they were sitting in someone's office, then in some storage closet by the director's office on the 17th floor of the Oakland Federal building.

Again, I have made multiple statements to many agencies of the U.S. Government in hopes that the illegal and unprofessional conduct from the management would stop, but the parties who I have reported to this, with ample amounts of evidence provided, have explained that the corruption cannot be stopped without some sort of ethical investigation conducted.

Please initiate some type of ethical investigation by an agency that is not going to try to cover up what they find, rather report the truth and do the right thing.

I have been a law enforcement officer in the U.S. Marine Corps, and I know that what is going on at the Oakland regional office with me and other veterans. It is wrong per the law, not my opinion.

Please, Congressman LaMalfa, assist us in whatever you can do. The veterans deserve better.

Semper Fi, USMC Disabled.

This is what it looks like. There are unfinished files sitting in the hallways, previously found in a broom closet.

Lastly, in a letter from yet another person who stepped forward when they finally saw somebody fighting back at different levels, our Veterans' Committee and other offices around the country, they see the shame being brought upon our veterans and, with that, our country.

This letter says:

There are huge amounts of these claims that are quite old, but because they are reclassified, are not worked expeditiously. Lots of these claims go back several years, but they are being worked as if they are only 2 or 3 years old because they are in a different group, and that is not considered a priority.

A lot of these claims, the 930 series, are review claims created because they found something wrong that we did. Usually, it is not logging in evidence in time before the claim is closed.

I personally logged in evidence on May 16, 2014, that was received by our regional office and date-stamped August 1, 2013. The claim had been closed months before, but because this evidence had not been logged in, it had also not been considered in the decision, which was a denial of benefits. Things like this happen every day.

Now, we open a review claim that will not get worked for months and, sometimes, a year or more. We have veterans that are terminal and asking for aid and attendants, and you would think that these claims, along with the older date of claims of the homeless, would be worked first, but a lot of the times, they are not.

If the regional office can do several easy claims, like hearing loss, tinnitus, then they will do that because then more claims are taken off the books, even though these may not be the veterans with the most need.

So, there, you see manipulation of statistics, manipulation of timing, making the numbers look better, and not making the veterans feel better.

I hope that image is one that will stay with you, all who have seen this or will see this all across our country. Much more needs to be done, not just pretty words, not just press conferences, not we will look into it or that we will throw money at it.

Congress does stand prepared to ensure that there is adequate funding to do it right, but we also expect that the dollars that taxpayers send to the government are used wisely and efficiently and not for bonuses for people that are acting not just ineptly, but, I believe, corruptly.

It is time to stop rewarding this bad behavior with more accountability. Americans have seen these stories. These horror stories are demanding a fix for the veterans health care system and their benefits. We must also demand an end to the phony claims, phony numbers, decades of waiting. It isn't just ineptness or miscues or errors. Someone is very deliberate and, I think, worthy of prosecution as fraud.

I think those VA employees who have been bold enough to step forward and let us know about what is going on in the backrooms behind the scenes. They are good employees who just want to see veterans served all across the country, so we want to hear more of these stories from anybody who might be watching or see this all across the country.

Contact your own Congressman, contact us, contact whoever will listen and seek remedies that mean something as we celebrate our fallen veterans this weekend. It isn't just about barbecues and skiing and picnics. Let's remember and honor these people.

The system is broken, but it doesn't have to be if we are willing to demand accountability and demand it immediately. That is what I am about, what my office will be about, my staff, but also many of my colleagues that either serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee or don't.

We will continue to spotlight this and make sure that the stories are heard all across the country, and those who are doing this to our veterans, these criminal acts, ultimately will be held responsible.

So I thank the whistleblowers, those VA employees who do care. We know there are many, many of you and thank you for your effort. God bless our veterans who have suffered and are still waiting and know that you have allies in this place who will see this through and get you the service you deserve.

God bless you all. God bless America.

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

ADDRESSING SENATORS' COMMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and I come to the floor this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to address you and bring up the topic of the dialogue that has been—I will say flowing forth on the floor of the United States Senate over the last few weeks.

As I listened to that dialogue and listened to the way they have taken Saul Alinsky's "Rules for Radicals" and decided that they are going to implement them and deploy them on the floor of the United States Senate, it occurs to me that when, out of the mouths of people like Senator SCHUMER and Senator REID and Senator DURBIN come these allegations—and sometimes allegations that name and target Members of the House of Representatives, it occurs to me that, when I came to this Congress, Mr. Speaker, in 2003, there was a rule that existed here that prevented a Member of the House of Representatives from naming a United States Senator here on the floor.

It was kind of a shield of protectionism, so that the Senators could not be directly criticized in the dialogue that we have here on the floor.

My good friend and then-Member of Congress, Tom Feeney from Florida, read through the rules, as a good, honest lawyer, newly elected to the United States Congress would, and he saw that rule and wondered: Why can't we utter the name of a United States Senator on the floor of the House of Representatives?

He could come up with no reason why we shouldn't be able to do that, and so he brought an amendment to the rules that struck that prohibition, and thereafter, thanks to then-Congressman Tom Feeney of Orlando, the rule is gone. It was amended, and that is a good thing because, now, I can actually name the people who are attacking me on the floor of the United States Senate, and let you know, Mr. Speaker, what is going on in that other body, that body that constantly calls for bipartisan work and bipartisan cooperation.

This is what I get from Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, New York, May 1, 2014, on the floor of the United States Senate. He decided he would target me and blame me for the things that he believes are failures of the entire House of Representatives.

Here are some of the quotes that CHUCK SCHUMER uttered on that day of May 1 from the floor of the United States Senate. He called me "an extreme outlier on the issue of immigration reform."

I would direct CHUCK SCHUMER to the Republican Party platform. You will find there language in the Republican Party platform that supports the position I have long held on immigration, and that position that I hold is this: We need to respect the rule of law. We need to secure our borders. We need to have an immigration policy that is designed

to enhance the economic, the social, and the cultural well-being of the United States of America.

It can't be for the Democratic Party of the United States of America because they are so closely aligned—in fact, they have enveloped the entire Progressive Party. The Progressive Party comes to this floor on a regular basis and gives speeches and presents their position.

Their position, at one time, could be found on the Democratic Socialists of America Web site, dsausa.org. There, socialism is celebrated. As Progressives celebrate socialism, they are wrapped up inside the Democratic Party.

We don't adhere to that on my side. We adhere to the rule of law and the Constitution, a secure border, a sovereign United States of America, and a policy for immigration that is designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States of America.

We have enough common sense, Mr. Speaker, to know that our country is limited in size and scope. It is a large country, but we cannot be the relief valve for all of the poverty in the world.

There are 7 billion people on the planet, and if they all have good sense, they would all want to live here. We need some of them in those countries to rebuild those countries and establish American principles, so that they can enjoy the prosperity that we enjoy, reconstructed around first principles, in the other countries of the world.

□ 1400

We need to lead the world. We don't need to necessarily bring all the world here to feed the world here in the United States. And so, an extreme outlier, not so. CHUCK SCHUMER represents the extreme outliers, and they are socialists, Marxists, progressives, liberal Democrats. I am sure that one of those labels will be one that he has already embraced, Mr. Speaker.

Second quote, Senator CHUCK SCHUMER of me, STEVE KING:

The rhetoric of Steve King is beyond the pale. I am certain that the majority of Republicans in the House have their stomachs churn when they see Steve King spew that kind of rhetoric.

That is not exactly collegial dialogue, Mr. Speaker, to see that kind of thing. What I wonder is why would CHUCK SCHUMER think that he would know when the stomachs of Republicans might churn. I think they might churn when they hear him say those things. Although, rest easy, Mr. Speaker, mine doesn't.

I take this all with good humor because I understand that it is a tactic. It is an Alinsky tactic, and it is designed to bring out a goal. It is not necessarily to raise me up to the point where he assigns me with the full sense of responsibility and authority to determine immigration policy here in the House of Representatives. Oh, I wish it

were so, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe it is so. Yes, there is some influence there. History will decide how much—not me, not CHUCK SCHUMER.

Here is his goal: I believe that Senator SCHUMER has concluded that he could taunt the leadership and the House of Representatives, and that includes our Speaker of the House, into bringing amnesty legislation to the floor of the House because, if it does and if it should pass, the Senate would conform with any amnesty legislation because they are controlled by Democrats.

I have long known and long been restrained by people in my own party, Mr. Speaker, from laying out the argument as to why almost every Democrat I know wants open borders and amnesty and a never-ending supply of illegal aliens in the United States of America.

It is a pretty easy formula to figure out, especially if you sit here for 10 or a dozen years engaged in hearings and debate on a weekly basis, you begin to hear the thread of their conversation and you begin to understand the real truth behind their motives. It works out to be this:

Of course there are a large number of illegal immigrants in the United States. We have been using the number 11 million since we stopped using the number 12 million, but they didn't stop coming into America. I don't quite understand why we would think that there are fewer illegal aliens in America today than there were 10 years ago. I believe there are more.

If they come across the border at the rates that the witnesses from the Border Patrol and other witnesses in the hearings have been testifying, they will say that they will stop perhaps 25 percent that try. When I go down to the border and ask them, they will say, well, 10 percent has to come first. It is probably not 10. Some will say, with a little smirk, 3 percent is maybe what we stop.

If I take the 25 percent, 25 percent effectiveness on our border and you look at those whom they do interdict on the border and you do the calculation, that turns out to be a number that is equivalent to 11,000 a night—on average, 11,000 a night coming across our southern border. That would be at some of the peak levels that we have, Mr. Speaker. I would think it is more objective for us to dial that number back down to somewhere in the neighborhood of about half of that. So half of 11,000, 5,500 a night is pretty close to the last reliable information that I found on how many are coming across our border illegally.

Well, so I asked this question: What was the size of Santa Anna's army? About that, about 5,500 or 6,000. So it gives you a sense, the size of Santa Anna's army coming across our southern border every night, on average. I don't say day and night. Most of it is at night. I have sat down on the border at night multiple times. I have traveled

the border and done multiple trips down there to monitor what is going on on our southern border. It has gotten a little better in Arizona, and it has gotten worse in Texas.

We don't have control of this border, but that doesn't trouble most Democrats, because they recognize that the millions of people that are coming into this country illegally are counted in the census. And so, if you would go to a district in California like MAXINE WATERS' district, she only needs about 40,000 to 50,000 votes in her district to get reelected to the United States Congress. If you go to my district, it is well over 120,000 votes for me to be reelected to the United States Congress. The difference in that is two things. One is I have a very, very high percentage of real American citizens that do vote in my district; she has a lower percentage. And I have a higher turnout of people who are responsible enough to vote; she has a lower percentage.

Illegal aliens are counted in the census all over America, and when new district lines are drawn, those district lines treat people the same as citizens. The Constitution doesn't say count the citizens and then reapportion; it says count the people.

And so Democrats are happy enough to see the country filling up with people that they get to count when they do a district, because they get a Democrat district that is another vote here in the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker. They want to turn this country into a single-party country.

When you think of what happened in California, they are trying to bring about the same kind of transition in Texas. If they can turn Texas from a red State into a blue State, there will never be another conservative elected to a national office in this country again. They know that. That is why they have thousands of their operatives working in Texas, trying to turn Texas over into a blue State.

They know that illegal immigration is an essential key. Back in 2007 or so when they bussed in tens of thousands of demonstrators, many of them self-professed illegal aliens in America, many of them wearing identical T-shirts that were issued to them apparently on the bus, then-alive Senator Teddy Kennedy stepped out to the west lawn of the Capitol and stepped up to the microphone and, through an interpreter, said to that group of people, who was interpreting to them in Spanish, he said:

Some say, report to be deported; I say, report to become an American citizen.

That was the Democrats' clarion call, the call out to illegal aliens in America to migrate toward the Democrat Party, to those that are outside of America to come into America and migrate towards the Democrat Party. They operate in those neighborhoods doing voter registration drives and signups and organizations, a lot of it funded by Federal dollars that matriculates down

into their organizations. They do know what they are doing. They have built a cultural edifice around much of the minority community in America, and much of it has been because, Mr. Speaker, they have been telling them lies. They have been telling them lies about the political opponents of the leftists that are engaged in those neighborhoods; and we have seen this flow, Mr. Speaker, as far as the White House.

The divisions that have been driven between Americans, divisions driven down the line of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, prosperity, those wedges have been driven in a calculated way for the political gain of the people that sit over on this side of this Chamber. I have seen too much of it to believe that I could be off by 1 degree in the statement that I have made, Mr. Speaker.

I am continuing onward, Senator SCHUMER of myself:

Steve King, a far right, way out of the mainstream outlier doesn't just spew hatred; he calls the shots.

Hmm, I don't think that he could point to any hatred that I have spoken to and identified as spewing. Calling the shots? No, I hear the wisdom of the Republican Conference. I have to hear what they say and what they think and where they anchor their thoughts. We have coalesced on this, Mr. Speaker: whatever we might do to change immigration law, we can't trust the President of the United States to enforce anything he doesn't like. It doesn't just have to be immigration law; it can be anything.

The President of the United States picks and chooses the laws that he will enforce. He essentially tells us: I am not going to enforce this series of laws because I don't like them, and I am not going to enforce these series of laws because I don't like them. It is not just immigration; although, that was some of the first examples and some of the most egregious examples, Mr. Speaker.

And we saw them come through as the Morton memos, and I will circle back to that in a moment. We saw the President, by executive edict, not always in executive order, sometimes a third-tier notice on a Web site of the United States Treasury, sometimes a verbal statement that he makes before a press conference in the Rose Garden at noon on a Friday. The President of the United States will step up and say, for example, when he was speaking to the churches who objected to their religious freedom being taken from them, their conscience protection that was to be assured to them, written into the ObamaCare law, after they took that religious freedom, conscience protection away from our people of faith, and in particular the Catholic churches that filed multiple lawsuits, and other religious organizations did the same, the President was taking 2 weeks of heat and criticism as the faith communities rose up, and he decided to put an end to that. So he held a press con-

ference at the White House at noon on a Friday, and with the Presidential seal in front of the podium, he stood there and said: I am going to make an accommodation to the religious organizations in America, and now I am going to require the insurance companies to provide these things for free.

Well, these things were contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations. Contraceptives, Mr. Speaker, we understand what they are. Abortifacients are pills that bring about the abortion of a little, innocent, unborn baby. Sterilizations are those things that might come with tubal ligations or vasectomies. Those were the things that were in ObamaCare that are particularly egregious to the principles of the Catholic church.

And so the President decided he would make an accommodation written in the rules, by the way—not the bill, but in the rules. The President said: I am going to make an accommodation to the religious organizations, and now I am going to require the insurance companies to provide these things for free. He repeated himself. He said: Provide these things for free. For free.

I thought, hmm, how is it that the President can step up and give a press conference and change a law or change a rule that has been published by Kathleen Sebelius' Health and Human Services? How does the President have the authority to simply speak and make those changes? Surely there must be a rule that is amended. Surely there must be a bill that has been introduced that has a lot of responsible cosponsors, that has a prospect of being passed. Maybe he has got an agreement with our Speaker and majority leader here and HARRY REID over in the Senate.

So we went back and scoured the rule, Mr. Speaker. The rule didn't change, not one i dotted differently, not one t crossed differently. There was no change in any written document, the written document that required the religious organizations to provide contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations.

The President said now the insurance companies have to do this for free. Not one word changed in print anywhere. The insurance companies stepped up to that verbal directive from the President of the United States. That should be appalling to any American citizen that took an eighth grade civics course to understand that the President doesn't write the laws. The President doesn't have the authority to change them. Congress has granted to the executive branch the authority to write rules, an Administrative Procedure Act that directs how those rules that are proposed by the executive branch are published for open public hearing. There is a process they must go through.

The President is not the king. The President doesn't get to issue edicts verbally from the podium and have the force and effect of law to change that

policy without any print being changed anywhere in a rule or in the Federal Register or in the Federal Code. That is what he did with that particular case, Mr. Speaker. I use that as an example to tell you how far this President has overreached from his constitutional authority.

So the President has first imposed contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations on our religious organizations, then lifted the imposition verbally by telling the insurance companies: Now you are going to have to do this for free. What did they do? They complied. They listened to the President's press conference and decided, okay, we are going to do what he tells us. They didn't go back and check the text—well, maybe the text of the press conference, maybe the text of his speech, but there was no rule. There was no law.

The President also suspended welfare-to-work. The temporary assistance to needy families was written that required welfare-to-work. It was written so that then Bill Clinton couldn't circumvent it. It was written tightly and with the idea that a President would stretch it. What happens? This President simply suspended welfare-to-work under TANF.

What else happened? How about President Bush's No Child Left Behind on education?

□ 1415

President Obama has now issued so many waivers that No Child Left Behind no longer exists. These were acts of the United States Congress nullified by executive acts of the President of the United States.

We will accept it if the court over across the street will nullify a law that is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, if they rule it unconstitutional. Most of the time we accept that. Sometimes we reject their judgment because we take an oath to the Constitution too, Mr. Speaker.

But we should be appalled at the constitutional violations of the President of the United States, who has continually overreached on immigration, on education, on welfare-to-work, on ObamaCare itself: the bill with his name and his signature. There are more than 30 changes that the President has brought about on that. Some of them are clearly unconstitutional. Most of them are difficult to litigate to a successful conclusion.

Who calls the shots here? Well, I make recommendations like anybody else does. Each Member follows their own conscience. It is nice to get the assignment—Senator SCHUMER, he says: They listen to me. Well, yes, and we listen to each other.

Here is another quote from Senator SCHUMER. He said that I am winning:

Steve King has three wins, the rest of the Republican Party and the rest of America is winless. Good for him, terrible for us. King is in the driver's seat of immigration reform and as long as he sits there, things will continue to be stuck in a rut.

Stuck in a rut, in the driver's seat, the rest of America is winless. No, the rest of America is winning each day that we can protect the rule of law, each day that we have something left that we can use to secure our borders, each day that we can deploy some type of law enforcement at the local government, State government, and the Federal Government too, out on the streets of America, that at least slows down this influx of illegal immigration that we have.

America is not winless when that happens. America would be wiped out from a perspective of the rule of law and the future and the destiny for our country if we allowed people like CHUCK SCHUMER, HARRY REID, and DICK DURBIN to set the policy for immigration. If they did that, the rule of law, at least with regard to immigration, would be destroyed, be gone. We couldn't reconstruct it again in our lifetime. Not just our lifetime, Mr. Speaker, but the lifetime of this Republic.

I would ask this question, Mr. Speaker: Has anybody read the Senate Gang of Eight immigration bill? I have. I have read through that entire bill, and I come to this conclusion. They have sent to us from the United States Senate a bill on immigration. It is expansive. It covers all kinds of things. But it is this: it is instantaneous amnesty for almost everybody that is in America illegally, instantaneous amnesty. It is prospective amnesty to the extent that it does not address how we might address people who get into America after the bill might be enacted. So the prospects are that it would be the next wave of those who would be, according to their description, living in the shadows.

So if we are not going to enforce the law in the future or if we are going to pass a Senate version of the bill—and we are not, but the Senate version of the bill, if it becomes law, doesn't do anything to bring about enforcement for those who would violate our immigration laws in the future, nothing. It may do something on the border. A \$40 billion Corker amendment blows the budget substantially without a guarantee that it is going to be functional. But is instantaneous amnesty for those that are here. It is prospective amnesty for those who would come here. And, Mr. Speaker, it is retroactive amnesty. And that means it goes back to those who have been deported in the past and says: We really didn't mean it. Why don't you apply to come back to America, you all come back now, you hear, because we really can't have deported you in the past and let people stay in America under the same conditions that we deported you in the past. That is the Senate version of the bill. It is ludicrous from a commonsense heart of the heartland middle America viewpoint, where we respect and love the rule of law.

So Mr. SCHUMER, Senator SCHUMER, went on: He called for my expulsion

from the Republican Party. I am pretty sure they are not going to listen to CHUCK SCHUMER on that. He says:

They can show some courage and say that the Steve Kings in the world can say whatever they want, but they have no place in a modern Republican Party.

Imagine a leftist activist, deploying Alinsky tactics on the floor of the United States Senate, who would tell the Republican Party that they should expel me, who in a lot of ways has stood with the entire platform consistently for a long time. I would have to go change the platform first. It would be easier just to become a Democrat. However, their ranks are not swelling as fast as ours are. Commonsense is prevailing, and we are seeing Republican majorities in the States, a likely Republican majority expanded here in the House of Representatives, and a real good shot at a Republican majority in the United States Senate. What does that say about who is calling the shots in America? It is not CHUCK SCHUMER, it is not HARRY REID, it is not DICK DURBIN.

So he continues. Two weeks later—he hadn't had enough—two weeks later he comes to the floor of the Senate again and goes through a series of some of the same things, which I will skip down through a little bit more quickly:

Far-right extremists, such as Congressman Steve King.

Another:

What has the House actually done on immigration these past 2 years?

This is CHUCK SCHUMER:

Nothing. Look it up. This is what Steve King wants, he wants the House to do nothing. He is winning and America is losing.

Well, no, the House has done something. In the appropriations bill last year, June 6, 2013, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill, I brought an amendment, an amendment that shut off all funding to implement or enforce the President's unconstitutional actions and exert constitutional actions that had to do with DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, and for prosecutorial discretion known as the Morton Memos.

The President's action is unconstitutional. He has no prosecutorial discretion to identify classes or groups of people and then exempt them from the law. Prosecutorial discretion must be on an individual basis; it cannot be on a group. They violated that. They know it. I read their material and debated with them and initiated a lawsuit. We are somewhat sidetracked right now on that. It is the nature of the thing.

My amendment passed this Congress 224 to 201. That is not nothing. That is restoring the rule of law and the Constitution immigration policy after it has been violated by the President of the United States. We sent that out of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker. We set it on HARRY REID's desk, and there it likely went into his

drawer and he took no action on it. So it is not that the House isn't doing anything, it is that the Senate did something really illogical: the Gang of Eight's bill for instantaneous, perpetual, and retroactive amnesty.

And then we have the number three-ranking Democrat in the Senate trying to taunt the Speaker of the House into doing something equally as foolish: bring amnesty to the floor of the House. This place would blow up and the American people would arrive here in short order because they love the rule of law. Not only natural born Americans, not only naturalized Americans, green card holders that come here to achieve the American Dream. That means from any country they came from and every country they came from, those who came here to love America and respect and appreciate the American Dream.

But what is happening is it is being eroded by destruction of the rule of law for political motivation on the part of people like Barack Obama, HARRY REID, CHUCK SCHUMER, and DICK DURBIN.

There is another quote here by CHUCK SCHUMER that says:

Enough is enough. We will not let our party be hijacked by extremists whose xenophobia causes them to prefer maintaining a broken system over achieving a tough, fair, and practical long-term solution.

Xenophobia. I had to look that up when we came to this Congress. We don't use that in the streets where I come from, but I have known its definition for a long time: being afraid of something that you don't know. Well, I don't often get accused of being afraid of anything, so when I am I pay a little bit of attention to that.

I would say this. CHUCK SCHUMER is not like me. I am not afraid of him so it is not xenophobia. HARRY REID is not like me. I am not afraid of HARRY REID, so that is not xenophobia. DICK DURBIN is not like me. I am not afraid of him. That is not xenophobia. What xenophobia are they talking about, Mr. Speaker, is my question?

So if we are going to have some kind of a challenge of rhetoric bouncing back and forth between the House and the Senate, let's do it face to face, let's do it eye to eye. Let's have that duel, not like Aaron Burr and Alexander Hamilton—I would be the one standing on the high ground on that—but let's do it like real men do it today, not dueling pistols at 50 paces, let's do this with microphones within arm's reach, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we could get to the bottom of this and we could determine who exactly had the xenophobia.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that while debate may include policy criticisms of the President and Members of the Senate, it is not in order to engage in personalities toward those parties.

STOP THE FRANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time this afternoon.

I am sorry you are not going to get the benefit of the posters I brought down here with me because I am talking about a topic that is not one we bring up a lot in this Chamber. It is the use of the congressional frank.

I will wager that when you were elected to Congress, the only thing you knew about the frank is that perhaps you cursed it from time to time when it showed up in your mailbox. I brought a copy down here because I am sure there are going to be staff and folks back in the office who hadn't seen one before, folks walking around the office building today.

But the frank, the congressional frank—why they call it the frank I do not know—is that signature that you and I put up in the top right-hand corner of our envelopes so that we can send mail.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, if you have gone to town hall meetings where this hasn't come up, I would be interested to know. Because on that list of congressional perks—and you know the ones I am talking about, ones like you get free health care for life, which of course is not true, ones like if you serve one term in Congress you get a free pension for life, also not true—but among those perks is the free mail perk, the congressional frank. It drives me crazy, Mr. Speaker, it drives my constituents crazy, and we have the power to fix it here in this Chamber. I want to stop the frank.

Now, folks might say if you want to stop the frank, why not just stop using the frank. Fair enough. It is because the law requires us to use it. I am going get to that later, Mr. Speaker, because I will bet you have not seen that code section before.

Here is an article from Bloomberg, Mr. Speaker, lest you think this is something that you and I just hear at town hall meetings. This is something that is out, and you see it in newspaper after newspaper after newspaper. A headline—this is two summers ago, Bloomberg: "Lawmakers Intent on Dictating How the U.S. Postal Service Cuts Billions From Its Spending Are Among Those Helping Themselves to a Favorite Congressional Perk: Free Mail."

I want to be clear: there is no free mail, there is no free mail in the United States Congress today. This frank that I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, every time you sign your name to the top of a letter you are paying the full freight on that letter. You are absolutely going to pay for it when it hits the Postal Service. Sometimes it is on the honor system that you are reporting it, sometimes the mail house here at the Capitol is counting it. There is no free mail.

But even a group as reputable as Bloomberg believes that there is. I

know with certainty, because I hear it from my folks back home, our constituents believe that there is. In this time where trust is the commodity that is in the tightest supply in this town, we must do those things to restore trust with men and women back home. We must end this favorite of congressional perks.

Now, this is Bloomberg 2012, Mr. Speaker. I don't want you to think this is something that we have just started talking about. You can't see it from where you sit. But I also brought The New York Times from March of 1875. That is right. March of 1875, The New York Times is chronicling a vote that was taken right here in the U.S. House of Representatives. Well, not right here in this building on this floor. It was taken through those doors and into the next Chamber. But it says this. It says:

By a vote of 113 to 65, the House concurred in the Senate amendment of the postal appropriations bill to restore the franking privilege.

Now, the franking privilege, this signing of your name on a letter, it came from England, and it came in the early days of the Postal Service, where maybe you had an important governmental responsibility, maybe you needed to communicate with folks on the other side of the country and there was no local post office close by. You could be living out on the frontier, you could be far away, you just might not have had a coin in your pocket. So it allowed in the name of government efficiency for Members of Congress to sign their name at the top of a letter and drop that into the postal stream.

□ 1430

I promise you there is not a man or a woman who serves in Congress today who does not know where his local post office is. There is not a man or woman who serves in Congress today who struggles to get over to the grocery store where there are stamps for sale.

We do not need to be able to sign our names at the top of an envelope today to get it done, but in 1875, after Congress had abolished the frank, in the name of abolishing congressional perks, the Senate passed a bill to bring it back into being. The House concurred.

The New York Times says this:

So far as our observation goes, there has never been any demand for the restoration of the franking nuisance, except on the part of Congressmen.

I want you to think about this. Where does this sense that Congress gets free mail privileges come from, Mr. Speaker? It comes from the fact that, once upon a time, Congress actually got free mail privileges.

Again, the Postal Service was in its infancy, and in order to conduct the people's business, the franking privilege was adopted from what folks had seen at play in England, but in 1875, Congress was still trying to grapple with the distrust that the franking privilege created amongst its constituencies.

The New York Times, March 1875:

So far as our observation goes, there has never been any demand for the restoration of the franking nuisance, except on the part of Congressmen.

Mr. Speaker, what I hope you will help me carry to our colleagues is that we no longer need that franking nuisance.

There will be men and women in this Chamber who will say: ROB, what is the big deal? Don't we have bigger problems to struggle with?

Of course we do, but this one is easy for us to fix. There are those men and women out there who believe that there is a congressional perk that exists in this Chamber—at a time of record budget deficits—that no other American has access to, and we can abolish it with the stroke of our pen right here in the House.

This is something that has plagued me and my conscience in a way that I just wanted to stop using it. I just wanted to start buying stamps. I want you to think about the micromanagement in this institution, Mr. Speaker.

My plan—my radical plan—was that I was going to buy a stamp and send a letter. Whoa. Lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, it turns out that that is against the rules. I have a copy here of the Members' Congressional Handbook from this Congress.

It says:

Postal expenses can be incurred only when the frank is insufficient.

That means, for the whole code section that tells you what the frank can be used for, only if you are outside of that code section can you put a stamp on.

I have highlighted it here, Mr. Speaker:

Postage may not be used in lieu of the frank.

Here it is, Mr. Speaker, in large print, with my name at the top of a letter. It embarrasses me every time it goes out the door because I know, even when I am doing the people's business—which I am doing with each and every letter that goes out the door in responding to constituents' concerns and in answering constituents' questions—that folks do not feel served on the other end.

They feel reminded that, perhaps, there is one set of rules for Congress and one set of rules for everybody else, but the rules that we have agreed to live by in this body prohibit me from buying a stamp and sending that letter out instead.

The good news, Mr. Speaker, is that it turns out, when the law is not written the way the law ought to be written, my constituents have empowered me with a voting card with which to change it.

I have partnered with my friend, TAMMY DUCKWORTH from Illinois, a Democrat on the other side of the aisle; and, together, we are going to stop the frank. We are going to abolish this so-called congressional perk—this free mailing privilege, this bane and stain

in this Chamber—that folks have been fighting to get rid of for over 100 years. We are going to do it.

I am not optimistic enough to believe that this can be done alone. That is why I have a fantastic partner on the Democratic side of the aisle, and that is why she and I, together, are going to those groups around this town who care about congressional accountability in order to make them our partners in this effort. I have quotes from two of them.

If you sit on the right-hand side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, the National Taxpayers Union is certainly a group that you know and respect. Their appeal is certainly bipartisan, but I know it has credibility on the right.

The National Taxpayers Union says this:

Repealing the so-called "franking privilege" is a fair and simple reform that will introduce pay-as-you-go budgeting to one of the most basic units of government—the congressional office. Check there "on board."

Now, if you are on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, I know Public Citizen is a bipartisan group. They speak to folks on both sides of the aisle, and public integrity is their mission.

Public Citizen says this:

Public Citizen heartily supports the Woodall-Duckworth legislation to rein in the abuse of taxpayer-funded frank mail for Members of Congress, and it applauds your work of making this commonsense legislation come from across party lines.

We can do this.

Here is my frustration as a 3-year Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I know it is your frustration, too. You can't do the big things without each other, and it is tough to find one another when you haven't been able to do the little things together that build the trust.

Trust is the commodity that is missing. It is not just missing between our constituents and this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, you know it is often missing within this Chamber. We must seize upon opportunities, big and small, to come together to do those things that we know are the right things to do.

I will say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker—because I know there are going to be folks back in their offices who are watching and who are saying: Hey, wait a minute. Don't we have a whole list of rules about the dos and don'ts of sending mail from a congressional office?

We do. Those rules and regulations are housed in what is called the Franking Commission today, which is actually the Committee on Mailing Standards.

I don't propose to abolish a single one of those. Those rules, for folks who don't know, are designed to prevent people from campaigning on the taxpayer dime out of their official offices.

Now, there are folks in this Chamber who might like to abolish those rules, too. That is not my fight. The stand-

ards that prevent Members from abusing the mail in their offices, that prevent them from campaigning out of their offices—all of those standards to try to make sure that taxpayer dollars are being targeted only at those taxpayer-required needs—will remain in place.

This, this signature at the top of a letter, suggests to every American that, somehow, when you get elected to Congress, the rules no longer apply to you, big rules and small rules, like licking a stamp. Now, you don't even have to lick the stamps anymore. You can just peel them off—they are self-stick now—and stick them right on.

We can do this. There is a low opinion that folks often hold of Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, but I believe we can buy stamps and stick them on letters. I believe that we can—but wait. There is nothing in what I propose that requires you to lick your own stamps or to even stick on your own stamps.

If you want to get a postal permit device like every business in America has, by golly, run your office like a business. If we want to change the rules, so that we use the penalty mail system, which is what the executive branch uses—what the White House would use, what the IRS would use, what the Justice Department would use, which is the same as a postage-paid marker from a business, except that it is a postage-paid marker from a government—fair game.

We are the only folks who run the show this way, and it is time for that to stop.

I don't think folks understand how far it goes. The franking privilege exists in statute. If I were to pass on my franking privilege, Mr. Speaker, it goes to my wife. Did you know that, if Members of Congress were to pass on, suddenly, their spouses would be allowed to start signing their names to letters and dropping them into the postal stream? Why is that? Why is this something that I can deed on after my demise? In fact, why is it something that exists at all?

The answer is, once upon a time, it was difficult to find a stamp. Can't we agree that those days are behind us?

Public Citizen can agree, and the National Taxpayers Union can agree, and TAMMY DUCKWORTH from Illinois can agree, and ROB WOODALL from Georgia can agree. I know this is something that we can do together.

Mr. Speaker, I don't claim that this is going to be the proposal that saves the world. It is not; yet, for every taxpayer who opens up the newspaper every day and does not find news about how his taxpayer dollars are being invested transformatively in the lives of children, invested transformatively for men and women harmed in the defense of this Nation, but instead, opens up the newspaper and finds story after story of waste, of fraud and of abuse, our role here in this Chamber is to root that out and to stop it wherever we may find it.

Don't you believe, before we can help someone else clean up his house, we must clean up our own house?

Mr. Speaker, I encourage you to visit my Web page—which is woodall.house.gov/stopthefrank—because if you and I don't push this amongst our colleagues, it is not going to rise to the level of action. It is just something that we can do. We can do it. We can do it right away. There is no need to delay. We can begin restoring faith one bit at a time.

Let's restore faith with this today, with another bill tomorrow and with another bill the day after that, and one of these days, we might find that the American people have trust and confidence in their Congress again. It wasn't true in 1875, and it may be optimistic to believe it could be true in 2015, but I am certain of this: if we know that we have opportunities and if we fail to seize those opportunities, we will never earn and, I dare say, deserve the trust of our constituencies back home.

Mr. Speaker, send any of your constituents who are interested to woodall.house.gov/stopthefrank, and in fact, encourage the folks that you see and interact with from other parts of the country to visit Stop the Frank. Then encourage their Congressmen and their Congresswomen to be a part of this effort.

This does not have to be a partisan issue because it is not a partisan issue. This does not have to be a wait-and-see issue because it is an issue we have been looking at for more than 100 years.

What this can be is a get-it-done-together issue that, again, with one small step at a time, begins to earn the trust of the American people that I know each and every Member of this Chamber wants to earn.

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

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. 2086. An act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 23, 2014, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5749. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5750. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the semiannual report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period October 1, 2014 through March 31, 2014; (H. Doc. No. 113—116); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

5751. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD236) received May 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5752. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 120814338-2711-02] (RIN: 0648-BE10) received May 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5753. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Vermilion Snapper [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XD173) received May 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5754. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD182) received May 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5755. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 130214139-3542-02] (RIN: 0648-XD222) received May 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5756. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Akadama Fireworks Display, Richmond Inner Harbor, Richmond, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0133] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5757. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Lake Havasu Gran Prix; Lake Havasu, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0177] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5758. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pago Pago Harbor, American Samoa [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5759. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Recurring Events in Northern New England [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0904] (RIN: 1625-AA08; AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5760. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Tred Avon River; Between Bellevue, MD and Oxford, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1059] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5761. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Eighth Coast Guard District Annual and Recurring Marine Events Update [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1061] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5762. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Revolution 3 Triathlon, Lake Erie, Sandusky Bay, Sandusky, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0730] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5763. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Barnegat Inlet; Barnegat Light, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0145] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5764. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, Rotary Club of Fort Lauderdale New River Raft Race, New River; Fort Lauderdale, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0001] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5765. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Great Egg Harbor Bay, (Ship Channel and Beach Thorofare NJICW), Somers Point and Ocean City, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0121] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5766. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Broad Creek, Laurel, DE [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0778] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5767. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Bat Mitzvah Celebration Fireworks Display; Joshua Cove; Guilford, CT [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0158] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5768. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Military Munitions Recovery, Raritan River, Raritan, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2012-1045] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5769. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Texas City Channel, Texas City, TX [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0034] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received May 5, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CHU, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BASS, Mr. ENYART, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FARR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4714. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish requirements for preferred banking arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4715. A bill to rescind unused earmarks provided for the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. DAINES):

H.R. 4716. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide certain Western States assistance in the development of statewide conservation and management plans for the protection and recovery of sage grouse species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NUNES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REED, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GIBBS, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 4717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent and expand the temporary minimum credit rate for the low-income housing tax credit program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. REED, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. NUNES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 4718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 4719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 4720. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the priority for enrollment of medal of honor recipients in the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage charitable contributions of real property for conservation purposes by Native Corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 4722. A bill to clarify that for purposes of all Federal laws governing marine fisheries management, the landward boundary of the exclusive economic zone between areas south of Montauk, New York, and Point Judith, Rhode Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4723. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize aliens who have been granted deferred action and work authorization under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program of the Department of Homeland Security and who otherwise satisfy the requirements for admission to a military service academy to be appointed to and attend a military service academy and, upon graduation, to be appointed as a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4724. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (popularly referred to as the Buy American Act) and certain other laws with respect to certain waivers under those laws, to provide greater transparency regarding exceptions to domestic sourcing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 4725. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that all veterans are eligible to participate in hospice care programs of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4726. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish an innovation in surface transportation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 4727. A bill to enhance interstate commerce by creating a National Hiring Standard for Motor Carriers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. FINCHER (for himself and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 4728. A bill to direct the Office of the Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and the Comptroller General of the United States to study the impact of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, and Appropriations, 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. GRAYSON (for himself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 4729. A bill to require debarment of persons convicted of fraudulent use of "Made in America" labels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4730. A bill to allow the return of personal property to victims of sexual assault incidents involving a member of the Armed Forces upon completion of proceedings related to the incident; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H.R. 4731. A bill to help individuals receiving assistance under means-tested welfare programs obtain self-sufficiency, to provide information on total spending on means-tested welfare programs, to provide an overall spending limit on means-tested welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the

Budget, Rules, Energy and Commerce, 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. KILMER (for himself, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 4732. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to ocean acidification; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4733. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase, expand, and extend the credit for hydrogen-related alternative fuel vehicle refueling property and to increase the investment credit for more efficient fuel cells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4734. A bill to repeal the authority of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to restrict mandatory pre-dispute arbitration; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 4735. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for a temporary shift in the scheduled collection of the transitional reinsurance program payments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 4736. A bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 4737. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to grant to States on the Gulf of Mexico jurisdiction over fisheries out to 9 nautical miles from shore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4738. A bill to ensure the safety of DOT-111 tank cars by improving standards for new tank cars and upgrading existing tank cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 4739. A bill to provide assistance to communities affected by total maximum daily loads established by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the depreciation recovery period for energy-efficient cool roof systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 4741. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the amount of monthly dependency and indemnity compensation payable to surviving spouses by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 593. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that in order to better understand water availability, sustainability, and security at a national scale, the United States should prioritize the assessment of the quality and quantity of surface water and groundwater resources, and produce a national water census with the same sense of urgency that was incorporated in the "Man on the Moon" project to address the inevitable challenges of "Peak Water"; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H. Res. 594. A resolution recognizing Older Americans Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BASS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Res. 595. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of May 23 as the "International Day to End Obstetric Fistula" to significantly raise awareness and intensify actions towards ending obstetric fistula; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COOK, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H. Res. 596. A resolution recognizing the Khmer and Lao/Hmong Freedom Fighters of Cambodia and Laos for supporting and defending the United States Armed Forces during the conflict in Southeast Asia and for their continued support and defense of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 4717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 4716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution:

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. TIBERI:

H.R. 4717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7 and Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7 and Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 14 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States; the authority to raise and support an army, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 4722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 4724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 4725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 4727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 4728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JORDAN:

H.R. 4731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 4734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 4735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 4736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 4737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) Article I Section 8—The Commerce Clause, granting Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several States;

(2) Article I, Section 8—The Necessary and Proper Clause, granting Congress the power to make all laws which are necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers vested by the Constitution of the United States; and

(3) Article IV, Section 3—The Federal Property Power Clause, granting Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 4738.

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 make

rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 4741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 164: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 303: Ms. DELAUNO.

H.R. 494: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 508: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 713: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 942: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 961: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1009: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1020: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1146: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1150: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1180: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1201: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1250: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 1254: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1274: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1502: Mr. ISSA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WOODALL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1507: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1563: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1732: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1771: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1801: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1851: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1920: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 2028: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2156: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2429: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 2500: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2692: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2772: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2807: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2825: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2827: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2841: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2852: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2870: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2959: Mr. UPTON and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 3022: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3116: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3279: Mr. AMASH and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 3377: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 3471: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3662: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 3676: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 3708: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 3717: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3836: Mr. WALZ, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CARTER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 3978: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3991: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3992: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 4041: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 4069: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 4086: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 4106: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 4135: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 4156: Mr. SCHRADER and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4172: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 4190: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 4213: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 4216: Mr. HOLT, Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 4217: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4240: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4250: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4257: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 4262: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4295: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4315: Mr. JONES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 4325: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 4328: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4351: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 4352: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4365: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 4417: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 4426: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 4437: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 4450: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. COLE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 4491: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 4507: Mr. COBLE and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4544: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 4558: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 4577: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 4582: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 4590: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 4622: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 4628: Mr. NADLER, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. MENG, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 4629: Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 4630: Ms. DELAUNO.

H.R. 4631: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr.

HOLDING, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 4636: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4637: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 4644: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. SPEIER, Mr.

JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 4645: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 4653: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 4672: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 4698: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 4701: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 4712: Mr. HORSFORD.
 H. Con. Res. 97: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H. Res. 30: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H. Res. 109: Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H. Res. 153: Mr. COOK.
 H. Res. 204: Ms. DELBENE.
 H. Res. 283: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H. Res. 538: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. DENT.
 H. Res. 571: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H. Res. 572: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 587: Mr. STIVERS.