United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

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

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 24, 2014.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

LIEUTENANT DARRYN ANDREWS: AMERICAN WARRIOR AND TEXAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And that's just the way it is.

FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Printed on recycled paper.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH USA GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING

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

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

[June 19, 2014]

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

(By Carmen Fowler LaBerge)

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

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

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

In the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus says:

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

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

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

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

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

PRESBYTERIANS JOIN THE ANTI-ISRAEL CHOIR

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

(By Jonathan Marks)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 2014]

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

(By Anthony Faiola)

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

Then come the Jew jokes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But it is also far more complex.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Enter Dieudonné.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INCREASING SEA LEVELS

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ENERGY

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

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

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

Unfortunately, the Obama administration's policies are contributing to

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

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

CELEBRATING IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AFGHANISTAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 IN 1—DEL RIO, TEXAS

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1030

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BOKO HARAM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECESS

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

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

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

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

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

PRESIDENT OBAMA MUST BRING OUR MARINE HOME

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

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

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

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

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

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

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

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

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

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

WRONG SIGNAL ON IMMIGRATION

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

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

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

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

JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

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

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

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

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

KOREAN WAR VETERANS LUNCH

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

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

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

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

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

1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM BY THE SENATE

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

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

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

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

BORDER CRISIS

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

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

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

News reports stated:

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

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

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

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT DICK SHIGEMI HAMADA

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

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

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

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

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

WE NEED TO SECURE OUR BORDER

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

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

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

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

□ 1215

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE WORKERS OF WARREN MILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

GI BILL ANNIVERSARY

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING MABON ''TEENIE'' HODGES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOGNIZING JUDGE JOHN WILSON OF TENNESSEE'S FIRST DISTRICT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OUTSTANDING ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TEXAS IMMIGRATION CRISIS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

President Kennedy once said:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As the scriptures tell us in John 15:13:

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

CHILDREN AT AMERICA'S BORDER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 636

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 3301—NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

''would circumvent longstanding and proven processes.''

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 1 minute.

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 341]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—184

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

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

NOT VOTING—28

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

□ 1347

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—221

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

NOES—186

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

NOT VOTING—24

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

□ 1355

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

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUSTOMER PROTECTION AND END USER RELIEF ACT

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

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

□ 1352

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

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

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. WATERS of California.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—163

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

NOES—249

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

NOT VOTING—19

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1401

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—168

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

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

NOES—242

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

NOT VOTING—21

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1405

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 345]

AYES—173

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

NOES—239

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

NOT VOTING—19

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

Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1409

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—177

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

NOES—233

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

NOT VOTING—21

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1412

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—252

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

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

NOES—158

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

NOT VOTING—21

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1417

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Page 10, after line 12, insert the following:

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

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

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

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

Page 52, after line 14, insert the following:

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

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

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

Page 54, after line 3, insert the following:

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—191

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

NOES—220

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

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

NOT VOTING—20

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

□ 1433

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—265

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

NOES—144

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

NOT VOTING—22

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

□ 1440

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

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

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

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1443

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

□ 1445

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you again for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. TERRY. I appreciate all of that.

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

□ 1500

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

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

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

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1515

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1530

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the American people that, certainly, energy is vitally important, and that is why we have introduced this bill, and that is why we brought this bill to the floor.

Because when you talk about creating jobs and stimulating the economy, you have to have low-cost, affordable, abundant, and reliable energy, or you cannot compete in the global marketplace.

As I had said earlier, I just want to reiterate, once again, that this bill does nothing but make the decision that we are going to treat oil pipelines, natural gas pipelines, and transmission lines all the same.

Right now, a natural gas pipeline that crosses an international boundary does not require a Presidential permit, but an oil pipeline and a transmission line to bring electricity across the border does require a Presidential permit.

As many speakers have said today, that Presidential permit or authority was not granted by the Congress; it was taken by executive orders. So all we are doing is saying that we are going to treat all of them the same.

Now, some people are saying that: well, you are eliminating the need for NEPA, you are not allowing NEPA review.

I had pointed out that there are 33 environmental laws that all of these pipelines or transmission lines would be subject to, and any Federal action, like crossing a stream that would create a necessity for a Clean Water Act permit, could very well generate a need for a NEPA review.

Nothing in this bill would limit the application of NEPA to the rest of the project. It would certainly apply to the cross border, but it would not limit application to the rest of the project.

So if a project required a right-of-way across Federal lands, the NEPA review would be initiated. Nothing in the bill would exempt the project from requiring applicable Clean Water Act permits, clean air permits, endangered species permits, or any other Federal permit.

So I would respectfully request the Members to support this commonsense bill. It would bring certainty to entities that are trying to bring more energy to America by treating gas pipelines the same as oil pipelines, the same as a transmission line.

In concluding, I would just like to say this: nothing in the bill creates a Federal right of eminent domain or supersedes a State's exercise of eminent domain authority.

In concluding, I would just like to say that, while the gentleman from California and I are on opposite sides of this issue—and a lot of issues—he has been a real leader in the U.S. Congress.

He announced earlier that he is not going to be seeking reelection, but the gentleman from California, HENRY WAXMAN, has been a leader in the U.S. Congress and recognized so throughout the country.

Even though he is going to be with us for 6 or 7 more months until the end of the year, I did want to acknowledge that he is recognized as a congressional leader, with great empathy and commitment to his views, although sometimes we disagree with his views.

With that, I urge the adoption of H.R. 3301 and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 3301, the North American Energy Infrastructure Act, of which I am a cosponsor. This legislation will ensure that transnational pipeline construction permits are considered on their merits instead of politics. Importantly, it is a substantive step towards more affordable energy prices. People are hurting, Mr. Chair. According to the American Automobile Association's daily fuel guage report, today's average gas price in the Tampa Bay market: $3.64, well up from $2.35 per gallon in 2009. Not only are gas prices up, but so too are the price of groceries and costs of heating and cooling your home or apartment. Domestic energy production helps Americans with their everyday costs. This is the bottom line. H.R. 3301 will aid in that effort. Support this bill and help lower energy costs for all Americans. I yield back.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–49. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3301

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''North American Energy Infrastructure Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDING.

Congress finds that the United States should establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process for the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of oil and natural gas pipelines and electric transmission facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity to and from Canada and Mexico, in pursuit of a more secure and efficient North American energy market.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT THE NATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c) and section 7, no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment under this section.

(b) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a cross-border segment for which a request is received under this section, the relevant official identified under paragraph (2), in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment unless the relevant official finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the cross-border segment is not in the public interest of the United States.

(2) RELEVANT OFFICIAL.—The relevant official referred to in paragraph (1) is—

(A) the Secretary of State with respect to oil pipelines; and

(B) the Secretary of Energy with respect to electric transmission facilities.

(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing for the request under paragraph (1), that the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(A) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(B) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the cross-border segment of the electric transmission facility.

(c) EXCLUSIONS.—This section shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment of an oil pipeline or electric transmission facility for the import or export of oil or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico—

(1) if the cross-border segment is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) if a permit described in section 6 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued;

(3) if a certificate of crossing for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has previously been issued under this section; or

(4) if an application for a permit described in section 6 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(A) the date on which such application is denied; or

(B) July 1, 2016.

(d) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(1) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this section or section 7 shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a cross-border segment is sought under this section.

(2) NATURAL GAS ACT.—Nothing in this section or section 7 shall affect the requirement to obtain approval or authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act for the siting, construction, or operation of any facility to import or export natural gas.

(3) ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT.—Nothing in this section or section 7 shall affect the authority of the President under section 103(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

SEC. 4. IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''No order is required under subsection (a) to authorize the export or import of any natural gas to or from Canada or Mexico.''.

SEC. 5. TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is amended by striking ''insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission's powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)''.

(2) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a–4(b)) is amended by striking ''the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.''.

SEC. 6. NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.

No Presidential permit (or similar permit) required under Executive Order 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), section 301 of title 3, United States Code, Executive Order 12038, Executive Order 10485, or any other Executive Order shall be necessary for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any cross-border segment thereof.

SEC. 7. MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.

No certificate of crossing under section 3, or permit described in section 6, shall be required for a modification to the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility—

(1) that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the transmission of electricity to or from Canada or Mexico as of the date of enactment of the Act;

(2) for which a permit described in section 6 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued; or

(3) for which a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment of the pipeline or facility has previously been issued under section 3.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Sections 3 through 7, and the amendments made by such sections, shall take effect on July 1, 2015.

(b) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official described in section 3(b)(2) shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of section 3; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of section 3.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''cross-border segment'' means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located at the national boundary of the United States with either Canada or Mexico;

(2) the term ''modification'' includes a reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, volume expansion, downstream or upstream interconnection, or adjustment to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations);

(3) the term ''natural gas'' has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a);

(4) the term ''oil'' means petroleum or a petroleum product;

(5) the terms ''Electric Reliability Organization'' and ''regional entity'' have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o); and

(6) the terms ''Independent System Operator'' and ''Regional Transmission Organization'' have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 113–492. Each such amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–476.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 18, strike ''a cross-border segment of''.

Page 2, beginning on line 3, strike ''a certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approval of''.

Page 2, line 5, strike ''the cross-border segment'' and insert ''the pipeline or facility''.

Page 2, line 6, strike ''CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING'' and insert ''APPROVAL''.

Page 2, line 10, strike ''cross-border segment'' and insert ''project''.

Page 2, beginning on line 14, strike ''issue a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment'' and insert ''approve such project''.

Page 2, line 17, strike ''of the cross-border segment''.

Page 3, line 3, strike ''a certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approval of''.

Page 3, beginning on line 4, strike ''a cross-border segment of''.

Page 3, line 7, strike ''issuing the certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approving''.

Page 3, beginning on line 8, strike ''the cross-border segment of''.

Page 3, beginning on line 16, strike ''the cross-border segment of''.

Page 3, beginning on line 20, strike ''a cross-border segment of''.

Page 4, line 1, strike ''cross-border segment'' and insert ''pipeline or facility''.

Page 4, line 7, strike ''a certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approval of''.

Page 4, line 21, strike ''a certificate of crossing for'' and insert ''approval of''.

Page 4, beginning on line 22, strike ''of a cross-border segment''.

Page 6, line 24, strike '', or any cross-border segment thereof''.

Page 7, line 2, strike ''certificate of crossing'' and insert ''approval''.

Page 7, beginning on line 14, strike ''a certificate of crossing for the cross-border segment'' and insert ''approval''.

Page 8, strike lines 7 through 11.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 629, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment ensures that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to full environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

NEPA was created to provide transparency so people would know what the impact of a project will be on their communities. However, H.R. 3301 will circumvent that transparency, making our lands vulnerable to spills, leaks, and other pipeline hazards, and this is why I have introduced this amendment, which will make certain proper diligence is given to protect the public's interests.

By ensuring a Federal NEPA review is conducted for the entire length of all cross-border projects, we can guarantee all proposals will get the full scope of review necessary to preserve our tremendous natural resources.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3301 makes an end run around NEPA. The bill redefines and significantly narrows the scope of NEPA's environmental review. While traditional NEPA review looks at the impacts of an entire project, this bill restricts NEPA review to only that portion of a project that physically crosses the border, and this restriction doesn't make any sense.

These massive projects are more than just a border crossing. When we approve transboundary pipeline or transmission line, we are approving a multibillion dollar infrastructure that may stretch hundreds of miles and will last for decades.

These projects pass through private property and sensitive lands and over aquifers. They transport hazardous substances that, if spilled or ignited, can cause serious damage.

Before making decisions about whether to approve such projects, we need to carefully consider their potential impacts on environment and on communities along their routes. Simply put, we should be looking at the effects of projects as a whole.

That is not what the bill before us does. Instead, it redefines the scope of NEPA's inquiry to only encompass the step across the border, and this is a nonsensical approach. It makes the process of environmental review essentially meaningless.

When Congress passed NEPA, it never intended this law to provide such a narrow review. Congress intended NEPA to provide policymakers with a critical tool to understand a project's full environmental impacts and consider lower-impact alternatives.

NEPA doesn't dictate the outcome or impose any constraint on projects. It simply requires the Federal Government to make some effort to understand the environmental impacts of major Federal actions and to inform the public of those impacts.

We should not be carelessly narrowing or creating loopholes in this law. When the Federal Government makes a decision about a major project, it should understand what it is doing.

As we have seen with Keystone XL, large energy projects often raise safety issues, economic implications, and environmental concerns, both for the local and global environments.

These projects affect communities all along their routes. It is simply common sense that we should understand the broad scope of these impacts before deciding to approve a project.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today prevents this review, which is why I urge all of my colleagues to support this important amendment that ensures that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to a full NEPA review.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

While I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), his amendment would, in effect, codify the Presidential permit not only for oil pipelines and transmission lines, but also for natural gas pipelines, which are now exempt from the Presidential permit. So he is going in the wrong direction, and would make it even more difficult.

As I said earlier, NEPA would apply anytime Federal action is triggered, and there are 33 different environmental laws that can trigger Federal action. So I am very much opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me. As ranking member on the Health Subcommittee, I, too, am hesitant to rise and oppose your amendment. What the amendment would do is it would ensure that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to full environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act.

The bill already guarantees that review at the national boundary based with the Department of Energy.

Existing Federal and State law guarantees an environmental review on the complete length of the project.

Current Federal laws that trigger NEPA reviews in addition to H.R. 3301 include the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Mineral Leasing Act, the Rivers and Harbors Act, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination for Fish and Wildlife Service consultation, the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, the Wilderness Act, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

The intent of this bill is not to eliminate any of the NEPA reviews within the continental United States. The problem we have right now is the Department of State is making a decision that really ought to be Federal agencies and even State governments who would need that.

If this amendment was adopted, it would require a State Department or a Presidential permit, and then all of the other agencies, and so it would make it impossible.

The argument for this bill, if you are opposed to Keystone, then you are allowing literally a thousand-car train of crude oil to come across the border now without any of these reviews. A pipeline is inherently safer. That is why we need to bring that crude oil by pipeline from Canada to the gulf coast, where our refining capacity is.

The amendment would actually expand what is under current law. It would make it even harder. The goal of the legislation is to have this North American energy independence market, and we don't need to throw up more roadblocks to keep companies from importing or exporting to Canada or importing or exporting to Mexico, where we already have free trade agreements.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides, if it is a cross boundary with Canada or Mexico, you cannot have a NEPA review, an environmental review, except right around there, right around where the boundary is. Now, if you built a pipeline in the United States and it went a thousand miles, you would have a review of it. But they are saying just because it goes across the boundary for a thousand miles, let's say, there would be no review. Even though it crosses streams and aquifers, it would not get a real environmental review that would be required if it were solely domestic. That makes no sense.

I urge support for the Pallone amendment because it fixes a problem and preserves meaningful environmental reviews. That is what we need for these projects. It corrects that part of the bill which I think is a glaring, glaring loophole.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–492.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 3(c)(4) and insert the following:

(4) if an application for a permit described in section 6 for such construction, connection, operation, or maintenance, or for a substantially similar project, is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 636, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill's supporters claim that it is just about the approval process for cross-border energy projects. They say it is not about approving the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline because that is under review now. But, in fact, that is what this bill really does.

If the President determines that the Keystone XL pipeline is not in the national interest, this bill would allow TransCanada to reapply under this new process designed to rubberstamp permits, and Keystone XL would almost certainly be approved under that process.

This bill establishes a new permitting process which would ensure rapid approval, and not particularly a clear evaluation. The bill makes it very difficult for Federal agencies to do anything other than approve the proposed project for two reasons.

First, the new permitting process narrows the approval and environmental review. And, secondly, the bill establishes this rebuttable presumption of approval, meaning the Federal agency must approve the project unless it finds that the cross-border segment of the project is not in the public interest.

I think this bill, which I have called the ''Zombie Pipeline Act,'' is just for the Keystone XL pipeline. They keep on trying to push that thing and not let it go through the process by which it is still being evaluated. So I urge that we close this backdoor way to ensure Keystone XL itself is brought up again, and I would urge support for this amendment because this bill is not a proper way to deal with that particular project.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

Ranking Member WAXMAN's amendment excludes any project with a pending permit application from the new approval requirements in the bill. The bill does not deal with Keystone XL. The bill shall not apply if an application for a permit for construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending. That is what the bill does, H.R. 3301.

The bill does not apply until after July 1, 2016. We are in 2014 now. Keystone XL has been at the State Department and White House for at least 5 years, and are they going to wait another 2 years? Now, if they want to wait until July 1, 2016, they would have to refile and start all over. But this bill has nothing to do with the Keystone permit. They could stand in line like anyone else after July 1, 2016, stand in line and get their permit. I would assume we would have a number of them.

But let me first take some time, and I appreciate my colleague, Ranking Member WAXMAN. I have been on the Energy and Commerce Committee since 1997, and most of the time we agree, but we do represent individual districts. But I want to say that I appreciate Mr. WAXMAN's service. We have worked together on a lot of legislation in the committee and even on the floor, but, obviously, we have a disagreement on energy. That is why I think the amendment is not needed, because the bill already prohibits it from applying to any current permit in the law.

Again, Mr. WAXMAN, I thank you for your service. I will miss you because I enjoy our discussions.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all of the nice words, but let's recognize this amendment. We just heard the statement that this doesn't apply to the Keystone XL pipeline because that is pending, and the bill says it doesn't apply to any project with permit approval pending on the date of enactment. But that doesn't exclude them if they are denied from coming right back and getting rubberstamped under the easier process under this bill.

So if this is not about the Keystone XL pipeline, adopt this amendment which says that the Keystone XL pipeline may not come back as a zombie for approval later if it doesn't get approved under the existing process.

I am just trying to keep people honest. I still have got 6 months to do that, so don't say good-bye to me yet. While I am here, and even after I have left the Congress, I will continue to point out when things are said that just don't add up. It doesn't add up to say that this doesn't apply to the Keystone XL pipeline; it could, and in fact it is a backdoor way to do that. And one might suspect that that is the whole purpose of the legislation. I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that if we pass H.R. 3301, the Keystone pipeline is still caught up in the Presidential permitting process. And if we adopt the Waxman amendment, the Keystone pipeline

would never, ever be able to come back with a new application.

Since they filed an application in September of 2008, and despite the State Department saying that there is no negligible environmental impact by approving it, President Obama continues not to approve it. So if after 2016 the Keystone pipeline entity wants to submit a new application under the new law, they would certainly and should have a right to do that. That is the only reason we oppose the Waxman amendment. I urge that Members vote against the Waxman amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–492.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 3, insert ''minor'' before ''modification''.

Page 7, line 6, insert '', such as a change in ownership'' after ''fac

Page 8, strike lines 12 through 17.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 636, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the Welch-Pingree-Michaud-Kuster-Shay-Porter amendment, and I want to thank my colleagues from northern New England for cosponsoring this amendment with me.

H.R. 3301, as we have been hearing, exempts literally all modifications of cross-border pipelines from Federal approval and environmental review without any regard to the impacts on public health, safety, and the environment. My view: that is a terrible idea.

Some pipeline modifications, in fact, are truly minor and are unlikely to affect the environment or put public safety at risk. For example, if the pipeline is sold to a new owner, there is no need for a Federal review. So there is a place here for no review.

But many modifications could have just as much impact as a brand new pipeline, and there is no justification to exempt from consideration those issues that would be reviewed if it were a new pipeline.

□ 1600

The Portland Montreal Pipe Line reversal is an exact example of a pipeline modification that could have very significant impacts. Currently that pipeline carries light sweet crude from the U.S. to Canada, but a proposal in the works is to reverse that pipeline to carry tar sands oil from Canada, through New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine, to ports of Casco Bay, where it would be loaded on the ships for export. That has raised a lot of concerns in these States.

Any spill of tar sands crude is a very big deal, far worse than any other type of oil spill. Vermonters are concerned about reversing of the pipeline to transport those tar sands, that it would accelerate the development of the tar sands oil, which is the dirtiest and most carbon intensive in the universe.

Forty-two towns and municipalities in the State of Vermont have passed resolutions opposing this project. Concerned citizens deserve to have their voices heard. Under H.R. 3301, the pipeline owners could completely skip the process. I oppose this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I might say I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) on the committee, and he does great work in the area of efficiency and other areas relating to energy, but I do oppose this amendment.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for his comments on the amendment.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

I, too, understand where my colleague on the committee and Congressman WELCH—let me leave with you one of our examples. You include also pipeline name changes in here. I understand your issue is reversing the flow. I would be glad to work with you, but I have a company that has been waiting years. They bought a pipeline coming from Canada into the United States. They have waited years just for the State Department to change their name.

What really bothered me—and I have contacted the State Department—the State Department said: Oh, well, we are looking at it, but we know you are going to build a lateral from North Dakota into your U.S. part of the line, and we do evaluate that.

The State Department has no right to evaluate those pipelines. It is on our property in the United States. They have the cross-border. What we are seeing is expansion of State Department authority.

I agree that you have an issue and I would like to see if we could work with you on it, but it shouldn't take 3 years to change a name because another company bought it. And believe me, I think the State Department is trying to overreach by saying: By the way, we are going to evaluate what you are doing in the continental United States.

We already have Federal agencies—the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and a host of Federal agencies—that will evaluate that pipeline that is in our country. The State Department needs to take care of their business. That is what worries me about your amendment, so I ask for a ''no'' vote.

I would love to work with you, because I think if there is a reverse flow, I think somebody needs to look at it. I appreciate it. I still request a ''no'' vote.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine, Representative PINGREE.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you very much, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. Chair, I am very proud to sponsor this amendment, along with my colleagues from Vermont, New Hampshire, and my fellow Mainer, to exempt pipeline reversals from the provisions of this bill.

In my opinion, the way this bill is currently written, it is extremely irresponsible because it basically exempts cross-border pipeline projects from the National Environmental Policy Act and would reduce not only critical Federal reviews, but also limit the vital public input that NEPA brings. That would raise great concerns for the constituents in my district who have a lot that they want to say in the public input process.

The amendment scope is limited to pipeline reversals and would at least make it clear that the underlying bill's waivers do not apply to the so-called Portland Montreal Pipe Line and other pipeline reversals. The Portland Montreal Pipe Line proposal threatens the entire southern Maine watershed, where 15 percent of my State's population gets its drinking water.

Oversight by NEPA is essential for this pipeline and any other, and I strongly oppose any attempts to waive NEPA or other reviews for this project. That is why I am here, to urge all my colleagues who care about ensuring that there is strong oversight and environmental review to support this amendment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. First of all, ''minor'' is an undefined term that gives little certainty to agencies or industry. One of the things that we are trying to get away from is the uncertainty of a Presidential permit and be treated like natural gas pipelines. As I said, in H.R. 3301, we are trying to treat all of them exactly the same: transmission lines, oil pipelines, natural gas lines.

I would also say that, under the gentleman's amendment, any modifications, such as volume expansion, downstream or upstream interconnections, or adjustments to maintain flow, would potentially be required to obtain a Presidential permit for the modification, even if the original project already has one. Then even operational changes may be subject to a Presidential permit, and ownership changes would be.

So, for those reasons, as I said, I respectfully would oppose the gentleman's amendment and ask the Members to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, two things. I want to speak to the leader of our Energy and Commerce Committee, but also to the proponent of this bill, Mr. GREEN.

We can have too much regulation or we can have too little regulation, and they both have problems. Mr. GREEN talks about the hassle his company is having getting a name change. That is ridiculous. That company should be able to change its name and not have to go through the hassle of a permit. Then when the agency holds back and doesn't even give them an answer for 3 years, we have a problem, and I agree with that. Under my amendment, those issues like a name change would not be at all subject to the permitting process.

On the other hand, we in Vermont are concerned about a reversal of flow and having tar sands go through. It is a really big deal. Forty-two towns in my State passed resolutions saying that they wanted to have a say in this. It is known that spills happen, and tar sands bills are a much bigger deal than other kinds.

What we have in the legislation is not working together to find what is the balance or to try to move us towards a balance so there are not unnecessary burdens for a name change and simple things, but, on the other hand, we don't abolish the review process altogether.

This legislation doesn't seek that balance. What this legislation does is, in effect, abolish the review process, and that is a problem, so our going from too much review on a name change to no review on tar sands coming through Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine.

Our legislation, I think, is the only thing that is being considered that, in fact, offers a balance. If it is a name change, a minor deal, no permit required. If it is significant, then, yes, you are going to have to go through the review.

I want to thank the chairman and the Speaker and the body for its time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont will be postponed.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DOMESTIC PROSPERITY AND GLOBAL FREEDOM ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1610

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, America's natural gas output has been rising since 2006, and the Energy Information Administration expects the increases to continue for decades to come. As a result, we can meet domestic demand for affordable natural gas while also producing a surplus for export to our allies around the world. The only thing standing in the way is outdated Federal redtape that greatly delays the construction of LNG export facilities.

H.R. 6, the bill before us, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, is a targeted bill that cuts redtape and puts the Department of Energy on a reasonable deadline to act on LNG export applications.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, GENE GREEN from Texas, for his cosponsorship of this bipartisan bill, and I urge the support of every Member in this Chamber for H.R. 6.

According to the lead study conducted for the Department of Energy, natural gas exports would be a net benefit to the American economy. These exports would improve the balance of payments and support up to 45,000 jobs associated with additional natural gas production as well as the construction and operation of LNG export facilities by 2018. Needless to say, these new jobs could not come at a better time for our economy.

Remember the concerns many of us had over the U.S. economy hemorrhaging billions of dollars every year going overseas to pay for energy imports. Well, for natural gas, the roles can be reversed, and we could be the ones selling energy on the global market and bringing in billions of dollars in job-sustaining revenues.

The economic impacts alone make natural gas exports a winning policy, but the geopolitical impacts are an incredible benefit as well and have been ignored for far too long. Allies around the world have told us that they would greatly benefit from American LNG.

Last October, the Committee on Energy and Commerce held a forum that included ambassadors and other officials representing 11 U.S. allies, all of whom strongly urged us to enter the global LNG marketplace. Since then, several other allies have stepped forward with the same request. This includes our friends in eastern Europe unfortunate enough to be reliant on Russia for natural gas.

Not only do these nations face unfair pricing, but political pressure, as a result of their dependence on Russia. These nations believe that the very passage of this legislation, the signal that we are serious about LNG exports, would immediately reduce Russia's negotiating leverage even before the first molecule of LNG shipment actually goes out. H.R. 6 will start doing good the very day it is enacted.

I should note that our efforts on LNG exports began before the current crisis erupted in Ukraine. Russia's actions over the past several months demonstrate the importance of this bill, and Russia's recent decision to cut off supplies to Ukraine further underscore the need for America to provide Europe an alternative supply of natural gas. Indeed, we can effectively push back against Russia's aggression and help our friends without ever putting any troops in harm's way.

□ 1615

Beyond Europe, we can also strengthen our economic ties with allies in Asia, who would rather buy their energy from us than from less reliable Middle Eastern suppliers.

We can also assist nations in achieving their environmental goals by offering the option of clean-burning natural gas, and we can help many developing countries by providing them with an energy source that is cheaper than the choices available to them now.

The economic benefits alone—or the geopolitical benefits alone—make LNG exports a worthwhile policy; but taken together, they make it a no-brainer. Unfortunately, the decades-old Federal approval process for LNG export facilities is acting as an impediment.

Proposed projects have languished at DOE for years on end. While DOE has recently announced some changes to the process, the agency is still under no deadline to act.

The amendment that I am offering with Mr. GREEN changes that. It provides that, once the extensive environmental review conducted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act is complete for a project, the Department of Energy has a 30-day deadline to issue a final decision on the application pending before the agency.

It is a sensible and workable solution to the current regulatory bottleneck. It is an answer to a call from our allies for energy security.

It is time to help our friends abroad. It is time to create jobs here at home.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 6.

I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON, I am writing concerning H.R. 6, the ''Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act,'' which the Committee on Energy and Commerce reported on June 19, 2014.

As reported, H.R. 6 contains a section on judicial review, which is within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 6, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert is jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 6, the ''Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.'' As you noted, the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce contains a provision that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Specifically, subsection 2(b) provides for judicial review of U.S. Department of Energy orders and failures to issue a decision on applications for authorization to export natural gas.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo seeking a sequential referral on H.R. 6, and I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and you will have my support for any such request.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 6 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was going to talk about this bill, and I will, but I really want to talk about the inflation in the naming of these bills. This is a bill to allow a faster process for exporting natural gas to other countries.

So what is it called? The Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. What do you follow after that? Peace and prosperity in our time, whatever that may, in fact, involve. I just think this bill is overrated in its title. I also want to say it is overrated in what it does.

There are 17 or 18 free trade countries, and they can have the export of natural gas to them right away. They are free trade countries that have an agreement with us. There is no problem in getting the approval for them. The question is: Are we going to approve export of natural gas to non-free trade countries?

The premise of this bill is that we are not doing enough to export natural gas to them or anyone else, I guess. Congressman GARDNER's bill would change the approval process for liquefied natural gas exports, presumably because the Department of Energy is moving too slowly, because they can approve an application now for export anywhere around the world.

In fact, DOE has moved—quite properly, it seems to me—to authorize these LNG exports. They have already approved seven export proposals, and they are continuing to evaluate additional applications.

What these approvals that we have already granted—had granted—the U.S. is poised to transform into the world's second largest exporter of LNG in the world, just behind Qatar. If they approve one more application, we would go from exporting no LNG today to being the largest exporter in the world in just a few years.

So why do we need this legislation? Certainly not to get domestic prosperity and global freedom because this bill doesn't accomplish either goal.

Currently, the Department of Energy goes through a process, and they perform a public interest determination when reviewing export applications, so they can carefully consider the effect of LNG exports on natural gas prices here and the impact of higher prices here on American consumers and these manufacturers that are benefiting from the lower price that they have seen for LNG here.

The public interest determination provides DOE an opportunity to examine a number of factors: energy security, geopolitical, and environmental considerations.

If we would have this bill adopted, it would short circuit this established review process for pending and future LNG export applications. The bill establishes a new deadline for DOE to decide on applications within 90 days of the close of the public comment period or enactment of the bill, whichever comes later.

That is a deadline that is established, so they are forcing the DOE to act, but if DOE looks at an application and they don't feel that they are ready to make a decision in that period of time, they are more likely than not to just turn it down. That doesn't seem to be a worthwhile goal, if we want to have more export of LNG.

This provision would require DOE simultaneously to review and make a decision on all the pending applications within 90 days. It is not realistic, and it certainly isn't responsible.

With few exceptions, environmental reviews haven't been completed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for any of these applications, so the deadline would force DOE to rush its review of each application and make its final decision without a final environmental review.

The other thing I want to comment on is all those ambassadors that told us they want this bill—because of the hold that Russia has over them—they might not even benefit if this bill were adopted because they are not free trade countries.

So there has to be an approval of an export for LNG to a non-free trade country. There is not an approval through the Department of Energy to any particular country. It simply approves the request of a company here to export the LNG.

Under our capitalist system, a business usually seeks the highest reward for its investment. The export of LNG to a non-free trade country is going to be better rewarded in Asia than it will be in Ukraine or in Eastern Europe, where they are so concerned, rightfully so, about what Russia is going to do. It

may not even help those countries, as so many of these ambassadors hoped it will.

I would say that this bill is not going to get us to export LNG any faster. Nothing in the bill affects the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's permitting of the actual LNG export terminals.

Rushing the DOE review is not going to speed up the construction of these projects. We need the construction of the infrastructure for the export of natural gas.

The last thing I want to say is there are some controversies about exporting LNG, not exporting it at all, but opening it up to export in a process where the export will be wide open.

A lot of manufacturers in this country are worried that, if we are exporting our LNG, that is going to raise the price of natural gas here at home. Well, of course it will. It will go to a lower price of LNG here at home to eventually a world price, if it could be freely exported around the world the way we have for oil. If that happens, they are afraid that this boom we have seen in manufacturing in the United States may be curtailed.

So it is not without controversy that people are looking at this legislation. In other words, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, if you lose your job because the price of natural gas goes up and you are working for a manufacturer that is benefiting from a lower price for natural gas here in the United States, they are not going to look at this as a bill that leads to domestic prosperity and global freedom, as the authors of this bill would have us believe.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that nothing in this bill changes the requirements of a NEPA analysis to be completed.

I share your frustration with the titles of bill names—the bill titles. Imagine our consternation over the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this bill to the floor.

I wholeheartedly support H.R. 6 for a number of reasons. I also want to address some of the issues that the gentleman from the other side raised.

First of all, let's consider international trade is the key to growth, it is the key to job creation, it is the key to reducing our deficits, and it is important geopolitically for the United States.

Because of this great advance in technology with hydraulic fracturing and drilling, we now have unprecedented levels supply of gas that we can use domestically for manufacturing, and we are seeing a domestic manufacturing renaissance.

Secondly, the amount of gas that we will export from this country, for a number of reasons, will not cause significant price spikes. In fact, it will add stability to the pricing of gas in this country and promote more drilling, which is what we need to do.

We need to take care of our own energy security here, and we can provide energy security for our partners—our trading partners—around the world. This is why we need to move forward on this.

It is clear that, over the last 2 years, the U.S. Department of Energy has raised its long-term forecast on gas production by nearly 40 percent, with price expectations having declined 15 percent over the same period.

So the point that the gentleman makes about price spikes because of LNG exports is really, really unfounded—an unfounded point.

LNG exports could contribute up to 450,000 jobs between the years 2016 and 2035 and add $73.6 billion annually to our GDP.

My home State of Louisiana—in fact, the Third Congressional District, my district, is the leading area in this whole effort. We have currently the first two Department of Energy and FERC-approved facilities that are undergoing construction today.

The first one, the Sabine Pass facility, will see its exports probably the end of 2015, early 2016. The others will follow.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. We currently have eight—eight—that are waiting and have been waiting over a year—eight facilities waiting over a year for approval from the Department of Energy. That is before they go through the expensive FERC process.

This is why we need this legislation: to get the Department of Energy to move forward on this, so that we don't hold up something that is going to help us grow our economy, create jobs, and be very important geopolitically.

Trade not only acts as a catalyst for creating jobs, it reduces deficits, promotes American goods and services internationally, and energy should be no different.

That is why we need to move forward. We have a unique opportunity. Let's embrace it now, and let's do the right thing for our country.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana, I respect him greatly, and he made an argument. I don't fully agree with his argument, but that is the purpose of the debate, to discuss ideas and air our point of view.

The author of this legislation, I guess, couldn't help himself because he said: imagine the consternation when they found that the Affordable Care Act was named the Affordable Care Act. There are millions of people around the country, for the first time, who are able to buy insurance that is affordable.

I don't believe, if this bill passed, that it would lead to domestic prosperity and global freedom. With all due respect to those who have a different point of view, what gall to say that this bill, which is controversial, and many Americans oppose because they feel it will hurt their prosperity here at home or our national security here at home, would think that an appropriate name is to say this bill is the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

Now that I have got that off my chest, Mr. Chairman, I want to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I don't think this bill is needed. LNG permits are being issued faster than they can be built.

This bill establishes a rigid deadline for DOE to complete its public interest review of LNG export applications. That approach raises significant concerns.

□ 1630

I would like to talk about two of the concerns: climate change and economics.

Mr. WAXMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCNERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. You don't think the bill is needed. Does that mean you are against domestic prosperity and global freedom?

Mr. MCNERNEY. No, I don't think that is what it means, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you. I just wanted that clarification.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Reclaiming my time, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change recently released its multiyear report on the state of climate science. The world's leading climate scientists examined the peer-reviewed science and confirmed that climate change is already happening on all continents and across the oceans and will get much worse if we don't act.

The impacts of runaway climate change will be severe: reduced crop yields, more heat waves and diseases, decreased water availability, and more extreme weather events.

That means that we need to scrutinize the energy infrastructure decisions that we make today because of their impacts on climate change in the future. Every decision to build a new LNG export terminal has climate implications. We need to understand and weigh those effects. Otherwise, we risk locking in infrastructure that will produce carbon pollution for decades to come or creating stranded investments that must be shut down before they have paid for themselves.

Natural gas combustion for electricity does emit less carbon pollution than coal, but natural gas production

does result in gas escaping, and natural gas is a much more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. We need to consider the effect of carbon emissions in the United States.

In addition, liquefying natural gas and shipping it overseas is an energy-intensive process that will result in some significant domestic carbon emissions. For example, the direct emissions from the Sabine Pass process will represent 2 percent of the entire State of Louisiana's emissions.

The Energy Information Administration's modeling shows that LNG exports would increase domestic natural gas production in the United States. Of course, that is obvious. This could increase emissions of methane, which is, as I mentioned, a potent greenhouse gas, unless we take very severe measures to control that pollution at the wellhead and throughout the natural gas system.

In a carbon-constrained world, we need to understand all of these domestic emissions' impacts and how they compare with emission impacts abroad. The DOE has taken a first step to begin looking at these issues but has not completed a rigorous study of the effects of the different levels of LNG exports on carbon emissions.

We need to make sure we understand the effects on climate change of major energy infrastructure investments that will last for decades.

My second concern is economic. Shipping natural gas overseas will raise domestic natural gas prices. That is basically the law of supply and demand—unless that law is no longer valid.

Manufacturing is seeing a domestic renaissance here in this country because of natural gas prices being lower. This is domestic manufacturing. We want to make things in America. We want to make it in America. We want to continue to see that renaissance. We want to see manufacturing increase throughout the country and throughout the States.

Therefore, I oppose the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would point out that our colleagues in the Senate have introduced legislation similar to our legislation here on LNG exports titled, the Freedom Through Energy Export Act, by our colleague from Alaska, Mr. BEGICH.

I point out, too, that when it comes to domestic prosperity, the fact that this could create 45,000 job opportunities, increasing the employment in energy to 3 million people by 2020, that is prosperity and freedom.

Hungary's Ambassador at Large for Energy Security, Dr. Anita Orban, testified that this legislation ''sends a clear signal that the global gas market is changing, that there is the prospect of much greater supply coming from other parts of the world.''

That is world security, freedom, prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), who has been a true leader on the issue of LNG exports.

Mr. TURNER. I want to thank the author of H.R. 6 for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, lifting self-imposed restrictions on natural gas exports is a win-win situation for the American people. It will create American jobs and strengthen our allies' independence, bolstering our economic and strategic partnerships.

As chairman of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, many foreign leaders have expressed to me the need for energy diversification and its importance to strengthen our strategic partnerships. We already cooperate with our allies on a variety of security issues. Energy security must also be a component of our strategic alliances.

America's emerging role as an energy producer has the potential to enhance our security relationships and influence the global marketplace.

As we have seen in Ukraine, Russia will not hesitate to use its energy resource dominance to expand its sphere of influence. Just last week, Russia's state-owned monopoly, Gazprom, cut off natural gas supplies to Ukraine.

In the Asia Pacific, Japan is a critical security partner as we counter threats posed by countries such as North Korea. Already the world's largest importer of natural gas, Japan is dependent on Russia, the Middle East, and Africa for nearly 50 percent of its natural gas imports and is seeking greater imports as a result of its 2011 nuclear power plant disaster.

Increasing U.S. natural gas exports, along with the development of other sources, such as the Southern Gas Corridor and the Eastern Mediterranean, will help diversify world natural gas supplies and create a more competitive, transparent, and diversified global natural gas marketplace. In fact, U.S. natural gas production has already influenced global markets.

Natural gas previously destined for the United States but no longer needed as a result of increased production was diverted to other markets. This increased supply has made the global natural gas market more competitive, helping to put more pressure on contracts indexed to the price of oil and allowing several European countries to renegotiate their long-term contracts with Gazprom.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TURNER. In fact, President Obama, Secretary of State Kerry, and Secretary of Energy Moniz have welcomed LNG exports to strengthen our strategic alliances. Mr. Chairman, I will submit their statements for the RECORD.

PRESIDENT OBAMA, CURRENT AND PAST ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS WELCOME U.S. LNG EXPORTS

President Barack Obama, in a joint statement with European leaders at the EU–US Summit on March 26, 2014: The situation in Ukraine proves the need to reinforce energy security in Europe and we are considering new collaborative efforts to achieve this goal. We welcome the prospect of U.S. LNG exports in the future since additional global supplies will benefit Europe and other strategic partners.

Secretary of State John Kerry, in a joint statement with European energy leaders at a meeting of the EU–US Energy Council on April 2, 2014: The Council further welcomed the prospect of US LNG exports in the future since additional global supplies will benefit Europe and other strategic partners.

Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz, in a joint statement with European energy leaders at the G7 Rome Energy Ministerial meeting on May 6, 2014: No country should depend totally on one supplier. We intend to promote a more integrated LNG market, including through new supplies, the development of transport infrastructures, storage capacities, and LNG terminals.

Mr. TURNER. Regardless of where U.S. natural gas is shipped, increasing supply in the global marketplace will provide international consumers with greater choice and thus increased leverage to negotiate prices.

U.S. natural gas exports will create jobs right here at home and will help foster a more competitive natural gas market.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 6.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, 7 percent of the American people approve of the United States Congress. I think one of the reasons for that low approval rating is that we have overpromised and underperformed what they expect of us.

If anybody would think that this bill in and of itself deserves to be called the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, I think they lose credibility with the American people. And there is not much more credibility to lose when they only support us at a rate of 7 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), for whom I have an enormous amount of affection, even though today we have had two bills where we have disagreed. He doesn't overpromise. He just states his views and supports what he believes in. Sometimes he even convinces me, but he is not doing a good job today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me. I have to admit that the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act is a bipartisan problem we have in this Chamber.

I rise as a cosponsor in support of H.R. 6.

H.R. 6 represents a bipartisan effort to legislate. I want to thank my colleague from Colorado, Congressman GARDNER, for working with me. I wasn't an original cosponsor, but through our committee process we

have worked it out. We achieved bipartisan support in the committee because we were working together. I think that is what the American people want Congress to do.

It is important to recognize that there are more than 30 export permits to export LNG. These permits represent more than 35 billion cubic feet a day in LNG exports.

Currently, the Department of Energy has conditionally approved six of them, but only one project has received final approval through DOE and through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

DOE has an important role in export to make sure that we don't increase our natural gas prices to where they are not affordable to our country. We are in an energy renaissance because of the success of natural gas, fracking, and directional drilling in our country, and we are producing more natural gas than we can use, whether it be for electricity production or for our chemical industry.

I represent a huge chemical complex in East Harris County. There is literally a renaissance in the expansion of those chemical industries. It is increasing jobs and our exports because a lot of those chemicals we are producing from our U.S. natural gas will be exported. So someone else will pay for those jobs in our district in East Harris County.

The Department of Energy has a role in this. The problem we have is that the Department of Energy has taken so long to approve these permits. The DOE really just needs to look if it is in our national interest. They include all these things under it. And that is correct.

Let me give you an example.

In Texas and North Dakota, we are flaring natural gas right now because we don't have customers in our country and we don't have a way to export it. It is bad for the environment. It is bad for the people who own those royalties because they are not getting paid for them. And it is just terrible to see something we can sell to someone else not be utilized.

So that is why I support this bill.

We wanted to find that sweet spot, so to speak, on where we can export what we are not using.

Those of you who are familiar with Texas, we hold in reverence our Blue Bell Ice Cream. If you are there, in their commercials they will say:

We eat all we can and sell the rest.

That is what I want to do with natural gas. I want to use all we can, but I want to sell all the rest we can't use so it will help our balance of trade, help some of our allies who need it, but also keep our workers working in both the oil patch and the gas patch.

My colleague states that one more approval would make us the largest LNG exporter in the world. But not all of these projects will be constructed. Only one has been approved all the way. Of the more than 30 applications, no more than a handful of these projects will be constructed and ultimately export LNG.

Further, it is important that we clarify the LNG permitting processing before we discuss H.R. 6.

There are two completely separate processes. First, a project must submit an application to export. If the project will send LNG to a country with which the U.S. has a free trade agreement, the application is automatically approved. In fact, the Port of Brownsville got their application approved in 30 days.

If the project sends LNG to a country without a free trade agreement—non-FTA—the DOE must issue a permit based on the public interest. For a project to actually export LNG in either case, the applicant must receive a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission permit.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reviews the environmental impacts of the actual LNG facility. The FERC process takes 12 to 18 months and costs approximately $100 million.

The issue H.R. 6 seeks to deal with is the non-FTA permits through the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy currently has 25 permits awaiting decision. The Department of Energy held most of these permits for more than 3 years. Even the DOE recognizes this is a huge problem and proposed changing the approval process.

While I support the DOE changes, unfortunately, they fail to provide any certainty. H.R. 6 would place a timeline for the DOE to issue a decision. Again, remember, the DOE is going to have 12 to 18 months to know that permit because it is going through the Federal regulatory process already.

We need to make sure that the environmental review process is protected—and that is what FERC does—but we also need to make sure that the DOE makes those decisions timely so they can get those permits issued.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 6 and provide certainty to the market.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. I would like to thank my colleague from California for his leadership on the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

This legislation would require the DOE to act quickly in considering applications to export liquefied natural gas.

New technologies have unlocked vast resources of natural gas across the country. Our natural gas production will increase by 56 percent between 2012 and 2014.

□ 1645

If you want to see what real natural gas development looks like in a place that could really use the economic development, come to northern West Virginia or to southwest PA. More production means more American jobs and more West Virginia jobs.

The Marcellus shale production in West Virginia is surging, and the possibility of LNG exports will mean more good-paying jobs here at home—and a lot of them. By 2035, LNG exports are expected to create 8,600 West Virginia jobs and put $1.7 billion in State revenues.

We need to do everything possible to put West Virginia resources to work for West Virginians, and today's legislation will make a real, positive difference for working families and communities in my State and in States across the Nation.

This bill would allow us to import jobs and economic opportunity, while we export both energy and physical security to our friends and allies. More than a third of the natural gas consumed in Europe comes from Russia, and I am sure our allies would rather be buying natural gas from the United States.

Passing this bill will create jobs in West Virginia and across the country. It will grow our Nation's economy and strengthen our relationships with our allies. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. I want to thank Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. I am a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation that will help to increase U.S. liquefied natural gas exports and help boost our economy.

In my 15th Congressional District in Texas, oil and natural gas extraction from the Eagle Ford shale has transformed this region, bringing thousands of new jobs, and growing wealth to many rural communities in South Texas.

A study by the University of Texas showed that the Eagle Ford shale has provided a $61 billion impact to Texas and has supported over 116,000 new jobs. More importantly, the boom in American natural gas production has drastically changed our many counties' energy future.

The United States is now the number one natural gas-producing nation in the world. The USA has more than enough natural gas to meet its domestic needs while also exporting to foreign countries at a huge benefit to the United States' economy.

Unfortunately, the existing application process at the Department of Energy has made it burdensome for companies to export liquefied natural gas to non-FTA countries. This bill will address that problem.

Mr. Chairman, this is a truly bipartisan effort that will resolve a longstanding issue within our administration on expediting exports of natural gas. Our bill, H.R. 6, will cut the red tape and move quickly to approve all pending liquefied natural gas applications at the Department of Energy for

our WTO allies, and it will provide future applicants with a much more reasonable process.

I want to thank Representatives CORY GARDNER and TIM RYAN for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes.''

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and I applaud my colleague from Colorado for his leadership.

This bill will expedite exports of liquefied natural gas, or LNG, to our allies abroad by cutting the red tape and streamlining the regulatory process. As a Nation, this has the potential to revitalize our economy, allow us to become energy independent, and to strategically advance our interests overseas.

Now, I know many Hoosiers back at home might be asking themselves: How does this help me? After all, we have limited natural gas wells and processing plants in Indiana. Let me state clearly that the answer is: yes, it will help them.

The bill would be an economic boon to the Hoosier economy. As the Nation's leading manufacturing State, Indiana contributes to the LNG business heavily by making and manufacturing the equipment that makes the gas extraction possible.

The natural gas and oil industry has already created 136,000 jobs in Indiana, and it makes up over 4.1 percent of our entire labor income.

The future for Indiana looks even brighter with the expansion of LNG exports. It is estimated that Indiana's economy would grow by $2.2 billion a year and produce as many as 12,800 new jobs by simply allowing shipments of gas to our trusted allies.

Just last week, I received a letter from the CEO of the Ports of Indiana that urged the passage of this legislation. He supports the passage because of the significant competitive advantage it will give our State, in terms of our geography and infrastructure, which will allow Indiana to further capitalize on LNG exports.

Now is the time to allow American entrepreneurship to increase domestic energy production and fuel job creation, but unfortunately, the administration has refused, time and time again, to get out of the way of this entrepreneurship.

The administration refuses to approve licenses for LNG exports, and as I speak now, there are 24 pending applications awaiting action from the Department of Energy. One has been waiting 917 days and counting.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is time to unleash the power of America's abundant natural resources in order to capitalize on our ingenuity and create thousands of good-paying jobs in my home State of Indiana and across the Nation. I urge its passage.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman for his yielding, and I thank him for his work as ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Chairman, with H.R. 6, we are embarking on a policy that will lock us into higher and more volatile natural gas prices, and that will erode a key advantage we have for domestic manufacturing, that being low natural gas prices.

Natural gas is used widely throughout our economy. It is, indeed, a valuable commodity, and we should be setting policy to ensure that we use it efficiently and effectively. LNG terminals are expensive to build and require a lot of energy to operate. The contracts signed by exporters commit them to exporting LNG for anywhere from 10 to 20 years.

We already had a small taste of what happens if there is an unexpected event that increases domestic demand when ready supplies are low and exports have increased.

At a time when we are producing record amounts of propane, we had some of the worst shortages and price spikes we have seen in years. It was not entirely due to export increases, but it was definitely a factor. Many of our communities are paying the environmental costs of this natural gas boom. This bill is now going to deny them the benefits associated with sacrifices.

There are very real concerns that this legislation would harm economic growth, job creation, and American manufacturing. This bill will not allow the adequate consideration of the public interest, including impacts on United States' consumers and manufacturers, before granting the approval of natural gas exports to countries with which we do not have a free trade agreement.

In fact, because we do have free trade agreements with a number of countries, exports of LNG to them do not require any public interest analysis. The DOE has approved billions of cubic feet to be exported to nations with which we have free trade agreements and to others as well.

We are in the midst of a manufacturing renaissance due, in part, to an abundance of affordable domestic natural gas. We have seen 12 consecutive months of growth in the manufacturing sector and a growing trend of the reshoring of jobs back to the United States.

Why would we want to turn that trend around?

Exports on the scale that this legislation would enable will raise domestic natural gas and electricity prices for every American and undermine our manufacturing competitiveness.

The United States' natural gas prices are less than one-half of Europe's and one-third less than in places like Japan and South Korea. The integration of the United States' and Asia's natural gas markets would lead to increases in prices for consumers and businesses, undoing the economic conditions that have led to the recent growth in American manufacturing.

The industrial sector represents some 22 percent of American energy use, with natural gas being the single largest input. Energy is consumed in the industrial sector for a wide range of purposes—from processing to heating, cooling, and as feedstocks to produce non-energy products.

The chemicals, pulp and paper, iron and steel, refining, and nonmetallic minerals industries account for about one-half of all energy used in this sector.

These industries alone represent millions of American jobs. That is why I am so concerned that the Energy Information Administration, the EIA, found that increased natural gas exports will ''lead to increased natural gas prices,'' and ''larger export levels lead to larger domestic price increases.''

The EIA looked specifically at the potential impact of these price increases on United States' manufacturers, and it found that a high level of LNG exports could increase natural gas costs for the industrial sector by between 5 and 27 percent annually.

The amendment I offered to the Rules Committee, an amendment which was not made in order, would have prevented section 2 of this bill from taking effect until there would be a determination that LNG exports would not adversely impact the competitiveness of the United States' manufacturing community.

American employers are struggling to compete in this global economy, especially with the jobs in the manufacturing sector. Domestic manufacturers are competing with countries that have low wages, limited environmental and worker protections, and manipulated currencies. Low-priced, abundant natural gas is a competitive advantage for domestic manufacturers. Let's not give that up.

This Congress has an obligation to prevent the loss of American manufacturing jobs. The revitalization of the American manufacturing industry and the bringing back of quality jobs from overseas should be the cornerstone of our efforts in Washington in order to help the private sector thrive and to put our people back to work.

This bill is only good for the natural gas-producing industry, and its increased benefits will be coming at everyone else's expense.

With that, I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, the Energy and Commerce Committee has

been tackling the issue of LNG exports for quite some time now.

What began as a solid case in favor of these exports has only grown stronger. I support this bill, H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, and I applaud, in particular, the sponsor, CORY GARDNER, for his efforts on this important bipartisan bill.

Last October, we held a forum that consisted of nearly a dozen representatives of foreign governments, as well as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, all of whom expressed their strong interest in buying LNG from the U.S.

Three of them—Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Lithuania—are Eastern European allies that are currently dependent on Russia for natural gas. They described in great detail how Russia wields natural gas as a weapon against them, threatening to raise prices or to even cut off supplies as a means of exerting political pressure.

We need to respond, as we are seeing their warnings playing out with the ongoing crisis, obviously, today in Ukraine. If Putin is not deterred, he will likely use the same tactics on other Eastern European countries in the years ahead. Russia's aggression is real, and American LNG can provide a much-needed lifeline away from Putin's grip as an alternative supply source.

The Energy Information Administration's estimated reserves of natural gas continue to be revised upward, ensuring that we can continue to provide American manufacturers with low-cost supplies, while having enough for export markets, and the Department of Energy has even concluded that natural gas exports will be a net benefit to our economy.

Early in our efforts, the DOE insisted that its process for approving LNG export facilities wasn't broken, but over the last year, there have been very few approvals, and most applications continue to languish—some for even more than a year—and the line continues to grow.

The DOE's most recent changes to the process, while a slight improvement from the existing queue, are still very disappointing. They do nothing to address the core problem of open-ended delays. Congress needs to act.

□ 1700

Throughout our efforts on this topic, there has been bipartisan interest in LNG exports. Since the bill was first introduced, the bipartisanship has only grown, and for that, I commend the bill's author, CORY GARDNER, for working with GENE GREEN and others on an amendment adapting the bill's language to address a number of concerns.

I know that we have reached the point where the passage of this bill, H.R. 6, will be seen as a bipartisan success story, as it should; and the Senate should follow our lead, stand up for jobs, as well as our allies, and quickly send this bill to the President's desk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. UPTON. Because of advances in technology and innovation, we are now entering a new era of abundance. America is emerging, yes, as an energy superpower. We can enjoy the domestic benefits of being an energy superpower while also projecting our influence as a force for good abroad. The Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act allows us to do both.

This commonsense bill says ''yes'' to jobs, ''yes'' to energy, and I would urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 6.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for bringing this bill to the floor. It is so important that we exploit American domestic resources to create jobs, create global stability, and make lower prices for consumers. This bill does all those things.

So we have a lot to thank you for, Congressman GARDNER, for what this bill could accomplish, and I appreciate that.

Let me address a couple of points that I think have been erroneously made. Some said that current users of natural gas won't benefit as much if this bill were to become law. That is simply not true.

There is such an abundance of natural gas in this country that we can supply domestic needs and, at the same time, have liquefied natural gas exports to our friends and allies. We can do both, and everyone will benefit. The shale gas revolution in this country is so amazing that that has made this possible.

Secondly, some have said that there will not be the same quality of environmental reviews of LNG if this takes place, and that is simply not true either. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission maintains its role to permit the siting of facilities, just as under current law, and FERC, as they are known, is required by the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, to conduct an environmental assessment and, if necessary, an EIS, an Environmental Impact Statement, if that is required. That does not change either. The same requirements under NEPA will still be met under this law, should it become law. So we are not in any way degrading or compromising environmental standards. They are still going to be satisfied.

So, for all those reasons, I want to thank the sponsor of this bill, Representative GARDNER, and I ask all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado how many more speakers you have?

Mr. GARDNER. We have two additional speakers.

Mr. WAXMAN. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Then I presume the gentleman from Colorado will want to close on his bill. So after your two speakers, we will close on our side, and then you can close.

Mr. GARDNER. At this point, we only have two remaining speakers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago, companies were building terminals to import natural gas at the cost of billions of dollars because analysts agreed that the United States economy was going to need natural gas from overseas. Today that scenario has flipped on its head, and import terminals are dormant. The Department of Energy has 19 applications waiting to get permission to export U.S. natural gas.

Thanks to technology breakthroughs, U.S. natural gas reserves have climbed 72 percent since 2000. We have more gas than we can use here in the United States. Mr. Chairman, we have the best ice cream company in the world in Brenham, Texas, and their motto is: ''We eat all we can, and we sell the rest.'' That is what our motto should be with natural gas. We should use all we can and sell the rest everywhere in the world that wants to buy it.

As chairman of the Trade Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, I did a hearing on more LNG exports in April. Every witness at the hearing, from the union representatives to a professor, agreed that we should export natural gas. We have too much gas and our allies have too little.

And then there is Russia. Russia has an energy stranglehold over Europe, including Ukraine. Just this past week, Russia announced it was going to require payments up front from Ukraine. Russia has already increased the price of natural gas and even stopped sending natural gas to Ukraine.

Isn't that lovely?

Ukraine needs access to natural gas down the road, and that could be the United States. We need to compete with Gazprom. That could be the United States. That is how we can help thwart Russian aggression in Eastern Europe.

Technically, the United States can export natural gas, but the approval process is slow as molasses. It is the government. The government takes too long to make a decision, and the Department of Energy wraps companies in red tape. Many times we can lose these natural gas contracts to our competitors.

So I support this legislation. I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the floor.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6, the

Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act, championed by my friend and colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Congressman GARDNER of Colorado, a true leader in this area. This Act will help expedite approval of U.S. liquefied natural gas exports to our allies.

The United States is experiencing a North American energy boom that analysts predict can produce enough natural gas to meet our domestic demands as well as that of our global allies, including Ukraine and other Eastern European nations currently at the mercy of Russian energy supplies. Expediting U.S. liquefied natural gas exports serves our national security interests as an aggressive Russian regime looks to expand power in former Soviet Union countries. This legislation helps our allies in eastern Europe and across the globe, while creating jobs here at home through private investment and economic opportunity essential to improving the American economy.

As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, I am proud to have helped bring this important energy global security measure to the floor today, and I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage. This is in the national security interest of the United States of America.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), a sponsor of H.R. 6, somebody who has been with this bill, this legislation, from the beginning as we have worked on this bipartisan process.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. I probably won't take all the time, but I did want to stand up in support of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chair, in my district in eastern Ohio, we have been—and I have heard speaker after speaker talk about the potential boom for our country and different regions of America. And my region that I represent is one of those areas along eastern Ohio.

I think if we are looking to address many of the issues of global warming, and I know there would be a lot of different discussions and opinions that I may have compared to a lot of people on the other side, but I believe that this is an opportunity for us to address that issue with liquid natural gas, to get it out into the marketplace, to make sure that the economic benefits are here in the United States, that our people in eastern Ohio, western Pennsylvania, into New York and the upstate New York area are able to benefit from this. FERC is going to have to approve these ultimately, at the end of the day, and so I don't think that we can pass up this opportunity to have a transition.

Now, I think, quite frankly, we missed the boat a few years ago when we had an opportunity to pass a comprehensive energy bill that would invest into—in the bill that came before this House, money into coal research was an opportunity that I think we missed.

There was an opportunity for wind and solar and the alternatives that I think, ultimately, will be a part of an extended portfolio here in the United States. But today, the opportunity is with liquid natural gas and getting it abroad.

In one of my positions on the German Study Group, we were in Germany talking to Chancellor Merkel, and the first thing she said to us, as our delegation was over there, was let's talk about natural gas, the first thing, because she had Putin at that time, a year, year and a half ago, breathing down her neck, and now here we are. So I think there is an opportunity here. This is one step in a long process.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and hope we can continue to build out this energy portfolio with natural gas and the others that will come along the way.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For those who want to export natural gas, this bill really isn't necessary because the Department of Energy is approving enough export of natural gas that will allow us, in a few years, to be the largest exporter of LNG in the world. So DOE is acting.

For those of you who are concerned about global freedom, well, when we get all the facilities going to be able to export the natural gas and once we get all of the approvals to export natural gas, the countries who are going to receive this natural gas are most likely going to be China, Japan, and India, because that is where they are paying higher prices for natural gas. It is going to be more profitable to ship the LNG there.

I don't fault the companies for doing that. They are in business to make money. It is going to provide more money to ship the natural gas there.

Well, what about Ukraine? What about the countries that are under threat from Russia?

Angela Merkel, the head of Germany, may not realize it, but natural gas is not going to be there for quite a long time. It is going to take years. Therefore, if you think domestic prosperity is hinging on the ability to export natural gas, we don't need this bill.

If you think global freedom is hanging on the balance waiting for this bill to become law—and by ''global freedom'' you don't mean freedom for China to get more natural gas or India or Japan, but Ukraine and countries in eastern Europe—don't count on this bill to bring about global freedom.

The bill is grossly titled because it is promising more than this bill can ever deliver, and I would urge that this bill is not necessary and ought to be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman for your leadership over this hour and thank the gentleman from California for the debate and the Members who came and debated this important piece of legislation today.

Look, we know this bill has the support of organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. People who represent the businesses of this country, the industrial might of this country, support H.R. 6 because they know that when we can produce our energy in our own backyard and help our allies to a greater prosperity for themselves, we are doing the right thing with H.R. 6.

□ 1715

This bill is the confluence of two policies that we try to promote but often fail to achieve: the policy of domestic job creation, where 45,000 people could be taken off the unemployment rolls because of H.R. 6. The other policy that we achieve with this legislation is to give our friends and allies a greater degree of freedom, a greater ability to be independent from Russia, their aggressive neighbors that just decide one day to invade.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6 is the work of a bipartisan group of lawmakers who have worked over the past several months to make sure that we have the support—not just from the Republican side of the aisle, but strong support from both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans who believe that we should answer the call from our friends and allies for energy security, for economic opportunity at home, and to make sure that we continue the energy revolution in this country.

Opposition to the bill, as I said in committee, is like hanging up on a 911 phone call from our friends and allies.

Let's pass this legislation. Let's achieve exactly what the title of this bill says: prosperity at home and help for our allies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 636 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3301.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1716

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes, with Mr. MILLER of Florida (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–492 offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–492 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 233, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—176

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—233

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—22

Campbell
Cantor
Cohen
Costa
Crowley
DeLauro
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1742

Messrs. POE of Texas, DUNCAN of Tennessee, HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. PETERS of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Tuesday, June 24th, 2014, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 350 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Pallone of New Jersey Amendment that ensures that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to full environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 240, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—171

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—240

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Cantor
Costa
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1748

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Tuesday, June 24th, 2014, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 351 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Waxman of California Amendment that excludes any project with a pending Presidential permit application from using the new approval requirements in the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 234, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—176

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—234

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Cantor
Costa
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Perlmutter
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1752

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Tuesday, June 24th, 2014, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 352 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Welch/Pingree/Kuster/Shea-Porter Amendment that ensures that major pipeline modifications receive a thorough environmental review.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3301) to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 636, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Schneider moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3301, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 9, after line 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. 10. PROTECTING THE GREAT LAKES AND OUR NATION'S DRINKING WATER SUPPLY.

The Secretary of State shall not approve an oil pipeline under section 3 if—

(1) a rupture or spill from such pipeline would result in toxic and cancer-causing chemicals, such as benzene, entering into the Great Lakes, the Ogallala Aquifer, or a community's drinking water supply; or

(2) the owner or operator of the oil pipeline was responsible for a major oil spill affecting a community's drinking water supply or has failed to properly clean up such a spill.

Mr. WHITFIELD (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Madam Speaker, this amendment would ensure that our Great Lakes and the Ogallala Aquifer, and the tremendous economic benefits that come from them, will remain protected and safe from toxic chemicals.

As stewards of the health and safety of our communities, we should take sensible approaches to protect our most valuable assets. This amendment would safeguard our drinking water in 16 States for millions of our constituents—in Illinois, Minnesota, Michigan, Indiana, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas.

The Great Lakes provide 56 billion gallons of fresh water per day for agriculture, municipal drinking water, and electricity production. Over 30 million Americans rely on the Great Lakes every day for their safe and clean drinking water.

This amendment would protect the Great Lakes from being put at risk by preventing the Department of State from approving projects that have the potential to contaminate the Great Lakes and their aquifers.

We owe it to our future generations to keep the Great Lakes healthy and to use the resources we have in a responsible and sustainable way.

This amendment also ensures that the owners and operators of pipelines who have been responsible for major spills in the past that resulted in contaminated community drinking water supplies will not receive special treatment to build additional pipelines across our borders.

When accidents occur in our Great Lakes, it is not a simple fix to restore the ecosystem and return to business as usual. The time it takes our Great Lakes to naturally rid themselves of pollutants can take up to 191 years. This is why we must take every precaution now to make sure that the health of our Great Lakes and the health of our economy are not put at risk for short-term gains.

□ 1800

Energy independence remains one of the primary drivers of our economy and will continue to have a major role in our future competitiveness and the health of our future generations. By eliminating commonsense environmental regulations and evaluations for projects with potentially massive public health consequences, it is a dereliction of our duty to protect our families, protect our communities, and protect our businesses that rely on the Great Lakes.

Instead of assessing the impact of the full project, the underlying bill would limit environmental review for new infrastructure projects to only the cross-border sections. We live in an interconnected environment, and the Great Lakes system is not an isolated resource but, rather, a complex ecosystem intertwined with the health and vibrancy of countless communities across two countries and eight States. What happens to one has an impact on all.

This amendment would ensure the proper planning and environmental impact evaluations are complete and that the total scope of projects are known and assessed.

The Great Lakes represents more than 1,000 miles of border between the United States and Canada. It is irresponsible to take on all the environmental risks to our drinking water, our $4 billion fishing industry, and the 200

million tons of shipping that occur on the Great Lakes, including 90 percent of the Nation's iron ore and 58 percent of the automobiles produced here.

It is irresponsible to put at risk the millions of Americans who rely on the Great Lakes and the Ogallala Aquifer for their basic human needs. It is irresponsible to take on the risk of chemical and toxic contaminants permanently changing our environment for the worst without doing our own due diligence.

For all Great Lakes and Great Plains communities, I ask that you take this commonsense step with us to protect our safe access to clean drinking water and to deny companies who have a track record of contamination from being given the opportunity to do so again.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Madam Speaker, I would just say that H.R. 3301 is designed to do one thing: to treat all pipelines and electric transmission lines exactly as natural gas pipelines are treated.

The Great Lakes, we are all committed to. There are 33 separate environmental laws that would not be changed by this legislation.

With all due respect, I view this as a procedural vote that says ''no'' to North American energy security and lower prices. It is time to say ''yes'' and end procedural delays. Please vote ''no'' on this motion and say ''yes'' to North American security.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 227, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—185

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1808

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call vote #353 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 3301—North American Energy Infrastructure Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 173, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

AYES—238

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent

DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—173

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Cantor
Crowley
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Hanna
Kingston
Lankford
Meeks
Mullin
Napolitano
Nunnelee
Polis
Rangel
Rush
Serrano
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Velázquez
Williams

□ 1817

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 354 due to a medical emergency in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on final passage of H.R. 3301—North American Energy Infrastructure Act.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4899, LOWERING GASOLINE PRICES TO FUEL AN AMERICA THAT WORKS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4923, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–493) on the resolution (H. Res. 641) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015; and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AUTISM COLLABORATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND SUPPORT ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4631) to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act of 2014" or the "Autism CARES Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall designate an existing official within the Department of Health and Human Services to oversee, in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense and Education, national autism spectrum disorder research, services, and support activities.

(b) DUTIES.—The official designated under subsection (a) shall—

(1) implement autism spectrum disorder activities, taking into account the strategic plan developed by the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee under section 399CC(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–2(b)); and

(2) ensure that autism spectrum disorder activities of the Department of Health and Human Services and of other Federal departments and agencies are not unnecessarily duplicative.

SEC. 3. RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 399AA of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "for children and adults" after "reporting of State epidemiological data";

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) by striking "establishment of regional centers of excellence" and inserting "establishment or support of regional centers of excellence"; and

(B) by inserting "for children and adults" before the period at the end;

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "center to be established" and inserting "center to be established or supported"; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking "2014" and inserting "2019".

SEC. 4. AUTISM INTERVENTION.

Section 399BB of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting "culturally competent" after "provide";

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii), by inserting "(which may include respite care for caregivers of individuals with an autism spectrum disorder)" after "services and supports";

(3) in subsection (e)(1)(B)(v), by inserting before the semicolon the following: ", which

may include collaborating with research centers or networks to provide training for providers of respite care (as defined in section 2901)''';

(4) in subsection (f), by striking ''grants or contracts'' and all that follows through ''for individuals with'' and inserting ''grants or contracts, which may include grants or contracts to research centers or networks, to determine the evidence-based practices for interventions to improve the physical and behavioral health of individuals with''; and

(5) in subsection (g), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

SEC. 5. INTERAGENCY AUTISM COORDINATING COMMITTEE.

Section 399CC of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''and annually update''; and

(ii) by striking ''intervention'' and inserting ''interventions, including school and community-based interventions'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (2), and inserting before such redesignated paragraph the following:

''(1) monitor autism spectrum disorder research, and to the extent practicable services and support activities, across all relevant Federal departments and agencies, including coordination of Federal activities with respect to autism spectrum disorder;'';

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking ''recommendations to the Director of NIH'';

(E) in paragraph (4), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', and the process by which public feedback can be better integrated into such decisions''; and

(F) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6) and inserting the following:

''(5) develop a strategic plan for the conduct of, and support for, autism spectrum disorder research, including as practicable for services and supports, for individuals with an autism spectrum disorder and the families of such individuals, which shall include—

''(A) proposed budgetary requirements; and

''(B) recommendations to ensure that autism spectrum disorder research, and services and support activities to the extent practicable, of the Department of Health and Human Services and of other Federal departments and agencies are not unnecessarily duplicative; and

''(6) submit to Congress and the President—

''(A) an annual update on the summary of advances described in paragraph (2); and

''(B) an annual update to the strategic plan described in paragraph (5), including any progress made in achieving the goals outlined in such strategic plan.'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking the paragraph designation, the heading, and the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(1) FEDERAL MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of the following Federal members—'';

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by inserting '', such as the Administration for Community Living, Administration for Children and Families, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Health Resources and Services Administration'' before the semicolon at the end; and

(II) by adding at the end ''and'';

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting ''and the Department of Defense'' after ''Department of Education''; and

(II) by striking at the end ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(iv) by striking subparagraph (E);

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''ADDITIONAL'' and inserting ''NON-FEDERAL'';

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''Not fewer than 6 members of the Committee, or 1/3 of the total membership of the Committee, whichever is greater'' and inserting ''Not more than ½, but not fewer than 1/3, of the total membership of the Committee'';

(iii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''one such member shall be an individual'' and inserting ''two such members shall be individuals'';

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''one such member shall be a parent or legal guardian'' and inserting ''two such members shall be parents or legal guardians''; and

(v) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''one such member shall be a representative'' and inserting ''two such members shall be representatives''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—

''(A) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT FOR NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—Non-Federal members shall serve for a term of 4 years, and may be reappointed for one or more additional 4-year terms.

''(B) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall not affect the powers or duties of the Committee. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy for an unexpired term shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of the member's term until a successor has been appointed.'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (f), by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

SEC. 6. REPORTS.

Section 399DD of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–3) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**REPORT**'' and inserting ''**REPORTS**'';

(2) in subsection (b), by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (9) as subparagraphs (A) through (I), respectively, and realigning the margins accordingly;

(3) by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and realigning the margins accordingly;

(4) by inserting after the section heading the following:

''(a) PROGRESS REPORT.—'';

(5) in subsection (a)(1) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking ''2 years after the date of enactment of the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act of 2011'' and inserting ''4 years after the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2014'';

(B) by inserting ''and the Secretary of Defense'' after ''the Secretary of Education''; and

(C) by inserting '', and make publicly available, including through posting on the Internet Web site of the Department of Health and Human Services,'' after ''Representatives''; and

(6) in subsection (a)(2) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), (as so redesignated), by striking ''Combating Autism Act of 2006'' and inserting ''Autism CARES Act of 2014'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated), by striking ''particular provisions of Combating Autism Act of 2006'' and inserting ''amendments made by the Autism CARES Act of 2014'';

(C) by striking subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), and inserting the following:

''(C) information on the incidence and prevalence of autism spectrum disorder, including available information on the prevalence of autism spectrum disorder among children and adults, and identification of any changes over time with respect to the incidence and prevalence of autism spectrum disorder;'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated), by striking ''6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Combating Autism Act of 2006'' and inserting ''4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2014 and, as appropriate, how this age varies across population subgroups'';

(E) in subparagraph (E) (as so redesignated), by striking ''6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Combating Autism Act of 2006'' and inserting ''4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2014 and, as appropriate, how this age varies across population subgroups'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''and, as appropriate, on how such average time varies across population subgroups'' before the semicolon at the end;

(G) in subparagraph (G) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking ''including by various subtypes,'' and inserting ''including by severity level as practicable,''; and

(ii) by striking ''child may'' and inserting ''child or other factors, such as demographic characteristics, may''; and

(H) by striking subparagraph (I) (as so redesignated), and inserting the following:

''(I) a description of the actions taken to implement and the progress made on implementation of the strategic plan developed by the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee under section 399CC(b).''; and

(7) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) REPORT ON YOUNG ADULTS AND TRANSITIONING YOUTH.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Autism CARES Act of 2014, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with the Secretary of Education and in collaboration with the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Attorney General, shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report concerning young adults with autism spectrum disorder and the challenges related to the transition from existing school-based services to those services available during adulthood.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall contain—

''(A) demographic characteristics of youth transitioning from school-based to community-based supports;

''(B) an overview of policies and programs relevant to young adults with autism spectrum disorder relating to post-secondary school transitional services, including an identification of existing Federal laws, regulations, policies, research, and programs;

''(C) proposals on establishing best practices guidelines to ensure—

''(i) interdisciplinary coordination between all relevant service providers receiving Federal funding;

''(ii) coordination with transitioning youth and the family of such transitioning youth; and

''(iii) inclusion of the individualized education program for the transitioning youth, as prescribed in section 614 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1414);

''(D) comprehensive approaches to transitioning from existing school-based services to those services available during adulthood, including—

''(i) services that increase access to, and improve integration and completion of, post-secondary education, peer support, vocational training (as defined in section 103 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 723)), rehabilitation, self-advocacy skills, and competitive, integrated employment;

''(ii) community-based behavioral supports and interventions;

''(iii) community-based integrated residential services, housing, and transportation;

''(iv) nutrition, health and wellness, recreational, and social activities;

''(v) personal safety services for individuals with autism spectrum disorder related to public safety agencies or the criminal justice system; and

''(vi) evidence-based approaches for coordination of resources and services once individuals have aged out of post-secondary education; and

''(E) proposals that seek to improve outcomes for adults with autism spectrum disorder making the transition from a school-based support system to adulthood by—

''(i) increasing the effectiveness of programs that provide transition services;

''(ii) increasing the ability of the relevant service providers described in subparagraph (C) to provide supports and services to underserved populations and regions;

''(iii) increasing the efficiency of service delivery to maximize resources and outcomes, including with respect to the integration of and collaboration among services for transitioning youth;

''(iv) ensuring access to all services necessary to transitioning youth of all capabilities; and

''(v) encouraging transitioning youth to utilize all available transition services to maximize independence, equal opportunity, full participation, and self-sufficiency.''.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 399EE of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280i–4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''fiscal years 2012 through 2014'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2019'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''fiscal years 2011 through 2014'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2015 through 2019''; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking ''$161,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2014'' and inserting ''$190,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of H.R. 4631, the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support—CARES—Act of 2014, introduced by Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey.

Autism CARES demonstrates our continued effort to address the needs of children and adults with autism spectrum disorder, ASD.

Thanks to the monitoring done by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, we know that as many as 1 in 68 children have ASD.

With recent studies showing that ASD can be detected in the first 6 months of life, the screening and diagnosis funded in the bill will mean early diagnosis and improved health and behavioral outcomes.

Many of these children are now transitioning into adulthood and will need community-based services to replace those provided by the schools. As a part of this bill, HHS will be required to study their needs and available services to identify gaps and make their transition seamless and productive.

The bill would also fund important research at the National Institutes of Health to understand and treat ASD and the operation of the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4631, the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act of 2014.

Autism spectrum disorder, or ASD, is a developmental disability that can lead to significant social, communication, and behavioral challenges.

We still do not know all the causes of autism, and we do not have a cure, but we do know that early intervention services can improve a child's development.

Recent data for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show more children than ever before are receiving an autism diagnosis. This is due, at least in part, to a broader definition of ASD and better diagnosis, but we cannot rule out the possibility of a true increase in the number of Americans with ASD.

Continued Federal support for autism activities at HHS will help us learn more about the causes of autism. It will help more children receive early diagnosis and intervention, as well as access to services that they need throughout their lives.

I want to acknowledge the sponsor of this legislation—Congressman SMITH and Congressman DOYLE; the sponsors of the Senate companion legislation, Senators MENENDEZ and ENZI; and leaders on the Energy and Commerce Committee and on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—for making it possible to have a consensus bill before the House today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, so we can send it to the Senate and on to the President for his signature, well in advance of the September 30 sunset provisions in current law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, the distinguished prime sponsor of the legislation, who has really provided the leadership on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the chairman for yielding and thank him for his strong support, along with Chairman FRED UPTON, former Chairman HENRY WAXMAN, and so many others—MIKE DOYLE, my good friend and colleague, who together, since 2000, headed up the Coalition for Autism Research and Education. We have done everything bipartisan. We have 91 members in the coalition right now.

I would also like to thank the staff, who have helped us move this bill and negotiate text, including Gary Andres, Cheryl Jaeger, Brenda Destro, Jean Roehrenbeck, Katie Novaria, Cate Benedetti, and, of course, Neil Bradley, and so many others who have been so critical to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, previous autism law, including the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act of 2011, made critical investments—continued by this bill—that are working to determine the causes of autism spectrum disorder, identify autistic children as early as possible to begin treatment, raise critical awareness, and develop new therapies and effective services.

The latest prevalence data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Mr. Speaker, is shocking. One in every 68 American children are on the autism spectrum, a tenfold increase over the last 40 years. Boys on the spectrum outnumber girls 5 to 1.

In my home State of New Jersey, one in every 45 children has ASD, the highest rate in the CDC study.

I would note parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, I have chaired two congressional hearings on global autism, and this developmental disability is everywhere—one conservative estimate, 67 million worldwide.

Looking back, Mr. Speaker, it was two dedicated parents from New Jersey who helped launch the comprehensive Federal policy we seek to reauthorize today.

Almost 17 years ago, September 1997, Bobbie and Billy Gallagher of Brick, New Jersey, and parents of two small autistic children, walked into my Ocean County office looking for help.

They believed Brick had a disproportionate number of students with autism and wanted action, especially for their son Austin and daughter Alana, so I invited CDC and other Federal agencies to Brick for an investigation, only to learn that prevalence rates were high not only in Brick, but in nearby communities as well.

Believing we had a serious spike in prevalence, I introduced the ASSURE Act, and that was incorporated as title I of the Children's Health Act of 2000.

Mr. Speaker, much progress has been made since. Today, the evidence suggests there is no single cause of autism or type. Genetic risk, coupled with environmental factors, including advanced parental age, low birth weight, and prematurity—among other factors—may be triggers.

Signs of autism in a child usually manifest between 12–18 months, some as early as 6 months, while some regress after the age of 2, yet transformative early intervention continues to lag.

According to the IACC:

The clinical reality is that, currently, only about 20 percent of children with ASD are being identified early (by 3 years of age).

That, Members of the House, is not good, and it has got to change. The research clearly shows that early diagnosis means early intervention and much better outcomes.

The most recent IACC strategic plan—and I encourage Members to read it. It is a textbook on how the Federal Government should do anything when it deals with research. They have pointed out that:

During the past few years, there has been a major revolution in ASD genetics research.

Research on the potential relationship between the immune system and ASD has grown considerably, resulting in ''major breakthroughs.''

They go on to say:

Much progress has been made in understanding the prevalence and biology of conditions that commonly co-occur with ASD, including epilepsy, sleep disorders, GI disturbances, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and other psychiatric comorbidities.

They also point out:

Particularly intriguing are the results of prenatal vitamin intake through supplements and diet, showing a 40 percent reduction in risk of ASD with prenatal vitamin supplements taken in the 3 months before or during the first month of pregnancy.

Daily folic acid is also highly recommended.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue that this bill seeks to address. Every year, 50,000 young people on the autism spectrum matriculate to adulthood and are in the process of losing services.

Jonathan Kratchman, a 16-year-old with Asperger's from New Jersey, was the keynote speaker at a Dare to Dream conference at Mercer County Community College last year. He stated:

I know I can be a great contributor to society when I graduate. However, I need continuing support to get there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Kratchman said:

If you take your high school diploma at age 18, you automatically lose services from your school district.

Both individuals with autism—like Jonathan—and their parents find themselves confronted with almost unimaginable challenges, including loss of school, housing, and then they have job needs.

□ 1830

We are in the midst of a huge yet largely invisible crisis that begs serious focus and remedies.

The Autism CARES Act tasks multiple Federal agencies to comprehensively study and report back to Congress on the special needs of autistic young adults and transitioning youth.

Additionally, Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS are in the process of requesting a comprehensive aging-out GAO report that will include key stakeholder involvement.

Passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is an important investment in a very important special group of people who, along with their families, caregivers, and friends, face seemingly endless challenges and struggles.

I strongly urge Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H.R. 4631, the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education and Support Act of 2014—Autism CARES ACT of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, previous autism law including the Combatting Autism Act of 2011 made critical investments—continued by this bill—that are working to determine the causes of autism spectrum disorder (ASD), identify autistic children as early as possible to begin treatment, raise critical awareness and develop new therapies and effective services.

According to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), ''ASD is a range of complex neurodevelopment disorders, characterized by social impairments, communication difficulties, and restricted, repetitive, and stereotyped patterns of behavior. Autistic disorder, sometimes called autism or classical ASD, is the most severe form of ASD, while other conditions along the spectrum include a milder form known as Asperger syndrome . . .''

The latest prevalence data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is shocking: 1 in every 68 American children are on the autism spectrum—a tenfold increase over the last 40 years. Boys on the autism spectrum outnumber girls 5 to 1.

In my home state of New Jersey, 1 in every 45 children has ASD, the highest rate in the CDC study.

I've chaired two congressional hearings on global autism—and this developmental disability is everywhere. One conservative estimate: 67 million worldwide.

Looking back, it was two dedicated parents from New Jersey who helped launch the comprehensive federal policy we seek to reauthorize today.

Almost 17 years ago—September 13, 1997—Bobbie and Billy Gallagher of Brick, New Jersey and parents of two small children with autism, walked into my Ocean County district office looking for help. They believed Brick had a disproportionate number of students with autism and wanted action especially for their son Austin and daughter Alana. So I invited CDC and other federal agencies to Brick for an investigation only to learn that prevalence rates were high not only in Brick but in nearby communities as well. Believing we had a serious spike in the prevalence of autism, I introduced H.R. 274—the Autism Statistics, Surveillance, Research and Epidemiology Act (ASSURE) which was enacted as Title 1 of the Children Health Act of 2000.

Much progress has been made since. Today, the evidence suggests that there is no single cause or type of autism. Genetic risk coupled with environmental factors including advanced parental age, low birth weight and prematurity among other factors may be triggers. Signs of autism in a child usually manifest between 12–18 months—some as early as 6 months—while some ''regress'' after 2.

Yet, transformative early intervention continues to lag. According to the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee (IACC): ''The clinical reality is that currently only about 20 percent of children with ASD are being identified early (by 3 years of age)'' and that members of the House is not good and has got to change. Early diagnosis means early intervention and better outcomes. IACC says ''More needs to be done to raise awareness in the practitioner community of the current capabilities and benefits of early, repeated screenings, early diagnosis, and early intervention.''

Research on autism is showing tremendous promise. The most recent IACC strategic plan—which is reauthorized for five years by Section 5—is filled with insight and actionable information:

''During the past few years there has been a major revolution in ASD genetics research. Using the newest molecular and epidemiological methods, recent data continues to strongly support the role of genes in ASD, and the understanding of this role has been greatly refined.''

''In infants at high genetic risk for ASD due to having an older sibling with autism, symptoms of autism begin to emerge as young as 6 months of age in those who later develop ASD. These new findings suggest that it may someday be possible to screen for children at risk for ASD before the emergence of the full symptoms of autism and early enough to facilitate even more effective intervention.''

''Research on the potential relationship between the immune system and ASD has grown considerably over the past 2 years, resulting in several major breakthroughs. In the realm of basic developmental research, immune cells and immune signaling molecules have been identified as essential for establishing stable connections between neurons during early brain development.''

''Much progress has been made in understanding the prevalence and biology of conditions that commonly co-occur with ASD, including epilepsy, sleep disorders, gastrointestinal (GI) disturbances, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and other psychiatric comorbidities.''

''The time around conception and during pregnancy are likely the most important time windows of heightened vulnerability for the development of the brain with supporting evidence from early reports linking autism symptoms to maternal ingestion of drugs.''

''Particularly intriguing are the results of prenatal vitamin intake through supplements and diet, showing a 40 percent reduction in risk of ASD with prenatal vitamin supplements taken in the 3 months before or during the first month of pregnancy.''

"A trend of decreasing ASD risk as mothers consumed greater daily folic acid intake from foods, vitamins, and supplements in the first month of pregnancy was also reported."

Over the past 5 years, progress has been made toward developing tools and practices for more effective screening and early diagnosis—and I am pleased that the Committee reports includes language that will ensure federal agencies pay particular attention to the need to focus on early diagnosis and intervention in children.

While biological differences in individuals with ASD were hypothesized earlier, there is now "data demonstrating specific changes in the genome and epigenome, gene expression, cell structure and function, brain connectivity, and behavior that have been linked to the causes and underlying biology of ASD."

I mentioned Bobbie and Billy Gallagher's children earlier because they represent a generation of young men and women who are aging out—both are now over 21 years old, which means far too much of their support system no longer exists.

Mr. Speaker, every year 50,000 young people on the autism spectrum matriculate to adulthood.

Jonathan Kratchman, a 16-year-old with Asperger's from New Jersey, was the keynote speaker at a "Dare To Dream Conference" at Mercer County Community College last year, where he stated: "I know I can be a great contributor to society when I graduate. However, I need continuing support to get there... Here is a fast fact. If you take your high school diploma at age 18, you automatically lose services from your school district."

Both individuals with autism, like Jonathan, and their parents find themselves confronted with almost unimaginable challenges including loss of school instruction, housing and job needs. We are in the midst of huge yet largely invisible crisis that begs serious focus and remedies.

The Autism CARES Act tasks multiple federal agencies to comprehensively study and report back to Congress on the special needs of autistic young adults and transitioning youth.

While studies show that young adults with autism appear to fare worse in employment outcomes—including when compared to young adults with other types of disabilities—there is evidence that with specialized support programs employment is feasible even among individuals with higher support needs.

I'm planning a congressional hearing next month in my global health committee on employers like software giant SAP which has actively recruited and hired over 700 young adults on the autism spectrum and recently told me these diligent young employees are extraordinarily effective workers.

Well planned transition programs will not only assist families and help shape a brighter future for individuals with ASD, they are also a smart investment that will reduce government spending in the long-term. The University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities recently estimated that: "Diverting just one young person into living-wage employment could save an average of $150,000 in SSI benefits over their lifetime. According to the Social Security Administration, transitioning just one half of one percent of current SSDI and SSI beneficiaries from benefits to self-sustaining employment would save $3.5 billion in cash benefits over the work-life of those individuals."

IACC recently concluded that since 2009, the adult services research field has made some important advances, including gathering of new data on the services available across the states, information about how adults are interacting with the service system, and data on the service needs of adults on the autism spectrum.

But in light of the severity of the aging out crisis, we must do more and do it fast and ensure we are providing a comprehensive and thorough review of available services—and those that need to be established. Additionally, Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS are in the process of requesting a comprehensive autism aging-out GAO report that will include key stakeholder involvement.

We are making real progress, but we still don't have all the answers.

Specifically, the Autism Cares Act of 2014 authorizes funding for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 at $22 million for the CDC, $48 million for the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) and $190 million for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and IACC activities—for a total of $1.3 billion.

I especially want to thank Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR, Chairman FRED UPTON and former Chairman HENRY WAXMAN as well as Chairman JOE PITTS—all strong and committed friends of persons with autism—for their critical support of this legislation.

Special thanks to my friend MIKE DOYLE. Since 2000, MIKE and I have co-chaired the 91 member congressional autism caucus—the Coalition on Autism Research and Education (CARE).

I am very grateful to the many excellent, professional staff who played key roles in helping move the bill and negotiate text including Gary Andres, Cheryl Jaeger, Brenda Destro, Jean Roehrenbeck, Katie Novaria, Cate Benedetti and of course Neil Bradley.

I also want to express my deep appreciation for the extraordinary contributions made by Autism Speaks, the Autism Society, the Association of University Centers on Disabilities and the American Academy of Pediatrics—all of whom strongly endorse H.R. 4631.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill today is an investment in a very important group of people who, along with their families, caregivers and friends, face seemingly endless challenges and struggles. I urge support.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Mr. GREEN, for yielding and for your support of the Autism CARES Act.

First off, I want to thank my good friend and Autism Caucus cochair CHRIS SMITH for his leadership and work on this critical legislation over the past 11 years. It has been a real pleasure and a labor of love to work with CHRIS on these issues. He is truly a champion in the autism community. I look forward to continuing that great working relationship with him.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that every time new data is released on autism spectrum disorders, the numbers become more and more troubling. In fact, the Centers for Disease Control's most recent data show a continued rise in autism prevalence rates: 1 in every 68 American children. That is 1 in 189 girls and 1 in 42 boys.

These are staggering numbers with serious implications for many aspects of American life. That is why passage of the Autism CARES Act today is so important: to continue research into the causes of autism, to educate health care providers and the public, to improve early diagnosis and intervention, to identify effective treatments, and to evaluate the types of services available to young adults with ASD. We can and must do better for the millions of Americans living with ASD and their families.

Many Federal autism programs were first authorized by the Combating Autism Act of 2006, which has made a huge difference in the lives of autistic Americans and their families. Since its inception, Congress has reauthorized these Federal autism programs twice. Without new legislation to reauthorize them, the funding for these important programs will expire on September 30 of this year.

We have made tremendous advances in understanding autism spectrum disorders, but this progress will be lost if Congress allows these programs to expire. This is why it is so important that Congress pass this commonsense, bipartisan, bicameral legislation like the bill that is before us today.

The autism programs this legislation would reauthorize are vitally important to many families and individuals across the country. Early diagnosis and intervention can make a huge difference in an autistic individual's life and can have a dramatic impact on the individual's family and community as well.

With the prevalence of autism spectrum disorders much higher than we thought just a few years ago, inaction is simply not an option.

I urge my colleagues to support the Autism CARES legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valued member of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4631, the Autism CARES Act, of which I am an original cosponsor. I want to commend a sponsor, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, as well as a Democratic prime cosponsor, Mr. MIKE DOYLE from the great State of Pennsylvania, for sponsoring this bill.

Autism is serious and it does not discriminate. People in all racial, socioeconomic, and ethnic groups are impacted, Mr. Speaker. Autism awareness and research is something people from all walks of life can support.

One in 68 children is diagnosed with autism. That is a disturbing statistic. This legislation will help direct autism research on a Federal level. This research is vital, and I am glad my colleagues and I have come together in a

bipartisan manner to continue autism research, early identification, intervention, and education.

I am proud to support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support final passage of this legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), my good friend and desk mate on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for yielding me the time. I want to thank my good friend, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey. I have so much respect for his hard work in doing this. Anyone who knows Chris knows that when he wants something done, he is tenacious. MIKE DOYLE has been his really good partner. We all take pride in this legislation.

I rise to support the Autism Collaboration, Accountability, Research, Education, and Support Act, or the Autism CARES Act. I am pleased that we have an opportunity to pass this today.

Autism, as my colleagues have said, affects more than 2 million individuals and their families across our country. The rate of diagnosis has climbed dramatically in recent years. Today, 1 out of every 68 American children is diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder by the age of 8. That is really shocking. These individuals and their families are counting on us to pass this bill.

The Autism CARES Act will extend and strengthen the efforts we established under the Combating Autism Act of 2006 and the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act of 2011. I was proud to support both of these bills on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Energy and Commerce Committee, and the full House. I am pleased to see that this legislation will give our autism programs the continued support they deserve.

With this bill, we will extend Federal autism programs for another 5 years, including vital autism research and prevalence monitoring, as well as training for medical professionals. This bill will also provide valuable updates to the law. It will increase coordination across Federal agencies and improve our understanding of the issues youth and young adults face as they transition out of school-based services.

These changes will advance our understanding of autism spectrum disorder and allow us to better assist the millions of Americans it impacts.

The programs provided for this in bill have traditionally enjoyed strong bipartisan support in the Energy and Commerce Committee. It enjoyed strong bipartisan support, as I guess it will as well here, because this is a strong bipartisan issue.

So I urge my colleagues to continue this commitment by voting for the Autism CARES Act today.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), one of our distinguished leaders.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One in 68 is diagnosed with autism, Mr. Speaker, and we have an opportunity to come alongside those families that are dealing with this diagnosis by supporting the Autism CARES Act. It is a holistic approach, one that takes on research, education, early detection, and intervention for those all across the autism spectrum.

There are so many times that we can get into dollars and cents and chapter and verse and future savings in all of these things, but think about it. Beyond all of that is something that is much more important, and it is this: we can be a part of helping children reach their potential as adults. It is the desire of every parent to see their child reach full potential. So we can do that by coming together with this legislation. Think about the joy that is involved in that.

I am pleased to associate myself with the work of Congressman SMITH in this effort and to be a cosponsor of the Autism CARES Act.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support this very important bipartisan legislation. I urge all Members to do so, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4631, the Autism CARES Act, which reauthorizes the Combating Autism Reauthorization Act. I want to commend my colleague, Representative CHRIS SMITH, for bringing this measure forward.

Our understanding of autism remains an unsolved puzzle. More children than ever are being diagnosed with communication and behavior disorders that lead to a diagnosis of autism.

Though our understanding of autism is limited, what we do know is that autism affects too many children, strains families, costs too much, and puts those it afflicts at an educational, professional, and social disadvantage compared to their peers.

Families with autistic children do everything they can to help their kids maximize their God-given abilities whatever those may be. But it's not always easy especially in a world where many don't understand the unique challenges autism presents. Helping these families better navigate this treacherous world would make a huge difference.

The Autism CARES Act provides federal support for critical autism research by reauthorizing research programs at the National Institute of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Department of Health and Human Services. The bill will help better coordinate federal autism research and ensure more focused efforts to maximize the benefits of the resources we invest in such research.

This bill also will begin efforts to determine how best to meet the needs of young adults with autism as they face the new challenges that come with being an adult.

These investments are extremely important because autism imposes tremendous emotional and financial costs on families and economic impact on the health care system. The investments called for by this bill will pale in comparison to the personal and financial benefits they will yield in the future.

Families struggling with autism face challenges many of us can't imagine. They need and deserve our help. It is time to commit ourselves to solving this puzzle today so autism can be prevented, treated, and cured tomorrow.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4631, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAUMA SYSTEMS AND REGIONALIZATION OF EMERGENCY CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4080) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4080

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN TRAUMA CARE PROGRAMS.

Section 1232(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–32(a)) is amended by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2019''.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO CERTAIN TRAUMA CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR REGIONALIZED SYSTEMS FOR EMERGENCY CARE RESPONSE.—Section 1232(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–32(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2014, not more than 50 percent of such amounts remaining for such fiscal year after application of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be allocated for the purpose of carrying out section 1204.''.

(b) CLARIFICATIONS UNDER TRAUMA SYSTEMS FORMULA GRANTS REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE AMERICAN BURN ASSOCIATION.—Section 1213 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–13) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting ''and (for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2014) contains national standards and requirements of the American Burn Association for the designation of verified burn centers,'' after ''such entity,'';

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(A), by striking ''and the American Academy of Pediatrics,'' and

inserting ''the American Academy of Pediatrics, and (for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2014) the American Burn Association,''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act'' after ''Act of 2007''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and the American Academy of Pediatrics'' and inserting ''the American Academy of Pediatrics, and (with respect to the update pursuant to the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act) the American Burn Association''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Part B of title XII of the Public Health Service Act is amended—

(1) in section 1218(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 300d–18(c)(2)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''1232(b)(3)'' and inserting ''section 1232(b)''; and

(2) in section 1222 (42 U.S.C. 300d–22), by striking ''October 1, 2008'' and inserting ''October 1, 2016''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support of H.R. 4080, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, introduced by Representative MICHAEL BURGESS.

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act by reauthorizing two important grant programs: the Trauma Care Systems Planning Grants and the Regionalization of Emergency Care Systems.

The first program supports State and rural development of trauma systems and the second funds pilot projects to design, implement, and evaluate innovative models of regionalized emergency care.

We know that immediate access to trauma care within the golden hour after injury is critical. By improving access to the specialized care designed to treat trauma injuries, both of these trauma bills will save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4080, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act. I am proud to be the lead Democratic sponsor on this important bill with my colleague from Texas, Dr. BURGESS. I want to thank him for his leadership and commitment to this issue.

This bill reauthorizes the programs that provide grants to States for planning, implementing, and developing trauma care systems, and establishes pilot projects that design innovative models of emergency care systems.

Ideally, trauma and emergency care systems respond quickly and efficiently to ensure that the seriously injured individuals receive the care they need within that golden hour—the time period when medical intervention is most effective at saving lives.

However, unintentional injury remains the leading cause of death for Americans aged 44 years and younger, and access to trauma centers is inconsistent throughout the country. In fact, 45 million Americans lack access to a trauma care center within that golden hour, which is the first hour after the injury.

Emergency departments and trauma centers are overcrowded, the emergency care system is splintered, and surgical specialists are often unavailable to patients who need them. This legislation helps establish the systems that save lives and improve the functioning of our trauma care systems.

Again, I want to thank Representative BURGESS for championing this effort with me. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Ranking Member PALLONE, and the work of the committee's staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee and bringing it to the floor today.

I support this bipartisan and I urge my colleagues to do the same, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, the distinguished vice chairman of the Health Subcommittee, who has been a real champion on this issue and is the prime sponsor of the bill.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, trauma is the leading cause of death for people under the age of 65. It is expensive, costing nearly $403 billion a year, third only to heart disease and cancer. It affects individuals of all ages, 35 million times each year, or one person every 15 minutes.

□ 1845

H.R. 4080 reauthorizes two existing, bipartisan grant programs that support the regionalization of emergency care and trauma systems across the country.

Trauma systems deliver a full range of care to injured patients. Most Members of the House have trauma systems either in their districts or nearby that are able to serve their constituents.

This bill is supported by the American Association of Neurological Surgeons, the American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons, the American Burn Association, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the American College of Surgeons, the Emergency Nurses Association, the American Trauma Society, the Congress of Neurological Surgeons, and the Trauma Center Association of America.

A study released in April found that patients living near a recently closed trauma facility were 21 percent more likely to die from their injuries. Two years after closure, the likelihood of death increased to 29 percent, emphasizing the importance of these grants.

This legislation passed out of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health by a voice vote and passed the full committee on April 3 unanimously. This legislation is broadly supported by medicine. It is bipartisan, and it has gone through regular order.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS as well as Ranking Members Waxman and Pallone, and the Energy and Commerce staffs on both sides of the dais: Clay Alspach, Robert Horne, Brenda DeStro, Katie Novaria, as well as Anne Morris Reid.

Mr. GREEN and I have worked on this issue for years, and I appreciate his continued partnership on the bill. I also want to thank his staff, Kristen O'Neill.

Finally, from my office, I want to thank Adrianna Simonelli and JP Paluskiewicz, who shepherded the bill through the process.

I urge all Members to vote in favor of this legislation. It is important for all of our districts.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise today in strong support of H.R. 4080, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act.

I would especially like to thank Dr. BURGESS of Texas and Representative GENE GREEN of Texas for introducing this very important, critical piece of legislation.

As has been mentioned, the leading cause of death for people under the age of 45 is trauma. It is, unfortunately, something a majority of States is not adequately prepared to handle. According to the CDC, trauma kills more Americans than AIDS and strokes combined. The Nation needs a robust network to respond quickly and efficiently to get seriously injured individuals to the appropriate trauma center within that golden hour that has been much discussed, which is the time period when medical intervention is the most effective in saving lives and in saving function.

H.R. 4080, if enacted, will allow for the development of innovative State and regionalized care, which is necessary to prevent these trauma deaths.

The bill would also direct States to update their model trauma care plans with the input of stakeholders. When the difference between life and death rests on the ability to deliver coordinated trauma care within the golden hour, we need legislation in place, such as H.R. 4080, in order to improve the delivery of emergency medical care to severely injured patients.

While we are at it, at some point, we should deal with the issue of liability reform for trauma centers because we need on-call specialists to deliver that care when we most need it, but that is a fight for another day. Today, let's get H.R. 4080 done.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation that was introduced by Dr. BURGESS and Mr. GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in closing, as a cosponsor of this bill and in working with my colleague Dr. BURGESS for a number of years on trauma care, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Again, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4080 is another very important and bipartisan bill, and I urge all of the Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4080, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVING TRAUMA CARE ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3548) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3548

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. TRAUMA DEFINITION.

(a) REVISED DEFINITION UNDER TRAUMA SYSTEMS GRANTS PROGRAMS.—Paragraph (4) of section 1231 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–31) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) TRAUMA.—The term 'trauma' means an injury resulting from exposure to—

''(A) a mechanical force; or

''(B) another extrinsic agent, including an extrinsic agent that is thermal, electrical, chemical, or radioactive.''.

(b) REVISED DEFINITION UNDER INTERAGENCY PROGRAM FOR TRAUMA RESEARCH.—Paragraph (3) of section 1261(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–61(h)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) The term 'trauma' means an injury resulting from exposure to—

''(A) a mechanical force; or

''(B) another extrinsic agent, including an extrinsic agent that is thermal, electrical, chemical, or radioactive.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3548, the Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014, introduced by Congressman BILL JOHNSON of Ohio.

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act by expanding the current definition of ''trauma'' to include an injury resulting from exposure to thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other agents.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3548, the Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014.

This legislation amends the definition of the word ''trauma'' for the purpose of trauma care grants authorized in title XII of the Public Health Service Act to include burns and other injuries resulting from electrical, chemical, or other exposures.

Strengthening our Nation's trauma care services is an important priority on which I hope to continue to work with Members on both sides of the aisle to address.

I want to thank Congressman JOHNSON for his sponsorship of this legislation, and I want to acknowledge the work of our committee—Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Ranking Member PALLONE—and of all the staff in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3548, the Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014, bipartisan legislation I am proud to have sponsored with the support and counsel of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I commend the committee staff for their hard work to move this legislation forward through markup at the subcommittee and full committee levels and to steer it to the House floor today.

This simple but important bill seeks to refine inconsistent definitions of what constitutes ''trauma'' as outlined in the United States Code.

Common sense would certainly point to many burn injuries as a type of trauma, but the U.S. Code doesn't recognizes them as such. The failure to incorporate the full range of traumatic injuries in the description of ''trauma,'' including burns, can result in gaps in coverage and in provisions of care throughout the care system. By modernizing this term as federally defined, Congress can ensure that it accurately reflects the medical realities of trauma and protects access to the provision of trauma care.

There are important gains to be made in the field of traumatic medicine by the further integration of care and by finding synergies between burn and trauma centers. This has been all too evident in efforts to save lives after national tragedies, such as 9/11 and the Boston Marathon bombing. The importance of strengthening our Nation's burn care infrastructure can't be stressed enough. Inadequacy and inconsistency in the U.S. Code around the classification of burns further compound serious shortfalls in our Nation's traumatic emergency medical care system.

Traumatic injury is the leading cause of death for those under age 44, but getting a victim of trauma to a level 1 or 2 trauma center within the first golden hour can make all of the difference. However, 45 million Americans do not have access to a level 1 or 2 trauma center within an hour's travel.

I applaud the efforts of my colleague Dr. BURGESS to reauthorize trauma programs and improve this system with his bill H.R. 4080, which I am also proud to support. I thank him for his endorsement of H.R. 3548, and I am grateful for his efforts to improve trauma care more broadly.

In addition, this legislation has the strong support of a broad coalition of the major medical societies and associations representing the trauma care community, including: the American Burn Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma, the American Trauma Society, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the Trauma Center Association of America, and America's Essential Hospitals.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS for their hard work in promoting the Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014.

I hope my colleagues will support this commonsense legislation that prevents gaps in coverage and improves the provision of trauma care, and I strongly encourage a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I

urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3548.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I also urge Members to support this commonsense legislation, bipartisanly supported.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3548, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1281) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1281

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Improved newborn and child screening and followup for heritable disorders.
Sec. 3. Evaluating the effectiveness of newborn and child screening and followup programs.
Sec. 4. Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children.
Sec. 5. Clearinghouse of Newborn Screening Information.
Sec. 6. Laboratory quality and surveillance.
Sec. 7. Interagency Coordinating Committee on Newborn and Child Screening.
Sec. 8. National contingency plan for newborn screening.
Sec. 9. Hunter Kelly Research Program.
Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 11. Reports to Congress.

SEC. 2. IMPROVED NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING AND FOLLOWUP FOR HERITABLE DISORDERS.

Section 1109 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–8) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''subsection (j)'' and inserting ''section 1117''; and

(ii) by striking ''and in consultation with the Advisory Committee'' and inserting ''and taking into consideration the expertise of the Advisory Committee'';

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) to assist in providing health care professionals and newborn screening laboratory personnel with education in newborn screening, counseling, and training in—

''(A) relevant and new technologies in newborn screening and congenital, genetic, and metabolic disorders;

''(B) the importance of the timeliness of collection, delivery, receipt, and screening of specimens; and

''(C) sharing of medical and diagnostic information with providers and families;'';

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''treatment'' and inserting ''followup and treatment''; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) to improve the timeliness of—

''(A) the collection, delivery, receipt, and screening of specimens; and

''(B) the diagnosis of heritable disorders in newborns.'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''application submitted for a grant under subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''application for a grant under this section'';

(3) in subsection (h), by striking ''application submitted under subsection (c)(2)'' each place it appears and inserting ''application for a grant under this section''; and

(4) by striking subsection (j) (relating to authorization of appropriations).

SEC. 3. EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING AND FOLLOWUP PROGRAMS.

Section 1110 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–9) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND FOLLOWUP**'' after ''**CHILD SCREENING**'';*

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''of screening,'' and inserting '', including with respect to timeliness, of screening, followup,'';

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''counseling, testing'' and inserting ''treatment, counseling, testing, followup,''; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including, as appropriate, through the assessment of health and development outcomes for such children through adolescence'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''counseling, testing'' and inserting ''treatment, counseling, testing, followup,'';

(ii) by inserting ''in a timely manner'' after ''in newborns and children''; and

(iii) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) methods that may be identified to improve quality in the diagnosis, treatment, and disease management of heritable disorders based on gaps in services or care; or

''(5) methods or best practices by which the eligible entities described in section 1109 can achieve in a timely manner—

''(A) collection, delivery, receipt, and screening of newborn screening specimens; and

''(B) diagnosis of heritable disorders in newborns.''; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) (relating to authorization of appropriations).

SEC. 4. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITABLE DISORDERS IN NEWBORNS AND CHILDREN.

Section 1111 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–10) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (6) as paragraphs (6) through (8), respectively;

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3), the following:

''(4) provide technical assistance, as appropriate, to individuals and organizations regarding the submission of nominations to the uniform screening panel, including prior to the submission of such nominations;

''(5) take appropriate steps, at its discretion, to prepare for the review of nominations prior to their submission, including for conditions for which a screening method has been validated but other nomination criteria are not yet met, in order to facilitate timely action by the Advisory Committee once such submission has been received by the Committee;'';

(C) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by inserting '', including the cost'' after ''public health impact''; and

(D) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''achieve rapid diagnosis'' and inserting ''achieve best practices in rapid diagnosis and appropriate treatment'';

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting before the semicolon '', including information on cost and incidence'';

(iii) in subparagraph (J), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iv) in subparagraph (K), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(L) the timeliness of collection, delivery, receipt, and screening of specimens to be tested for heritable disorders in newborns in order to ensure rapid diagnosis and followup.'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''180'' and inserting ''120''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ''If the Secretary is unable to make a determination to adopt or reject such recommendation within such 120-day period, the Secretary shall notify the Advisory Committee and the appropriate committees of Congress of such determination together with an explanation for why the Secretary was unable to comply within such 120-day period, as well as a plan of action for consideration of such pending recommendation.'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) DEADLINE FOR REVIEW.—For each condition nominated to be added to the recommended uniform screening panel in accordance with the requirements of this section, the Advisory Committee shall review and vote on the nominated condition within 9 months of the date on which the Advisory Committee referred the nominated condition to the condition review workgroup.'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall meet at least 4 times each calendar year, or at the discretion of the Designated Federal Officer in consultation with the Chair.'';

(5) by amending subsection (g) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

''(g) CONTINUATION OF OPERATION OF COMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Advisory Committee shall continue to operate through the end of fiscal year 2019.

''(2) CONTINUATION IF NOT REAUTHORIZED.—If at the end of fiscal year 2019 the duration of the Advisory Committee has not been extended by statute, the Advisory Committee may be deemed, for purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, an advisory committee established by the President or an officer of the Federal Government under section 9(a) of such Act.''; and

(6) by striking subsection (h) (relating to authorization of appropriations), as redesignated by paragraph (3).

SEC. 5. CLEARINGHOUSE OF NEWBORN SCREENING INFORMATION.

Section 1112 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–11) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''data'' and inserting ''information''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4) maintain current information on the number of conditions for which screening is conducted in each State; and

''(5) disseminate available evidence-based guidelines related to diagnosis, counseling, and treatment with respect to conditions detected by newborn screening.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(4)(D), by striking ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2008'' and inserting ''Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''developing the clearinghouse'' and inserting ''carrying out activities''; and

(B) by striking ''clearinghouse minimizes duplication and supplements, not supplants'' and inserting ''activities minimize duplication and supplement, not supplant''; and

(4) by striking subsection (d) (relating to authorization of appropriations).

SEC. 6. LABORATORY QUALITY AND SURVEILLANCE.

Section 1113 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–12) is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**AND SURVEILLANCE**'' before the period;*

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''and in consultation with the Advisory Committee'' and inserting ''and taking into consideration the expertise of the Advisory Committee''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''timeliness for processing such tests,'' after ''newborn-screening tests,''; and

(3) by striking subsection (b) (relating to authorization of appropriations) and inserting the following:

''(b) SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and taking into consideration the expertise of the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children established under section 1111, may provide, as appropriate, for the coordination of surveillance activities, including—

''(1) through standardized data collection and reporting, as well as the use of electronic health records; and

''(2) by promoting data sharing regarding newborn screening with State-based birth defects and developmental disabilities monitoring programs.''.

SEC. 7. INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON NEWBORN AND CHILD SCREENING.

Section 1114 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–13) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''the Administrator, the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality,'' and inserting ''the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs,''; and

(2) by striking subsection (e) (relating to authorization of appropriations).

SEC. 8. NATIONAL CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR NEWBORN SCREENING.

Section 1115(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–14(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''consortia'' and inserting ''consortium''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''The plan shall be updated as needed and at least every five years.''.

SEC. 9. HUNTER KELLY RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 1116 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) providing research findings and data for newborn conditions under review by the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children to be added to the recommended uniform screening panel;

''(D) conducting pilot studies on conditions recommended by the Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children to ensure that screenings are ready for nationwide implementation; and''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''of the National Institutes of Health Reform Act of 2006''.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Part A of title XI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300b–1 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end, the following:

''SEC. 1117. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEWBORN SCREENING PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.

''There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) to carry out sections 1109, 1110, 1111, and 1112, $11,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019; and

''(2) to carry out section 1113, $8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''.

SEC. 11. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) GAO REPORT ON TIMELINESS OF NEWBORN SCREENING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives concerning the timeliness of screening for heritable disorders in newborns.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An analysis of information regarding the timeliness of newborn screening, which may include the time elapsed from birth to specimen collection, specimen collection to receipt by laboratory, specimen receipt to reporting, reporting to followup testing, and followup testing to confirmed diagnosis.

(B) A summary of any guidelines, recommendations, or best practices available to States and health care providers intended to support a timely newborn screening system.

(C) An analysis of any barriers to maintaining a timely newborn screening system which may exist and recommendations for addressing such barriers.

(b) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on activities related to—

(i) newborn screening; and

(ii) screening children who have or are at risk for heritable disorders; and

(B) not less than every 2 years, submit to such committees an updated version of such report.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under this subsection shall contain a description of—

(A) the ongoing activities under sections 1109, 1110, and 1112 through 1115 of the Public Health Service Act; and

(B) the amounts expended on such activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1281, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014, introduced by Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD of California and Representative MIKE SIMPSON of Idaho, which now includes 120 cosponsors.

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act to extend and revise a grant program for screening, counseling, and other services related to genetic disorders. H.R. 1281 reauthorizes Federal programs that provide assistance to States to improve and expand their newborn screening programs, support parent and provider education, and ensure laboratory quality and surveillance.

Newborn screening is an important public health program for testing every newborn for certain conditions not apparent at birth. This early screening and diagnosis can be life changing for these children and their families. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1281, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Newborn screening is conducted for a number of genetic, metabolic, hormonal, and functional conditions that may not be apparent at birth. Approximately one in every 300 newborns has a condition that can be detected through screening. If diagnosed early, many of these disorders can be managed successfully.

H.R. 1281 reauthorizes the Department of Health and Human Services' Advisory Committee that recommends conditions to be included in the uniform screening panel; allows the Advisory Committee to begin the consideration of certain new conditions more quickly; and requires the Secretary of HHS to make determinations on the committee's recommendations in a shorter period of time.

The bill also extends support for State programs involving screening, counseling, education, and other services; demonstration programs to evaluate the effectiveness of services; and a clearinghouse of resources related to newborn screening.

This legislation puts a new emphasis on the timeliness of newborn screening in all of these activities, and it requires the GAO to report to Congress on this issue.

I want to thank the sponsors of this legislation, Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD and Congressman SIMPSON; the

sponsors of the Senate companion legislation, Senators HAGAN and HATCH; and the leaders on the Energy and Commerce Committee and on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, for their work on this bill.

I support H.R. 1281, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD, for her leadership on this important issue.

I come to the House floor tonight to speak in support of H.R. 1281, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act, which I am proud to cosponsor.

For the last 50 years, newborn screening services have played an important role for families across the country. Screening for developmental disabilities or diseases at birth can identify treatable diseases early and give a child the opportunity to live a healthy life.

I also want to take a moment to thank a leading advocate for newborn screening, Buffalo Bills Hall of Fame Quarterback Jim Kelly, who is from New York's 27th District.

In 1997, Jim and his wife, Jill, founded Hunter's Hope Foundation shortly after their son Hunter was diagnosed with Krabbe disease. Krabbe disease is fatal when left untreated and, tragically, cut Hunter's life short.

With universal newborn screening, the story of Hunter Kelly and countless others with developmental diseases could have been different.

I urge the House to reauthorize this vital program today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to my colleague from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD). We came in at the same time in 1993.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act. I introduced this bill to help ensure our babies continuing receiving lifesaving newborn screenings.

I extend my sincere thanks to my lead cosponsor, Congressman MICHAEL SIMPSON, for his support and his long history of championing newborn screening services.

I thank Senators KAY HAGAN and ORRIN HATCH for introducing the Senate companion bill, which passed by unanimous consent in January of this year.

I also thank the coalition of public health groups—especially the March of Dimes and the Association of Public Health Laboratories—for working with my office over the last 10 years on this critical issue.

Lastly, I would be remiss if I did not mention Debbie Jessup of my staff, for her outstanding management of my bill, and the work of two exceptional public health fellows, Arianna Baseman and Daphne Delgado, who provided strong leadership in moving the bill forward.

Newborn screening is a public health intervention that involves giving babies a simple blood test to identify many life-threatening genetic and metabolic illnesses before symptoms begin. Newborn screening is one of the great public health success stories of the 20th century.

Prior to the enactment of the original Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act in 2008, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required infants to be screened for a complete panel of recommended disorders, and there was no Federal repository of information on the diseases.

Today, 44 States and the District of Columbia require screening of at least 29 of the 31 core treatable conditions. Today, professionals and parents have centralized access to newborn screening information when their baby is diagnosed with one of these disorders.

Since the passage of the original bill, newborn screenings have improved, and new screenings have been added. These screenings are critical for the approximately 12,000 babies who, each year, test positive for one of these treatable diseases.

Fifty years ago, before newborn screening tests were developed, the conditions of these babies would have gone undetected until symptoms appeared. As a result, they would have unnecessarily died or suffered from their lifelong disabling disorder.

Today, because of newborn screening, they have an opportunity and they have hope for a relatively normal life.

The ability to rapidly identify and treat these disorders is making a difference between health and disability—and even life or death—for the children affected by these severe diseases. Unfortunately, critical gaps and challenges still remain.

Due to existing discrepancies in the number of tests given from State to State, each year, approximately 1,000 infants tragically die or are permanently disabled from otherwise treatable disorders.

The passage of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will help avoid these preventable tragedies by providing States with the resources they need to improve their newborn screening programs and to uniformly test for all recommended disorders.

It also provides States with assistance in developing followup and tracking programs. These provisions will help our financially burdened health care system by saving billions of dollars over the life of these children.

In addition, this bill renews the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders and requires the CDC to ensure the quality of laboratories involved in newborn screening.

The bill also continues the Hunter Kelly Newborn Screening Program, which helps NIH researchers develop better detection, prevention, and treatment strategies.

Mr. Speaker, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act will continue to help parents and health providers to be knowledgeable about the importance of newborn screening tests, and it will help ensure all our newborn babies receive the comprehensive and consistent testing they need to have healthy, happy, and productive lives.

Where a baby is born should not determine its chance to have a healthy future.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the passage of H.R. 1281.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), one of the greatest champions that this Chamber has ever seen in the cause of human life, and I share that cause with him as well.

I thank the authors for their positive intentions on this bill. I am a mother of five biological children and 23 foster children, and that is what every parent and every mother and every father hopes, is to have the best possible health care for their children, the best possible outcome.

I do share concerns on this bill as well, as well intentioned as this is, and let me just list what my concerns are.

Number one, the Federal Government will have the ability to collect and automatically store the blood sample of every baby in the United States. There won't be any allowance for parental consent to be required before the storage of these blood samples are made.

Every baby's DNA, which is the entire genetic code of that baby, will be under the control of the government.

I have data privacy concerns. Why should anyone, especially our government, have everyone's identity at their disposal?

Third, there is no provision for any parent to opt out, so this legislation presumes that every parent of every newborn in the United States of America pre-agrees that the government can have their baby's blood sample, which contains their DNA code, and that the government can indefinitely store that data.

What limitations will there be on our government and what they can do with this information and how they will handle this data?

Now, Mr. Speaker, knowing that our government has the potential to control every American's health care under ObamaCare, how could government's control of a baby's DNA information impact the full access to health care or education opportunities or job opportunities for a child who is predetermined, by their DNA, to potentially have a problem later in life?

These are just a few of the questions, Mr. Speaker, that I believe need to be addressed.

I know this bill has passed the Senate. I know it will be voice-voted. I would like to ask for a rollcall vote, but I understand that the process is already deep on its way.

I do hope that these questions will be addressed in future legislation. It may not be done in this legislation. I hope it will be in the future because we should not be—Americans should not see the death of privacy, especially of the most sensitive private information that every American can have, their DNA, their genetic code, what God gave to them—that should be something that is between the individual, their doctor, and God; and it shouldn't be for the government to control that data.

I want to thank Mr. PITTS. I, in no way, cast any negative aspersion upon himself or any of the authors on this bill. These are just some of the questions that I have.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers. I urge support for the legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support, again, for this important and bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1281, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1098) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1098

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. CDC PROGRAMS FOR PREVENTION AND SURVEILLANCE OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) PREVENTION.—Section 393B(b)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1c(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''health-status goals for 2010, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2010'' and inserting ''health-status goals for 2020, commonly referred to as Healthy People 2020''.

(b) SURVEILLANCE.—Subsection (b) of section 393C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1d) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) Not later than'' and inserting the following:

''(b) REPORTS.—

''(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) SUBSEQUENT REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Director of the National Institutes of Health and in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall submit to the relevant committees of Congress a report that—

''(A) identifies which recommendations in the report under paragraph (1) have been adopted and which recommendations in such report have not been adopted; and

''(B) includes a description of planned activities to address each recommendation in such report that has not been adopted.''.

(c) FUNDING.—Section 394A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–3) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' after ''1994,'';

(2) by striking the second period at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: ''Of the amounts made available to carry out this part for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, there is authorized to be appropriated $6,100,000 to carry out sections 393B and 393C.''.

SEC. 3. STATE GRANTS FOR PROJECTS REGARDING TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 1252 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–52) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking '', acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration,'';

(2) in paragraphs (1)(A)(i) and (3)(E) of subsection (f), by striking ''brain injury'' and inserting ''traumatic brain injury'';

(3) in subsection (h), by striking the comma after ''under this section'' and inserting a comma before ''including''; and

(4) by amending subsection (j) to read as follows:

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For carrying out this section and section 1253, there is authorized to be appropriated $9,760,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.''.

SEC. 4. STATE GRANTS FOR PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SERVICES.

Section 1253 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d–53) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking '', acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration (referred to in this section as the 'Administrator'),'';

(2) in subsections (c), (d)(1), (e)(1), (e)(4), (g), (h), and (j)(1), by striking ''Administrator'' each place it appears and inserting ''Secretary'';

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking the subsection heading and inserting ''REPORTING'';

(B) by striking ''Each protection and advocacy system'' and inserting the following:

''(1) REPORTS BY SYSTEMS.—Each protection and advocacy system''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REPORT BY SECRETARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the services and activities carried out under this section during the period for which the report is being prepared.''.

(4) in subsection (i)—

(A) by striking ''Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration'' and inserting ''Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''by the Administrator'' and inserting ''by the Secretary'';

(5) in subsection (k), by striking ''subtitle C'' and inserting ''subtitle C of title I'';

(6) by striking subsection (l) (relating to authorization of appropriations); and

(7) by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (l).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1098, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act, introduced by Representative BILL PASCRELL of New Jersey, which will continue to provide the needed services that help patients with a traumatic brain injury, TBI.

More than 3.17 million Americans live with a disability that resulted from a TBI, including children and adults, athletes and soldiers.

The prevention and surveillance work done at the Centers for Disease Control keeps the public and providers aware of TBI research that leads to early diagnosis and treatment.

Research at the National Institutes of Health improves the understanding of TBI and identifies treatments that will improve lives. Programs available at the Health Resources and Services Administration help families to better care for their members who suffer from a TBI.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1098, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014.

Traumatic brain injury, or TBI, is an unexpected blow or a jolt to the head. These injuries affect people of all ages. A soldier in a blast injury, an elderly person who has fallen, or a young driver involved in a car crash can experience TBI.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate more than 2 million Americans experience a traumatic brain injury each year.

The vast majority of these individuals have an injury that can be treated at a hospital emergency room, but not

all Americans are as fortunate. Their injuries can have more devastating consequences and may result in death or lasting disability.

The TBI program at the Department of Health and Human Services was first established in 1996 and has been reauthorized twice, in 2001 and, again, in 2008.

The legislation before the House today, once again, reauthorizes the TBI program. It would extend TBI surveillance and research activities. It will also extend programs for TBI services and support administered across Health and Human Services.

I want to commend the sponsors of the legislation, Congressman PASCRELL and Congressman ROONEY, and I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, and Ranking Member PALLONE and the work of our committee staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee and bringing it to the floor today.

I support this bipartisan bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman PASCRELL, my good friend and colleague.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the passage of this legislation, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN; Chairman PITTS; my friend from New Jersey, Ranking Member PALLONE; and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas for their thoughtful consideration and support for millions of traumatic brain injury survivors and their families. Additionally, I want to thank my fellow cochair of the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force, Congressman TOM ROONEY of Florida, for his leadership on this important issue as well.

Throughout my 13 years working on this issue, I have witnessed firsthand how these programs make a difference in people's lives.

You have heard the numbers, but let's go beyond the numbers. Traumatic brain injury has become the signature wound of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Twenty percent of our soldiers deployed are estimated to have experienced a brain injury. Many returning servicemembers suffering from TBI will receive care and rehabilitation services within the Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs.

But others suffering from TBIs that are initially undiagnosed or misdiagnosed will later look to the civilian community and local resources for information and service. That is why it is essential that we continue to foster civilian-military collaboration, like the Department of Defense Center of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury, to build a system that ensures returning troops receive what they need to put their lives back together again.

Unfortunately, TBI remains the silent epidemic in this country. That is why the legislation today is so critical.

The TBI Act is the only legislation that specifically allocates Federal funds for programs supporting individuals with brain injury.

Originally passed in 1996 and reauthorized in 2000 and 2008, the TBI Act represents a foundation for coordinated and balanced public policy on prevention, education, research, and community living for people living with TBI and their circles of support.

And it has produced results. For nearly 18 years, the Traumatic Brain Injury Act has successfully provided direction and legal authority for the vast traumatic brain injury community.

Grants within the TBI Act have helped States improve access to health and other services for persons with TBI. Prior to this law, they did not have the tools to even assess their own needs.

Thanks to the TBI Act and its directive to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, we now have a record of incidents, including details and prevalence, plans for prevention, and, finally, access to treatment. We have also begun to educate the public and provide much-needed scientific data for our scientists, health care providers, and policymakers.

Additionally, under this act, the National Institutes of Health is conducting basic and applied research in TBI, making great strides in our knowledge of the brain and the impact of TBI. Mr. Speaker, this is in direct correlation to the President's BRAIN Initiative. We keep on meeting together to explore this new horizon, which I think is going to dramatically have very positive consequences.

The Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014 will elevate the TBI program within Health and Human Services by moving the program from Maternal and Child Health's Children's Program, in acknowledgement of the impact of TBI across the age span, including older adults and returning servicemembers and veterans. Our intention is for the program to be relocated to the Administration on Community Living to better coordinate with Federal agencies regarding the long-term services and support available to individuals with other disabilities.

Brain injury survivors from all walks of life, and their families, look to community and local resources for all types of information and assistance. Regardless of the source of the injury, this legislation will ensure the framework, the information and research resources, are available to help.

Mr. Speaker, only a strong commitment will allow us to continue the incredible advances we have made in the area of basic brain injury: prevention, detection, early treatment, physical and mental rehabilitation, long-term care, and patient advocacy issues.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I urge support for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, this is another piece of important legislation, and it enjoys bipartisan support. I urge the Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1098, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1681

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations.
Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.
Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 202. CIARDS and FERS special retirement credit for service on detail to another agency.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.
Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.
Sec. 303. Specific authorization of funding for High Performance Computing Center 2.

Sec. 304. Clarification of exemption from Freedom of Information Act of identities of employees submitting complaints to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.
Sec. 305. Functional managers for the intelligence community.
Sec. 306. Annual assessment of intelligence community performance by function.
Sec. 307. Software licensing.
Sec. 308. Plans to respond to unauthorized public disclosures of covert actions.
Sec. 309. Auditability.
Sec. 310. Reports of fraud, waste, and abuse.
Sec. 311. Public Interest Declassification Board.
Sec. 312. Official representation items in support of the Coast Guard Attaché Program.
Sec. 313. Declassification review of certain items collected during the mission that killed Osama bin Laden on May 1, 2011.
Sec. 314. Merger of the Foreign Counterintelligence Program and the General Defense Intelligence Program.

Subtitle B—Reporting

Sec. 321. Significant interpretations of law concerning intelligence activities.
Sec. 322. Review for official publication of opinions of the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice concerning intelligence activities.
Sec. 323. Submittal to Congress by heads of elements of intelligence community of plans for orderly shutdown in event of absence of appropriations.
Sec. 324. Reports on chemical weapons in Syria.
Sec. 325. Reports to the intelligence community on penetrations of networks and information systems of certain contractors.
Sec. 326. Report on electronic waste.
Sec. 327. Promoting STEM education to meet the future workforce needs of the intelligence community.
Sec. 328. Repeal of the termination of notification requirements regarding the authorized disclosure of national intelligence.
Sec. 329. Repeal or modification of certain reporting requirements.

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—National Security Agency

Sec. 401. Appointment of the Director of the National Security Agency.
Sec. 402. Appointment of the Inspector General of the National Security Agency.
Sec. 403. Effective date and applicability.

Subtitle B—National Reconnaissance Office

Sec. 411. Appointment of the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.
Sec. 412. Appointment of the Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office.
Sec. 413. Effective date and applicability.

Subtitle C—Central Intelligence Agency

Sec. 421. Gifts, devises, and bequests.

TITLE V—SECURITY CLEARANCE REFORM

Sec. 501. Continuous evaluation and sharing of derogatory information regarding personnel with access to classified information.
Sec. 502. Requirements for intelligence community contractors.
Sec. 503. Technology improvements to security clearance processing.
Sec. 504. Report on reciprocity of security clearances.
Sec. 505. Improving the periodic reinvestigation process.
Sec. 506. Appropriate committees of Congress defined.

TITLE VI—INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

Sec. 601. Protection of intelligence community whistleblowers.
Sec. 602. Review of security clearance or access determinations.
Sec. 603. Revisions of other laws.
Sec. 604. Policies and procedures; nonapplicability to certain terminations.

TITLE VII—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Sec. 701. Technical amendments to the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949.
Sec. 702. Technical amendments to the National Security Act of 1947 relating to the past elimination of certain positions.
Sec. 703. Technical amendments to the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The term ''congressional intelligence committees'' means—

(A) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2014 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The Department of Defense.

(4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(5) The National Security Agency.

(6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(7) The Coast Guard.

(8) The Department of State.

(9) The Department of the Treasury.

(10) The Department of Energy.

(11) The Department of Justice.

(12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(14) The National Reconnaissance Office.

(15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

(16) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101 and, subject to section 103, the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2014, for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill S. 1681 of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AVAILABILITY.—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President.

(2) DISTRIBUTION BY THE PRESIDENT.—Subject to paragraph (3), the President shall provide for suitable distribution of the classified Schedule of Authorizations, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

(3) LIMITS ON DISCLOSURE.—The President shall not publicly disclose the classified Schedule of Authorizations or any portion of such Schedule except—

(A) as provided in section 601(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 3306(a));

(B) to the extent necessary to implement the budget; or

(C) as otherwise required by law.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR INCREASES.—The Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2014 by the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed 3 percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such Schedule for such element.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish guidelines that govern, for each element of the intelligence community, the treatment under the personnel levels authorized under section 102(a), including any exemption from such personnel levels, of employment or assignment in—

(1) a student program, trainee program, or similar program;

(2) a reserve corps or as a reemployed annuitant; or

(3) details, joint duty, or long term, full-time training.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify the congressional intelligence committees in writing at least 15 days prior to each exercise of an authority described in subsection (a).

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2014 the sum of $528,229,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

(b) AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 855 positions as of September 30, 2014. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are

authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account for fiscal year 2014 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2015.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2014, there are authorized such additional personnel for the Community Management Account as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a).

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2014 the sum of $514,000,000.

SEC. 202. CIARDS AND FERS SPECIAL RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR SERVICE ON DETAIL TO ANOTHER AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(b) of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2013(b)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''service in the Agency performed'' and inserting ''service performed by an Agency employee''; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Agency activities'' and inserting ''intelligence activities''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applied to retired or deceased officers of the Central Intelligence Agency who were designated at any time under section 203 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2013) prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 303. SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING FOR HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING CENTER 2.

Funds appropriated for the construction of the High Performance Computing Center 2 (HPCC 2), as described in the table entitled Consolidated Cryptologic Program (CCP) in the classified annex to accompany the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6; 127 Stat. 198), in excess of the amount specified for such activity in the tables in the classified annex prepared to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277; 126 Stat. 2468) shall be specifically authorized by Congress for the purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094).

SEC. 304. CLARIFICATION OF EXEMPTION FROM FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT OF IDENTITIES OF EMPLOYEES SUBMITTING COMPLAINTS TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 103H(g)(3)(A) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(g)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''undertaken;'' and inserting ''undertaken, and this provision shall qualify as a withholding statute pursuant to subsection (b)(3) of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act');''.

SEC. 305. FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS AUTHORIZED.—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 103I the following new section:

''SEC. 103J. FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

''(a) FUNCTIONAL MANAGERS AUTHORIZED.—The Director of National Intelligence may establish within the intelligence community one or more positions of manager of an intelligence function. Any position so established may be known as the 'Functional Manager' of the intelligence function concerned.

''(b) PERSONNEL.—The Director shall designate individuals to serve as manager of intelligence functions established under subsection (a) from among officers and employees of elements of the intelligence community.

''(c) DUTIES.—Each manager of an intelligence function established under subsection (a) shall have the duties as follows:

''(1) To act as principal advisor to the Director on the intelligence function.

''(2) To carry out such other responsibilities with respect to the intelligence function as the Director may specify for purposes of this section.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 103I the following new item:

''Sec. 103J. Functional managers for the intelligence community.''.

SEC. 306. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PERFORMANCE BY FUNCTION.

(a) ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS REQUIRED.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 506I the following new section:

''SEC. 506J. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PERFORMANCE BY FUNCTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2016, and each year thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall, in consultation with the Functional Managers, submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on covered intelligence functions during the preceding year.

''(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include for each covered intelligence function for the year covered by such report the following:

''(1) An identification of the capabilities, programs, and activities of such intelligence function, regardless of the element of the intelligence community that carried out such capabilities, programs, and activities.

''(2) A description of the investment and allocation of resources for such intelligence function, including an analysis of the allocation of resources within the context of the National Intelligence Strategy, priorities for recipients of resources, and areas of risk.

''(3) A description and assessment of the performance of such intelligence function.

''(4) An identification of any issues related to the application of technical interoperability standards in the capabilities, programs, and activities of such intelligence function.

''(5) An identification of the operational overlap or need for de-confliction, if any, within such intelligence function.

''(6) A description of any efforts to integrate such intelligence function with other intelligence disciplines as part of an integrated intelligence enterprise.

''(7) A description of any efforts to establish consistency in tradecraft and training within such intelligence function.

''(8) A description and assessment of developments in technology that bear on the future of such intelligence function.

''(9) Such other matters relating to such intelligence function as the Director may specify for purposes of this section.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'covered intelligence functions' means each intelligence function for which a Functional Manager has been established under section 103J during the year covered by a report under this section.

''(2) The term 'Functional Manager' means the manager of an intelligence function established under section 103J.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 506I the following new item:

''Sec. 506J. Annual assessment of intelligence community performance by function.''.

SEC. 307. SOFTWARE LICENSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 108 the following new section:

''SEC. 109. SOFTWARE LICENSING.

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR INVENTORIES OF SOFTWARE LICENSES.—The chief information officer of each element of the intelligence community, in consultation with the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community, shall biennially—

''(1) conduct an inventory of all existing software licenses of such element, including utilized and unutilized licenses;

''(2) assess the actions that could be carried out by such element to achieve the greatest possible economies of scale and associated cost savings in software procurement and usage; and

''(3) submit to the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community each inventory required by paragraph (1) and each assessment required by paragraph (2).

''(b) INVENTORIES BY THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community, based on the inventories and assessments required by subsection (a), shall biennially—

''(1) compile an inventory of all existing software licenses of the intelligence community, including utilized and unutilized licenses; and

''(2) assess the actions that could be carried out by the intelligence community to achieve the greatest possible economies of scale and associated cost savings in software procurement and usage.

''(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a copy of each inventory compiled under subsection (b)(1).''.

(b) INITIAL INVENTORY.—

(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELEMENTS.—

(A) DATE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the chief information officer of each element of the intelligence community shall complete the initial inventory, assessment, and submission required under section 109(a) of the

National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(B) BASIS.—The initial inventory conducted for each element of the intelligence community under section 109(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall be based on the inventory of software licenses conducted pursuant to section 305 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277; 126 Stat. 2472) for such element.

(2) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community shall complete the initial compilation and assessment required under section 109(b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a).

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended—

(1) by striking the second item relating to section 104 (relating to Annual national security strategy report); and

(2) inserting after the item relating to section 108 the following new item:

''Sec. 109. Software licensing.''.

SEC. 308. PLANS TO RESPOND TO UNAUTHORIZED PUBLIC DISCLOSURES OF COVERT ACTIONS.

Section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) For each type of activity undertaken as part of a covert action, the President shall establish in writing a plan to respond to the unauthorized public disclosure of that type of activity.''.

SEC. 309. AUDITABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 509. AUDITABILITY OF CERTAIN ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL AUDITS.—The head of each covered entity shall ensure that there is a full financial audit of such covered entity each year beginning with fiscal year 2014. Such audits may be conducted by an internal or external independent accounting or auditing organization.

''(b) REQUIREMENT FOR UNQUALIFIED OPINION.—Beginning as early as practicable, but in no event later than the audit required under subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, the head of each covered entity shall take all reasonable steps necessary to ensure that each audit required under subsection (a) contains an unqualified opinion on the financial statements of such covered entity for the fiscal year covered by such audit.

''(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The chief financial officer of each covered entity shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees an annual audit report from an accounting or auditing organization on each audit of the covered entity conducted pursuant to subsection (a).

''(d) COVERED ENTITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'covered entity' means the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 508 the following new item:

''Sec. 509. Auditability of certain elements of the intelligence community.''.

SEC. 310. REPORTS OF FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE.

Section 8H(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended in paragraph (1)—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) An employee of an element of the intelligence community, an employee assigned or detailed to an element of the intelligence community, or an employee of a contractor to the intelligence community, who intends to report to Congress a complaint or information with respect to an urgent concern may report such complaint or information to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.''; and

(3) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''Act or section 17'' and inserting ''Act, section 17''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or section 103H(k) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)).''.

SEC. 311. PUBLIC INTEREST DECLASSIFICATION BOARD.

Section 710(b) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–567; 50 U.S.C. 3161 note) is amended by striking ''2014.'' and inserting ''2018.''.

SEC. 312. OFFICIAL REPRESENTATION ITEMS IN SUPPORT OF THE COAST GUARD ATTACHÉ PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other limitation on the amount of funds that may be used for official representation items, the Secretary of Homeland Security may use funds made available to the Secretary through the National Intelligence Program for necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities for official representation items in support of the Coast Guard Attaché Program.

SEC. 313. DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW OF CERTAIN ITEMS COLLECTED DURING THE MISSION THAT KILLED OSAMA BIN LADEN ON MAY 1, 2011.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall—

(1) in the manner described in the classified annex to this Act—

(A) complete a declassification review of documents collected in Abbottabad, Pakistan, during the mission that killed Osama bin Laden on May 1, 2011; and

(B) make publicly available any information declassified as a result of the declassification review required under paragraph (1); and

(2) report to the congressional intelligence committees—

(A) the results of the declassification review required under paragraph (1); and

(B) a justification for not declassifying any information required to be included in such declassification review that remains classified.

SEC. 314. MERGER OF THE FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM AND THE GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of National Intelligence shall carry out the merger of the Foreign Counterintelligence Program into the General Defense Intelligence Program as directed in the classified annex to this Act. The merger shall go into effect no earlier than 30 days after written notification of the merger is provided to the congressional intelligence committees.

Subtitle B—Reporting

SEC. 321. SIGNIFICANT INTERPRETATIONS OF LAW CONCERNING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.), as added by section 309 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 510. SIGNIFICANT INTERPRETATIONS OF LAW CONCERNING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

''(a) NOTIFICATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c) and to the extent consistent with due regard for the protection from unauthorized disclosure of classified information relating to sensitive intelligence sources and methods or other exceptionally sensitive matters, the General Counsel of each element of the intelligence community shall notify the congressional intelligence committees, in writing, of any significant legal interpretation of the United States Constitution or Federal law affecting intelligence activities conducted by such element by not later than 30 days after the date of the commencement of any intelligence activity pursuant to such interpretation.

''(b) CONTENT.—Each notification under subsection (a) shall provide a summary of the significant legal interpretation and the intelligence activity or activities conducted pursuant to such interpretation.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS.—A notification under subsection (a) shall not be required for a significant legal interpretation if—

''(1) notice of the significant legal interpretation was previously provided to the congressional intelligence committees under subsection (a); or

''(2) the significant legal interpretation was made before the date of the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

''(d) LIMITED ACCESS FOR COVERT ACTION.—If the President determines that it is essential to limit access to a covert action finding under section 503(c)(2), the President may limit access to information concerning such finding that is subject to notification under this section to those members of Congress who have been granted access to the relevant finding under section 503(c)(2).''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 509, as so added, the following new item:

''Sec. 510. Significant interpretations of law concerning intelligence activities.''.

SEC. 322. REVIEW FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF OPINIONS OF THE OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CONCERNING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

(a) PROCESS FOR REVIEW FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, establish a process for the regular review for official publication of significant opinions of the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice that have been provided to an element of the intelligence community.

(b) FACTORS.—The process of review of opinions established under subsection (a) shall include consideration of the following:

(1) The potential importance of an opinion to other agencies or officials in the Executive branch.

(2) The likelihood that similar questions addressed in an opinion may arise in the future.

(3) The historical importance of an opinion or the context in which it arose.

(4) The potential significance of an opinion to the overall jurisprudence of the Office of Legal Counsel.

(5) Such other factors as the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence consider appropriate.

(c) PRESUMPTION.—The process of review established under subsection (a) shall apply a presumption that significant opinions of the Office of Legal Counsel should be published when practicable, consistent with national security and other confidentiality considerations.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall require the official publication of any opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel, including publication under any circumstance as follows:

(1) When publication would reveal classified or other sensitive information relating to national security.

(2) When publication could reasonably be anticipated to interfere with Federal law enforcement efforts or is prohibited by law.

(3) When publication would conflict with preserving internal Executive branch deliberative processes or protecting other information properly subject to privilege.

(e) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE CLASSIFIED OPINIONS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that would have been selected for publication under the process of review established under subsection (a) but for the fact that publication would reveal classified or other sensitive information relating to national security shall be provided or made available to the appropriate committees of Congress.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR COVERT ACTION.—If the President determines that it is essential to limit access to a covert action finding under section 503(c)(2) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093(c)(2)), the President may limit access to information concerning such finding that would otherwise be provided or made available under this subsection to those members of Congress who have been granted access to such finding under such section 503(c)(2).

(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—The determination whether an opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel is appropriate for official publication under the process of review established under subsection (a) is discretionary and is not subject to judicial review.

SEC. 323. SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS BY HEADS OF ELEMENTS OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY OF PLANS FOR ORDERLY SHUTDOWN IN EVENT OF ABSENCE OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the head of an applicable agency submits a plan to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in accordance with section 124 of Office of Management and Budget Circular A–11, pertaining to agency operations in the absence of appropriations, or any successor circular of the Office that requires the head of an applicable agency to submit to the Director a plan for an orderly shutdown in the event of the absence of appropriations, such head shall submit a copy of such plan to the following:

(1) The congressional intelligence committees.

(2) The Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(3) The Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(4) In the case of a plan for an element of the intelligence community that is within the Department of Defense, to—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(b) HEAD OF AN APPLICABLE AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''head of an applicable agency'' includes the following:

(1) The Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) Each head of each element of the intelligence community that is within the Department of Defense.

SEC. 324. REPORTS ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN SYRIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report on the Syrian chemical weapons program.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A comprehensive assessment of chemical weapon stockpiles in Syria, including names, types, and quantities of chemical weapons agents, types of munitions, and location and form of storage, production, and research and development facilities.

(2) A listing of key personnel associated with the Syrian chemical weapons program.

(3) An assessment of undeclared chemical weapons stockpiles, munitions, and facilities.

(4) An assessment of how these stockpiles, precursors, and delivery systems were obtained.

(5) A description of key intelligence gaps related to the Syrian chemical weapons program.

(6) An assessment of any denial and deception efforts on the part of the Syrian regime related to its chemical weapons program.

(c) PROGRESS REPORTS.—Every 90 days until the date that is 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a progress report providing any material updates to the report required under subsection (a).

SEC. 325. REPORTS TO THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ON PENETRATIONS OF NETWORKS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS OF CERTAIN CONTRACTORS.

(a) PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING PENETRATIONS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish procedures that require each cleared intelligence contractor to report to an element of the intelligence community designated by the Director for purposes of such procedures when a network or information system of such contractor that meets the criteria established pursuant to subsection (b) is successfully penetrated.

(b) NETWORKS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUBJECT TO REPORTING.—The Director of National Intelligence shall, in consultation with appropriate officials, establish criteria for covered networks to be subject to the procedures for reporting system penetrations under subsection (a).

(c) PROCEDURE REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) RAPID REPORTING.—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall require each cleared intelligence contractor to rapidly report to an element of the intelligence community designated pursuant to subsection (a) of each successful penetration of the network or information systems of such contractor that meet the criteria established pursuant to subsection (b). Each such report shall include the following:

(A) A description of the technique or method used in such penetration.

(B) A sample of the malicious software, if discovered and isolated by the contractor, involved in such penetration.

(C) A summary of information created by or for such element in connection with any program of such element that has been potentially compromised due to such penetration.

(2) ACCESS TO EQUIPMENT AND INFORMATION BY INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PERSONNEL.—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(A) include mechanisms for intelligence community personnel to, upon request, obtain access to equipment or information of a cleared intelligence contractor necessary to conduct forensic analysis in addition to any analysis conducted by such contractor;

(B) provide that a cleared intelligence contractor is only required to provide access to equipment or information as described in subparagraph (A) to determine whether information created by or for an element of the intelligence community in connection with any intelligence community program was successfully exfiltrated from a network or information system of such contractor and, if so, what information was exfiltrated; and

(C) provide for the reasonable protection of trade secrets, commercial or financial information, and information that can be used to identify a specific person (other than the name of the suspected perpetrator of the penetration).

(3) LIMITATION ON DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall prohibit the dissemination outside the intelligence community of information obtained or derived through such procedures that is not created by or for the intelligence community except—

(A) with the approval of the contractor providing such information;

(B) to the congressional intelligence committees or the Subcommittees on Defense of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for such committees and such Subcommittees to perform oversight; or

(C) to law enforcement agencies to investigate a penetration reported under this section.

(d) ISSUANCE OF PROCEDURES AND ESTABLISHMENT OF CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall establish the procedures required under subsection (a) and the criteria required under subsection (b).

(2) APPLICABILITY DATE.—The requirements of this section shall apply on the date on which the Director of National Intelligence establishes the procedures required under this section.

(e) COORDINATION WITH THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO PREVENT DUPLICATE REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures to permit a contractor that is a cleared intelligence contractor and a cleared defense contractor under section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) to submit a single report that satisfies the requirements of this section and such section 941 for an incident of penetration of network or information system.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CLEARED INTELLIGENCE CONTRACTOR.—The term ''cleared intelligence contractor'' means a private entity granted clearance by the Director of National Intelligence or the head of an element of the intelligence community to access, receive, or store classified information for the purpose of bidding for a contract or conducting activities in support of any program of an element of the intelligence community.

(2) COVERED NETWORK.—The term ''covered network'' means a network or information system of a cleared intelligence contractor

that contains or processes information created by or for an element of the intelligence community with respect to which such contractor is required to apply enhanced protection.

(g) SAVINGS CLAUSES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or limit any otherwise authorized access by government personnel to networks or information systems owned or operated by a contractor that processes or stores government data.

SEC. 326. REPORT ON ELECTRONIC WASTE.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the extent to which the intelligence community has implemented the recommendations of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community contained in the report entitled ''Study of Intelligence Community Electronic Waste Disposal Practices'' issued in May 2013. Such report shall include an assessment of the extent to which the policies, standards, and guidelines of the intelligence community governing the proper disposal of electronic waste are applicable to covered commercial electronic waste that may contain classified information.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED COMMERCIAL ELECTRONIC WASTE.—The term ''covered commercial electronic waste'' means electronic waste of a commercial entity that contracts with an element of the intelligence community.

(2) ELECTRONIC WASTE.—The term ''electronic waste'' includes any obsolete, broken, or irreparable electronic device, including a television, copier, facsimile machine, tablet, telephone, computer, computer monitor, laptop, printer, scanner, and associated electrical wiring.

SEC. 327. PROMOTING STEM EDUCATION TO MEET THE FUTURE WORKFORCE NEEDS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Secretary of Education and the congressional intelligence committees a report describing the anticipated hiring needs of the intelligence community in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including cybersecurity and computer literacy. The report shall—

(1) describe the extent to which competitions, challenges, or internships at elements of the intelligence community that do not involve access to classified information may be utilized to promote education in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including cybersecurity and computer literacy, within high schools or institutions of higher education in the United States;

(2) include cost estimates for carrying out such competitions, challenges, or internships; and

(3) include strategies for conducting expedited security clearance investigations and adjudications for students at institutions of higher education for purposes of offering internships at elements of the intelligence community.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.—In developing the report under subsection (a), the Director shall take into consideration existing programs of the intelligence community, including the education programs of the National Security Agency and the Information Assurance Scholarship Program of the Department of Defense, as appropriate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HIGH SCHOOL.—The term ''high school'' mean a school that awards a secondary school diploma.

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(3) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term ''secondary school'' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 328. REPEAL OF THE TERMINATION OF NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS REGARDING THE AUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.

Section 504 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277; 126 Stat. 2477) is amended by striking subsection (e).

SEC. 329. REPEAL OR MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) THREAT OF ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES USING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.—Section 114 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3050) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(2) TREATY ON CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE.—Section 2(5)(E) of the Senate resolution advising and consenting to ratification of the Document Agreed Among the States Parties to the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) of November 19, 1990, adopted at Vienna May 31, 1996 (Treaty Doc. 105–5) (commonly referred to as the ''CFE Flank Document''), 105th Congress, agreed to May 14, 1997, is repealed.

(b) MODIFICATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 410(b) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (50 U.S.C. 3309) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) NOTIFICATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall each notify the congressional intelligence committees each time each such Director creates an advisory committee. Each notification shall include—

''(1) a description of such advisory committee, including the subject matter of such committee;

''(2) a list of members of such advisory committee; and

''(3) in the case of an advisory committee created by the Director of National Intelligence, the reasons for a determination by the Director under section 4(b)(3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) that an advisory committee cannot comply with the requirements of such Act.''.

(2) INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 102A(g)(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(g)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) The Director of National Intelligence shall, in a timely manner, report to Congress any statute, regulation, policy, or practice that the Director believes impedes the ability of the Director to fully and effectively ensure maximum availability of access to intelligence information within the intelligence community consistent with the protection of the national security of the United States.''.

(3) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION.—Section 506D(j) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3100(j)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2014''.

(4) ACTIVITIES OF PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OFFICERS.—Section 1062(f)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1(f)(1)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''quarterly'' and inserting ''semi-annually''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the table of contents in the first section, by striking the item relating to section 114 and inserting the following new item:

''Sec. 114. Annual report on hiring and retention of minority employees.'';

(2) in section 114 (50 U.S.C. 3050)—

(A) by amending the heading to read as follows: ''**ANNUAL REPORT ON HIRING AND RETENTION OF MINORITY EMPLOYEES**'';

(B) by striking ''(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON HIRING AND RETENTION OF MINORITY EMPLOYEES.—'';

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subsections (a) through (e), respectively;

(D) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) (as so redesignated)—

(I) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(II) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated), by striking ''clauses (i) and (ii)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A) and (B)'';

(E) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph), by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''section''; and

(F) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(ii) by striking ''subsection,'' and inserting ''section''; and

(3) in section 507 (50 U.S.C. 3106)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''(1) The date'' and inserting ''The date'';

(ii) by striking ''subsection (c)(1)(A)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)'';

(iii) by striking paragraph (2); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (F) as paragraphs (1) through (6), respectively;

(B) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) by striking ''(A) Except'' and inserting ''Except''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) in subsection (d)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(II) by inserting ''and'' after ''March 1;'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

TITLE IV—MATTERS RELATING TO ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Subtitle A—National Security Agency

SEC. 401. APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.

(a) DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.—Section 2 of the National Security Agency Act of 1959 (50 U.S.C. 3602) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(b)'' before ''There''; and

(2) by inserting before subsection (b), as so designated by paragraph (1), the following:

''(a)(1) There is a Director of the National Security Agency.

''(2) The Director of the National Security Agency shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(3) The Director of the National Security Agency shall be the head of the National Security Agency and shall discharge such functions and duties as are provided by this Act or otherwise by law or executive order.''.

(b) POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may designate the Director of the National Security Agency as a position of importance and responsibility under section 601 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 402. APPOINTMENT OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 8G(a)(2), by striking ''the National Security Agency,''; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or the Federal Cochairpersons of the Commissions established under section 15301 of title 40, United States Code;'' and inserting ''the Federal Cochairpersons of the Commissions established under section 15301 of title 40, United States Code; the Director of the National Security Agency;''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''or the Commissions established under section 15301 of title 40, United States Code,'' and inserting ''the Commissions established under section 15301 of title 40, United States Code, the National Security Agency,''.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the amendments made by sections 401 and 402 shall take effect on October 1, 2014, and shall apply upon the earlier of—

(1) in the case of section 401—

(A) the date of the first nomination by the President of an individual to serve as the Director of the National Security Agency that occurs on or after October 1, 2014; or

(B) the date of the cessation of the performance of the duties of the Director of the National Security Agency by the individual performing such duties on October 1, 2014; and

(2) in the case of section 402—

(A) the date of the first nomination by the President of an individual to serve as the Inspector General of the National Security Agency that occurs on or after October 1, 2014; or

(B) the date of the cessation of the performance of the duties of the Inspector General of the National Security Agency by the individual performing such duties on October 1, 2014.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR INITIAL NOMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(A) or (2)(A) of subsection (a), an individual serving as the Director of the National Security Agency or the Inspector General of the National Security Agency on the date that the President first nominates an individual for such position on or after October 1, 2014, may continue to perform in that position after such date of nomination and until the individual appointed to the position, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, assumes the duties of the position.

(c) INCUMBENT INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The individual serving as Inspector General of the National Security Agency on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be eligible to be appointed by the President to a new term of service under section 3 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Subtitle B—National Reconnaissance Office

SEC. 411. APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 106 the following:

''SEC. 106A. DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is a Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.

''(b) APPOINTMENT.—The Director of the National Reconnaissance Office shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(c) FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES.—The Director of the National Reconnaissance Office shall be the head of the National Reconnaissance Office and shall discharge such functions and duties as are provided by this Act or otherwise by law or executive order.''.

(b) POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may designate the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office as a position of importance and responsibility under section 601 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 106 the following:

''Sec. 106A. Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.''.

SEC. 412. APPOINTMENT OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.)—

(1) in section 8G(a)(2), as amended by section 402, is further amended by striking ''the National Reconnaissance Office,''; and

(2) in section 12, as amended by section 402, is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office;'' before ''as the case may be;''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or the National Reconnaissance Office,'' before ''as the case may be;''.

SEC. 413. EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by sections 411 and 412 shall take effect on October 1, 2014, and shall apply upon the earlier of—

(1) in the case of section 411—

(A) the date of the first nomination by the President of an individual to serve as the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office that occurs on or after October 1, 2014; or

(B) the date of the cessation of the performance of the duties of the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office by the individual performing such duties on October 1, 2014; and

(2) in the case of section 412—

(A) the date of the first nomination by the President of an individual to serve as the Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office that occurs on or after October 1, 2014; or

(B) the date of the cessation of the performance of the duties of the Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office by the individual performing such duties on October 1, 2014.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR INITIAL NOMINATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(A) or (2)(A) of subsection (a), an individual serving as the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office or the Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office on the date that the President first nominates an individual for such position on or after October 1, 2014, may continue to perform in that position after such date of nomination and until the individual appointed to the position, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, assumes the duties of the position.

(c) INCUMBENT INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The individual serving as Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be eligible to be appointed by the President to a new term of service under section 3 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Subtitle C—Central Intelligence Agency

SEC. 421. GIFTS, DEVISES, AND BEQUESTS.

Section 12 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3512) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting ''GIFTS, DEVISES, AND BEQUESTS'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by inserting ''by the Director as a gift to the Agency'' after ''accepted''; and

(B) by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''this subsection'';

(3) in subsection (b), by striking ''this section,'' and inserting ''subsection (a),'';

(4) in subsection (c), by striking ''this section,'' and inserting ''subsection (a),'';

(5) in subsection (d), by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''subsection (a)'';

(6) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(7) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f)(1) The Director may engage in fundraising in an official capacity for the benefit of nonprofit organizations that provide support to surviving family members of deceased Agency employees or that otherwise provide support for the welfare, education, or recreation of Agency employees, former Agency employees, or their family members.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'fundraising' means the raising of funds through the active participation in the promotion, production, or presentation of an event designed to raise funds and does not include the direct solicitation of money by any other means.''.

TITLE V—SECURITY CLEARANCE REFORM

SEC. 501. CONTINUOUS EVALUATION AND SHARING OF DEROGATORY INFORMATION REGARDING PERSONNEL WITH ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

Section 102A(j) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(j)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION'' and inserting ''CLASSIFIED INFORMATION'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(5) ensure that the background of each employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, each contractor to an element of the intelligence community, and each individual employee of such a contractor who has been determined to be eligible for access to classified information is monitored on a continual basis under standards developed by the Director, including with respect to the frequency of evaluation, during the period of eligibility of such employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, such contractor, or such individual employee to such a contractor to determine whether such employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, such contractor, and such individual employee of such a contractor continues to meet the requirements for eligibility for access to classified information; and

''(6) develop procedures to require information sharing between elements of the intelligence community concerning potentially derogatory security information regarding an employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, a contractor to an element of the intelligence community, or

an individual employee of such a contractor that may impact the eligibility of such employee or officer of an element of the intelligence community, such contractor, or such individual employee of such a contractor for a security clearance.''.

SEC. 502. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CONTRACTORS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(x) REQUIREMENTS FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY CONTRACTORS.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the head of each department of the Federal Government that contains an element of the intelligence community and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, shall—

''(1) ensure that—

''(A) any contractor to an element of the intelligence community with access to a classified network or classified information develops and operates a security plan that is consistent with standards established by the Director of National Intelligence for intelligence community networks; and

''(B) each contract awarded by an element of the intelligence community includes provisions requiring the contractor comply with such plan and such standards;

''(2) conduct periodic assessments of each security plan required under paragraph (1)(A) to ensure such security plan complies with the requirements of such paragraph; and

''(3) ensure that the insider threat detection capabilities and insider threat policies of the intelligence community apply to facilities of contractors with access to a classified network.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contracts entered into or renewed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 503. TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS TO SECURITY CLEARANCE PROCESSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall conduct an analysis of the relative costs and benefits of potential improvements to the process for investigating persons who are proposed for access to classified information and adjudicating whether such persons satisfy the criteria for obtaining and retaining access to such information.

(b) CONTENTS OF ANALYSIS.—In conducting the analysis required by subsection (a), the Director of National Intelligence shall evaluate the costs and benefits associated with—

(1) the elimination of manual processes in security clearance investigations and adjudications, if possible, and automating and integrating the elements of the investigation process, including—

(A) the clearance application process;

(B) case management;

(C) adjudication management;

(D) investigation methods for the collection, analysis, storage, retrieval, and transfer of data and records; and

(E) records management for access and eligibility determinations;

(2) the elimination or reduction, if possible, of the use of databases and information sources that cannot be accessed and processed automatically electronically, or modification of such databases and information sources, to enable electronic access and processing;

(3) the use of government-developed and commercial technology for continuous monitoring and evaluation of government and commercial data sources that can identify and flag information pertinent to adjudication guidelines and eligibility determinations;

(4) the standardization of forms used for routine reporting required of cleared personnel (such as travel, foreign contacts, and financial disclosures) and use of continuous monitoring technology to access databases containing such reportable information to independently obtain and analyze reportable data and events;

(5) the establishment of an authoritative central repository of personnel security information that is accessible electronically at multiple levels of classification and eliminates technical barriers to rapid access to information necessary for eligibility determinations and reciprocal recognition thereof;

(6) using digitally processed fingerprints, as a substitute for ink or paper prints, to reduce error rates and improve portability of data;

(7) expanding the use of technology to improve an applicant's ability to discover the status of a pending security clearance application or reinvestigation; and

(8) using government and publicly available commercial data sources, including social media, that provide independent information pertinent to adjudication guidelines to improve quality and timeliness, and reduce costs, of investigations and reinvestigations.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the analysis required by subsection (a).

SEC. 504. REPORT ON RECIPROCITY OF SECURITY CLEARANCES.

The head of the entity selected pursuant to section 3001(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(b)) shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report each year through 2017 that describes for the preceding year—

(1) the periods of time required by authorized adjudicative agencies for accepting background investigations and determinations completed by an authorized investigative entity or authorized adjudicative agency;

(2) the total number of cases in which a background investigation or determination completed by an authorized investigative entity or authorized adjudicative agency is accepted by another agency;

(3) the total number of cases in which a background investigation or determination completed by an authorized investigative entity or authorized adjudicative agency is not accepted by another agency; and

(4) such other information or recommendations as the head of the entity selected pursuant to such section 3001(b) considers appropriate.

SEC. 505. IMPROVING THE PERIODIC REINVESTIGATION PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until December 31, 2017, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall transmit to the appropriate committees of Congress a strategic plan for updating the process for periodic reinvestigations consistent with a continuous evaluation program.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an analysis of the costs and benefits associated with conducting periodic reinvestigations;

(2) an analysis of the costs and benefits associated with replacing some or all periodic reinvestigations with a program of continuous evaluation;

(3) a determination of how many risk-based and ad hoc periodic reinvestigations are necessary on an annual basis for each component of the Federal Government with employees with security clearances;

(4) an analysis of the potential benefits of expanding the Government's use of continuous evaluation tools as a means of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of procedures for confirming the eligibility of personnel for continued access to classified information; and

(5) an analysis of how many personnel with out-of-scope background investigations are employed by, or contracted or detailed to, each element of the intelligence community.

(c) PERIODIC REINVESTIGATIONS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''periodic reinvestigations'' has the meaning given that term in section 3001(a) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(a)).

SEC. 506. APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

TITLE VI—INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS

SEC. 601. PROTECTION OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XI of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 1104. PROHIBITED PERSONNEL PRACTICES IN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AGENCY.—The term 'agency' means an executive department or independent establishment, as defined under sections 101 and 104 of title 5, United States Code, that contains an intelligence community element, except the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(2) COVERED INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELEMENT.—The term 'covered intelligence community element'—

''(A) means—

''(i) the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the National Reconnaissance Office; and

''(ii) any executive agency or unit thereof determined by the President under section 2302(a)(2)(C)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, to have as its principal function the conduct of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence activities; and

''(B) does not include the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(3) PERSONNEL ACTION.—The term 'personnel action' means, with respect to an employee in a position in a covered intelligence community element (other than a position excepted from the competitive service due to its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character)—

''(A) an appointment;

''(B) a promotion;

''(C) a disciplinary or corrective action;

''(D) a detail, transfer, or reassignment;

''(E) a demotion, suspension, or termination;

''(F) a reinstatement or restoration;

''(G) a performance evaluation;

''(H) a decision concerning pay, benefits, or awards;

''(I) a decision concerning education or training if such education or training may

reasonably be expected to lead to an appointment, promotion, or performance evaluation; or

''(J) any other significant change in duties, responsibilities, or working conditions.

''(b) IN GENERAL.—Any employee of an agency who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action, shall not, with respect to such authority, take or fail to take a personnel action with respect to any employee of a covered intelligence community element as a reprisal for a lawful disclosure of information by the employee to the Director of National Intelligence (or an employee designated by the Director of National Intelligence for such purpose), the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the head of the employing agency (or an employee designated by the head of that agency for such purpose), the appropriate inspector general of the employing agency, a congressional intelligence committee, or a member of a congressional intelligence committee, which the employee reasonably believes evidences—

''(1) a violation of any Federal law, rule, or regulation; or

''(2) mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

''(c) ENFORCEMENT.—The President shall provide for the enforcement of this section.

''(d) EXISTING RIGHTS PRESERVED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

''(1) preempt or preclude any employee, or applicant for employment, at the Federal Bureau of Investigation from exercising rights provided under any other law, rule, or regulation, including section 2303 of title 5, United States Code; or

''(2) repeal section 2303 of title 5, United States Code.''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 1104. Prohibited personnel practices in the intelligence community.''.

SEC. 602. REVIEW OF SECURITY CLEARANCE OR ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.

(a) GENERAL RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3001(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(b)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Not'' and inserting ''Except as otherwise provided, not'';

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014—

''(A) developing policies and procedures that permit, to the extent practicable, individuals to appeal a determination to suspend or revoke a security clearance or access to classified information and to retain their government employment status while such challenge is pending; and

''(B) developing and implementing uniform and consistent policies and procedures to ensure proper protections during the process for denying, suspending, or revoking a security clearance or access to classified information, including the ability to appeal such a denial, suspension, or revocation, except that there shall be no appeal of an agency's suspension of a security clearance or access determination for purposes of conducting an investigation, if that suspension lasts no longer than 1 year or the head of the agency or a designee of the head of the agency certifies that a longer suspension is needed before a final decision on denial or revocation to prevent imminent harm to the national security.''.

(2) REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The policies and procedures for appeal developed under paragraph (7) of section 3001(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, as added by subsection (a), shall provide for the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, or the inspector general of the employing agency, to conduct fact-finding and report to the agency head or the designee of the agency head within 180 days unless the employee and the agency agree to an extension or the investigating inspector general determines in writing that a greater period of time is required. To the fullest extent possible, such fact-finding shall include an opportunity for the employee to present relevant evidence such as witness testimony.

(b) RETALIATORY REVOCATION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES AND ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.—Section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) RETALIATORY REVOCATION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES AND ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Agency personnel with authority over personnel security clearance or access determinations shall not take or fail to take, or threaten to take or fail to take, any action with respect to any employee's security clearance or access determination in retaliation for—

''(A) any lawful disclosure of information to the Director of National Intelligence (or an employee designated by the Director of National Intelligence for such purpose) or the head of the employing agency (or employee designated by the head of that agency for such purpose) by an employee that the employee reasonably believes evidences—

''(i) a violation of any Federal law, rule, or regulation; or

''(ii) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety;

''(B) any lawful disclosure to the Inspector General of an agency or another employee designated by the head of the agency to receive such disclosures, of information which the employee reasonably believes evidences—

''(i) a violation of any Federal law, rule, or regulation; or

''(ii) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety;

''(C) any lawful disclosure that complies with—

''(i) subsections (a)(1), (d), and (h) of section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.);

''(ii) subparagraphs (A), (D), and (H) of section 17(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)); or

''(iii) subparagraphs (A), (D), and (I) of section 103H(k)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)(5)); and

''(D) if the actions do not result in the employee or applicant unlawfully disclosing information specifically required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs, any lawful disclosure in conjunction with—

''(i) the exercise of any appeal, complaint, or grievance right granted by any law, rule, or regulation;

''(ii) testimony for or otherwise lawfully assisting any individual in the exercise of any right referred to in clause (i); or

''(iii) cooperation with or disclosing information to the Inspector General of an agency, in accordance with applicable provisions of law in connection with an audit, inspection, or investigation conducted by the Inspector General.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Consistent with the protection of sources and methods, nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to authorize the withholding of information from Congress or the taking of any personnel action against an employee who lawfully discloses information to Congress.

''(3) DISCLOSURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A disclosure shall not be excluded from paragraph (1) because—

''(i) the disclosure was made to a person, including a supervisor, who participated in an activity that the employee reasonably believed to be covered by paragraph (1)(A)(ii);

''(ii) the disclosure revealed information that had been previously disclosed;

''(iii) the disclosure was not made in writing;

''(iv) the disclosure was made while the employee was off duty; or

''(v) of the amount of time which has passed since the occurrence of the events described in the disclosure.

''(B) REPRISALS.—If a disclosure is made during the normal course of duties of an employee, the disclosure shall not be excluded from paragraph (1) if any employee who has authority to take, direct others to take, recommend, or approve any personnel action with respect to the employee making the disclosure, took, failed to take, or threatened to take or fail to take a personnel action with respect to that employee in reprisal for the disclosure.

''(4) AGENCY ADJUDICATION.—

''(A) REMEDIAL PROCEDURE.—An employee or former employee who believes that he or she has been subjected to a reprisal prohibited by paragraph (1) may, within 90 days after the issuance of notice of such decision, appeal that decision within the agency of that employee or former employee through proceedings authorized by subsection (b)(7), except that there shall be no appeal of an agency's suspension of a security clearance or access determination for purposes of conducting an investigation, if that suspension lasts not longer than 1 year (or a longer period in accordance with a certification made under subsection (b)(7)).

''(B) CORRECTIVE ACTION.—If, in the course of proceedings authorized under subparagraph (A), it is determined that the adverse security clearance or access determination violated paragraph (1), the agency shall take specific corrective action to return the employee or former employee, as nearly as practicable and reasonable, to the position such employee or former employee would have held had the violation not occurred. Such corrective action may include back pay and related benefits, travel expenses, and compensatory damages not to exceed $300,000.

''(C) CONTRIBUTING FACTOR.—In determining whether the adverse security clearance or access determination violated paragraph (1), the agency shall find that paragraph (1) was violated if a disclosure described in paragraph (1) was a contributing factor in the adverse security clearance or access determination taken against the individual, unless the agency demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that it would have taken the same action in the absence of such disclosure, giving the utmost deference to the agency's assessment of the particular threat to the national security interests of the United States in the instant matter.

''(5) APPELLATE REVIEW OF SECURITY CLEARANCE ACCESS DETERMINATIONS BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—

''(A) APPEAL.—Within 60 days after receiving notice of an adverse final agency determination under a proceeding under paragraph (4), an employee or former employee may appeal that determination in accordance with the procedures established under subparagraph (B).

''(B) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense, shall develop and implement policies and procedures for adjudicating the appeals authorized by subparagraph (A).

''(C) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Consistent with the protection of sources and methods, at the time the Director of National Intelligence issues an order regarding an appeal pursuant to the policies and procedures established by this paragraph, the Director of National Intelligence shall notify the congressional intelligence committees.

''(6) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit or require judicial review of any—

''(A) agency action under this section; or

''(B) action of the appellate review procedures established under paragraph (5).

''(7) PRIVATE CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit, authorize, or require a private cause of action to challenge the merits of a security clearance determination.''.

(c) ACCESS DETERMINATION DEFINED.—Section 3001(a) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) ACCESS DETERMINATION.—The term 'access determination' means the determination regarding whether an employee—

''(A) is eligible for access to classified information in accordance with Executive Order 12968 (60 Fed. Reg. 40245; relating to access to classified information), or any successor thereto, and Executive Order 10865 (25 Fed. Reg. 1583; relating to safeguarding classified information with industry), or any successor thereto; and

''(B) possesses a need to know under such an Order.''.

(d) EXISTING RIGHTS PRESERVED.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to preempt, preclude, or otherwise prevent an individual from exercising rights, remedies, or avenues of redress currently provided under any other law, regulation, or rule.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341), as amended by this title, shall be construed to require the repeal or replacement of agency appeal procedures implementing Executive Order 12968 (60 Fed. Reg. 40245; relating to access to classified information), or any successor thereto, and Executive Order 10865 (25 Fed. Reg. 1583; relating to safeguarding classified information with industry), or any successor thereto, that meet the requirements of paragraph (7) of section 3001(b) of such Act, as added by this section.

SEC. 603. REVISIONS OF OTHER LAWS.

(a) INSPECTOR GENERAL ACT OF 1978.—Section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) If the head of an establishment determines that a complaint or information transmitted under paragraph (1) would create a conflict of interest for the head of the establishment, the head of the establishment shall return the complaint or information to the Inspector General with that determination and the Inspector General shall make the transmission to the Director of National Intelligence and, if the establishment is within the Department of Defense, to the Secretary of Defense. In such a case, the requirements of this section for the head of the establishment apply to each recipient of the Inspector General's transmission.'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

''(h) An individual who has submitted a complaint or information to an Inspector General under this section may notify any member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives or the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, or a staff member of either such Committee, of the fact that such individual has made a submission to that particular Inspector General, and of the date on which such submission was made.''.

(b) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.—Section 17(d)(5) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting ''(i)'' after ''(B)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) If the Director determines that a complaint or information transmitted under paragraph (1) would create a conflict of interest for the Director, the Director shall return the complaint or information to the Inspector General with that determination and the Inspector General shall make the transmission to the Director of National Intelligence. In such a case, the requirements of this subsection for the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency apply to the Director of National Intelligence''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) An individual who has submitted a complaint or information to the Inspector General under this section may notify any member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives or the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, or a staff member of either such Committee, of the fact that such individual has made a submission to the Inspector General, and of the date on which such submission was made.''.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—Section 103H(k)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(I) An individual who has submitted a complaint or information to the Inspector General under this section may notify any member of either of the congressional intelligence committees, or a staff member of either of such committees, of the fact that such individual has made a submission to the Inspector General, and of the date on which such submission was made.''.

SEC. 604. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES; NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN TERMINATIONS.

(a) COVERED INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELEMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered intelligence community element''—

(1) means—

(A) the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the National Reconnaissance Office; and

(B) any executive agency or unit thereof determined by the President under section 2302(a)(2)(C)(ii) of title 5, United States Code, to have as its principal function the conduct of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence activities; and

(2) does not include the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) REGULATIONS.—In consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence shall develop policies and procedures to ensure that a personnel action shall not be taken against an employee of a covered intelligence community element as a reprisal for any disclosure of information described in 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 601 of this Act.

(c) REPORT ON THE STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit a report on the status of the implementation of the regulations promulgated under subsection (b) to the congressional intelligence committees.

(d) NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN TERMINATIONS.—Section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 601 of this Act, and section 3001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341), as amended by section 602 of this Act, shall not apply if—

(1) the affected employee is concurrently terminated under—

(A) section 1609 of title 10, United States Code;

(B) the authority of the Director of National Intelligence under section 102A(m) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(m)), if the Director determines that the termination is in the interest of the United States;

(C) the authority of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency under section 104A(e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3036(e)), if the Director determines that the termination is in the interest of the United States; or

(D) section 7532 of title 5, United States Code, if the head of the agency determines that the termination is in the interest of the United States; and

(2) not later than 30 days after such termination, the head of the agency that employed the affected employee notifies the congressional intelligence committees of the termination.

TITLE VII—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 701. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949.

Section 21 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3521) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(D), by striking ''section (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(E), by striking ''provider.'' and inserting ''provider''.

SEC. 702. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947 RELATING TO THE PAST ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS.

Section 101(a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking the semicolon and inserting ''; and'';

(2) by striking paragraphs (6) and (7);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (6); and

(4) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by striking ''the Chairman of the Munitions Board, and the Chairman of the Research and Development Board,''.

SEC. 703. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 506 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277; 126 Stat. 2478) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Section 606(5)'' and inserting ''Paragraph (5) of section 605''; and

(2) by inserting '', as redesignated by section 310(a)(4)(B) of this Act,'' before ''is amended''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if

included in the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–277).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, S. 1681.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank my colleague from Maryland, DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, for the great work done by him and the entire Democrat caucus of the committee as well as all of my Republican members for what is a good bipartisan national security bill.

I also want to thank Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN and SAXBY CHAMBLISS for their work in the Senate to put a bill together that I think America will and should be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, the Intelligence Authorization Act is an annual blueprint for the work of the intelligence community. The bill sets the priorities for our critical intelligence efforts. Passing a yearly intelligence authorization bill is the primary method by which Congress exerts its budgetary and oversight authority over the intelligence community.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, the bulk of this committee's recommendations are found in the classified annex to the bill, which is the same fiscal year '14 annex the House recently passed as part of a combined fiscal year '14 and fiscal year '15 intelligence authorization bill.

At an unclassified level, I can report that the annex for fiscal year 2014 authorizes funding that is slightly below the President's budget request level. Its funding levels are in line with the levels appropriated by the enacted appropriation act for the National Intelligence Program and the National Defense Authorization Act for the Military Intelligence Program.

The House recently passed its version of the fiscal year '14 bill by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. The bill contained many of the same provisions in the same form as are contained in the Senate bill, S. 1681. And S. 1681 also contains a few additional provisions that were negotiated with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves at a very interesting time in history. Al Qaeda has metastasized into dangerous affiliates, and safe havens have emerged in Syria, parts of Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and the tribal areas of Pakistan. The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant is attempting to build a state across the Middle East, from Lebanon to Iraq, including Syria, Jordan, and, unfortunately, Israel as well.

They already control a jihadist Disneyland the size of Indiana. Without leadership from the United States, this will quickly devolve into a full-blown sectarian war, which only helps ISIL's political ambitions.

ISIL does not recognize a border between Syria and Iraq, and we have to remain focused on ISIL across the region so that a safe haven does not emerge on either side of that border.

The goal of our counterterrorism strategy is to deny safe haven from which terrorists can plan attacks against the United States—they can finance; they get breathing space; they can further radicalize individuals from around the world.

Al Qaeda is also regaining a foothold in northeast Afghanistan, just as the President announced a complete withdrawal of United States military forces, and the counterterrorism capability that comes with it, by the end of 2016. We are about to make the same mistake in Afghanistan that we did in Iraq.

Uneven leadership in recent years has also emboldened adversaries like Russia and China, who are increasing their military and intelligence spending and are working to change the international order, to the detriment of the United States and our interests.

We rightly demand that our intelligence agencies provide policymakers with the best and most timely information possible on the threats we face. We ask them to track terrorists wherever they train, plan, and fund-raise. We ask them to stop devastating cyber attacks that steal American jobs. We ask them to track nuclear and missile threats. And we demand that they get it right every day of the year.

The dedicated men and women of the intelligence community are some of the finest patriots I have had the privilege to meet. And within budget constraints and the often unclear policy guidance from the White House, this bill seeks to ensure that they have the resources and the authorities necessary to keep our Nation safe.

I urge the passage of S. 1681 and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I first want to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman ROGERS, for his leadership. Once again, he has produced a bipartisan and bicameral Intelligence Authorization Act that we are taking up today.

I know he is retiring. He has served his country well as an FBI agent and on the Intelligence Committee, and now as chairman. We are going to miss him. But I know that whatever he does, he will always think of the United States of America first. So I thank the gentleman for his leadership and his friendship.

I also want to acknowledge the members of our committee, both Democrat and Republican, and our staff who have come together as a team in a bipartisan way to do what is right for our country.

Now, this Chamber passed its fiscal year 2014 and 2015 Intelligence Authorization Act less than a month ago, with over 300 votes in favor. Today we are taking up just the Senate's fiscal year 2014 bill, which the Senate recently passed by unanimous consent.

I hope the House passes this bill and sends it to the President's desk today. We need these annual intelligence authorization acts to ensure the most rigorous oversight and accountability over all U.S. intelligence agencies and over all U.S. intelligence activities. We must ensure that our intelligence agencies spend money only on programs of which Congress is informed and approves. This bill does that.

We also need these annual intelligence authorizations to set the priorities for our intelligence professionals and their agencies and to allocate resources to critical national security programs, including those that detect, prevent, and disrupt potential terrorist attacks. This bill does that, also.

And we need the intelligence authorization acts to promote fiscal discipline. This bill makes cuts to certain areas and adds money in other in a responsible, well thought-out, and fiscally prudent way. The result is a budget below the President's request. In fact, since Chairman ROGERS and I assumed leadership of the Intelligence Committee, we have reduced the Intelligence Committee's budget by 20 percent, without reducing capability. I am pleased to see the Senate is going along with us.

I do want to acknowledge, also, Senators FEINSTEIN and CHAMBLISS for working together with us in a partnership to do what is right for our country and our national security.

The unclassified legislative text in this Senate bill is very similar to what this Chamber debated last month. It makes substantial improvements to the security clearance process. It requires detailed reports on matters such as electronic waste and chemical weapons in Syria. And it promotes education in science, technology, engineering, and math.

□ 1945

The Senate also added three substantive provisions, all of which greatly promote transparency, oversight, and accountability.

First, the bill creates independent, Senate-confirmed NSA and National Reconnaissance Office directors, as well as independent, Senate-confirmed NSA and NRO inspectors general.

Second, the bill requires the Attorney General to establish a process for

the regular review for publication of Department of Justice legal opinions provided to the intelligence community.

It also requires that any classified opinions that can't be published be made available to the appropriate committees or Members of Congress. Third, it amends the National Security Act to prohibit any personnel actions against a lawful intelligence community whistleblower.

As for the classified schedule of authorizations, it is identical, except for some minor, prorated adjustments.

We encouraged all Members to review the classified schedule of authorizations, as well as the classified text, and I am pleased that so many have come down to the Intelligence Committee's classified spaces to do so.

We have spent a long time poring over every aspect of this bill—in our committee spaces, at the agencies, with the Senate, and in the remotest corners of the Earth, where our intelligence professionals operate—and I can say this is a very good bill, which I am proud to support.

For the sake of keeping the country and its allies safe, for the sake of vigorously overseeing even the most classified intelligence programs, and for the sake of our intelligence professionals who work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, often in harm's way, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and send it to the President today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama, TERRI SEWELL, who is a very good member of our committee.

I just want to say that Ms. SEWELL is a new member of the Intelligence Committee, and through her dedication, intellect, and willingness to travel, she is quickly becoming a highly influential member on our committee.

She also keeps her focus on the people, both the American people as a whole, and the intelligence professionals who work every day to keep us safe.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the Fiscal Year 2014 Intelligence Authorization Act. The annual authorization act is the most substantial oversight mechanism Congress has over the intelligence community.

Most of the work within the intelligence community and our work on the Intelligence Committee happen behind closed doors and, therefore, far from the television cameras. Let me assure you, though, just because C–SPAN is not in the room when we have our regular meetings and hearings does not mean there is a lack of opinion, discussion, and debate.

There is rigorous back and forth about the necessity and the necessary number of core contractors within the intelligence community, how to best exploit and preserve the documents from the Osama bin Laden raid, and the appropriate ways to respond to unauthorized public disclosure of covert actions.

We ask hard questions in this committee of our witnesses. We read and study legal authorities for U.S. engagement around the world and ensure that the intelligence professionals tasked with protecting America not only have the tools they need to do their jobs, but are held accountable for their actions.

Director Clapper said recently that ''at the heart of our work is our people.'' This bill makes some important changes in the workforce of the intelligence community. It requires the Director of National Intelligence to ensure that contractors have in place security measures consistent with the DNI standards for intelligence community networks.

It requires the DNI to ensure insider threat capabilities of the IC apply to contractors. The bill also requires the DNI to submit a strategic plan for improving the process of reinvestigation, so those individuals who have security clearance are interviewed on a routine basis, to ensure they continue to uphold the standards and requirements necessary to access classified information.

On a final note about the workforce of the intelligence community, Director Clapper continued, ''A diverse workforce is critical to the mission success.''

He is right. The threats America faces are complex, ranging from proliferation of nuclear weapons to terrorism, to Russian plans and intentions. We need people who understand all cultures and backgrounds and who can use their unique experience for creative solutions.

The IC has made some progress on diversity. Minority representation in the largest intelligence agencies increased to 24 percent in 2013; yet there is still work to be done.

Recently, the CIA released an unclassified report on women in leadership and found that women in the CIA who sought greater responsibility were hindered by organizational and societal challenges.

Indeed, throughout the major intelligence agencies, female hiring has remained below 40 percent for the fourth consecutive year. Women made up 51 percent of the general population in 2013, but only 39 percent of the workforce in the IC community.

In addition, the percentage of female managers was only 35.5 percent. CIA is reviewing the situation of its minority and women officers, and I commend that initiative, and I strongly urge other agencies within the IC to do the same.

This bill and the IC's efforts are good steps in the right direction. However, we have to stay in stride and look for efforts to create a more inclusive, equitable, and diverse workforce.

Going forward, I hope to look at the status of women and minority workers throughout the IC and how to increase their management ranks. Our workforce is our greatest asset and our greatest strength.

There are many parts of this bill which cannot be discussed on the floor. The United States keeps secrets for a reason. However, let me say that the intelligence professionals at each of the 16 IC agencies go to work every day to do their jobs, keep America number one, and to protect the homeland.

I want to commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their leadership on the Intel Committee. It was a committee assignment that I was not sure I wanted to accept at first, but I know how important our national security is.

I want to thank your staff, Mr. Chairman, and the ranking member's staff for helping new members come up to speed. Indeed, what we do here is so critically important. The Fiscal Year 2014 Intelligence Authorization is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentlewoman for joining us on the committee. It is sometimes long hours and thankless work, and I am fairly confident our IQ on the committee has doubled since she has arrived on the committee.

Penetrating questions, robust debate, curiosity that has no bounds, and her travel around the world has been critically important to the work we do on the committee, and the work that she has done on the committee has been exceptional in adding to the product that you see before us today.

I think that is one of the reasons it is such a good bill. I wanted to thank the gentlewoman for her work on the 2014 fiscal bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to ensure the most rigorous oversight and accountability over all U.S. intelligence agencies and all U.S. intelligence activities, I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

I also urge my colleagues to support this bill for the sake of all of us, not just in America, but around the world, who benefit from the work of our intelligence community in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, so that our dedicated intelligence professionals who work worldwide—often in harm's way—can keep us safe and our allies safe. They are truly the best in the world.

We can disagree about policy, but we should never disagree about the professionalism, bravery, and devotion to the

rule of law that are the hallmarks of our intelligence professionals.

Finally, once again, let me just thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership for these past years. I also want to sincerely thank every member of the Intelligence Committee.

I want to thank Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL for being here tonight and for being involved in this bill. You were a big part of our success.

We debate, and we argue, but we always negotiate, and we always keep in our minds what is most important: the security, privacy, and civil liberties of the American people.

Together with the Senate—and I thank Senators FEINSTEIN and CHAMBLISS again—we have produced for the House to consider today a truly strong bill, which I am proud to support. I urge all my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my ranking member, and I want to thank all the staff—Republican and Democrat staff. These bills don't come together for the fond wishes of us Members alone.

We have very dedicated and committed staff who sit down and work through the issues, just the way the Members do, and we wouldn't have this product today if it weren't for that collaboration, and I want to thank all of them for that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank DUTCH on a personal note. There is a lot to not like in this town, and there is a lot to not like in this place, but it shows you—and I think it shows Americans—that when you sit down and have mutual respect for each other, even though we disagreed on certain issues, you can come to a conclusion that is in the best interest of the United States.

Through forging that relationship, I think we forged a lasting friendship that I will always be grateful for, so I want to thank you for that.

Thank you for your work on national security, and thanks to all the staff who brought us here today. We have a lot more work to do, so we can't be too nice to them.

We are going to have to get a lot of pounds of flesh between now and the end of the year, to get a lot of work done.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask and encourage this body to support a bill that will provide national security safety for the United States for the following years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1681.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JIM JORDAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JIM JORDAN, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, for my testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JIM JORDAN,
Member of Congress.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION INVASION

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, our current immigration policies and political rhetoric broadcast to people around the world that they can come here illegally without consequence. In fact, if they do, they will be rewarded for it. We send this message, and then we act surprised when an illegal immigration invasion into our country skyrockets.

A growing crisis at our southern border sees tens of thousands of children being abandoned at our doorstep. Their parents miscalculated. They heard someone talk about the DREAM Act and thought their children would be taken care of.

Ultimately, this crisis was brought on by Democrats and Republicans who have advocated granting legal status to those people who are here illegally, especially in terms of the so-called ''DREAMers.''

While most of those advocating such policies have good motives and good hearts, they have unintentionally created a humanitarian and bureaucratic crisis that our government is not equipped to handle.

I say we should send them home. The children and those who have come here illegally need to be sent home, whether they are adults or children.

PLAYING POLITICS FOR THE CAMERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I appreciate the opportunity to do so.

There are a number of topics that are on my mind, and generally for me, Mr. Speaker, it flows from the previous debate.

As I listened to the deliberation and the dialogue and I will say the cooperative nature that came between the chairman and the ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence here this evening, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that kind of dialogue, and I think our Founding Fathers would be very pleased if they could see that this work that is being done, a lot of it behind closed doors in the Select Committee on Intelligence, is being done in a deliberative process, sometimes in a classified setting, but often in a nonpartisan environment.

It seems as though, when the television cameras come on, the partisan nature of this United States Congress is amplified by the media's coverage of the events that take place, and when the doors get closed, we get serious about policy in a different kind of a way.

We are no longer messaging to America or simply having that kind of debate and dialogue that our Founding Fathers envisioned, and I don't know that it is particularly a phenomenon that is unique to the United States Congress.

At the time of our Founding Fathers, we didn't have instantaneous media communications that went out across the District of Columbia or into the States or across the country, for that matter, or the world.

□ 1945

As technology developed, they had the printing press. The printing press allowed for newspaper to be printed in a limited form, in a compressed and compact form. And as that message went out across the country, sometimes it took weeks for the actions here in Congress to penetrate into the public. And by then, there was another wave of action and another wave of action, an entirely different rhythm here in Congress as compared to the rhythm that we have here. I think the pace of what we do in this Congress is related to the ability to translate a message out to the American people and out to the world.

And so now going from an era when information traveled at its fastest pace, as our Founding Fathers helped shape this Nation, information traveled at its fastest pace about as fast as a horse could gallop. That was the closest thing they had to lightning speed of communications back in 1776. Today, information travels at the speed of light, and it is not only that there is a single piece of information that goes

out of here at the speed of light, but all kinds of pieces of information can go out simultaneously everywhere, not just to the District of Columbia, not to the surrounding States alone, not to the 50 States that we have and the U.S. territories across the reaches of the globe and the Pacific, for example, but everywhere in the world it can go at the speed light, which is as close to instantaneously as possible. And it can be transmitted out of an iPhone. It used to be a BlackBerry and they got a little bit too slow for us. Now, we can send video around the world in real time from a device that hangs from our belt. That has changed the posture of the politics in the United States Congress. It has changed the messaging. It has changed the civilization, and it changed the culture in different ways.

So now, we have people sitting in their living rooms all over America who for a long time now have been able to sit down from that desk and do email. That is a methodology that is now more than 20 years old, the ability to transfer instantaneously a letter that we might write on an electronic page and click the ''send'' button and it can go anywhere around the world at roughly the speed of light. But now there are millions of people sitting there who have practiced with email extensively and set up their email trees. And now a faster way to do that is on Facebook, and a more compressed way is to send it out by Twitter. There are a number of different social media that people are exercising, and there will be more that will be developed.

While that happens, the American people are projecting their opinions and their observations instantaneously to their families and to their friends, to the people who are part of their distribution list, those who are their followers on their friend list. This has changed the way we do business in this country, and it has brought about public opinions that are accelerated in a faster way; a far, far faster way than how public opinions were formed in, say, the era of our founding.

Because of this, it has been an expansion of our economy, the expansion of our efficiency. We are far more productive than we were before because we can communicate more quickly than before. But at the same time, it has opened us up for the kind of attacks that come from people who, in the era of our founding, in that era of say 235 years ago or so, they had no capability of reaching Americans, no capability of getting to our shores, and no capability of penetrating into the domestic life of Americans. We were safe enough then from the Barbary pirates. We had to go there before they would attack us.

Yet, at that era of time, 20 percent of the Federal budget that was appropriated in this city was committed to paying tribute, which was bribes, you might say ''mordida'' in today's terms, to the Barbary pirates. Now we find ourselves still fighting the same kind of ideology, of people who would use cyberspace to attack us, who would use airplanes to attack us, both of which were not envisioned by our Founding Fathers, both of which can get here far faster than a Barbary pirate corsair could be rowed across the Atlantic Ocean. That has changed the rhythm of what we do.

The Select Committee on Intelligence sees a lot of this. They see the most immediate intel that we have. They try to address this appropriately. And some of the things that we need to do is intel on our enemies.

So I am hopeful that this bill which has just been passed will contribute to making it safer for Americans, and make our enemies, whose simple design is that they would want to kill us because we are not their culture, not their religion, not their—and when I refer to them as ''civilization,'' I have to put that in quotes, Mr. Speaker. But that is the situation that is in front of us.

As the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence delivers a bill to the floor about which most of us don't have inside knowledge of, we have to keep in mind what has happened with the intelligence community and the results of the attacks that have taken place around the world. That takes me to what we saw, heard, and learned and thought we knew, to a greater degree than most Americans would agree did know, with regard to Iraq.

We went in there to liberate them in March of 2003. I was here in this Congress then. I remember the intelligence that was delivered. I remember the rhythm that was taking place, the message delivered by the President and the Vice President, the agreement on what they had for intelligence that went from U.S. intelligence, Israeli intelligence, French intelligence, everybody in the intelligence community for the world agreed essentially on the same thing, and Saddam was removed from power. American and coalition forces went in to do that, and in the ensuing aftermath of the liberation, we saw an ebb and flow of forces in Iraq.

One of them was a surprise for me to learn, as al Qaeda stepped in to places and took over in places like Fallujah and Ramadi—that we allowed that to happen on our watch. We occupied bases in Iraq. We had swept through the country and cleaned the country up. We had set up a government and turned it over to the voice of the Iraqi people. Free enterprise was starting to flow. Oil was starting to flow and was starting to go into the treasuries of Iraq. And yet, cities like Fallujah and Ramadi and others were taken over by al Qaeda. We watched that happen. That happened under the Bush administration. After it got to a certain point, President George W. Bush began to look for solutions. He was not willing to accept a capitulation in Iraq, an all-out pullout of Iraq that would have allowed for al Qaeda and our American enemies, generally Sunni-related forces, to take Iraq back over again. That was what we had under Saddam, not al Qaeda but the Sunni forces dominated Iraq. And the forces within Iraq that had been pushing back on American forces and Shia forces within Iraq, our President was not willing to accept that. President Bush was not willing to accept that.

He put together the surge, the counterinsurgency strategy that was drafted by General Petraeus. General Petraeus took some time off from his combat leadership in Iraq to sit down at Fort Leavenworth and write the counterinsurgency strategy. That strategy, before it was actually brought forward and published, was a strategy that was beginning to be developed to be implemented in Iraq.

I had the circumstance of timing to have been in Iraq before the surge was a name but when the concept was being discussed and developed by our commanders in the field and pushed by General Petraeus at the time. I saw the success of the surge as we went in and aligned ourselves with the tribal interests of the Sunnis as well as the Shias, who understood that al Qaeda was too brutal, that they could not be trusted to simply allow the Iraqi people to run their own country and run their own government, and so they aligned themselves with the people who they envisioned would be the successful ones on the other side of the violent and bloody conflict that was ensuing.

That aligned the right people on the right side, on our side of that particular battle, Mr. Speaker, that particular phase of the war in Iraq. There were many battles. It allowed for the surge of U.S. forces to step in, sweep al Qaeda out and build an alliance and an allegiance with local tribal interests say, in Anbar, and in multiple provinces and really all of Iraq to establish a peaceful foundation that would allow for a legitimate government of, by, and for the people of Iraq, and a free enterprise system to be put in place. They had then an opportunity to succeed and an opportunity to build a stable democracy in the country of Iraq.

Those were the circumstances that the Bush administration left for the Obama administration. However, I would add one piece to this that is apparently not being discussed in today's news media, Mr. Speaker, and that is this: on November 17, 2008, after Barack Obama was elected for his first term in office, President Bush, under his administration, I will say allowed or recommended or assented to our U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Ryan Crocker, who is an individual who is a wonderful public servant, one of the most knowledgeable people that we have on that whole area of the world we call the Middle East and whom has impressed me with the deep knowledge and the good judgment he has, and the careful rhythm of the work that he does, someone who has an eye on the moving of the organism in that part of

the world and how U.S. policy influences that part of the world. So I wanted to put these commercials in for Ambassador Crocker because I remain very impressed with Ambassador Ryan Crocker.

It came to be his task to sign, however, a new status of forces agreement with Iraq. The moment I read that status of forces agreement, which was signed by Ambassador Crocker on behalf of President Bush, November 17, 2008, after President Obama was elected, so under the lame duck era of President-elect Obama and in the last months of President Bush's administration—Ambassador Crocker signed the status of forces agreement, which agreed to pull all military forces out of Iraq, agreed to abandon the bases that we had established, abandon the airstrips that we had established, and the defensive positions, and the ability to project force in Iraq was not only diminished, it was essentially eliminated by that agreement.

I was alarmed that the administration would negotiate and agree to such a status of forces agreement that so weakened our ability to project power in Iraq; that with all of the blood and treasure that was invested, it sent the message that said either we don't care any longer or we have such confidence in the Maliki regime and such confidence in the new government that had been set up throughout those bloody years in Iraq that we didn't need to be there any longer.

I think of the history of the United States' involvement, Mr. Speaker, and the times we have gone into places like Germany, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, for example, around the world where America has invested blood and treasure, we have also established bases to operate from, to project power, to project force, to protect freedom throughout the reaches of the interests of the United States of America, and at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives and billions, in fact trillions of dollars, we have not in the past washed our hands and walked away as if we wanted to be finished with it, except that as I speak, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that we did have General Winfield Scott in Mexico in about 1845. We signed the Treaty of Hidalgo which essentially gave Mexico back to Mexico after the Americans had invaded and occupied the state of Mexico, including Mexico City. We could have stayed. We could have established an American presence there. We could have brought the American civilization into Mexico. Looking back on it historically, perhaps we should have done so, but that was the time when American blood and American treasure was just packaged up and brought back home again, although out of that bargain came the Gadsden Purchase and also a new line of American border between the United States and Mexico. So there was something gained from that.

In this case, we sacked up our bats and went home. We left a few marines in the embassy in Baghdad. The rest of it, we left to the Iraqis. As the intelligence came up, Mr. Speaker, and we watched what was going on, we learned that ISIS was growing and the conflict in Syria reached a questionable peak last September, last August, actually, around Labor Day in September when President Obama announced that he was planning on doing a tiny little, itsy-bitsy, teeny-weeny surgical strike into Syria, and that was when Secretary of State Kerry said it would be, and this is not an exact quote, but what I remember is that the strike would be infinitesimally small. So a tiny, little military ding on Assad's regime to send a message to him: Don't use your chemical weapons any longer on Syrians. Well, that never happened. It didn't happen partly because we needed the British cooperation. Or, apparently, the President wanted the British cooperation and David Cameron, the Prime Minister, went to the British Parliament and said, I would like to have authorization to conduct a military operation strike—I don't know if he said infinitesimally small—in Syria.

□ 2000

And the British Parliament rejected that proposal, and so David Cameron was powerless to go forward in support of a U.S. effort that might have been a military strike or two, however small they might have been, in Syria.

Then our President, President Obama, toyed with the idea of coming to Congress and asking us for the permission or the endorsement or the authority to conduct operations in Syria.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that my opinion is, constitutionally, the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. Some in this Congress would argue that the President can't issue a military strike order without first getting the consent of Congress.

I would argue instead that we are living in an era where the President of the United States must have that authority. He must have the authority to, in an instant, order a military strike if that is what the circumstances and the intelligence say is required. It is the President's decision. If the President orders our military into operations and over a period of time—and I think that an appropriate period of time today is a 30-day window—then if it is going to go beyond that, he should come back to Congress and ask for our support and ask for our endorsement of those military operations. But the initial strikes, the President has to have the authority, and has the authority under the Constitution, to order an immediate and military strike.

The President didn't do that. He followed David Cameron's request before the British Parliament, and then when the British Parliament said, no, he toyed with the idea of asking Congress. Congress sent enough messages out through the media that essentially was a whip check on the vote of Congress on whether we would authorize military force going into Syria.

When the President understood he wasn't going to get that authorization, then he decided apparently not to act in Syria, and he decided apparently to lead from behind—which is the definition of following, not leading—and he decided apparently to do the things in foreign policy that we have seen him do continually, and that is best described by the word ''dither.'' The President has been dithering on foreign policy, especially the things that require immediate response.

There is a theory in human nature and philosophy that says that if you procrastinate, then eventually the decision will be made for you, that if you dither, the decision will be made for you.

Action in Syria, or the decision, was resolved by dithering and waiting, and now it became clear that we can't identify good guys on either side of this argument. We had good guys. And I didn't advocate for this, Mr. Speaker, and so I am somewhat of a Monday morning quarterback looking back on this Syrian issue.

We had some intelligence that identified the people that were good people, those who wanted to see a free Syria. The Free Syrian Army initially led by Syrians that believed in a free Syria and Syrians that believe that Syria needed to remain a nation-state, a country unto itself, that was owned, operated, and run, a government that responded to the people of Syria, that was the initial ideology that drove the Free Syrian Army by the intel that I picked up. I have traveled into that part of world a number of times, Mr. Speaker.

One of the colonels who was a leader in the movement was essentially, I'll say, given over to the Assad regime in a military operation and was then pressed into prison, and that made him powerless. At that point, al Qaeda and the offshoots of al Qaeda and the factions of it began to assert themselves and infiltrate the Free Syrian Army to the point where we are not able any longer to identify the positive forces in Syria. You have al Qaeda and their affiliates, including ISIS, that are operating there, that have established the foundations for what they believe is to be the future caliphate of Islam.

As a result, partly the result of the U.S. not asserting itself, partly the result of perhaps not having intelligence that was good enough in that part of the world, the U.S. didn't act. The President led from behind. The U.S. didn't act. The British Parliament said ''no'' to David Cameron, and we have a mess in Syria. We have had multiple executions and beheadings taking place, Christians being persecuted and killed in Syria as well. Now the foundation of ISIS has flowed out of Syria and is flowing across Iraq.

This group, the ISIS, has asserted themselves to the point where some are

saying we need to avoid a civil war in Iraq. I will argue instead we are almost past that. We are almost past the point where the civil war has actually been engaged and it is closer to the point where it could be over, resulting in an ISIS invasion and occupation of nearly the entire nation-state of Iraq. They pushed that far into the countryside where the majority of the real estate is controlled and occupied by them.

This is an astonishing development, especially considered in light of the President's statements 3 or 4 months ago when he told America and the world that we didn't need to worry very much about ISIS because they are simply the junior varsity—the junior varsity, Mr. Speaker. How could a force, a junior varsity that doesn't have an identifiable source of military supplies and munitions—although we have some intel on where that comes from—that doesn't have a confident, identifiable source of funding to pay their people or buy their equipment munitions—although we have some fairly good sources on where that comes from—how could this junior varsity rise up in a period of 3 to 4 months from the time that the President said that they are the JV, how could they rise up and take over that much of Syria and flow into Iraq and invade and occupy Anwar province, for example, and now take the refinery at Baiji, the largest refinery in Iraq, and shut down or control the oil supply in Iraq? Now they have diverted it back to their own uses. Now we are at gas rationing in Iraq. Baghdad is threatened to be surrounded. The President has announced some days ago that he is willing to send up to 300 military personnel into Iraq presumably to prepare to evacuate Americans.

This is a calamity of colossal proportions, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, it was unforeseen by the White House and the President of the United States, the wise Commander in Chief and the people in the White House who have the maximum access to the entire intelligence community, the intelligence community that is being discussed and reauthorized here on the floor of the House tonight by the chair and the ranking member, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I would think that the question that it doesn't take much intelligence to ask is: Mr. President, how did you miss this? How did you declare ISIS the junior varsity? How could they have emerged as this powerful force that is sweeping across Iraq?

This isn't a civil war. This is a blitzkrieg by the enemy that is taking over the civilian governments and invading and occupying the towns in Iraq and executing the people who do not fit their particular religious sect. They are persecuting Christians. They are driving Christians out of that part of the world, and they are killing those that they choose to.

It isn't that alone. They bragged over a week ago that they had executed 1,700 Iraqi soldiers. Most of these soldiers will be Shi'a. And it is the Sunnis that are doing the executing and the killing. They have long been the most aggressive, the most militant, the most brutal, and the most violent force of the Islamic world, in that part of the world, in Iraq in particular.

ISIS has apparently and, according to some news accounts, are so violent and so brutal that they have even caused al Qaeda itself to step back from them and say: You are too violent and too brutal. Now, that is going a long way to think that people that would fly planes into the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, and burn to death the Americans that they did would find that the brutality of ISIS is so brutal that they would want to distance themselves from it.

I am not sure I believe that analysis. I think that that is one of those conclusions du jour that we come to; once you hear somebody say it, it gets repeated again and again, and pretty soon others pick it up, no one challenges it, and now we think that al Qaeda has been repulsed by the brutality of ISIS. I am not convinced of that.

Mr. Speaker, I can say this: I am repulsed by their brutality. I am repulsed by the beheadings that they do. I am repulsed by the videos. I am repulsed by the pictures. I am repulsed by the summary executions of hundreds, and probably thousands, of people that don't fit their religious sect that find themselves within the enforcement capability now of the black-flagged ISIS.

I am repulsed by what has come out of there. If we could see the actual reality of all the things that are going on within that part of the battle zone and in the aftermath of it as they go down through the streets and do their ethnic cleansing, I think we will find that thousands of people have been summarily executed by ISIS.

I think we will find that at least hundreds have been beheaded. I think we will find that thousands have been shot in the back of the head as they have their hands tied behind them and they are forced to kneel. I think we will find that in those numbers there will also be hundreds, and perhaps thousands, that have been forced to lay on the ground in a ditch and simply executed with AK–47 fire into the back of their heads or wherever. I think we will find that some—in fact, the videos are out there now—have been forced to kneel beside a pit in a hole in the ground that has a fire burning in it from gas poured into the hole, had gas poured onto their heads and then pushed into the hole to be burned to death in a pit.

That is the kind of brutality that we have that is taking over that part of the world. That is the kind of people that have raced across the desert, in the open desert, and faced no air power from the United States of America whatsoever. They have only faced this: the President sitting in the White House dithering, a President who has decided—he gave a speech a week ago last Friday at noon in this town, and this speech was, he came out to do his press conference and he said—I am going to give this my summary version, the STEVE KING interpretation of the President's speech that day, a week ago last Friday at noon. He essentially conveyed this message to us:

Things aren't going as well in Iraq as we had hoped. There is an enemy that has penetrated into Iraq. We are not going to have boots on the ground in Iraq. I have several options. We are going to study the options for a few days. It will take at least that long to evaluate. There will be no boots on the ground. We have options, but we are not going to deploy any options until such time as there are political solutions. If there is not a political solution, there is not going to be peace in Iraq.

So he says: I am going to require the Iraqis to produce a political solution before we will use any of the options that we have that might—he didn't say this—but that might help them, was the implication. There will be no boots on the ground. We are going to study this for a few days. Then after we study it, we are going give the Iraqis an assignment, and the assignment will be: produce a political solution and then maybe we can get around to helping you.

Huh. Well, that is the formula, Mr. Speaker, for dithering. That is the formula for dithering rather than fiddling. And while Iraq is being invaded by the black flag, radical Islamists to establish a caliphate, the President is dithering in a very similar way that Nero was fiddling while Rome was burning.

Iraq is collapsing. The soil in Iraq has been sanctified by the blood of our warriors and our heroes to the tune of billions upon billions of U.S. dollars, much of it borrowed from foreign countries to keep this budget and this economy afloat. All of that price, and we don't know how this is going to come out?

I actually don't expect that the entire nation-state of Iraq will be swamped by the black flag ISIS. I don't actually expect that, but it is a significant threat that that happens—a significant threat. As we watch the map, as the flood and the takeover of that sanctified sand in Iraq is getting greater and greater on the side of ISIS and smaller and smaller for the Shi'as, and while the confusion within what I would call the legitimized Government of Iraq causes them to retreat and back up, it looks like their last redoubt is likely to be Baghdad.

The President has dithered, and the opportunities for air strikes from the military have diminished and now the opportunities to actually bring what would otherwise be a cheap delay, at least, of that invasion, an invasion that runs at the speed that is as fast as an American military, an American armor penetrated into Iraq when we

went in to liberate in March of 2003. ISIS is penetrating into Iraq at a speed almost that fast without nearly the equipment, without nearly the planning, without nearly the communications as the Iraqis peel backwards in front of them.

□ 2015

This is something more similar to—well, I will put it this way: when Desert Storm came about and needed to be done, there was much discussion in the public airways in this country about the Republican Guard in Iraq, these crack troops that were highly trained and well equipped.

Even though their tanks were a little bit on the old side, they were supposedly well maintained and well positioned, and their armor could not be penetrated. To send U.S. forces against them in the desert was going to be a bloodbath supposedly, if you listen to some of the pundits here in this country, generally the liberal ones.

I am listening to this dialogue and have been to the locations now a number of times, and I see where they have dug their tank pits, and they take a bulldozer, dig the sand out in two directions, pull the tank down in, they set that tank in, in a fighting position, and it can fire.

It can fire from that fighting position, and any kind of horizontal fire will be blocked by the dirt that surrounds it, but from the air, they are sitting ducks.

That seemingly did not occur to the liberal people who were pontificating about how fearsome the Republican Guard was, but we know what happened when the American Air Force began to fly sorties over the Republican Guard and over their armored divisions.

A similar, in fact, a greater vulnerability existed for ISIS, as they traveled down the paths through the desert and the roads—easy, easy targets for the U.S. Air Force.

While this is going on, the President had decided: I am going to spend some days thinking about this, we have to study this, we will gather all this intel together, and then I am going to require a political solution for the Iraqis, I am going to dither.

Frustrating and infuriating, it should send a message to the Iraqis there isn't a will there. Our enemies know that, so they push on us. They push on us in Iraq, and we are watching the real estate be taken over, with black flags flying over it.

We are watching the will of the Iraqi troops to collapse in the face of the enemy. We have watched, as I said, the refinery of Baiji is now invaded and occupied, Fallujah is, and Ramadi is—multiple cities—Tal Afar, on and on, multiple cities in Iraq taken over, who now have a black flag of al Qaeda's affiliate, ISIS, flying over it.

The influence of America is diminished and pushed backwards. Iraq looks to Iran as an ally. They wonder if the U.S. is going to do anything.

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker. We are faced with a Russia that is pushing hard against the free world, a Putin who took the glory of the Olympics and the Russian hypernationalism that flowed from it and decided that he would immediately, after the Olympics in Sochi, went in and invaded and occupied Crimea.

He had a base there with a lease on it. If it was just a place to operate from, he could have done that peacefully, without violating international law and without going and invading and occupying. He could have operated freely out of his naval base there in Crimea. He chose not to do that.

I think it is ironic that Yalta was invaded and occupied by Putin. That was the location where Stalin and Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt negotiated the line across Europe that was to be the line in the aftermath of the Second World War, which became the Iron Curtain and became the dividing line between east and west.

Yalta was invaded and occupied as a component of Crimea, by Putin riding on the wave of Russian hypernationalism that came from the success of the Olympics, and now, he is pushing into Ukraine and testing them.

We know that—no, let's just say this, Mr. Speaker: we believe that, when troops show up and they are wearing Russian uniforms and they are carrying Russian weapons and they appear to be deployed as Russian troops in everything except a lacking of insignias on their uniforms and not flying a Russian flag, who do we think these people are? Do we think they are something other than Russians?

Why would we think that some force that looks, for all the world, like Russian forces—because Putin doesn't admit that they are Russian, somehow they might have come from someplace else. Who do we think they are? The Russians, the Russians in Russian uniforms, with Russian equipment, Russian supplies, Russian systems, everything except the Russian insignias.

Meanwhile, we don't hear from the President of the United States in a strong way, and meanwhile, Ukrainians wonder what is going to happen. They wonder if they have a chance of defending themselves. They wonder if any other part of the world is going to do that. Are we going to see the Iron Curtain be pushed westerly again?

When the Berlin Wall came down November 9, 1989, that was the crashing down of the Iron Curtain. For a time, freedom echoed across Europe, all the way across Europe. In fact, it echoed, at least theoretically, all the way across Asia, to the Pacific Ocean, and it has been pushed back again by the strong arm of Vladimir Putin.

Now, we are seeing a line of demarcation between east and west that is being redefined by Putin with his hypernationalism, in his effort to restore the old Soviet Union—the former Soviet Union.

The Eastern bloc countries are very nervous about what happens with a very aggressive Putin. They are very nervous because they wonder: Do they have an ally in the United States?

They wonder if they can hang on for another 2½ years until a new President is elected that is going to believe in America, in a robust America, an America that defends itself, an America that has bonded with its allies, an America that has tax and regulatory policies that allows for the growth over a free enterprise system, so that we can see an economic vigor that will drive our economy here and give us confidence in who we are again and go to the furthest outreaches of the world where Americans are doing business in country after country.

The AmCham, the American Chamber of Commerce, and nation after nation become the ambassadors of the United States. They teach the world about trade and free enterprise. They teach the world about we have an American—it is not a hypernationalism. What it is is a very active commercial style. I would give an example.

As I deal with the Australians, for example—and I have a special affection for the Aussies—they will come and make contact, and they will make friends, and they will be sociable. Then they will go away, come back again, and do that same thing.

On the third time, they are more likely to bring up the discussion about the business that they want to conduct, Mr. Speaker, but Americans are not like that. We are a little bit different.

We are more like the Donald Trumps, where we come in, we figure out what we want to do businesswise, we think we understand what the other party needs and wants in a business deal, we believe that all parties involved in a business deal need to have an opportunity to profit.

So if $1 is going to change hands with one other person, two people need to benefit from that, the buyer and the seller. If it is a three-way deal, then three entities benefit. If it is thousands or tens of thousands of people—shareholders, for example—everybody is designed to benefit from that.

We go in and we say: Here is the deal. This is our proposal. This is why it is good for you. This is why it is good for us. This is why we ought to sign here on the dotted line. We will get around to all the niceties and discussion afterwards. Maybe we will have a meal or a drink together, but let's do the business, and then we will talk about the social side.

That is the American way. We do business fast. We do business efficiently. It is a culture that has developed in this country because we have had an unfettered ability to buy, sell, trade, make, gain—here in America, without a government interference, without the belief that we had to set at the table negotiators that represented

the government, negotiators that represented the unions, to sit and talk with the negotiators that represented the capital.

In America, we do business with capital—capital because we do business for a profit and capital deserves a return on its investment. Labor gets the benefit from that profit by increasing wages and benefits to hire the best people to produce that good or service that has a marketable value.

That is what has made America's economy great, is our attitude about buy, sell, trade, make, gain, do good, produce goods and services with a marketable value here and abroad.

Let's send our Americans abroad to do business, let them take our values there, let them encourage people to come here and do business with us, and let's open up our trade wherever we can all over the world, with a free and smart trade system, that if we are going to grant access to our markets, what we ask is let us also have access to your markets.

We don't believe etiologically in trade protectionism. We believe in free and smart trade. We don't believe in stupid trade. Stupid trade would be, well, you have access to our markets, but it is okay with us if we don't have access to yours. No deal.

Americans make a lot of deals, and we make them efficient, we make them smart, we make them fast, and we make them all over the world. That has been a foundation of the burgeoning growth of the American economy and the American civilization.

It has been restrained in recent years because we have a leadership that has failed to convince me that they believe in free enterprise.

We should remember that, even on the immigration flashcards that we have, Mr. Speaker, when legal immigrants come to America and they want to study to become citizens of the United States, they will study the history of this country and the things that are necessary to be prepared to take the naturalization test.

USCIS, the Citizenship and Immigration Services, has a collection of flashcards that they can study from, so they can be prepared for the test.

These flashcards are laminated. They are about this big. They are mostly red in their base with white letters on them, and you can look at them and ask this question: Who is the Father of our Country? Flip that card around. The answer: George Washington.

Who emancipated the slaves? Other side of the card: Abraham Lincoln. What is the economic system of the United States of America? Flip the card over: free enterprise capitalism, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I wish that the White House believed in it as much we ask our legal immigrants to believe in it as they prepare for the test for the naturalization to citizenship of the United States. That is part of who we are; yet our economy is stagnant, it is flat.

There seems to be an attitude that emerges from the administration that free enterprise and that capitalism itself is somehow a dirty word. No, it is a foundation of the economy of the United States of America. It is on the test.

They believe, as I watch their reaction, that somehow the capital, the employers, are victimizing both employees and customers and that there is plenty of money there and plenty of profit there to pay for more regulation, to pay for more taxation, and to pay for more raises and wages and benefits for employees that could be dictated by the White House.

That is not the American way. It has got to be free enterprise. The relationship between the employer and the employee is up to them, not up to the government. The government can't set wages.

A government can't determine that one work is comparable to another work. Only supply and demand can do that effectively and efficiently. That is the American way, Mr. Speaker.

There are other things that are the American way. For example, we don't support lawbreakers. We don't believe that people who habitually, in a calculated way, systematically violate America's laws should be rewarded for doing so.

We understand that, when Ronald Reagan said, what you tax, you get less of; what you subsidize, you get more of; and if you subsidize lawbreakers—if you reward lawbreakers, you get more lawbreakers.

I was disappointed with Ronald Reagan. I was disappointed twice during his administration. I watched him closely. I believe that Ronald Reagan understood the founding principles of this country so confidently and so clearly that no amount of lobbying, no amount of rhetoric, no amount of misinformation was going to change his adherence to the fundamental principles that are the pillars of American exceptionalism.

So here in this Congress, in 1986, in the House and down through the rotunda and the Senate, there was an intense debate about amnesty.

The debate went something like this: There are 1 million illegal immigrants in America. They have come across the border—generally across the border from Mexico—and it is too difficult, we can't deport them all—I think I have heard that before—so we must make an accommodation to them.

We are having difficulty getting enforcement at the border because there are competing interests in those who would drag down the effort to enforce our immigration laws, especially secure the border, but we can get full cooperation on border security and full cooperation on domestic enforcement if we just give amnesty to the million people that are here illegally, and from this point forward hereafter, we will all enthusiastically join together and enforce immigration law, and INS will be in every office of every employer in America, examining your records, to make sure that you are carefully following the law and being there to be the tool to help enforce immigration law.

I listened to that, and I thought: President Reagan, you know you can't reward lawbreakers. If you do that, you are going to get more lawbreakers—just like if you subsidize any activity, you are going to get more of that activity, and if you tax it, you are going to get less of it.

Well, the penalty for violating the law is equivalent to a taxation. It is a deterrent for violating the law. The greater the penalty, the less law violators that you have.

□ 2030

The less the penalty, the greater the incentive, the more law violators you have. So, if you wanted to subsidize lawbreakers, you are going to get lots more lawbreakers.

These arguments, I thought, were so clear that I didn't need to go stand outside the White House with a sign. I could just write a letter here and there and with great confidence raise my family, run my business, and have trust that the President of the United States would veto that Amnesty Act that was to come to his desk in 1986.

It came to his desk and the people around him strongly encouraged President Reagan to sign the Amnesty Act and take all of this disagreement and all of this angst off the table that had to do with the million illegal aliens who had entered the United States illegally or were unlawfully present in America, give them a legal presence and be done with it, and INS will enforce this law at the border—Border Patrol—and internally at Immigration and Naturalization Services.

Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act. In my construction office, as an employer, I hit the high levels of frustration, at least for that stage of my life, but I began to comply with the law.

When we had applicants for jobs that came in, I made sure that I took the records that they have. I made sure that I evaluated their documents and their Social Security card, if I could get it. Most of the times, I could then. And a driver's license. At least two forms of identification.

I made sure that our job application form collected the records necessary that were required by that 1986 Amnesty Act. I made sure that I kept those records for every applicant. I was prepared for our employees and the applicants for the jobs that wanted to come in and work for King Construction, and I made sure that I had all those records up to snuff. I was meticulous in keeping those records and making sure that my executive secretary kept those records because I feared—or I was concerned—I don't know that I was afraid, because I did it right—but I expected INS, or Immigration and Naturalization Services, the forerunner to

now ICE, to show up at my office and say, We want to see your records. We want to make sure that you haven't hired anybody illegally. We want to make sure you haven't entertained hiring anybody illegally. We want to make sure that you have collected the documentation so that you are not enabling the employment of illegal aliens in America.

Well, you all know this, Mr. Speaker. Nobody ever showed up from INS, as they didn't show up in millions of employers' offices around the country. The enforcement didn't materialize domestically. It didn't really get enhanced at the border either. The promise of enforcement came unfilled, but the promise of amnesty for a million people came in triplicate.

Three times the number of people that were projected to be amnestied by the 1986 Amnesty Act were actually granted amnesty. Over 3 million of them were granted amnesty. I have met with a respectable number of them at random and happenstance over the years, and I asked them, What do you think of amnesty? They will look at me and they will say, I support amnesty. I think it was a good idea. Amnesty was good me for, amnesty was good for my family. Amnesty is a good policy.

So I say, What do you think about the rule of law and what do you think about the reward when people break the law? Should they be rewarded for it?

Well, that takes them off in a place they don't want to discuss. They just know what was good for them. I don't disagree. It was good for them, but it was bad for America. It was really bad for America, because here we are 28 years later and we are still debating the issue. The carrot of amnesty still hangs out in front of people from all over the world that says, Well, Americans have a soft heart. They are the most generous Nation in the world, welcoming immigrants to the tune of 1.2 million legal immigrants a year.

We don't even care about the quality of the standards of those who are coming into America legally—not very much, anyway—because between 7 and 11 percent of the legal immigration in America is immigration that is measured by some kind of a standard that might be an index of what they can do to contribute to our country.

Every nation in the world should have an immigration policy that is designed to enhance the economic, social, and the cultural well-being of that country.

I have long stated and continue to believe that we must have an immigration policy here that is designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States of America. We can't operate an immigration policy that seems to be designed to become the safety valve for those in poverty in the world—over 7 billion people. The poverty in the world grows at a faster rate than we have the ability to drain off even those who are the most aggrieved by poverty.

By the way, the numbers that I have seen when we were back at about 6 billion people on the planet were that there were about 4.6 billion people on the planet that had a lower standard of living than the average person from Mexico.

So if you think about alleviating poverty, there are many places to draw people from where the poverty is worse. And there are many places to draw people from where the perpetrators of violence come in significantly greater numbers.

However, even the violent death rate in the United States is only one-third of the violent death rate in Mexico. If you compare violent death rates in other countries, Mexico is one of the safer countries from Central America and on south. I think you actually have to get down to Chile before you find a country that has a violent death rate in the Western Hemisphere comparable to the lower death rate of the United States.

At one time, Colombia had a violent death rate 15.4 times that of the United States. Our rate today is 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000. Roughly 10 years ago, our violent death rates was 4.5 violent deaths per 100,000. At that time, Mexico's violent death rate was 13.2. A 4.6 violent death rate in the U.S., a 13.2 violent death rate in Mexico.

Drug wars and the massive killings that have taken place that have exceeded 50,000 people in Mexico—maybe 70,000 or more that have died in the drug wars—that is part of the statistic that has taken Mexico at a higher violent death rate now of over 18 per 100,000, and perhaps there is some index here that the U.S. violent death rate has gone in that period of time from 4.6 on up to 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000, but the ratio remains the same. Mexico is about three times more violent than the U.S., but it is significantly less violent than countries like Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

It has been stated here in this Congress that the highest murder rate, I believe, in the world, is Honduras. I have not seen those numbers, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know that that is true, but I can tell you the violent death rate in Guatemala is 74.9 violent deaths per 100,000 compared to 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000 in the United States.

It is easy enough to do the math. It is a little more than 11 times the violent death rate of the United States in Guatemala. So there is significant violence there, but some of the people that are the perpetrators of that violence are also migrants.

If we look at McAllen, Texas, and the housing that is taking place as illegal immigrants come across the border, it looks like thousands and probably tens of thousands of what I will call migrants that appear to be coming from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, they come a thousand miles through Mexico, arrive at the Rio Grande River, and stage themselves to try to come across the river into the United States.

They are brought across by coyotes who are part of the drug cartels. Sometimes they come on jet skis, sometimes in rafts, sometimes in inner tubes. They come across the river.

The staging that is there and the pushing of the people that are in here, the mix of the population that are being picked up at McAllen, Texas, is reported in the Guatemalan newspaper to be this. Of that mix of unaccompanied minors—certainly, they aren't all unaccompanied minors, but it is a special category—of that mix, 80 percent are male—that is, 8 out of 10 are boys, 2 out of 10 are girls—younger than 18. They are 17 and younger. Eighty percent boys, 20 percent girls.

Of the country of origin, two-thirds of them are from the three countries that we have defined as OTMs, or other than Mexicans—Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. That is two-thirds of them.

We see pictures of little kids. We hear stories of a 3-year-old, a 2-month-old, 4, 5, 6, and 7-year-olds. Yes, they are there. They are there in some kind of numbers. Mostly, those younger kids are in the company of, generally, a mother or a parent.

Of those unaccompanied minors, 83 percent of them—let me get my numbers right here—80 percent are boys. Eighty-three percent of them fit this age group, Mr. Speaker, and that is they are either 15, 16, or 17 years old. Eighty percent are boys and 83 percent fit those three ages—prime ages for gang recruitment.

It isn't all innocents that are coming into America through this. Yet we have a heart, we have an obligation. The first thing we have to do is stop this, and we have to send them back and we have to require the countries of origin to distribute them in the places they want them to live in their country of origin.

We have an agreement. The reason only 12 percent are from Mexico is we have an agreement forged by a bill that passed this Congress in 2008 that requires Health and Human Services to negotiate a repatriation policy. So when we pick up the unaccompanied minors, within 48 hours they are to be turned over to Mexican authorities and taken back to their homes in Mexico, to a significant degree. And not always within 48 hours. That does work, which is why we don't see a larger number of Mexicans coming in on that.

But the OTMs—the other than Mexicans—are exploiting a loophole because we don't have an agreement with those countries. We need to change the statute here in Congress and send a bill to the President that negotiates an agreement so those countries can receive those unaccompanied minors. They will be required to do so. And if we fail to reach those agreements, we should then freeze the foreign aid to those countries so that that amount cannot increase to provide them an incentive.

I would remind the people, Mr. Speaker, who are sending their children here, releasing a child and saying, Go across a thousand miles of Mexico, go with enough pesos to pay mordida to get to the United States, and present yourself to the Border Patrol and say, I am afraid that I'll be killed in my country, I remind them that in this country, if a mother or a father loses track of their child and their child wanders off down the street, they are guilty of child endangerment. They are guilty of child abandonment.

If they are guilty of that, maybe not always on the first offense, but on subsequent offenses we do this. We take those children into the custody of our Health and Human Services, whichever the State may be, and we can terminate the parental rights and we can place that child into foster care and we can transfer that child into adoption. Because we in this country do not tolerate parents who abandon their children or fail to take care of their children or endanger their children.

That is the very description of what happens if you send a child across a thousand miles of a country. That has got to stop, Mr. Speaker. I will be introducing legislation very soon that addresses that very topic.

I appreciate your attention and indulgence, and I yield back the balance of my time.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA: INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have to catch my breath after listening the last hour to an unbelievable stream of consciousness.

I want to be very specific about some things that we really need to do here in Congress.

Often, we come to the floor in the evening and we talk about the subject of making it in America, rebuilding the American economy brick by brick, road by road, job by job, and putting the manufacturing sector back on its feet.

Today, my colleagues and I want to talk about one part of that Make It in America agenda, and that is not the trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, or research, but rather the infrastructure part of that equation.

Infrastructure is the foundation upon which any economy grows. And the American infrastructure has a problem.

Here is the problem.

The American infrastructure is falling down, falling apart, overused, overworn, and in desperate need of rebuilding. We can do it. America once built the greatest infrastructure in the world. We are falling way, way behind in our own country and we are not even keeping up with other countries, such as China, which is building everything everywhere and laying in place an infrastructure that will carry them into the future.

□ 2045

Here is why we are not keeping up. Here is why we are falling down. Here is why we have potholes. Here is why cars are losing their ability to stay on the road. It is not because the drivers can't drive but because we are not spending the money that we once did. Way back in 2002, we were spending some $325 billion a year. Right now, we are down to somewhere below $250 billion on infrastructure. That is why we see bridges collapsing. That is why we have the transportation snarls and all of the problems in our transportation system.

As they say in the Middle East, just wait. It will get worse. Here in America, we are just 2 months away from this happening. We are going to fall off the transportation bridge. The funding for transportation programs, funded by the Federal Government, will run out of money sometime in August, perhaps in early September, depending on several factors that are simply unknown, but the funding for the maintenance and construction of our roads and bridges by the Federal Government will be over. There will be no more Federal funding available unless this Congress acts.

We have a roadmap. We have a plan. We have a program. President Obama and the Transportation Department, with Secretary Foxx, recently laid out a program called the GROW AMERICA Act. It is a program that would provide $302 billion over the next 4 years, which is money that is desperately needed for rail, buses, ports, the freight system—''buses'' meaning light rail, heavy rail. It is for the transit systems in our cities and the rail systems—Amtrak—bridges and highways. All of this is available. The GROW AMERICA Act is a real proposal. It is one that this Congress should take up. If there are some who have better ideas and better plans, bring them forward. For highways, it is about $199 billion. For bridges and buses, it is about $79 billion and about $10 billion for the freight systems. For the rail, it is another $10 billion to $12 billion.

All of this is possible, but we need to do this. We need to finance it, and this program by the President is fully financed. The $302 billion relies upon the existing excise tax that all of us pay for our gasoline, for our diesel fuel. The President would add another $100 billion or so to fill up the pot so that we would have the $302 billion, which is some 27 percent more than we presently are spending on the transportation system. Where does that extra money come from? It comes from corporate reforms, but that is not the only proposal on how to finance our transportation system.

In a few minutes, I will turn this over to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who will talk about that in some more detail. Also joining us tonight is my colleague from Kansas City, Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), who will be talking about his transportation system in that area.

But this is a real plan—a real proposal—all of the details that we would need on how we could develop the freight programs: where you would connect the ports to the rail systems, how you would provide those intermodal proposals, how we could repair the bridges—the funding for it—over a period of time, and the highways. It is all coordinated around fixing the things that are broken, not necessarily adding but fixing first, fixing what is broken.

For the rail systems, critically important is the intercity rail, which is the Amtrak system here on the east coast. Then this happens to be the Capitol Corridor in my own district, which runs from Roseville, all the way through San Jose and through San Francisco. It is one of the most heavily used rail corridors in the entire system.

One of the things that we also talk about here in the Make It In America is that we spend our tax money on American-made goods. If we are going to spend $302 billion of American taxpayer money, my legislation would increase the Buy American provisions, and I want to give you just one brief example of what it means:

This is the most modern locomotive in the United States, and it is, arguably, one of the most modern electric locomotives in the entire world. It is built in Sacramento. This is money that was made available in the American Recovery Act, the stimulus bill. Written into that bill was a provision that said that money—some $800 million—for Amtrak locomotives had to be spent 100 percent on American-made locomotives. Siemens, the big German manufacturing company, looked at that, and it said: $800 million and 100 percent American made? We could do that. So they took their factory in Sacramento and expanded it, and this is the first locomotive among those that will come off the lines—some 70 or 80 of them—that will be 100 percent American made. This locomotive will soon be operating here on the East Coast Corridor. Eventually, we will get those in Sacramento, but those will be diesel elective.

The final point I want to make before turning this over to my colleague Mr. BLUMENAUER is this. These were men and women in my district—Fairfield, California—in December of last year, who attended a job fair that I put on in Fairfield. I expected to find a few of my fellow citizens attending that. This job fair took place in December, and the temperature was just below 40 degrees. It was a foggy and rather cold day. More than 1,000 people lined up outside our job fair seeking a job.

Americans want to go to work. Americans want to work. They want those good, middle class jobs that come from building the infrastructure. It is just not the hard hat jobs. These are the technicians, the engineers, the accountants, the secretaries, the people who are working on the software. There are all of those jobs, and these are the men and women who want them.

So our plea today to our colleagues on the Republican side is: Let's go to work. Let's go to work here in the Congress. Let's put forward a transportation bill that avoids that transportation cliff, that allows the American public to go back to work—tens of thousands of jobs. Indeed, 3.5 million Americans will lose their jobs in the coming year if we fail to put together a transportation bill. That 3.5 million plus thousands upon thousands more will be able to go to work if we get this transportation program moving.

The President has given us a program, the GROW AMERICA Act. If there are those with better ideas, they should come forward. We should act upon that legislation, improve upon it and figure out the financing. If the President's notion of ending unnecessary corporate tax loopholes and giveaways isn't the best way, then let's put together a better way.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would yield back my share of the time and, if possible, turn it over to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), to manage the remaining portion of this session.

TRANSPORTATION—A VISION FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin, if I could, by thanking my friend from California for his ongoing leadership, advocacy, and focus on how we are going to rebuild and renew the country—making these critical investments, putting people to work, and calling upon this Congress to get in gear to be able to move the country forward. I appreciate his courtesy and his leadership.

I would like to begin, if I could, by turning to another of my colleagues from Kansas City, Missouri, Reverend EMANUEL CLEAVER, who is a gentleman who was kind enough to give me a visa to visit his district recently. I watched not just the affection that his constituents had for him but the big plans, evidenced in his community, that were dealing with how we put the pieces together for a more sustainable future—a vision for transportation. It was fascinating for me to watch, and I appreciate his allowing me to be a part of it.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas City at this time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Thank you, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, particularly with Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. GARAMENDI, who spoke earlier, because they have long histories—longer, in fact, than I have been in the House—of pushing for transportation issues.

I think that this is a rather sad and somewhat tragic moment in our history. The interstate highway system was developed and put in place in 1956, and who would have thought when we entered the 21st century that the Congress of the United States would fail to keep that system in top condition?

The transportation bill affects Americans in every State of this country. A robust Federal investment in transportation is an economic engine, strengthening hundreds of communities. The thing that I have said often in my district and, frankly, in hearings is that the best stimulus for the economy—the very best stimulus—is a transportation bill. The weird thing is that the infrastructure is the backbone of our economy upon which businesses, families, and communities thrive. Everyone is involved in this. Red or blue, urban or rural, we all rely on transportation and infrastructure. Ensuring economic prosperity is of paramount importance. It is not a Republican or a Democratic goal but one that we all share.

One of the things that has troubled me most since being elected to Congress 10 years ago is that we have somehow narrowed everything down to the point at which it is either red or blue—it is either Republican or Democratic. I am not sure how we can look at highway systems in terms of political tribalism. I served as the mayor of Kansas City for 8 years during the 1990s, and I can truthfully say that I had no idea on a day-to-day basis, based on what people said and did, who the Republicans were and who the Democrats were. We were all interested in trying to preserve Kansas City. When there was a pothole in one of the streets in Kansas City—and Kansas City is a huge city. It's 322 square miles. To give you an idea, you can put San Francisco inside our city limits 30 times or St. Louis three times. It is a huge city—what we all were interested in is making sure that it was fixed because there was no Republican way of fixing it, and there was no Democratic way of fixing it. We fixed the pothole. One of my great disappointments when I arrived here was that there was a Republican or a Democratic philosophy on everything, including on transportation and infrastructure.

Every dollar invested in Missouri transportation generates $4 of economic activity. The Federal Highway Administration actually estimates that, for every $1 billion spent on transportation, 34,000 direct and indirect jobs are created. Just think about that. There are 34,000 indirect and direct jobs that are generated. That is why I take every opportunity I can to talk about infrastructure and improvements to our roads and bridges and waterways in my district and in districts around the country.

Investments in transportation and infrastructure generate growth and jobs during initial design, construction, and then postconstruction. I can tell you that, at a time like this when we are still having some healing needed with our economy, this is the time to pump it up. We don't need QE4. We don't need to do another Dodd-Frank. We need to pass a transportation and infrastructure bill. That will begin to help heal this economy because it is a job creator.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers' 2013 report card—and I hope the people at home get this—3,500 bridges in Missouri alone are considered structurally deficient. There are 3,500 bridges in my State that are considered structurally deficient.

□ 2100

Over 3,300 are considered functionally obsolete. That is 14 percent of the bridges in the State of Missouri are functionally obsolete, and every day, Kansas Cityans and Missourians are driving over those bridges.

That is a tragedy because it is not only bad in Missouri, it is that way all over this country—all over the country, and this body is the only body that can address the problem.

While I agree that States should step up to raise the necessary revenues and make crucial investments themselves, it should be no surprise that interstate commerce is a duty in which this Congress is uniquely poised to fulfill.

We are a nation of red States and blue States, urban communities and rural communities. I represent both. While each State must make investments within the communities, the responsibility to ensure our Nation remains connected and globally competitive falls on this Congress.

Bridge after bridge after bridge is in danger. Highways are crumbling, and we cannot sit by and play partisan politics and argue while our infrastructure continues to deteriorate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight, hoping that these words are not falling on the floor and will not be impactful. When we come in here like this, we are hoping that these words matter and that things can change and that they will change.

It is my hope that this Congress will act and act quickly because we cannot wait until the last minute, going into August, when we will end up looking at a highway trust fund becoming insolvent, and that means it will drop below the $4 billion funding level as soon as next month, July. We must do something, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank Mr. BLUMENAUER for all the work that he has done on this issue over the years, and I hope that the American people will just saturate us with letters telling us: Pass a highway and transportation infrastructure bill.

Thank you, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you very much, Congressman CLEAVER. I appreciate your painting a very powerful picture, taking it home, as an example, and the work that you have done, both in Congress and as a local leader, a mayor, a member of the city council.

You understand this. You understand that the infrastructure in Kansas City, Missouri, used to be a point of pride. It was something that brought people together, but that is not unique to your community or mine.

Infrastructure used to be a point of pride that united Americans across this great Nation. 152 years ago, the Transcontinental Railroad under, I might say, a Republican President—President Lincoln—helped us be able to develop the United States.

It tied the country together. It helped in terms of the opening up of the west, and the United States from that point, until the end of World War II, had the finest passenger rail system in the world—not there anymore.

As was referenced, under the leadership, signed into law by President Eisenhower, there was a bipartisan initiative, a Democratically-controlled Congress, a Republican President, who initiated the interstate highway system.

The United States, over the course of a quarter century, had the largest public works project in our history to that point. It was in every State in the Union. It created more economic value than it cost, and it was a point of pride to have the finest road system in the world.

Similarly, we have made great advancements in our history dealing with water and sewage systems.

The simple fact is, as was referenced by both my colleagues already this evening, the United States is falling behind. We are no longer rated number one in the world. The last survey I saw put us at 14th and falling.

We are investing the smallest amount of percentage of our economy as we have in 20 years—less than 2 percent—and far less than our competitors in China, in Europe, Japan, India.

The United States is in trouble. Unless and until we are able to get our act together to be able to protect, maintain, and enhance our infrastructure, we are not going to be able to meet the needs of the American people, and in fact, we are going to lose our competitive position around the world.

On top of this, we are in the midst of a funding crisis for our infrastructure, and this could not come at a worse time.

As both my colleagues indicated, investing in infrastructure is one of the best ways to create family-wage jobs. The estimates are between 25,000 and over 30,000 jobs for each billion dollars that is invested.

The most recent report I saw from Standard & Poor's said, for $1.3 billion, it is 29,000 jobs.

That investment would actually lower the deficit $200 million, and it would increase overall economic activity in the United States a third more than the $1.3 billion invested. The $1.3 billion gives you, overall, $2 billion rippling through the economy.

While we are slowly falling apart, while we are struggling with a jobless recovery, and how we could desperately use these family-wage jobs that will be created in every State in the Union, there is also ongoing damage to individuals. They don't have to be on a bridge that collapsed.

AAA tells us—and that is the preeminent organization nationally that represents motorists—they have followed this very closely. Their estimate is that the average motorist incurs $323 a year of damage to their cars because of inadequately maintained roads, so it is not just that they are not getting the service.

It is not just that they are trapped in congestion. It is actually costing them money every month, in terms of damage to what, for most Americans, is their second or third most valuable asset.

Last Congress gave up on a 6-year reauthorization. They just couldn't do it. They walked around it, but they couldn't deal with the funding question, so they settled for a short-term, 27-month extension that expires in 98 days. September 30, it is over, but the money in the transportation trust fund will not last nearly that long.

My colleague mentioned that, next month or so, we are going to drop below the trust fund balance that the Department of Transportation tells us is necessary to be able to manage the hundreds and hundreds of contracts all across the country that are part of the unique Federal-State-local partnership.

They can't take the trust fund down to zero, so they are going to start cutting back this summer, and because our partners around the country in State and local government understand what is happening, they are starting to cut back now.

More than eight States are already signaling what they are going to have to forego this summer, so we have got a summer slowdown, and it is only going to get worse, and Congress, in the meantime, spins its wheels.

It is hard to be meaningful in efforts to reauthorize the surface transportation bill, which is on the verge of expiring, if you don't even know what your resources are.

We have no idea what the resources are that are available to the House Transportation Committee and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works because we haven't established how we are going to pay for it.

Now, we have heard gimmicks from our Republican friends. You know, last Congress, their solution was to take away all the guaranteed funding for transit and for transportation enhancements.

The enhancements, by the way, are the most popular program that the Department of Transportation administers. They were going to take away that guaranteed funding.

I find that somewhat ironic because that guaranteed funding came from Ronald Reagan. In the Reagan administration, they decided that they were going to have 20 percent in the transit account and 80 percent in the highway account, so you wouldn't have uncertainty. You wouldn't have people battling every year, year in and year out, about going forward on major projects.

Most important, if you are going to deal with major transit and highway projects, you need certainty; and President Reagan and his administration, in their wisdom, promoted a program that established the highway trust fund and had a separate account for transit.

Well, last Congress, the gimmick was: we will just strip away all that guaranteed funding, and we will have some theoretical money to keep the transportation program afloat.

It blew up in their face. They were able to get it through the Ways and Means Committee on a party line vote, by the way, never having a hearing on it, just moved to a work session, and it was roundly attacked.

Groups, truckers, business, environmental groups, local governments, transit, the entire infrastructure community rose up in rebellion against this goofy idea that was not going to deal with the fully funding needs, and it was going to pit people against one another.

The outrage was so strong that our Republican friends couldn't even bring their own bill to the floor, and it collapsed, and we were ending up with this 27-month gimmick.

It was funded by simply draining every dollar out of the highway trust fund, and in so doing, they thought they could maybe last for 27 months. Well, as we are finding out, they can't.

The next gimmick that we are hearing about—and I love this one—it is fascinating. Our Republican friends have required the post office, unlike any other agency—or near as I can tell, any business—to prefund the health insurance of future employees, so they are charging the post office an extra $5 billion a year for employees that aren't even on the payroll, let alone their retirement in the future.

So the post office has some challenges in terms of different patterns, in terms of this prefunding obligation, shifting use of the post office, and the refusal of some in Congress to allow the post office to operate like a business, so it has got a funding crisis.

The Republican alternative is to take a post office that has a funding crisis—it is a real one, it was artificially created, but it is a real crisis—and to eliminate Saturday mail delivery for 10 years and take these theoretical savings by eliminating Saturday home service and use these theoretical savings from an agency that they claim is going bankrupt, and they are actually trying to make go bankrupt, and use it

for another bankrupt institution—that is the highway trust fund.

Ludicrous—10 years' savings of eliminating home delivery, which are theoretical, no sense at all that they are going to materialize, but for 10 years—and it would just produce enough money to get us into the next fiscal year, and leave the post office worse off than it is now.

Luckily, I think our friends on the other side of the aisle have realized that is not a solution, and I think they have dropped that, realizing it is not going to go anywhere.

There are actual proposals that would meet this challenge. I have got legislation that has been endorsed by the AFL–CIO, by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, by both the truckers and AAA, the contractors, engineers, local government, transit, to just—straight up—deal with the fact that we haven't raised the gas tax for 21 years—pretty straightforward. It works.

□ 2115

My colleague, PETER DEFAZIO from Oregon, a senior member on the Transportation Committee, has proposed looking at a barrel tax for oil and makes a strong case that this would have significant advantages and would allow us to go forward.

You know, I don't care what solution we come up with. There are a number of good ideas. Last week, Senator MURPHY of Connecticut and Senator CORKER of Tennessee came up with a proposal in the Senate that they thought would provide those resources.

What is interesting is that the House has been AWOL on this. We have not had a single hearing in Ways and Means this year, last year, the year before that, or the year before that. It has been 42 months since the Republicans took over. We haven't had a single hearing on transportation finance. I find that shocking. I find it embarrassing as a member of the committee and as a Member of the House of Representatives. As an American, I find it shameful that we are not doing our part.

Luckily, the other body is moving. My friend and colleague, Senator RON WYDEN of Oregon, the chair of the Senate Finance Committee, is moving ahead with some alternatives that would help keep the trust fund afloat so that we can avoid the summer shutdown and we don't have to stop the programs and put these people out of work. It will give us breathing room so that the people in the House can step up and do our job.

Mr. Speaker, every single Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee requested the Republican leadership—months ago—to at least give us a hearing. You don't have to buy into any solution, but let's come together, look at the problem, and hear solutions from the Americans who are dealing with it. Let's hear from the Governors. Let's hear from the transit agencies, from the State transportation commissions, highway departments. Let's hear from the men and women who work in the maintenance and construction of our infrastructure—the bridges, the roads, the transit. Let's hear from the engineers, the truckers, the representatives of the automobiles. They have got some strong opinions. They have potential solutions. They have done research that the committee should hear about, that every Member of Congress should hear about.

Sadly, as the clock winds down, as we look at the summer shutdown and the pending bankruptcy of the highway trust fund, the House is frozen in place. Time is slipping away. We have just a few dozen legislative days before the House is scheduled to adjourn for the election, and we have not one thing on the agenda to deal with this.

I hope that my Republican colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee will join us in at least having a hearing, listening to alternatives, working together to analyze the pros and cons of the various approaches going forward. I hope that every Republican and every Democrat makes a commitment that we are not going to adjourn for the year until we provide the American people, the businesses and communities that depend on it, a robust, well-funded, stable highway transportation trust fund with dedicated funding. That was the key to President Eisenhower and the success of the interstate freeway system. That has helped us with aviation. It has made a difference in terms of transit.

The American people deserve no less than us our doing our job—robust funding, stable funding, dedicated funding that will allow American communities to have the partnership of the Federal Government that they need for the infrastructure they deserve. I strongly urge my colleagues to reflect on this, and I hope each American makes clear their desires and their expectations about how Congress meets this responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FITZPATRICK (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of travel delays.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 24 after 5 p.m., June 25 and June 26 on account of a family emergency.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 316. An act to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1044. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the word that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

S. 2086. An act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 25, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6114. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Biennial Core Report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 112-81, section 2464(B)(e) (125 Stat. 1368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6115. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter notifying that the Department intends to assign women to previously closed positions in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6116. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 14 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6117. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in FY 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6118. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6119. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishing a List of Qualifying Pathogens Under the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act [Docket No.: FDA-2012-N-1037] (RIN: 0910-AG92) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6120. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Relations, Corporation for National Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6121. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6122. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6123. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's annual report for Fiscal Year 2013 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6124. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6125. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6126. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's semiannual report from the Office of the Inspector General during the 6-month period ending March 31, 2014 and the OIG's Compendium of Unimplemented Recommendations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6127. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the 2013 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6128. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6129. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulations, Definition of Indian Tribe [NPS-WASO-NAGPRA-15507; PPWOCRADN0, PCU00RP14.R50000] (RIN: 1024-AD98) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6130. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Cemeteries, Demonstration, Special Event [NPS-WASO-REGS-14841; PX.XVPAD0517.00.1] (RIN: 1024-AE01) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6131. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Maximum Civil Money Penalty Amounts; Civil Money Penalty Complaints; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0113] received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6132. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the 2014 Annual Report: The U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) Status of Actions Addressing the Safety Issue Areas on the National Transportation Safety Board's (NTSB) Most Wanted List; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6133. A letter from the Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-5001A and R-5001B, Fort Dix; NJ [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0260; Airspace Docket No. 13-AEA-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6134. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Akutan, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0032; Airspace Docket No. 13-AAL-5] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6135. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of the Philadelphia, PA, Class B Airspace Area [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0922; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6136. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Blairsville, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0731; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-18] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6137. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Bois Blanc Island, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0986; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-25] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6138. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Grand Forks, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0214; Airspace Docket No. 14-AGL-10] received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6139. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Burial Benefits (RIN: 2900-A082) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6140. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Technical Corrections to Regulations [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0005] (RIN: 0960-AH55) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6141. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Obtaining Evidence Beyond the Current ''Special Arrangement Sources'' [Docket No.: SSA-2011-0099] (RIN: 0960-AH44) received June 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6142. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report for the Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties for the Fourth Quarter of 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 641. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 113–493).

Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 4944. A bill to require the submission of a report to the Congress on parasitic disease among poor Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 4945. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue Transportation Bonds to fund transportation projects in each State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 4946. A bill to promote the tracing of firearms used in crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 4947. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 4948. A bill to provide for emergency supplemental appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4949. A bill to establish the National Office of New Americans to support the integration of immigrants to the United States into the economic, social, cultural, and civic life of their local communities and the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK of Washington (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 4950. A bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States for 7 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BERA of California (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 4951. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4952. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized remote shut down of a cellular phone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4953. A bill to grant a Federal charter to the National American Indian Veterans, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 to provide an exemption from the protections of that Act with regard to certain prospective employees whose job would include caring for or interacting with unsupervised children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 4955. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to extend the tariff preference level on imports of certain cotton and man-made fiber, fabric, apparel, and made-up goods from Bahrain under the United States-Bahrain Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 4956. A bill to greatly enhance America's path toward energy independence and economic and national security, to conserve energy use, to promote innovation, to achieve lower emissions, cleaner air, cleaner water, and cleaner land, to rebuild our Nation's aging roads, bridges, locks, and dams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, Space, and Technology, Oversight and Government Reform, the Budget, Rules, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 4944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 4945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 1

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 4946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. II, Sec. 3, Cl. 3 (''[The President] shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed[.]''); US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (''Congress shall have the power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.'') (This bill would instruct the Attorney General to give preferential treatment to police forces that meet certain criteria when distributing grant money, therefore this bill is a valid exercise of Congressional authority per the Necessary and Proper Clause provided the Attorney General's duties, as an agent of the President, to enforce federal law and punish criminal wrongdoing).

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 9, Cl. 7 (''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law[.]''); US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (''Congress shall have the power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof'') (This bill would instruct the Attorney General to give preferential treatment to police forces that meet certain criteria when distributing grant money, therefore this bill is a valid exercise of Congressional authority per the Necessary and Proper Clause to instruct how the Executive Branch can spend appropriated monies).

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 [The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states and the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 4948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Section 9

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 4949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 4950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to regulation of interstate commerce).

By Mr. BERA of California:

H.R. 4951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 4952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foriegn nations, and among the several states, and with Indian Tribes

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

By Mr. SOUTHERLAND:

H.R. 4955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 4956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 279: Mr. BARBER, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 411: Mr. NUGENT and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 517: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 543: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 594: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 688: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 713: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 787: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 812: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 831: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 920: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 942: Mr. WALZ, Mr. BARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 958: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 963: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 975: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 988: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 997: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1136: Mr. GARCIA, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1150: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1180: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1189: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1225: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1289: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1509: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1518: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1563: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1620: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1751: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2001: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2144: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2170: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 2263: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2283: Mr. MICA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CAMP, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2368: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2415: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2453: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2500: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2521: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2529: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2663: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2673: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2734: Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 2835: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2841: Ms. ESTY and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2959: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. YODER, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 3221: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3320: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3382: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3403: Mr. DENHAM.
H.R. 3482: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3489: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
H.R. 3505: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3544: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 3620: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3649: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3680: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARR, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 3708: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 3712: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 3722: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3963: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3989: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3992: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 4012: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 4041: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4103: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4119: Mr. NADLER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4123: Mr. COHEN and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 4148: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4166: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4190: Ms. MOORE and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4217: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 4234: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4286: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4325: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4347: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4349: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4351: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4411: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 4415: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4432: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LONG, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROSS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 4450: Mr. OLSON and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 4474: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4475: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 4491: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 4510: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 4521: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 4558: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4577: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. MCALLISTER.
H.R. 4578: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 4612: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 4640: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4646: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4653: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4664: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 4698: Mr. MICA and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4704: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4707: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 4723: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4727: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 4740: Mr. HANNA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4741: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4749: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4780: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 4781: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4792: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4807: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4841: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4864: MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 4881: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 4882: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 4899: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4904: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4927: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4930: Mr. REICHERT.
H.J. Res. 20: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 30: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 109: Mr. FORBES and Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Res. 281: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H. Res. 416: Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 456: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 503: Mr. CAPUANO.
H. Res. 529: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 587: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 601: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HIMES and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H. Res. 620: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FINCHER, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H. Res. 621: Mr. FORBES and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 630: Mr. WALZ and Ms. LOFGREN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The amendment to be offered by myself or a designee, to H.R. 4899, the Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2014 No. 99

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The guest chaplain, Reverend Gloria Chaney-Robinson, Senior Pastor of Shiloh Baptist Church in Scranton, PA, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we pause in these revered halls to give thanks and to offer petition. We acknowledge in this place You have called humankind to exhibit righteousness and justice. You desire harmony, accord, peace, and wholeness. Bless now the representatives who gather in this place of policy and procedure.

We ask, O God, that You would impart the gift of now vision and future sights. We pray for Your gifts of vision, discernment, sensitivity, and perceptiveness. For those assembled present and those to come, grant the posture of patience and of cooperation. To those in debate, discussion, discourse, and duty, allow calm clarity.

Allow truth to reign, justice to reside, and mercy to resonate. Keep ever before us the broken, the disappointed, those in despair, and the destitute. Set ears to hear the cries of the poor, the needs of the sick, and the afflicted. Please allow hearts assembled to do that which is best for all.

In advance, for what You will do, we say thank You. We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. 2363, the Hagan Sportsmen's Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. 2363, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, shooting, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m. this morning, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At 11 a.m. the Senate will proceed to executive session, and we will have five rollcall votes which will be to confirm three judges from Florida, one from Vermont, and also a very important cloture vote on the Rodriguez nomination, to be the Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services at the Department of Homeland Security.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we still have scores and scores of good men and women on the Executive Calendar waiting to be confirmed. The delay by the Republicans is untoward. It has never happened before, and we are working through these as quickly as we can. The judges only take an hour of postcloture time, but the nominations take 8 hours of postcloture time. We can yield back 4 hours, which we do almost every time, but these stalling tactics by the Republicans have added to our doing nothing here in the Senate not by hours or days or weeks but by months. It is so unfortunate. We have never had a situation such as this before.

As everyone knows, we changed the rules as they related to judges, and thank goodness we did that. Justice can move forward in our country without the delay and obstruction that has taken place over the last number of years with Republicans holding up judges. We, through the chairman of the committee, have moved lots of judges. We now have four circuit court judges we have to move toward, and we will do that, even though each one of those takes 30 hours. We are nearly caught up with district court judges, which speaks well for the Judiciary Committee and the Senators who are forwarding names to the President for submission to the committee.

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. President, tomorrow we are going to turn to the Workforce Investment Act—a nice, important piece of legislation. It is a picture of what we should be doing here on legislation in general. The Workforce Investment Act is a very complicated piece of legislation. We are not going to spend a lot of time on it, but that should not in any way take away from the importance of this legislation. It is very important legislation. It is an example of how we should be able to get done in the Senate.

I commend Senators MURRAY, HARKIN, and ALEXANDER for working to get this bill to us. They have spent untoward hours and hours of time to get us here. Everyone knows LAMAR ALEXANDER is a peacemaker, and I appreciate his work. I was told a few minutes ago that he came to the floor and said: Why don't we go ahead on the appropriations bills and on amendments that appear to be controversial, and we can have a 60-vote threshold on those? I suggested the same thing yesterday.

We voted here approximately 50 times. I have been forced to have, because of the McConnell rule, 60 votes

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

on anything that is the least bit controversial. Let's move through the appropriations bills. People on my side of the aisle want to do this, and I don't know why the Republicans would prevent us from doing that, but that is where we are now.

VOTING RIGHTS

I will talk to the press about the next issue in more detail at a subsequent time, but I wish to congratulate RAND PAUL, the junior Senator from Kentucky.

About 15 years ago, I offered an amendment on the Senate floor that said if someone has been convicted of a crime or felony and completed their sentence, if they go to jail, and their probation, if they got probation, they should be able to vote, and that is what RAND PAUL said.

RAND PAUL offered legislation that said if it is a nonviolent crime, they should be able to vote when they have completed their time. I went a little farther than that with my legislation, but I appreciate his suggestion. I will have more to say about that later, and I hope I don't get him in trouble with the Republican caucus for congratulating him.

This is something that is long overdue. As a country, we should allow people who have served their time and penance, or however you want to state it, the ability to vote. I have said it before, and I now have said it for a third time. I will have a lot more to say about it later today.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Will the Chair announce the business of the day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

FOR-PROFIT SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for a number of years I have come to this floor to talk about an issue I wish to bring up again this morning, and the issue is for-profit colleges and universities.

Many people, when they hear me describe this, don't understand which schools I am talking about. It is not the public and private universities that you would think of automatically, such as the University of Illinois and Northwestern University and others. It is the for-profit world of higher education.

The for-profit colleges and universities are led by the Apollo Group, which owns the University of Phoenix, and is the largest; DeVry University, which is based out of Chicago; Kaplan and Corinthian, and many others.

They bring about 10 to 12 percent of all the high school graduates into their for-profit colleges. They receive from the Federal Government 20 percent of all the Federal aid to education because the tuition they charge is very high, and these for-profit colleges have another distinction—their students account for 46 percent of all college student loan defaults. They enroll 10 percent of the students and account for 46 percent of the student loan defaults.

What is going on here? What is going on here is they are charging these students a high tuition for these for-profit schools, and they are not preparing them to go to work or at least not to work at jobs where they can pay off those student loans. As a result students will drop out before they finish or they will finish with a diploma that is worthless. They can't find a job, they can't pay back their student loans, and now they are in the worst of all possible worlds—deep in debt with no education to speak of.

The reason I am raising the point about the for-profit colleges and universities is because there have been several significant developments. Education Management Corporation owns a group of schools called the Art Institutes. I have run into them in the Chicagoland area. Argosy is another one of these for-profit schools, as is ITT Tech, and I mentioned Kaplan and Apollo.

Career Education Corporation has schools such as the American Intercontinental University and the Harrington College of Design. They sound very appealing.

I met one of the students who attended Harrington. Her name is Hannah Moore. She is a young woman from Chicago. She went to community college for 2 years, and then she transferred into the Harrington College of Design in the suburbs of Chicago to get a degree in design. When it was all over, after she received her degree, she could not find a job—not in that field. It turned out the degree was basically worthless.

When she left Harrington College of Design, she had a college debt of $125,000. She could not find a job, and she could not make the payments. She had to move back in with her parents because that is all she could do, and because she could not keep up with the payments, her college loan debt grew to $150,000. Her father came out of retirement to help her pay for it.

Think about it. She did what she thought was a good thing in going to college, went to one of these worthless for-profit schools, and now her life has literally changed forever because of this mountain of debt.

Then there is a group called Corinthian College, which I want to focus on here. Corinthian College is based out of California. The local college's name, you may recognize, is Everest Colleges. We have 6 in Illinois, about 10 in Michigan, a dozen in California, and they are across the United States.

It turned out that last year evidence surfaced that Everest Colleges were falsifying the information they provided to the Federal Government. In some cases it turns out they even paid employers to hire Everest graduates for a short period of time so they could report to the government that their graduates had found jobs, and then after the report was made, the people were let go. They didn't have a job.

Everest was asked to send additional information to the Federal Government about this fraudulent practice, and for 5 months they failed to do it. Then last week the U.S. Department of Education said: Because Everest won't provide us with the data they are supposed to under the law, we are going to suspend new student loan money to them for 21 days. Everest Colleges—or Corinthian, their parent corporation—announced that because of this, they will not have enough money and may not be able to continue their operations. The value of stock in this corporation, Corinthian Corporation, went down to the range of 28 cents last week. Nobody would loan them money.

Right now some 75,000 students across America are enrolled in Everest Colleges with student loans, and there is a very good chance that Everest Colleges—Corinthian as we know it—will not survive.

My obvious question is: What will happen to these students? They have the debt to go to this worthless school that appears to be going out of business.

We are working with the U.S. Department of Education right now. I am concerned about where these students are going to end up. I contacted the community colleges in my State and said: Reach out to the Everest College students and see if you can rescue these kids.

But when we look at this and put it in perspective, we see this is only one of many for-profit colleges and universities. Most parents and most students don't know this whole brand of higher education is out there. They think it is just like every other college. It is not, and we are not doing a good enough job at the Federal level to regulate these for-profit colleges and universities that are exploiting these students.

Let me tell my colleagues one story that was reported recently that I think is horrible, involving Corinthian Colleges. It is an article written by David Halperin entitled ''For-profit College Enrolls 'Exploits' Student Who Reads at Third-grade Level.''

A 37-year-old man with what appeared to be a developmental disability—he was described as shaking, speaking haltingly, reading at an elementary school level—37-years-old—was allowed to enroll in Everest College's criminal justice program.

According to the librarian who worked with him—and subsequently resigned because of the treatment of this man—the man was rarely able to comprehend sentences, was unable to sound out words, and does not have the ability to read documents he was asked to sign. She was worried about his ability to even understand the debt he was signing on for, the student loan debt at one of these Everest Colleges.

It apparently didn't matter to Everest. They were ready to sign him up into college. As long as this man was eligible to take out Federal loans, Everest was going to get paid. The man was just an ATM machine spitting out dollars to Everest Colleges.

Is that outrageous, to think they would lure someone with a disability into signing up?

The list goes on and on, including Ashford University, another one of these for-profit colleges and universities.

The obvious question we have to ask is this: When will our Department of Education and when will this Congress address this travesty? What is existing across the United States with these for-profit colleges and universities is an outrage, and it is exploiting the students and their families.

Sadly, a couple of weeks ago we tried to pass a bill on the floor of the Senate so that students could renegotiate their student loans and bring down the interest rates. Every Democrat voted for it. We needed 5 Republicans out of 45 to join us so that students in States such as New Jersey and Illinois could renegotiate their student loan rates down and make them more affordable. We got three Republicans: Senator COLLINS of Maine, Senator CORKER of Tennessee, and Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska. We needed two more to start the debate about renegotiating college loans.

I think we have to wake up here. This debt families across America are facing—44 million individuals paying college loans—is an outrage. Part of it was started by these for-profit schools, but another part of it just reflects a debt that is out of control, and we ought to be more sensitive to it.

We are going to call this again. ELIZABETH WARREN brought the bill to the floor. This time we are going to hope that some of our Republican colleagues go home to their States and in town meetings actually speak with families who are paying college student loans. If they will, I think they will understand they should join us in this effort: to give these college students and their families a fighting chance to pay off their loans and to reform this higher education system to stop the outrageous conduct by these for-profit colleges and universities.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE LOGJAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last summer I said it felt as though the White House had hung a ''Gone Campaignin' '' sign outside the Oval Office. President Obama didn't seem the least bit interested in passing serious, bipartisan solutions for the middle class. It was all campaigning, all the time.

On the rarest of occasions when he did come to Congress, it was for internal campaign rallies with his party. Well, it has actually only gotten worse.

Since last summer he has barely picked up the phone and his bill-signing pen is literally starting to rust. Here is the reason: This summer the Democratic-controlled Senate seems to have put out a ''Gone Campaignin''' sign of its own. That is why the Democratic Senate has become a veritable graveyard of good ideas.

Most people assume the purpose of the Senate is to pass legislation to help the American people, but these days the Democrats who run the Senate seem to think their role is actually to just bury good legislation. They are more interested in pleasing their far left political patrons—patrons who appear to oppose everything that could actually help the American middle class.

Case in point: The Republican-led House of Representatives has already passed hundreds of pieces of legislation this Congress—legislation introduced by Members of both parties, including dozens of jobs bills, that remain stuck here in the Senate. That means President Obama has not had to sign or veto them, and the Senate majority leader has been all too happy to protect him from choosing between helping the far-left fringe and the vast American middle. In other words, Senate Democrats are on a mission this summer to obstruct solutions for the middle class at every turn and to prevent almost any serious legislating from occurring at all—at all.

Over in the House the minority party has been offered more than 160 votes on their amendments since last July. Here in the Senate the Democratic leadership has blocked all but nine Republican rollcall votes.

And it is not just Republican amendments getting squashed either. The Democrats who run the Senate are so scared of legislating these days they are blocking virtually every amendment on both sides. It has gotten to the point where one House Democrat, a Congresswoman from Texas, has now had twice as many rollcall votes on amendments since last July—15—as the entire Senate Democratic caucus combined. One Member of the House in the minority party has had more votes than all of the Democratic Senators combined over the last year. Between the 55 Senate Democrats, they have had seven amendments in a year.

In other words, the majority leader is treating his one caucus even worse than he is treating us.

Even committee work can no longer escape the Democratic majority's political obsession. The majority shut down the committee process on important legislation that should have been and would have been bipartisan—bills about patents and appropriations.

This is the kind of stuff that makes Americans so very mad at Washington. I mean, how do we justify stifling the voices of so many Senators and the tens of millions of Americans they were sent here to represent? It is indefensible. It has gotten worse and worse under current Democratic leaders.

Of course, every now and then, when we push hard enough, we are able to force our Democratic friends to allow a few—a few—bipartisan ideas to go through, such as the job training and workforce development bill we expect to pass tomorrow. But, boy, that is the rare exception around here—a very rare exception. Instead, we usually just see the game playing on important issues.

On energy, Democratic leadership blocked every attempt to provide relief to blue collar families who have been bulldozed by the administration's elitist war on coal jobs. They will not help the millions of Americans who struggle every single day with high utility bills, and they will not allow a serious vote on shovel-ready projects such as the Keystone Pipeline, either. Senate Democrats have blocked just about every effort to move forward on these issues. In so doing the Democratic leadership actually embarrasses the handful of Democratic Senators who still call for action on energy and Keystone—even veteran Members who chair committees. It just shows what little influence those Members actually have under the current Democratic leadership.

It all lays bare a very simple truth about today's Democratic Senate: If the far left hates it, it ain't happening.

That is true with health care too. The middle class is being plummeted by ObamaCare. A recent study showed that an average 27-year-old Kentuckian from Taylor County saw his premiums skyrocket by almost 60 percent this year. Constituents such as he are looking to Washington for leadership and for solutions, but Senate Democrats will not even allow sensible bipartisan health care solutions to come to a vote.

Instead, we just get more politics, such as the legislation we hear may be coming up later this week—a tactic designed by the Democratic campaign committee to make Americans forget—forget—that Democrats voted to raid Medicare—voted to raid Medicare—by $700 billion to fund new ObamaCare spending. Every Democrat in the Senate, on Christmas Eve, 2009, without exception, voted to take $700 billion out of Medicare to help fund ObamaCare.

Senate Democrats are actually trying to distract from their votes to raid Medicare by making it even harder to

save and strengthen Medicare. But Americans will not forget that the sponsors of the proposal were the very same people who voted to raid Medicare in the first place, through ObamaCare.

And they will not forget what happened last week either when Republicans advanced a series of bills aimed at increasing flexibility in the workplace and boosting upward mobility. We thought Democrats might want to work with us in a bipartisan manner to move these bills forward, but apparently the far left will not let them. Democratic leadership will not even consider legislation I have introduced that would help more moms and dads work from home while caring for young children. My bill aims to bring tax policy in line with what life is really like for working parents, and it would help young families save on child care costs too. But as I said, Senate Democrats have just gone campaigning.

For the Democratic leadership, helping the middle class seems to be far from priority one. But the middle class needs help right now, and the only way to offer working moms and struggling college graduates real solutions is to break through the Senate Democratic logjam.

There are two ways to accomplish that. Either our friends on the other side can get serious about working for the people who elected them or the people who elected them can make the decision for them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday the White House held its Summit on Working Families. On the summit's Web site, the White House notes: ''Too many working Americans—both men and women—are living paycheck to paycheck, struggling to make ends meet and respond to the competing demands of work and family.'' That, unfortunately, is the truth.

But what the White House does not acknowledge is how much its policies have done to create that situation. Working families have not fared well under the Obama administration. Household income has fallen by $3,500 on the President's watch. Meanwhile, prices for nearly everything have risen. Food prices have gone up. Tuition costs are soaring. Airline fares are rising. The cost of recreational activities, such as going to the movies, has risen. And energy prices are placing a huge burden on American families.

Gas prices have nearly doubled since the President took office. Low-income families in my State of South Dakota pay an average of 24 percent of their income on energy costs alone. And things are set to get much worse.

This month the President's EPA announced plans to implement a massive energy tax on Americans. Thanks to this tax, energy bills could rise to crippling levels for many families in the next few years. That is not what families need, especially—especially—when they are already paying huge amounts for health care.

ObamaCare was supposed to make things better for American families. The President assured the American people that his health care law would reduce premiums by $2,500. But since ObamaCare passed, not only have premiums not fallen, they have actually risen—gone up—by $2,500.

Millions of Americans were forced off the health plans they were promised they could keep and into exchange plans that frequently cost more money and offer less. Too many American families now have exchange plans with massive deductibles—some as high as $12,000 or more.

What middle-class family can afford to pay $12,000 a year for medical care—$12,000 on top of their premiums? That is like having an additional mortgage payment every single month. It is no wonder 54 percent of Americans do not think the President ''is able to lead the country and get the job done,'' according to a recent Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll.

So what can you do if you are a working family living paycheck to paycheck and struggling with the high cost of everything from health care to gasoline? Well, over the past few years the answer has been not much because opportunities are few and far between in the Obama economy. Instead of promoting policies to create jobs, too often the President has proposed policies that kill jobs.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has reported that ObamaCare will cause 2.5 million full-time workers to leave the workforce. Mr. President, 2.6 million Americans earning less than $30,000 are in danger of having their hours and wages cut thanks to ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek rule. Mr. President, 63 percent of those workers are women.

The President and his party have also pushed hard for a minimum wage hike the Congressional Budget Office said would destroy up to 1 million jobs. Low-income Americans would be hit the hardest by that.

Then there is the President's national energy tax. In addition to raising energy bills for all Americans, the President's energy tax would result in the loss of tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of jobs. The rule would gut the coal industry, putting tens of thousands of workers out of work there.

It is difficult to reconcile the President's ostensible commitment to families with a policy that would put thousands and thousands of parents out of a job.

The Keystone XL Pipeline would allow the President to put thousands of Americans to work. With a stroke of his pen, the President could sign off on this project and the 42,000-plus jobs it would support. Instead, he has ignored American workers and union leaders and chosen to pander to the wishes of his extremist environmental base.

The American people need jobs—steady, good-paying, long-term jobs with opportunities for advancement. Democrats and the President are not giving that to them. Instead of spending time on real job-creation measures, the majority leader has chosen to waste the Senate's time on gimmicky, politically motivated legislation.

If Democrats were serious about providing real relief to American families, they would be working with Republicans on the many bills we have proposed to spur job creation and to support American workers—bills such as Senator COLLINS' Forty Hours Is Full-Time Act, which would repeal the ObamaCare 30-hour workweek rule, which is resulting in lower wages and fewer hours for American workers; or Senator FISCHER's workplace advancement amendment, which would further equip women with the tools and knowledge they need to fight discrimination in the workplace; and Senator RUBIO's RAISE Act, which would amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow employers to give merit-based pay increases to individual employees, even if those increases are not part of a collective bargaining agreement; and Senator MCCONNELL's Working Parents Home Office Act, which would fix a flaw in the Tax Code that prevents men and women from claiming a home office deduction if their home office has a baby crib so they can care for their child while they are working.

President Obama has talked about the importance of flextime for parents so they can adjust their work hours for parent-teacher conferences or soccer games. Well, Senator LEE has a bill that would help workers handle the constant challenge of work-life balance by allowing private-sector employers to offer all individuals who work overtime a choice between monetary compensation and comp time. Unfortunately, like so many other Republican bills, the Lee Working Families Flexibility Act is buried in the majority leader's Senate graveyard.

Traditionally thought of as a place where bills go to be debated, the Senate has, instead, become the place where bills go to die. But it is not just bills that go to die here; it is the solutions to improve the lives of millions of Americans. In addition to the many Senate Republican jobs bills that the majority leader has prevented from seeing the light of day, there are dozens—literally dozens—of House-passed jobs bills—several of them bipartisan—that the majority leader refuses to bring up. The Senate historically has

been a place where the voices of all Senators—Republican and Democrat, majority and minority—have been heard. But lately, the Senate seems to have become nothing so much as an arm of the Democrats' campaign committee. Democrats have brought up bills designed to win votes, not solve problems.

The Democratic leadership has worked hard to protect its vulnerable Members from ever having to take challenging votes. They do not want Democrats in tough campaigns to have to choose between the American people and the Democratic Party's far-left political base.

One of Congress's most basic duties is to consider appropriations, yet over the past 2 weeks the majority leader has pulled not one but two appropriations bills from committee consideration because he did not want his Members to have to take votes on ObamaCare or on the President's national energy tax.

That is wrong. We are here to take tough votes. If you do not want to have to take hard votes, do not run for the Senate. There is a lot of stuff that—amendments get offered by our colleagues on the other side that I do not like to vote on either, but that is what we are here for. We are here to debate. We are here to take votes. We are here to offer amendments, to put legislation on the floor.

All of us have different ideas. I may not agree with some of the things that are offered up by my colleagues on the other side, but the fact of the matter is, they have a right, on behalf of the constituents they represent, to bring the issues to the floor that are important to their constituents, and for us to debate them, and for us to vote on them.

In fact, the majority leader has exerted such tight control over the Senate that over the past year he has not only blocked almost all Republican amendments, he has blocked almost all of his party's amendments as well.

Since July of 2013—almost a year ago—the majority leader has allowed votes on just 9 Republican amendments, and just 7 Democratic amendments—out of 1,500 amendments that have been filed on the floor of the Senate.

Think about that. The world's greatest deliberative body—open to amendment, open to debate—1,500 amendments get filed; Republicans get 9 votes. I understand the whole idea, the political motivation of the leader in trying to protect his Members from having to take tough votes. But how are you as a majority Member—how do the Democrats in the Senate go back to their constituents at home and say: It is advantageous for us to be in the majority in Washington, when you have only had votes on seven amendments? Think about that. How do you, with a straight face, go back to your constituents and say: Being in the majority matters in the Senate, when Democrats here are only getting—in the last year—seven amendments voted on? It is outrageous. One a month—about one amendment a month—is what we are voting on here, roughly.

Senators were elected to speak for the people of their State and to make sure their concerns are represented in the Senate. When Senators cannot add their voices to the process, the American people's concerns are not getting heard.

The American people have had a tough time getting their voices heard over the past few years. Over and over, they have made it clear they need good jobs and more economic opportunity. Instead, they have gotten 5½ years of higher costs and low job creation, and the jobs that are being created are not the kinds of jobs that were lost—the good-paying jobs that provide opportunities for advancement.

Republicans have proposed numerous bills to expand opportunities for American families and workers. It is time for the Senate to vote on these bills. The American people have spent enough time being ignored. It is high time for the Senate to change the way it is conducting its business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

MINE BAN TREATY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday in Maputo, Mozambique, representatives of many of the 161 countries that have joined the treaty banning the production, stockpiling, export, and use of antipersonnel landmines convened the third review conference in the 15 years since the treaty came into force.

The impact of that treaty, once ridiculed as a naive dream by many in the U.S. defense establishment, has been extraordinary. The vast majority of landmine use and production has stopped. New casualties have dropped significantly. Many countries have cleared the mined areas in their territories.

Of the 35 countries that have not yet joined the treaty, including the United States, almost all abide by its provisions. We can be proud that the United States has been the largest contributor to programs to clear mines and to help mine victims. Those programs have saved countless lives. In fact, the Leahy War Victims Fund was first used in Mozambique.

But I remember during the negotiations on the treaty how officials in the U.S. administration at the time urged, even warned, their counterparts in other countries, including our NATO allies, against signing the treaty. In the end, every member of NATO except the United States joined it.

Some in our government said it was a meaningless gesture that would accomplish nothing. I think they resented that other governments, especially Canada, and nongovernmental organizations from around the world could achieve something outside the U.N. negotiation process, which had utterly failed to address this problem.

Instead, the treaty has already accomplished more than most people expected, thanks to the extraordinary advocacy of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and three-quarters of the world's governments, many of whose people have suffered from the scourge of landmines.

But the problem is far from solved. There are still thousands of deaths and injuries from mines each year, and most are innocent civilians.

Twenty years ago this week, in a speech at the United Nations that inspired people around the world, President Clinton called for a global ban on antipersonnel mines. I was proud of President Clinton for doing that, but his Presidency, his administration, was outmaneuvered by the Pentagon, and it failed to join the treaty. Then, during the 8 years of the last Bush administration, nothing happened. In fact, during those years, the White House reneged on some of the pledges of the Clinton administration.

When President Obama was elected, I thought we would finally see the United States get on the right side of this issue. After all, we fought two long wars without using antipersonnel mines. All our NATO allies and most of our coalition partners have banned them.

But that has not happened.

Now we rightly condemned, and I do condemn, the Taliban for using victim-activated IEDs, which are also banned by the treaty, but we still insist on retaining our right to use antipersonnel mines.

Eighteen years ago, President Clinton charged the Pentagon to develop alternatives to antipersonnel mines. Instead, the Pentagon has fought every attempt to get rid of these indiscriminate weapons, even if they do not use them.

As I have said many times, no one argues that antipersonnel mines have no military utility. Every weapon does. Poison gas has a military utility, but we outlawed it a century ago. Are we incapable of renouncing, as our closest allies have, tiny explosives that are the antithesis of precision-guided weapons, weapons we have rightly not used during two long wars, weapons that kill children and innocent civilians, and weapons that should bring condemnation to anybody using them?

We talk about the importance of avoiding civilian casualties. We all believe in that. We have seen how civilian casualties can turn a local population against us. We do not export antipersonnel landmines. We do not use them. We can drive a robot on Mars by remote control, but we say we cannot solve this problem. It begs credulity.

This is not an abstract issue. This girl is who I am talking about. I have met countless people like her. She is lucky. She survived, even though without hands and legs. Many others like her bleed to death.

I have been to clinics in poor countries where, instead of soccer balls, they make artificial limbs like these. We support them with the Leahy War Victims Fund. I am glad we can help, but I wish there was absolutely no need for that.

I visited a young girl in a hospital after the Bosnia war. Her parents had sent her away so she could be safe. The war ended. The soldiers returned home. She was running down the road calling out to her parents, and she stepped on a mine. Both her legs were blown off. The war was over, but not for her.

We recently sent people to that part of the world after flooding. Why? Because thousands of landmines still in the ground had washed up and moved around. Schoolchildren now face the danger again, because even though they had mapped where the landmines were that was before the floods.

As in the past, the White House hides behind their failure to act by pointing at North Korea. Who is not concerned about North Korea? But are we so dependent on antipersonnel landmines that we cannot develop war plans to defend South Korea without them? I reject that just as former commanders of our forces in South Korea rejected it long ago.

Last week, after a cursory 2-minute debate that inaccurately described the landmines in the Korean DMZ as U.S. mines, which they are not, and that inaccurately asserted, based on erroneous press reports, that the White House is about to join the mine ban treaty, which it is not, the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee adopted by voice vote a prohibition on the use of funds to implement the treaty.

The amendment's sponsor even claimed that the one thing—the only thing—stopping a North Korean invasion is U.S. antipersonnel mines. Balderdash. Did the Pentagon tell them that? Of course not. I wonder how many, if any, Members of that subcommittee have even read the treaty.

One would think, 61 years after the Korean war, that the Pentagon would not still be arguing that the defense of South Korea depends on tiny, indiscriminate explosives that would pose a threat to U.S. forces if we counterattacked. It makes you wonder.

This country, with the most powerful army, that spends far more money on its armed forces than any country in the world, has to rely on antipersonnel landmines? Oh, come on.

President Obama can still put the United States on a path to join the treaty, but time is running out. It will require some revision of our Korea war plans. That can be done in a manner that protects the security of South Korea and our troops. It needs to be done, because without the participation and support of the United States, the most powerful Nation on Earth, no international treaty can achieve its potential.

I commend the participants at the Maputo review conference. I regret the United States is there only as an observer, as it has been since the Ottawa process began 18 years ago. We sit on the sidelines as though we have no role in this. What a missed opportunity, what a stain on the country that should be the moral leader.

The next review conference is in 2019, the 25th anniversary of President Clinton's speech. What an anniversary it would be if that next review conference were held in Washington, with the United States attending as a party to the treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that a June 22 article in the Boston Globe and a June 23 article in the New York Times on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, June 22, 2014]

FORMERLY A LEADER ON LAND MINE BAN, OBAMA NOW BALKS

(By Bryan Bender)

WASHINGTON.—In 2005, then-Senator Barack Obama wrote to a constituent that he would use his influence to help advance an international treaty banning land mines, decrying what he called the ''horrific injuries and loss of life'' among civilians long after wars end.

But in his five-plus years as president, Obama has not asked the US Senate to ratify the pact signed by 161 other nations, showing an unwillingness to take on military officials who assert that the devices, which the Pentagon last used in battle in 1991, are still needed. Instead, his administration has repeatedly delayed a review of the issue initiated early in his first term.

Senator Patrick Leahy, the Vermont Democrat who has spent more than two decades directing federal funding to clear minefields and provide victims with wheelchairs, prosthetics, and job training, is so frustrated at Obama's lack of action that he is complaining bitterly and publicly about it.

''I think of children who have gone to something shiny on the side of the road thinking it was a toy and instead having their legs blown off,'' Leahy said in a blunt floor speech in late March, the first in a series he has delivered to focus attention on the issue. ''President Obama, you know what you should do.''

Indeed, what is most vexing to many treaty supporters is that the United States has done more than other countries to address the problem, but still hasn't taken up the treaty.

In addition to spending more than $2 billion over the last two decades to reduce the threat and aid victims, the United States has halted the production and export of so-called ''persistent'' or ''dumb'' mines that have no disarming mechanism and can remain a danger for unsuspecting villagers for decades.

''The United States has actually probably lived up to about 90 percent of the requirements of the treaty,'' said Lloyd Axworthy, the former foreign minister of Canada who hosted the treaty negotiations, expressing incredulity that the United States has nonetheless long resisted giving up the weapons.

Although it was among the first to call for a treaty banning land mines, the United States is now the only member of the NATO military alliance that has not joined the pact. The only other nation in the Western Hemisphere to refuse is Cuba. When treaty signatories meet on June 23 in Mozambique to discuss ways to accelerate the destruction of mines as well as strengthen the pact, the United States will attend only as an observer.

''It was US leadership that really got the ball rolling,'' said Bobby Muller, president of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, who was a key organizer of the original movement to ban the weapons. ''But the United States is shamefully behind the curve.''

THE KILLING CONTINUES

In late May, a six-year-old girl was killed and five other villagers wounded in Myanmar when they came upon a land mine near the border with Thailand.

The same week the US State Department dispatched a ''quick reaction force'' to Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina where flooding had dislodged land mines left over from the civil war in the former Yugoslavia.

Advocates for the ban believe America's continued reluctance to embrace the treaty is slowing momentum to render politically unacceptable a weapon that kills or injures an estimated 10 people every day in the 60-some countries where they remain in the ground. For example, US allies Ukraine and Finland have recently signaled they might withdraw from the treaty out of military necessity.

Three dozen countries still remain outside the treaty, according to a recent report by the Arms Control Association, a nonprofit advocacy group, including the United States, China, Russia, India, and Pakistan. Together they collectively account for an estimated stockpile of 160 million landmines, while experts say there is no reliable way to estimate how many landmines are still littering global battlefields.

AT FIRST, SOME HIGH HOPES

The ''Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and on Their Destruction'' was proposed in 1997, requiring member nations to no longer use land mines, destroy all remaining supplies, and remove those planted on their territory.

The so-called Ottawa Treaty was heralded as the first global arms treaty to emerge from civil society, as opposed to governments. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines, a coalition of 1,400 nongovernmental organizations from around the world—led by American Jody Williams—was awarded the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize for spearheading the effort, which also benefited from high-profile advocates like the late Princess Diana.

The treaty's unique evolution is viewed as a possible reason why the American military brass is still resisting; the thinking goes that commanders fear that giving up land mines could encourage similar efforts by human rights groups to seek to ban other types of controversial weapons, such as drones.

The United States initially was a leading advocate of the pact; then-US President Bill Clinton called the land mine problem ''a global tragedy.''

''In all probability, land mines kill more children than soldiers, and they keep killing after wars are over,'' Clinton said.

But he opted not to sign the treaty and seek its ratification after US military leaders insisted that they needed time to develop alternatives to mines.

The Bush administration also adhered to that position, while the US Army began developing so-called ''smart'' mines as a replacement, devices officials say are now ready to be part of the arsenal.

One alternative, called the Spider, is designed to detonate only by command and to self-defuse after a limited period. It is designed and built in part by Textron Systems

in Wilmington, Mass. Textron officials did not respond to a request for comment.

When Obama came into office in 2009 there were high hopes that he would seek to join the treaty; he instead ordered up a review that has gone on for five years.

Asked about the assessment, Edward Price, a spokesman for the White House's National Security Council, said, ''We are pressing forward to conclude our review of US land mine policy'' but declined to provide details.

''The United States shares the humanitarian concerns of the parties to the Ottawa Convention,'' Price added, noting that ''the United States is the single largest financial supporter of global humanitarian demining efforts.''

A Pentagon spokeswoman, Lieutenant Commander Amy Derrickfrost, defended the military's position. She said that in addition to ending the use of so-called ''dumb'' mines in 2010, the US military also no longer uses plastic mines, which cannot be identified with a metal detector or other mine surveillance technologies.

But the military continues to say that it must have the ability to use anti-personnel land mines.

''I consider them to be an important tool in the arsenal of the armed forces of the United States,'' General Martin Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a congressional hearing in March, especially on the Korean penninsula, where they are intended to help blunt an invasion by the North Korean army.

The Pentagon position has its share of supporters on Capitol Hill, including Representative Randy Forbes, a Virginia Republican, who calls land mines ''vitally important to the defense of South Korea.'' Fearing that Obama will sign the treaty, he has proposed an amendment to a new defense bill that would prohibit the administration from implementing the treaty.

Many observers, however, remain surprised at the extent of opposition at the Pentagon to the treaty.

''Some of the guys that wrote the [Korean] war plans were advocates of the mine ban,'' said retired Army Lietenant General G. Robert Gard, who traveled to South Korea in the late 1990s at Leahy's request to make an assessment.

Gard, who is chairman of the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation, a nonprofit think tank, said commanders asserted ''we could accomplish the things that land mines were purported to do for us by other means.''

A veteran of the Korean and Vietnam Wars, Gard believes that the continued Pentagon resistance is driven by fear that giving in could embolden human rights groups to try to ban other weapons.

He described the argument: ''If you give in to those flaky nongovernmental organizations they will try to to make us get rid of other weapons we really need.''

Meanwhile, the ongoing land mine policy review—the third such assessment since the Clinton years—has treaty advocates such as Williams, the peace prize recipient, deeply frustrated.

She said in an e-mail that she ''does not understand why this review has taken place at all and even less do we understand or accept why it has taken five years already and President Obama still seems unable to bring it to a conclusion that can be shared with the American public.''

'LIFE FOREVER RUINED'

The gruesome photographs, blown up to nearly life size for maximum effect, line a small, cluttered office of the Senate Appropriations Committee. One depicts a pair of legless men looking up from their wheel chairs, another a woman hobbling along with the help of a stick.

The images were all captured by Leahy, an amateur photographer who has personally chronicled dozens of innocent war victims from Central America to Southeast Asia.

His crusade against land mines began more than two decades ago in a jungle village in Nicaragua, at the height of its civil war.

''There was a little boy, probably 12 years old, one leg, homemade crutch. He'd lost his leg from a landmine,'' Leahy recalled in an interview in his Senate office, where some of his war victim photos hang at eye level above his desk.

Leahy asked the boy if he was injured by the forces loyal to the Sandinista government or the so-called Contra rebels. ''Well, he had no idea. He just knew that his life was forever ruined.''

Leahy later used his perch on the panel overseeing the State Department budget to establish a US fund to help the most vulnerable victims of war, which was later named the Leahy Victims Fund. He also provided money for mine clearance groups around the world.

Leahy later proposed legislation prohibiting the United States from exporting land mines. To help convince a skeptical Senate, he persuaded DC Comics to publish a Batman comic edition in which the caped crusader, in his effort to rescue a child, had to walk through a minefield.

The last panel depicted the child reaching for a shiny object and being warned by Batman not to pick it up before there was a ''Kaboom.''

Leahy provided a copy of the special issue to every senator; his legislation passed by voice vote without opposition. He now remains optimistic that if Obama would sign the land mine treaty and send it to the Senate for ratification it has a good chance of garnering the required two-thirds, or 67 votes, to pass—despite the overall partisan rancor.

''I don't want to sound like I am on a crusade but nothing has gripped me as much since I have been here,'' Leahy said, tearing up when recalling how he lifted a Vietnamese landmine victim into his wheelchair. (''He grabbed my shirt, he pulled me down, and he kissed me''.)

''This is today's poison gas,'' Leahy said. Failing to join the treaty, he believes, ''is a moral failure of our country.''

[From the New York Times, June 23, 2014]

TREATY IS MAKING LAND MINES WEAPON OF PAST, GROUP SAYS

(By Rick Gladstone)

Despite the conflicts in Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan, the armed uprising in Ukraine and turmoil in other hot spots in the Middle East and Africa, one of war's most insidious weapons—antipersonnel land mines—have been largely outlawed and drastically reduced, a monitoring group said in a report released Monday.

In the 15 years since a global treaty prohibiting these weapons took effect, the use and production of the mines has nearly stopped, new casualties have plummeted, and more than two dozen countries once contaminated by land mines buried since old wars have removed them, said the report by the group, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

''The Mine Ban Treaty remains an ongoing success in stigmatizing the use of land mines and mitigating the suffering they cause,'' said Jeff Abramson, the project manager of Landmine Monitor, the group's research unit.

The group, which won a Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 for its work, released the report to coincide with the Third Review Conference of the Mine Ban Treaty, which convened Monday in Maputo, Mozambique, where representatives from its 161 signers and other participants will spend five days discussing how to further strengthen enforcement of the agreement.

Antipersonnel mines are hidden explosive devices that are buried in the ground and designed to be detonated when a person steps on or near them, causing indiscriminate death and grievous injury. They can lie dormant for decades, long after a conflict has ended. Many of their victims are children.

The United States, which was among the original countries to call for a treaty banning mines and has done much to help other countries purge them, has not signed the treaty. It is among the 36 countries that have not signed it and is the only NATO member outside the treaty. (Russia and China also have not signed.)

An American delegation is attending the Maputo conference only as observers.

Human rights advocates criticize the United States for what they call a conspicuous lapse that may be dissuading other countries from joining the treaty.

The Obama administration, which says it has been evaluating the treaty's provisions since 2009, has issued conflicting signals about its intentions.

''It's going to be embarrassing for the U.S. to have to explain to the high-level officials at the summit meeting why it has been reviewing its land mine policies for five years without making a decision,'' said Stephen Goose, the executive director of the arms division at Human Rights Watch and the chairman of the United States Campaign to Ban Landmines, a coalition of groups that has been pressing the United States to join.

American defense officials have resisted a blanket renunciation of land mines. Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a congressional hearing in March that he considered such weapons ''an important tool'' in the American arsenal, citing as an example their use in South Korea to deter an invasion from North Korea.

Others, however, have expressed frustration over what they regard as an inexcusable American refusal to join the treaty. Senator Patrick J. Leahy, a Vermont Democrat and a prominent supporter of the treaty, has pressed the administration in speeches this year to endorse it.

''If land mines were littering this country—in schoolyards, along roads, in cornfields, in our national parks—and hundreds of American children were being crippled'' like children in Cambodia, Mr. Leahy said in an April 9 statement, ''how long would it take before the White House sent the Mine Ban Treaty to the Senate for ratification.''

Despite its apparent reluctance to join the treaty, the United States has spent more than $2 billion in the past two decades to help clear mines and aid victims, more than any other country.

The United States also has stopped production and export of so-called dumb mines that cannot be disarmed, and it no longer uses plastic materials that can foil metal detectors used to decontaminate mine-infested areas.

The report by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines said that only five countries—Israel, Libya, Myanmar, Russia and Syria, all nonsigners of the treaty—had used antipersonnel land mines since 2009.

But it also reported that Yemen, which has signed the treaty, disclosed last November that it violated its pledge against land mine use in 2011.

The report said global stockpiles of mines had dropped sharply, with 87 signers of the

treaty having completed their promised destruction of a total of about 47 million mines, since the treaty took effect. Twenty-seven nations contaminated with mines have proclaimed themselves mine-free during that period.

Casualties from leftover mines have also declined by more than half since the treaty took effect, the report said. Yet in the roughly 60 countries where contamination from land mines and other explosive remnants of war remains a problem, an estimated 4,000 people a year are killed or wounded.

The report said nearly half the victims were children. In Afghanistan, it said, children constitute 61 percent of all such casualties since 1999.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business until 11 a.m.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I inform the Senate that the three judges from Florida we are about to vote on have the support of Senator RUBIO and I. It is as a result of a bipartisan process. It is actually a nonpartisan process as to how we select our judges in Florida. Senator RUBIO and I appoint a judicial nominating commission in the three judicial districts in Florida. They then, when there is a vacancy of a judge or U.S. attorney or U.S. marshal, receive the applications, do the interviews, and make—for one vacancy—three recommendations. Senator RUBIO and I then take these three recommendations, the two of us together interview the applicants. The arrangement we have with the White House—and of course we know the President could select whomever he wants, but the White House has graciously agreed, and this has been a longstanding practice with the Federal judge selections from Florida, the White House has agreed they will pick from among the three we send.

Senator RUBIO and I send comments to the White House about the three, even though what we primarily do is tell the White House if we have an objection to any one of the three who come through the judicial nominating commission process.

Therefore, what we do is we take politics out of the selection of judges.

I highly recommend to the Senate Paul Byron and Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, both of the Middle District, and Beth Bloom of the Southern District.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH).

Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PAUL G. BYRON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

NOMINATION OF CARLOS EDUARDO MENDOZA TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

NOMINATION OF BETH BLOOM TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

NOMINATION OF GEOFFREY W. CRAWFORD TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Paul G. Byron, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida; Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida; Beth Bloom, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida; and Geoffrey W. Crawford, of Vermont, to be United States District Judge for the District of Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate prior to the Byron nomination.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON BYRON NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Paul G. Byron, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida?

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Chambliss	Kirk	Stabenow
Coats	Klobuchar	Tester
Coburn	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	Markey	Walsh
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Fischer	Mikulski	
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—6

Cochran	Johanns	Rockefeller
Heinrich	Pryor	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MENDOZA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on the Mendoza nomination.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, just to remind the Senate, this judge and the next one—as was the previous one—were done by the Judicial Nominating Commission process that Senator RUBIO and I use in order to take any kind of politics out of the selection of judges. It has worked very well for years, and this judge and the next one are part of that process.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida?

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator

from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Chambliss	Kirk	Stabenow
Coats	Klobuchar	Tester
Coburn	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Toomey
Coons	Lee	Udall (CO)
Corker	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Manchin	Vitter
Crapo	Markey	Walsh
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	McConnell	Whitehouse
Enzi	Menendez	Wicker
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden
Fischer	Mikulski	
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—6

Cochran	Johanns	Rockefeller
Heinrich	Pryor	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON BLOOM NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the Bloom nomination.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Beth Bloom, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baldwin	Graham	Murphy
Barrasso	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson
Bennet	Harkin	Paul
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Chambliss	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Coburn	Klobuchar	Tester
Collins	Landrieu	Thune
Coons	Leahy	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Merkley	Wyden
Flake	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Pryor	Schatz
Johanns	Rockefeller	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON CRAWFORD NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes equally divided prior to the vote on the Crawford nomination.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, is this the Crawford nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Let me say he is strongly supported by both Senators from Vermont, and I might say also by the people of Vermont.

I yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Geoffrey W. Crawford, of Vermont, to be United States District Judge for the District of Vermont?

Mr. INHOFE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second. There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was annuonced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Barrasso	Grassley	Nelson
Begich	Hagan	Paul
Bennet	Harkin	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Boxer	Hirono	Rockefeller
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kirk	Shelby
Coats	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coburn	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Markey	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	King	Schatz
Johanns	Pryor	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, with respect to the confirmed nominations, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a cloture vote on the Rodriguez nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Elizabeth Warren, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Charles E. Schumer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be

Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rockefeller
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Landrieu	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Casey	Levin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—44

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Pryor
Johanns	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 52, the nays are 44. The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m.; that when the Senate reconvenes, the time until 4:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled in the usual form; and that at 4:30 p.m. all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the Rodriguez nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

NOMINATION OF LEON RODRIGUEZ TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Nomination of Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 4:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Republican whip.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, there are two things I wish to address here briefly on the floor of the Senate. The first, strangely enough, has to do with an editorial that appeared in the New York Times this weekend.

I remember one of the people who was influential to me when I was coming up through the political system in Bexar County, TX, and in Austin, and now working here in Washington and back home in Texas. One of my mentors said: Don't ever get into a fight with somebody who buys ink by the barrel.

That seemed like pretty sage advice, but maybe it is a little dated these days because so much of what we see in the news is not in written newsprint itself.

The point is, the editorial in the New York Times this weekend I am referring to was talking about criminal justice reform, a topic that in recent months has produced some genuine bipartisan legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor of one of those reform bills, along with my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE.

Our bill would allow low-risk Federal prisoners to earn credit toward completing a portion of their sentence outside of prison walls—for example, through home confinement, through halfway houses or community supervision.

Strangely enough, the Times editorial praises our bill as an example ''of significant progress toward a legislative solution.''

Unfortunately, it then proceeds to blame Senate Republicans, including me, for stalling progress on the bill and preventing a vote on the sentencing bill introduced by the distinguished majority whip, DICK DURBIN of Illinois.

The strange thing about it is, as every Senator and everybody within the sound of my voice knows, it is Majority Leader REID who determines what legislation comes up on the Senate floor, and this editorial didn't mention him at all. An amazing oversight. The last time I checked, the majority leader was the only person in the Chamber with the power to schedule a vote on any legislation he wants, and he can do so whenever he wants.

So for the record, I wish to correct the error in the New York Times editorial. I strongly support criminal justice reform, including sentencing reform. My concerns about the sentencing reform bill cosponsored by Senator DURBIN and Senator LEE are that I believe the criteria it uses are excessively broad in deciding whose prison terms to shorten. But I think those are the sorts of things that could be worked out through an open amendment process on the Senate floor. And—I am sure we all agree on this—we don't want to prematurely release dangerous, higher level drug traffickers. That is my concern, that the bill is overly broad and would include them. Those kinds of concerns should not be taken lightly—and I am sure they are not—and I look forward to working with my colleagues to address them.

To reiterate, my opinions about the sentencing bill have nothing to do with the majority leader's prerogative to schedule a vote. He could schedule that vote anytime he wants. I would like to think the New York Times editorial board is knowledgeable enough to know that, but apparently they need a reminder.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

In the last week I have come to the floor a number of times to talk about the humanitarian crisis in South Texas. This of course is caused in large part by 52,000 unaccompanied minors, mostly from Central America, who have shown up on America's doorstep, on our border, saying they want to live in the United States. It is estimated those numbers could rise to as many as 60,000 to 90,000 this year alone and maybe double next year unless something is done.

I have to say I am somewhat encouraged because the Obama administration is finally acknowledging—somewhat belatedly, but finally they are acknowledging their policies may have contributed to this crisis in the first place.

This past weekend Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson published what he called an open letter to the parents of children crossing our Southwest border. This letter ran as an op-ed in Spanish language media outlets, and it warned parents of the extraordinary dangers facing Central American migrants who travel through Mexico, including the danger of kidnapping, sexual assault, torture, and murder.

Secretary of Homeland Security Johnson also made clear that the children who have been pouring into South Texas will not be eligible for the Obama administration's so-called deferred action programs. This is what he said:

There is no path to deferred action or citizenship, or one being contemplated by Congress, for a child who crosses our border illegally today.

In other words, Secretary Johnson's op-ed implicitly acknowledged that President Obama's policies have created a perception that children who make it across the border will be allowed to stay. I must say it is a very dangerous perception and one that simply has to be corrected, not only for the sake of U.S. border security and for the rule of law but for the sake of the very children who now constitute the humanitarian crisis on our southwestern border.

In discussing this matter with a number of our colleagues on a bipartisan basis, it has been observed that the drug cartels, which used to just traffic in drugs, now traffic in people. They have changed their business model. Essentially, they control the corridors by which drugs, people, and weapons traverse Mexico and, in this instance, come from Central America.

The fact is there should be a lot of concern on our part that this flood of unaccompanied children will prove to be a distraction from the interdiction of dangerous drugs coming across the same borders. In fact, in the Rio Grande sector of the Border Patrol, in the Rio Grande Valley, as the distinguished chairman of the Homeland Security Committee knows, there has actually been a drop in the number of drug interdictions coming across the southwestern border in part because the Border Patrol and other law enforcement have been diverted to deal with this humanitarian crisis.

I see the chairman on the floor, and it looks as though he has a question on his mind. I yield to him for a question if he has one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his thoughtful comments.

When I was Governor, and long before that, and certainly in the Senate, I have liked to focus on underlying causes, not just the symptoms or problems but how do we solve the underlying challenge that is before us.

In this case we focus so much on the border and what we are doing on the border. We have tens of thousands of men and women arrayed there, drones, all kinds of technology to stop people from coming in. It is important for us to defend and secure our borders. The Senator from Texas has been a champion for that, and I would like to think I have as well, also, having been to Guatemala and El Salvador in the last couple of months, and Mexico and Colombia, trying to understand what is the underlying cause here.

As the Senator from Texas knows probably better than most of us, a big part of the underlying cause is the lives the folks are being forced to live in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. As we squeeze that bubble in northern Mexico to try to go after the narco drug lords, we squeeze that bubble and they go somewhere else—they head south. They have made life miserable in those countries for a lot of people.

So as we secure our borders and do all the work there, sending a strong, clear message, as Secretary Johnson has said, to those parents of those in Guatemala and El Salvador, it is also important to figure out how we partner with Colombia and those folks in Mexico and Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, to improve the hellacious lives many are living, with a lack of hope, lack of safety, lack of jobs, lack of opportunity, lack of education. We can do that. We can do that while at the same time securing our borders. We have to do both. And the underlying cause is important.

I have no questions, but I want to thank the Senator for his thoughts this evening, for yielding, and for giving me a chance to join him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee is exactly right to say we can't just look at the border in dealing with this crisis.

My friend HENRY CUELLAR from Laredo, TX, a Member of the House of Representatives, likened this to a football game. He said: You can't only do goal line defense. We need to find ways of deterring people from leaving their homes in the first place and coming to the United States.

I know Vice President BIDEN was in Guatemala this last week and Secretary Johnson was in the Rio Grande Valley, and I know they are looking at all of this. There is no simple, single-shot answer to it. But the fact is there are a lot of people who want to come to the United States, for obvious reasons.

But I look at it as even though we are a nation of immigrants, we are a nation of legal immigration, one of the most generous in the world. I think we naturalize roughly 800,000 people a year now because they want to become American citizens through the legal system.

But to have this mass of humanity come at such a great flood and in such a short period of time, particularly as unaccompanied minors, threatens to capsize the boat. It creates a lot of hardship in local communities, States, and places around the country we wouldn't expect to be dealing with this, because they are going to have to be taken care of. We are committed to making sure these children are taken care of, but we have to send a message very clearly that if you are a parent contemplating this circumstance, you should not send your children, particularly on the perilous and dangerous journey leading from Central America.

I have mentioned in recent days a book written in 2013 called ''The Beast'' by a courageous Salvadoran writer named Oscar Martinez. Mr. Martinez, a journalist, traveled I think eight different times with the migrants from Central America and wrote in this book about their experiences and, unfortunately, the unspeakable brutalities these migrants encounter on a daily basis—again, because they are traveling through a smuggling corridor controlled by the cartels, in this instance the Zetas. The Zetas are a spin-off of the Sinaloa cartel. They used to traffic in drugs, but now they realize they can make money off these migrants—and they do, in terrible sorts of ways. Of course they are lawless, and the brutalities they exact on these migrants are shocking.

For example, Mr. Martinez in his book ''The Beast'' tells a story of one migrant woman who was raped on the dirt-and-straw floor of a cardboard shack before being strangled to death in a Mexican town along the Guatemalan border. This woman's picture was subsequently published in a local newspaper on a half page, with two other pictures of tortured bodies. In the meantime, an epitaph was written on a small cross that read: The young mother and her twins died November 2008.

I realize this is shocking and really horrible, and we prefer not to even think about it. But I think we need to acknowledge—and certainly the parents who send their young children unaccompanied on this long, perilous journey need to understand—what they are vulnerable to.

The dangers of the trans-Mexican migration journey have become far worse over the past decade as powerful drug cartels have effectively taken over the human trafficking business. As Caitlin Dickson in the Daily Beast reported yesterday:

> While the journey north was always treacherous and costly, in the hands of the cartels it has become deadlier than ever. The entire border, and the routes leading up to it, are controlled by some combination of Los Zetas, Sinaloa, and Knights of Templar cartels, along with a few smaller groups—making it impossible to cross without their permission.

What they have to pay to exact their permission is a tax or a fee—basically, protection money—to allow them to pass more or less safely through their territory. As I have said many times, there is nothing at all humane about encouraging mothers, daughters, fathers, and sons to put their lives in the hands of such vicious criminals. Yet when the President has talked as he has over the years about dealing humanely with migrants, he acts as if the decision to demonstrate more and more leniency or deferred action when it comes to our enforcement or immigration laws is itself a humanitarian act. Yet perversely what it does is it encourages this sort of illegal immigration and encourages mothers and fathers to subject their children to these tremendous brutalities.

I can only hope the ongoing crisis we are seeing now along the southwestern border will dispel any illusions that

somehow by saying, well, we will not enforce our immigration laws as to this class of individuals, we are going to pick and choose or we have deported too many people, so we are going to quit deporting people—these actions and inactions have consequences, and this is the sort of consequence that sort of action produces. I hope it will dissuade the President from announcing yet another unilateral suspension of immigration enforcement later this summer.

There are various stories written and rumors told that the President, if immigration reform doesn't pass this year in Congress, will take action unilaterally through an Executive order. He has encouraged that perception, saying, ''I have a pen and I have a phone,'' and he has issued a number of Executive orders in a number of different areas, but I hope the President doesn't compound the problem by further sending the message that he is going to unilaterally suspend enforcement of our immigration laws because the consequences will be big and they will further jeopardize the health, welfare, and well-being of the people he thinks he is trying to help.

I would ask the President: What is more important, is it political posturing—trying to show to an important constituency that you are sympathetic to their concerns—or are we going to focus primarily on people's lives and their welfare?

Given all that has happened in this humanitarian crisis, how on Earth could the President possibly justify another unilateral change in immigration enforcement that will likely lead to another surge like we have seen on the border.

It is pretty simple. Unless we send a clear message that our borders are being enforced and that our laws are being upheld, we will continue to face crisis after crisis after crisis. Meanwhile, untold numbers of migrants will continue suffering and dying in Central America and Mexico just trying to get here or get here—showing up on our doorstep—and overwhelm our capacity to deal with them in a responsible way.

I yield the floor, and I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to do call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Colleagues, there is an unprecedented crisis unfolding on our border. The crisis threatens the very integrity of our national border, our laws, and our system of justice. It is something I have been talking about for a number of years, but it has reached unusual and dangerous proportions. It is a crisis of this administration's own making and a crisis the administration's policies continue to encourage.

America deserves leaders in the executive branch who will stand up and say clearly: The crisis must end now. The border is closed. Please do not come unlawfully to America. If you do come unlawfully, you will be deported. This is what we expect from our Chief Executive, the chief law enforcement officer in America and, for that matter, the head of Homeland Security, the office in charge of Border Patrol and ICE officers.

But President Obama and Secretary Johnson at the Department of Homeland Security refused—just refused—to plainly make this statement. How can they not? It is their duty. It is the law of the United States, and it is causing people around the world, particularly in Central America, to believe they can come unlawfully to America. It is encouraging this to happen. They are getting wrong messages from the leadership in our country.

So let's review the evidence.

On March 20, 2014, the University of Texas at El Paso did a study that was funded and supported by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Directorate, and it states that ''both Border Patrol and ICE officers agreed that the lack of deterrence for crossing the U.S./Mexican border has impacted the rate at which they have apprehended UACs.''

UACs are unaccompanied alien children.

Officers assert that ''UACs are aware of the relative lack of consequences they will receive when apprehended at the U.S. border.''

Get this: Officers are certain the UACs are aware of this.

UTEP [University of Texas El Paso] was informed that smugglers of family members of unaccompanied alien children understand that once a UAC is apprehended for illegal entry into the United States, the individual will be reunited with a U.S.-based family member pending the disposition of the immigration hearing.

There will be some sort of hearing set for them.

This process appears to be exploited by illegal alien smugglers and family members in the United States who wish to reunite with separated children. It was observed by the researchers that the current policy is very similar to the ''catch and release'' problem that the Department of Homeland Security faced prior to the passage of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

If we catch somebody in the United States unlawfully, they will be given some minimal process and then released on bail and told to return back to court in so many weeks or months. In many cases, they do not show up. They enter the country unlawfully against the laws of the United States. They are apprehended but released—and why would they show up?

Recently Border Patrol agents in the Rio Grande Valley questioned 230 illegal immigrants about why they came. These are particularly related to children, and 95 percent said they believed they would be allowed to stay and take advantage of the ''new'' U.S. ''law'' that grants a free pass or ''permiso'' being issued by the U.S. government to adults traveling with minors and unaccompanied children.

So this is what they said 95 percent of the people who came illegally believe. This memo that leaked out of the Department of Homeland Security continued:

The information is apparently common knowledge in Central America and is spread by word of mouth and international and local media. A high percentage of the subjects interviewed stated that their family members in the United States urged them to travel immediately, because the United States government was only issuing immigration 'permisos' until the end of June 2014.

On June 10, 2014, newspapers in Honduras and Guatemala quoted Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson as saying this—this is what he is being quoted as saying in Central America: ''Almost all agree that a child who crossed the border illegally with their parents or in search of a father or a better life, was not making an adult choice to break our laws, and should be treated differently than adult violators of the law.''

This conveys a message. Isn't it clear that people who are not students of the esoteric aspects of American law would hear the Secretary of Homeland Security basically saying if you are a young person and you come you will be treated differently? Then they hear they will be given a ''permiso'' and allowed to stay and be taken care of, that there is no risk or danger in coming to the United States unlawfully.

On June 13, the Washington Post published an article entitled ''Influx of minors across Texas border driven by belief they will be allowed to stay in U.S.'' How hard is it to reverse that belief? We have not done it.

On June 19, Democratic Congressman HENRY CUELLAR of Texas said, ''As long as they know they are going to be released and allowed to stay here, they are going to keep coming.'' Isn't that true?

The New York Times quoted one teenager from Honduras whose mother had sent for him: ''If you make it, they take you to a shelter and take care of you and let you have permission to stay.''

Records show the administration knew this surge we are seeing at the border, which is unprecedented in our history, was coming, and they knew of it for some time and did nothing to stop it or to send the message: Don't do this. Do not come to America unlawfully. Make your application if you feel you are justified in coming, and it will be processed in regular order. Indeed, the administration sought, rather than to stop this dramatic surge, to accommodate it.

Even before the public became aware of the beginning of the surge of this nature at our border, on January 29 of this year, the Federal Government—

get this—posted an advertisement seeking bids from a contractor to handle 65,000 ''unaccompanied alien children'' crossing the southern border. This was in January.

In 2011 we had approximately 6,000 coming into the country unlawfully. So in January of this year they posted an advertisement to handle 65,000. So this raises serious questions. Why would the administration claim to be surprised by the current influx of unaccompanied minors when they were taking bids in January for a contract to handle the exact situation—almost the exact number—we are seeing? This year it is expected to hit about 90,000 children; whereas, in 2011 it was 6,000. Projections from official sources say we may hit 130,000 next year. How did the administration anticipate the very numbers it seems we have at least to date?

In March of this year the Department of Health & Human Services estimated in its fiscal year 2014 budget proposal that the number of unaccompanied illegal alien children apprehended in 2014 this year would rise to 60,000, which is up 814 percent from the 6,560 who were apprehended in the United States only 3 years ago.

Over the weekend the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security published an ''open letter to the parents of children crossing our Southwest border'' on a Spanish language wire service. I had demanded of him in the Senate Judiciary Committee that he send a clear message, and he actually refused to do so. I had to ask him about three or more times before he would finally say: It is unlawful to come here, and that is the reason you shouldn't. He said: You shouldn't come because it is dangerous. He said: You shouldn't come. It is not a good idea. But he was not simply saying: Do not come unlawfully.

In newspapers in Central and South America and on Univision's Web site the letter noted, in part, that the Senate comprehensive immigration bill ''provides for an earned path to citizenship, but only for certain people who came into this country on or before December 31, 2011.''

The Senate bill died in the House and will not become a law, and it was wrong to have done that very thing. That is what the law said, but it wasn't passed. But the very fact that Mr. Johnson is advertising in foreign countries an earned path to citizenship for illegal immigrants undermines his primary responsibility, which is to enforce the law. The most primary responsibility for Mr. Johnson is not to see how many people he can apprehend and actually go through the cost and process of deporting; the primary job is to deter criminal activity to begin with, to send a message and back it up that people cannot come successfully illegally. Don't come. Then you will see a large dropoff instead of this 800-percent increase we see today.

Human beings are rational actors, and if they believe the United States is granting citizenship to illegal aliens who arrived before 2012, it stands to reason that the U.S. Government will move that date back if more illegal aliens arrive in the years to come. Why wouldn't they think they would be given amnesty too? That is what happened in 1986—amnesty was given. There were 3 million people who were given legal status, and the message was heard.

Some say that today, we have over 11 million illegal aliens in the country.

Even a 2009 internal Department of Homeland Security report on approaches for implementing immigration reform recognizes this fundamental fact. This 2009 report said:

> Virtually all immigration experts agree that it would be counterproductive to offer an explicit or implied path to permanent resident status (or citizenship) during any legalization program. That would simply encourage the fraud and illegal border crossings that other features of the program seek to discourage. In fact, for that reason and from that perspective, it would be best if the legislation did not even address future permanent resident status or citizenship.

That is from an official government report.

Contrary to the administration's claims that illegal immigrants are acting on mere rumor and misinformation, it is the sad reality of lax enforcement plus the lack of a clear message that is driving the surge. The reality is if you get into the country today, you are not going to be deported. That is true.

A leaked May 30 internal memo written by the top border official, Deputy Chief Ronald Vitiello, said:

> Currently only 3 percent of apprehensions from countries other than Mexico are being repatriated to their countries of citizenship, which are predominately located in Central America.

I repeat, only 3 percent are being repatriated back home.

According to the former head of Enforcement and Removal Operations for ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, Gary Mead:

> It's taking a year or more in some places for people to come up on a hearing and many times, they don't have an attorney, or they've lost an attorney, and they get an extension, and maybe it's two years before they have a hearing. And in the interim period, they enroll in school, or they get a job, or they are reunited with family members, and then they are no longer an enforcement priority.

That is significant. Even if after 2 or 3 years a judge finally orders removal—assuming the individuals show up in court at all—many illegal immigrants simply ignore that order, and having been here for a period of years, no one makes them leave.

As former ICE Director John Sandweg said: ''If you are a run-of-the-mill immigrant here illegally, your odds of getting deported are close to zero.''

Yesterday, Byron York published in the Washington Examiner the findings of Jessica Vaughan, Director of Policy Studies at the Center for Immigration Studies, which shows that the United States deported a total of 802 minors to Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador in 2011, 677 in 2012, and down to 496 last year. Weighed against the tens of thousands pouring in, it is clear that once again the reality on the ground—not merely rumor, talk, or policy—of the lax enforcement has influenced decisionmaking in Central America.

It is obvious to me. I have been a Federal prosecutor. You have to send the message, and if the message is heard that if you violate a certain law, you will be disciplined, the number of people who violate the law will drop. If you never enforce speeding tickets, people will speed. If you enforce them systematically, people will slow down.

York quotes ex-ICE official Gary Mead:

> If you're getting 90,000 a year, or 50,000 a year, or even 25,000 a year, and you only remove 1,200, you're not eliminating the backlog.

How obvious is that?

Additionally, those here illegally have taken advantage of an asylum system that is easily open to abuse and that the administration has sought to widen rather than narrow. This asylum question is very serious. House Judiciary Committee Chairman GOODLATTE recently stated:

> Many of the children, teenagers, and adults, arriving at the border are able to game our asylum and immigration laws because the Obama administration has severely weakened them and many thousands have already been released into the interior of the United States. What does President Obama plan to do with those who have already been released from custody?

That is a good question. We have a situation now where illegal immigrants seek out and turn themselves in to the Border Patrol officer. They come across the border and go straight to them and turn themselves in. That is a fact. What happens then? They are taken farther into the United States to be reunited with family members, apply for a job, attend school, have children in U.S. hospitals, and stay in the United States—whether through skipping court hearings, receiving asylum, or simply ignoring orders to leave.

We can all expect that 5 or 10 years from now—and correct me if I am wrong—politicians in this body will probably say these illegal immigrants ''came here through no fault of their own'' and are entitled to citizenship. Is this a policy of a great nation? It is a policy of a nation that believes and advocates for open borders, but it is not a policy that is compatible with a system of law, duty, and order.

If people apply and wait in line, why should other people be able to come from the outside, break in line, move ahead of them unlawfully, and then ultimately receive the very thing they sought unlawfully? The chaos continues.

Indeed, the President actively continues to incentivize even more illegal immigrants. That is the effect of what

he has accomplished here. He reauthorized his DACA program—based on a bill that did not pass the Senate or the House—for 2 years, which is a policy that exempts whole classes of certain individuals, particularly young people, from the immigration laws of the United States. He held a White House ceremony in the White House honoring 10 DACA recipients. DACA recipients are people who enter the country illegally. He also unilaterally authorized an additional 100,000 guest workers, and now the Justice Department is hiring lawyers to represent unaccompanied alien children in immigration court to maximize the number of those who will receive permission to stay in the country.

Claims that DACA—this policy of nonenforcement unilaterally carried out by the President of the United States not to enforce the law—does not apply to these new arrivals is simply a distraction. DACA is a unilateral action that established the precedent that those who come to America at a certain age will receive special exemptions from the law. That is what it says.

ICE officers report they are often forced to release even high-risk individuals of unknown ages and dates of entry who simply assert DREAM Act privileges.

In the internal Border Patrol memo, Deputy Border Patrol Chief Vitiello stressed the only way to stop the flow is to show potential illegal immigrants that there will be real consequences for their action. He said:

> If the U.S. government fails to deliver adequate consequences to deter aliens from attempting to illegally enter the U.S. the result will be an even greater increase in the rate of recidivism and first-time illicit entries.

Our immigration system is unraveling before our very eyes. It is unbelievable. The American people have been denied the protections they are entitled to under our immigration system. Washington is failing the citizens of this country in a most dramatic and open way. Laws are passed by elected representatives of the people. We have passed laws that say you can't come to America without permission, and you need to file your papers and follow the rules. It is unlawful to just walk across the border because you want to come to this country. That is not lawful in this country.

I am calling on all the leaders and officials in this town to take the firm, bold, and decisive steps that are necessary to restore order and restore our borders. It is important for the children who are at risk. Many of them are having a difficult time. They have run out of money and the coyotes and smugglers have taken their money and mistreated them. We have heard a lot of horrible stories.

What is the best way to fix this problem? The best way to fix it is to have the President of the United States and the Secretary of Homeland Security say we are not going to accept you coming unlawfully. Please do not come. Don't do it. Make your application like everybody else. Wait your turn like everybody else. We are not against immigration or young people, but it is unacceptable to have a lawless system—as we have today—that is placing children at risk and overwhelming our enforcement officers.

One TV program today said the Border Patrol officers, instead of doing their duty, are changing diapers. We have gone from 6,000 to maybe 90,000 to 100,000-plus next year. The cost of the budget item last year for these kinds of things was about $800 million. I think they are now saying they need $2.28 billion a year just to handle this overflow. We don't have money to do that. It is not the right thing. It is dangerous for children, it is corrosive of the law.

The President must send a clear message: Do not come. Please follow the law, and if you come anyway, contrary to the law, you will be apprehended, you will be deported, and you will be required to return home.

I thank the Chair, yield the floor, and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I would like to discuss the nomination of Leon Rodriguez to be the Director of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service. Mr. Rodriguez was appointed on December 19 and approved by the Judiciary Committee on April 3rd by a vote of 11–7.

I want to explain my opposition.

First and foremost, Mr. Rodriguez lacks adequate immigration experience to lead this agency. I only say that because his nomination comes on the heels of potentially sweeping immigration reform legislation. When we read his responses to my questions, it becomes clear that he has little appreciation for what this job as director entails. He basically says that he has a lot of studying to do. I think, with the situation of immigration in this country—the need for immigration reform—that we need to do better than have a director of the agency who says he has a lot of studying to do.

Second, his previous experience with Casa de Maryland is a concern as well. He was a member of the board of directors there from 2005 to 2007. The mission of Casa de Maryland is to help improve quality of life and fight for equal treatment for low-income Latinos. There is surely nothing wrong with that. That is a very noble cause. But if we peel back their mission statement, we will see that the activities they are involved in are a lot greater than just improving the quality of life for low-income people. They aid people here illegally in finding employment and gaining legal status in this country. They provide legal services to do so, and they fund day labor centers that focus on ensuring undocumented workers can find work on a daily basis. And, of course, that entails the use of taxpayers' money to accomplish that goal.

Their efforts are in direct conflict with the mission of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service. That agency has to ensure the integrity of immigration programs and benefits. Casa de Maryland believes that anyone, even those who are here in contravention of our law, should be eligible for benefits. The organization has pushed for driver's licenses for people here unlawfully. They have worked to undermine REAL ID, a Federal law that needs to be fully implemented by the States. They have organized rallies that promote legal status for people who have broken the law. They have trained undocumented workers to understand their rights and published a cartoon pamphlet advising people not to speak to law enforcement when approached. They go so far as to encourage them not to even provide their names.

Mr. Rodriguez claimed that he had no knowledge of this pamphlet put out by Casa de Maryland. Yet, he was on the board at the time the pamphlet was published and disseminated.

Mr. Rodriguez doesn't disavow their work or their contempt for law enforcement. In fact, he stated in one response that he was ''supportive of the use of local tax measures to support the day labor centers'' that Casa de Maryland established.

So it is concerning that he could bring this same philosophy to an agency whose mission is to oversee legal immigration in the United States. And we all know that we are a welcoming Nation of immigrants because about a million people come here every year legally, and they are welcomed, and our laws allow that.

Now, a third reason to oppose him is my concern about Mr. Rodriguez's commitment to responding to congressional oversight, and my colleagues know how strongly I feel about Congress's doing its constitutional job of oversight; in other words, to be a check on the executive branch of government, to make sure that the laws are faithfully executed. Despite assurances given during his hearing, Mr. Rodriguez repeatedly failed to provide responsive answers to many of my questions. Mr. Rodriguez was not responsive to the questions I posed even in writing. While he repeatedly stated he would review the programs and policies if confirmed, Mr. Rodriguez claims not to be privy—that is his word—to internal functions or have knowledge of how the agency works. He refused to provide his opinions on very critical matters facing the agency, and I will give my colleagues examples.

In his initial responses he stated the following response not once, not twice,

but 17 times: ''If confirmed, I will certainly commit to a careful study of this program to determine any additional appropriate steps forward, including any possible changes to address this matter.''

We are talking about a person who gives that response, and he is directing an agency of 18,000 people. He is not going to be ready to go to work on day one, and they need somebody who is ready to go to work yesterday.

The second time around asking questions, he responded a bit differently in each question, but always alluded to the fact that he was ''not privy to the internal factors upon which USCIS and its leadership base its decisions.''

I wish to give my colleagues one example. I asked about whether drunk drivers or sex offenders should be eligible for legal status and immigration benefits. He responded in both instances saying, ''In most cases, individuals who have been found guilty of a serious crime should not receive immigration benefits.''

Well, that is a big question mark. What does he mean by ''in most cases''? I would read that this way: So when should these individuals be allowed to receive benefits and legal status? That is the question that is unanswered by his response.

By not answering the questions about felons, drunk drivers, or even gang members, he is essentially toeing Casa de Maryland's line that no one should be deported.

He could not offer an opinion of his own or elaborate when such people should get benefits. He said he would be forthcoming with Congress, but his repetitive answers show, No. 1, he is avoiding the questions, and No. 2, he has a lot of studying to do before he takes this job.

A fourth reason: He wasn't forthcoming with his views on what we call around here DACA, the Deferred Action for Child Arrivals program that grants work authorizations and stays of deportation for anyone under the age of 31.

One of the most pressing items on the agency's plate right now is whether we are going to renew the President's DACA directive. In his hearing and twice afterwards in questions for the record, I asked Mr. Rodriguez about his plans with DACA and whether he would expand the program. I couldn't get a straightforward answer from him. I asked if he had any discussions about the program, and he stated that he was only ''generally aware'' of the renewal process. He clearly knew the agency published a renewal form for public comment, yet he claimed to have little knowledge or opinion on the matter.

What is more, I am told by employees within the agency that he has a person at the table who is reporting to him directly on the agency's decisions. I am told he has a conduit during discussions on the deferred action program. It is not clear how much he is driving the policies, but it concerns me that he claims no knowledge of this matter.

Had Mr. Rodriguez been more forthcoming, we would also know what is in store for the President's directive. Will he simply renew it, or will he expand it, as many believe is the plan? Congress should know this man's views on those very important matters.

In connection to DACA, I asked about information sharing with USCIS and other Federal entities. My colleagues know I rely on whistleblowers for a lot of information. Just recently, a whistleblower brought me a case in which the FBI asked for information on a DACA applicant. The FBI agent, in an email, said this:

> I am checking to see if there was any information available regarding fugitive ''john smith''? We would love to get him in custody. I was interested in knowing where he submitted his fingerprints and if he left a home address.

Now, that is the Federal Bureau of Investigation doing its work. Here is what the USCIS provided in response to the FBI:

> We cannot confirm that a DACA request has been filed without reason to believe that the requestor would represent an enforcement priority. However, according to your email, the agent can see what form was filed. As such, you could also direct him to our website for additional publicly available information regarding immigration forms.

The USCIS's response to the FBI was essentially this: Sorry. We can't help you. We must protect the confidentiality of the applicant. That is not quoting anybody; that is the hypothetical answer I think our immigration agency gave to the FBI.

But this isn't the only case we have like this. I have been informed about the lack of information sharing by the USCIS since DACA began in 2012. I asked Mr. Rodriguez about his commitment to provide law enforcement with information on people who apply for immigration benefits. Now, I didn't ask about the statutory or regulatory hurdles in information sharing, but he refused to answer. I asked about his commitment to making sure people who defraud the government—or who are lawfully denied benefits—are turned over to law enforcement for removal. In one instance, he said it depended on the person's circumstances.

The immigration agency is part of the Department of Homeland Security. Its core mission is, as we would expect, to protect the homeland. Yet, this agency has a culture that I call ''getting to yes.'' In other words, cut a whole bunch of red tape and don't worry about what the law says. Just get people approved to be in this country.

Mr. Rodriguez's nonresponsive answer on this matter of ''getting to yes'' concerns me, because it is not consistent with the mission of the department. I wanted a firm commitment he would change that culture, and I couldn't get that from him.

Let me also address his connection to Mr. Perez, former head of the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice, now the Secretary of Labor. Mr. Perez, of course, was involved in the Department's decision to decline the prosecution of the New Black Panther Party voter intimidation case.

During his hearing, Mr. Rodriguez admitted he was aware of emails between political employees and career prosecutors discussing the decision to decline to prosecute that case. At that time, Mr. Rodriguez was serving as Mr. Perez's chief of staff and personally assisted in preparing Mr. Perez for his testimony before Congress. Yet, after Mr. Perez testified that the political appointees were not involved in the decision when Mr. Rodriguez said that they were involved in that decision, Mr. Rodriguez made no effort to correct the testimony after the fact.

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service can be a very powerful agency. They grant benefits to foreign nationals and are implementing the President's weak prosecutorial discretion initiatives. This agency will have a lot of responsibility if an immigration reform bill is passed by Congress. We are talking about 12 to 30 million undocumented people applying for benefits if this legislation is passed. They will carry out an administrative amnesty if a bill is not passed.

Under President Obama, this agency has implemented very controversial policies and practices. Many of the policies this agency has undertaken were included in the July 2010 internal memo I obtained entitled ''Administrative Alternatives to Comprehensive Immigration Reform.'' That sounds a little bit like ''I have got a pen and a phone, and if Congress won't, I will.'' The purpose of the memo was to ''promote family unity, foster economic growth, achieve significant process improvements and reduce the threat of removal for certain individuals present in the United States without authorization.'' The memo highlighted creative ways to achieve ''meaningful immigration reform absent legislative action.''

Remember when the President said: I have got a pen and a phone, and if Congress won't, I will.

That is a perfect example of it.

While the administration suggested this memo was only an internal deliberative document concocted by some bored bureaucrats, the Department has already undertaken many of these proposals. They will do even more under the new Director's leadership if the President decides to act unilaterally regarding immigration.

Remember the President who said: I have a pen and a phone, and if Congress won't, I will.

The agency's culture of ''getting to yes'' must change before any legalization program is carried out. The Homeland Security inspector general has reported on this culture. Their own internal watchdog, the IG, admonished the leadership for appearing to pressure line adjudicators to ''get to yes.'' Their report clearly shows that the immigration service has a lot of work to do to

get rid of the ''get to yes'' culture that has pervaded this agency in recent years.

The fact that one-quarter of the immigration service officers felt pressured to approve questionable applications and 90 percent of the respondents felt they did not have sufficient time to complete interviews of those who seek benefits certainly warrants significant changes be made immediately. It does not appear Mr. Rodriguez is inclined to do that.

This culture stems from the leadership suggesting that line adjudicators lean toward approval and focus on eligibility and less on fraud. Unfortunately, I did not get any sense from Mr. Rodriguez that he was committed to changing the culture.

Mr. Rodriguez's appointment to this agency concerns me a great deal. I hope my colleagues, before voting this afternoon, will have that same concern. I question his experience and his managerial judgment to lead an agency of 18,000 Federal employees. Unfortunately, I doubt his sincerity in working with Congress on oversight requests. I wish he had been more forthcoming.

For these reasons and others, I oppose the nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, later this afternoon the Senate will vote on Leon Rodriguez as head of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. While I am unable to support this nomination, this is the prime time to raise some of the issues that are happening on the southwest border. I will summarize some of my remarks.

We have an incredible situation, as we all know, happening on the border today. We have had thousands of kids cross the border. In fact, from October 1 to mid-May, there were 148,017 apprehensions. Of those, a significant number—this is just the Rio Grande Valley in Texas—a significant number of those were unaccompanied minors. In fact, there were so many that we did not have the capacity to deal with them there, and many, to the great chagrin of many in Arizona, were shipped to Arizona to process and then released into the custody of a guardian or someone.

The Border Patrol and others are trying to make the best of a very tragic and unfortunate circumstance. I do not think anybody faults them for the big burden they have. I think they are doing the best they can.

But what the situation really points out is that not only do we have insufficient resources on the border itself to deal with those trying to cross, but once people get here, we have insufficient resources, infrastructure, and policies to actually deal with them in a timely fashion. They are actually released—most of them—and asked to appear at a later date. It is estimated that quite a few do not. In fact, very few will show up at their court date.

What are we to do here? Obviously those of us who have dealt with this situation for a long time—those of us from border States—have advocated broad legislation to deal with border security, a guest worker plan, mechanisms to deal with those who are here illegally now, employer enforcement—many items. But if we cannot get to that yet—I wish we could, but if we cannot get to that yet, then we need to have better policies for dealing with those who have come across the border and whom we are going to hold. If we are going to grant them asylum—or some of them—then that needs to be done. If not, we cannot just assume that we are going to release them and assume they will come back for their court date or at their appointed time.

So this is a situation with which we have to deal. One thing we need to address immediately is to try to stem the tide of those who are coming. Interviews suggest overwhelmingly—in fact, in one case there were 250 crossers during a 1-week period or a 2-week period into Texas. I believe 95 percent of them indicated that the main motivation for them coming across the border—this is largely unaccompanied minors—was that they would be granted some kind of legal status that would allow them to stay. This is contrary to our law. This is contrary to the President's deferred action program. To qualify for that program, you would have had to have been here for 7 years. You cannot just arrive today or yesterday or tomorrow and qualify for this program. Nor was this contemplated by any legislation that has been passed by either body. The legislation we passed in the Senate does not allow those who come now to stay. You will have had to have been here since, I believe, December of 2011.

But what is happening is cartel members, human smugglers, and others are misinterpreting or willingly telling people they will receive some kind of legal status when they come. Too many people believe that, particularly from the countries of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala.

Some suggest it is just economic conditions or violence in those countries that is driving people northward. That, no doubt, has some truth to it. There are some who come for those reasons. But we have seen a massive spike just in the last couple of months that cannot be explained by economic conditions or violence in those countries. It is because they believe they will be afforded some legal status.

Senator MCCAIN, I, and many others in this body have raised this with the administration and have asked the administration to make it clear that those who come now will not be allowed to stay.

I have a letter that has been—I think this is an advertisement or has been translated into Spanish. It is being circulated in the affected countries from Secretary Jeh Johnson at the Department of Homeland Security. It is a good letter. It says the right things. I am glad we have taken that step. Vice President JOE BIDEN was in those countries telling those in charge and others that those who come now will not be allowed to stay; they will be deported. That is good. We need to keep that up. But what we really need right now is for President Obama himself to make such a statement. In all deference to the Vice President and the Secretary of Homeland Security, they simply do not carry the weight of the President of the United States making a statement and then following up that statement with a concerted effort in those countries to let people know they should not come north. That would make a tremendous difference. I call upon the President to make such a statement and to follow up that statement with efforts in those countries to make sure people understand this.

First and foremost, we need to stem the tide of those coming. It is estimated that this year there could be as many as 90,000 unaccompanied minors who come across the border. That figure may be higher next year. We have to stem that tide and then quickly figure out how we can deal with those who cross the border and whom we apprehend. We simply do not now have the infrastructure or policies that allow us to deal with them in a rationale, humane way.

I would call upon the President to make such a statement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

(The remarks of Mr. WALSH pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 483 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Resolutions Submitted.'')

Mr. WALSH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes in a colloquy with a number of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. BARRASSO. I come to the floor today with the ranking member of the Senate energy committee to discuss the issues of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

I turn to my colleague from Alaska to invite her to share with the Senate some of her observations, considerations, and concerns as we seek approval of an opportunity to create more jobs in America and improve our economy, as well as energy security for our country. I turn to the Senator from Alaska and ask her concerns, comments, and solutions that she may have regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I appreciate that my friend and colleague from Wyoming is helping to lead this discussion about the Keystone XL Pipeline and really to encourage the Senate to move on it, to do something on this rather than just talk about it.

We are sitting here Tuesday afternoon. We had a series of votes on judges here this morning, and it looks like we are going to have some more this week. But from the view of so many around this country who are worried about jobs, worried about the economy, worried about what is happening with the IRS, with the VA—and not to mention what has happened on the world scene—it looks like we are going to have yet another unproductive week in the Senate.

Since we are here and we have time, I can't think of a better time on a better issue to take up than this Keystone XL Pipeline.

The bill that we are asking to be brought up is Senate bill S. 2280. It was introduced by our colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN. He introduced it on May 1.

It was placed on the legislative calendar a few days later. It has 55 cosponsors. When we talk about bipartisan issues and initiatives within the Senate, 55 is a very good number. It includes 11 Democrats, including the chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

We are well behind the House of Representatives, though, on this initiative. They passed a Keystone bill over 1 year ago, but we have been working in the energy committee. We had a Keystone bill that was reported out of the energy committee just last week.

We passed an original bill on a bipartisan basis. It has not yet been filed, but it is virtually identical to Senator HOEVEN's bill, which we are discussing today.

But I did vote. I know my colleague from Wyoming and I know the Presiding Officer voted for Senator LANDRIEU's original bill. I did so because I think it is good policy to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. I committed at that hearing, and I certainly commit now, that I am going to do everything I can to help advance this initiative. If and when her bill is placed on the calendar, I intend to support that as well.

But the problem that we have—and it should be no surprise to most—is no matter how many Keystone bills are added to the calendar, it appears that the majority leader is going to ignore them. It doesn't matter how long Keystone has been under review, it doesn't matter how many new jobs will be created, and it doesn't matter that the delays are political and not substantive.

The fact of the matter is we cannot get to that point where we can take up this important initiative. The majority leader could have offered us a vote on Senator HOEVEN's bill at any point over these past 6 weeks, but he has chosen not to.

It seems very clear to me that he has no intention of moving to it, especially if we just kind of sit back on this and don't push. It may be that is the will of some in this body—that they don't want us to do anything, they don't want us to push forward. But I think that is contrary to the will, to the wish of 56 Members of this Chamber, and it is contrary to our national interests.

It is interesting to note Democrats were not always opposed to importing crude oil from Canada, as they would appear today. Back in 1970 the Nixon administration announced that it would place a quota on Canadian oil imports, and it was none other than Senator Ted Kennedy who led the fight against this decision.

Senator Kennedy said in a Senate hearing in March of 1970:

> The reason why Canadian oil has never been restricted in the past is obvious. Canadian oil is as militarily and politically secure as our own and thus there can be no national security justification for limiting its importation.

Those were pretty telling words back then, and I think they still hold true today. It wasn't only Ted Kennedy. There were other Democrats who opposed the Nixon administration's restriction on trade with Canada: Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin and Senator McIntyre of New Hampshire.

I think we have had such an opportunity on this floor to debate the merits of the Keystone XL Pipeline and to debate not only how many good-paying jobs it can bring to us but how it can help this Nation and Canada as we work to promote our North American energy independence.

Our energy partnership with Canada has taken decades to develop. It has had some rocky times, but all good and worthy relationships take a little bit of work to maintain.

So if the Obama administration is unwilling to do the hard work of diplomacy and make this remarkably easy decision—approving a job-creating and a security-enhancing pipeline—then I think it is time for Congress to act. That is why a few of us have gathered here today to move this issue forward, to do more than just talking about it, but to get the Senate to the point where we might actually have an opportunity to vote on it and do some good for this country.

So we are sitting here waiting. We have an opportunity to do it, and I think we should end the delay. I think we should move forward with this bill.

Mr. BARRASSO. I agree, Mr. President. Just think about what happened last week. Extremists from the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, a terrorist group, attacked the largest oil refinery in Iraq. This terrorist group was actually kicked out of Al Qaeda for being too extreme.

It is a striking reminder to all of us—all of us in this Chamber and all of us in this Nation—how important it is for the United States to take swift action to increase energy production here in North America. Energy security is key.

President Obama essentially conceded the point last week during a press conference when he announced he was sending troops back into Iraq. He was asked what Iraq's civil war is in terms of national security interests to the United States, and he gave a couple of reasons:

> Obviously issues like energy and global energy markets continue to be important.

Despite the urgency, the President refuses to take steps to reduce the effect that Iraq's oil can have on American national security in the future. The President admits energy is a national security interest but he refuses to do anything about it that is meaningful.

What do the President and the administration think should happen? The President was asked a week or so ago, as a result of a huge spike in oil prices per barrel of oil as a result of what was happening with ISIS in the Middle East: What about all of this?

He said he was concerned, but he said: The gulf should pick up the slack and produce more oil. Not North America, not the United States. The gulf. He was talking about the Persian Gulf should pick up the slack.

Vice President BIDEN put out a plan last week to support energy production—but not in the United States, in the Caribbean.

America shouldn't be asking for more energy from the Caribbean or the Persian Gulf. We should be producing more energy on our own, in our own gulf coast, offshore, on Federal lands, in Alaska.

That is why last week the Energy and Natural Resources Committee passed legislation approving construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. The bill passed the committee. The ranking member said there was bipartisan support. Even Democrats voted for it. That bill would send oil from Canada into States such as North Dakota. The Senator from North Dakota is here on the floor. It will send oil from Canada and North Dakota to refiners in Texas and Louisiana.

Last week Democrats in the committee voted for this bill and talked about how important it is. The Keystone XL Pipeline application has been pending for more than 5 years. The State Department has done five environmental reviews of the project. All five have found the Keystone XL Pipeline will cause no significant environmental impact. We should not delay this project any longer. Democrats should push their party leaders to vote on this bill.

I am disappointed—I know my colleagues are—that Senate Democrats up to this point have chosen to block this important bill. I think it is outrageous the way a small group of Democrats refuse even to consider having a debate on this vital measure—energy security for our country, energy at home.

America needs the jobs. We need the energy. According to the U.S. State Department, this bill would support thousands and thousands of jobs. Energy is a national security issue for the United States, and this bill would help produce energy here in North America—not what the President said, where they will pick up the slack in the Persian Gulf.

The bill is on the calendar right now. The Democratic majority leader can bring it up for a vote, and we are going to ask him to do so today. The Chair of the Energy Committee should call on the majority leader and demand that he act on the bill.

We are here in the Senate and we get elected to the Senate to vote. The Keystone XL Pipeline is important. This bill is important. Democrats who want to vote against it can make their arguments and cast their vote.

So I turn to my friend and colleague, the Senator from North Dakota—a Senator who has been an incredible leader, a former Governor of his State, a Senator who knows the issue well, who knows the value of American energy—U.S. energy, North American energy—the impact on jobs, the impact on the economy, the impact of energy as a geopolitical weapon in what is happening around the world.

I ask my friend and colleague from North Dakota if he thinks there is any reason whatsoever to delay action on this bill or if we should move ahead.

I see the Senator from Oklahoma has also joined us. So there are obviously significant and growing voices coming to the floor to say it is time to vote now, not additional delay, not additional studies, not additional talk. It is time to vote.

I turn to my friend and colleague from North Dakota, the former Governor of North Dakota—I think the longest serving Governor in the history of the State—for his impression of why it is time to vote today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the esteemed Senator from Wyoming not only for being here today to talk about this important issue but for his tremendous leadership on energy issues.

Wyoming produces an incredible amount of energy for this country, and the Senator from Wyoming well knows that you not only have to produce that energy, you have to get it to market, and you need pipelines to move oil and gas to market. We move some by truck, some by train. But we can't move everything by truck and by train. We have to have pipelines, and that is what this is all about.

The Keystone XL Pipeline is the latest, greatest technology that is the most efficient and the safest way to move this product to market. It will actually result in less greenhouse gas than if we don't build the pipeline, as was determined by the administration's own environmental impact statement produced by the Department of State.

I have some additional comments I wish to make on this important issue, but first I would turn to the esteemed Senator from Oklahoma and ask that he provide some of his comments and insights from a State that produces an incredible amount of energy, and where actually hydraulic fracturing started in this country and has been done safely since I think the 1950s; somebody who understands not only that we have to produce energy so we can get to energy independence, but that we have to have the infrastructure to move that product safely to market.

With that, I turn to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and ask his thoughts on this important issue as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I do appreciate that. I might elaborate a little bit.

Oklahoma is not just the place where they first started hydraulic fracturing, it was done in Oklahoma in 1948, and, according to Lisa Jackson, who was the Obama-appointed EPA Director, never has there been a confirmed case of groundwater contamination.

I know we are getting strapped for time here and I regret that. I draw the Presiding Officer's attention to the chart I am holding up here.

It happens that Cushing, OK, is considered to be the crossroads of the pipelines throughout the United States. In Cushing, OK, we had I guess the only trip President Obama has ever made to Oklahoma. He came to Oklahoma. Looking in the background, there are all the tubes up there to dramatically make a statement. And that statement:

I'm directing my administration to cut through the red tape, break through the bureaucratic hurdles, and make this project a priority, to go ahead and get it done.

That is what the President said in Oklahoma. I wasn't there, but that is what he said. That is a direct quote. Then he did everything he could do to destroy the Keystone Pipeline.

He made the statement down there: I'm not going to do anything to create a problem for the southern leg that goes from Cushing down into Texas. Well, there is a reason for that. The reason is, he couldn't do it. The reason he is stopping up there, because it crosses the country line from Canada into the United States. He has some jurisdiction there. But there is nothing he could do to stop it. So he came down to tell us that he wasn't going to do that.

I have to say to the President: People in Oklahoma aren't that dumb. They know you didn't have that authority or you would have stopped it.

The portion between Canada and Cushing is the part that remains stalled. At this point I think the reason is one guy named Tom Steyer. Let me introduce him.

First, we always hear a lot of things about the Koch brothers and other people who are putting money in or are concerned about it. This actually is a statement made by this very wealthy person. I am sure he is a nice person. Tom Steyer is a multibillionaire. He is very liberal. He is from the State of California. He is a good friend of the junior Senator from California, and he has made the statement that he is going to put up $100 million to spend in campaigns of people who would do two things: one, try to resurrect the issue of global warming—which is dead. I can remember when global warming would be polled as the No. 1 or No. 2 problem in the country. Right now, according to last week's Gallup poll, it is No. 14 out of 15. So that is a dead issue.

But $100 million would do two things: first, to resurrect that issue; secondly, to stop the Keystone Pipeline.

A few weeks ago he said explicitly—and these are his words, not mine:

> It is true that we expect to be heavily involved in midterm elections. We are looking at a bunch of races. My guess is that we will end up being involved in eight or more races.

We just learned this week that as the President marks his 1-year anniversary of his climate action plan, Tom Steyer is going to meet personally with him. So there is $100 million at work right there, if that is what it takes for a meeting. And we all know what the cost would be.

This is very important. One thing that has not been refuted, way back in the beginning of the whole global warming thing they talked about the cost is going to be somewhere between $300 billion and $400 billion a year. The Wharton Economics Foundation, MIT, Charles Rivers, everyone agreed with that.

The Keystone Pipeline, which Tom Steyer wants to stop, would create 42,000 jobs, and tens of thousands more would be supported in the manufacturing sector. But Keystone is just the tip of the iceberg.

If we look at this chart, No. 3, we can see all of the domestic energy resources being developed around the country right now. We are going through a shale revolution in America, and the only thing that is getting in the way is the Federal Government.

This is interesting: In the last 6 years, oil production on private and State lands is up 61 percent. On Federal land, however, oil production is down 6 percent. Now how could that be?

This map shows throughout the United States—not all in the western part. Look at New York and Pennsylvania. This is where the development is coming from, all of it on State and private land, an increase in 5 years, 5½ years, of 61 percent. At the same time, on Federal land it is down by 6 percent.

The IFC International, a well-respected consulting firm, released a report last month which said U.S. companies would need to invest $641 billion of infrastructure over the next 20 years to keep up with the growing oil and gas production.

What does it mean for jobs? According to the analysis, the spending on these new pipelines alone will create 432,000 direct jobs. And that is based on a conservative estimate. That does not assume we develop all of the resources in our country. If that were included, it would be a lot more.

So keeping this from happening would be a great impact for imposing anti-energy, global warming policies. We need to build the Keystone Pipeline and provide regulatory certainty for the entire energy infrastructure sector. Without it, we will never reach energy independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the colloquy has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. How much time is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 33 minutes remaining on the Republican side. But the question of the colloquy time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent I be given 4 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. What time do we have the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 4:30.

Mrs. BOXER. That is the reason we were very careful with the time. And we gave my good friends—and they are my good friends—a lot of extra time.

I will allow the Senator to proceed for 1 minute. But after that, we need equal time on this. So I give 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator asked for 4 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for 1 minute.

Mr. INHOFE. If I could ask my friend if we could compromise: 2 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Let me think it over. OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate my good friend from California thinking it over.

Anyway, 432,000 direct jobs. And when we stop and think about it, keeping it from happening would have the impact and effect of stopping us from becoming oil independent. We could do that.

The Keystone Pipeline needs to be built. We all know about the jobs. More importantly, there is not a single good reason why it shouldn't happen.

Tom Steyer's goal is to stop the oil in Canada from being developed, but he can't do it. We have seen this just in the last week. The Canadians have conversations going with China to have them accept it if we don't complete our Keystone Pipeline.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2280

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar No. 371, S. 2280, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline; that there will be up to 4 hours of debate and that the Senate then proceed to vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I wish to explain how I come to my conclusion at the end by saying a couple of things.

I see that my dear friend—and these are all my friends whom I particularly enjoy working with—I say to my friend from Oklahoma, he said Tom Steyer is from California. This is correct. So is Justice Kennedy, and so is Richard Nixon, who signed the Clean Air Act. Richard Nixon signed the Clean Air Act, and I was a cosponsor of that act. And Republican Herbert Walker Bush signed the Clear Air Act Amendments.

Mr. INHOFE. Would the Senator yield to that point, because I was a cosponsor of that act.

Mrs. BOXER. I will not yield.

The fact is that Republican objections to controlling carbon pollution took that all the way to the Supreme Court.

Another thing on which I need to correct the record is my friend Senator BARRASSO talked about our President as if our President doesn't care about our being energy self-sufficient. The United States is producing more oil at home than it is buying from the rest of the world for the first time in nearly two decades. Let me repeat that. The United States is producing more oil at home than it is buying from the rest of the world for the first time in nearly two decades. And PolitiFact marked that as true and accurate.

I want to say to my friend who has left the floor, Senator MURKOWSKI—another good friend of mine—we offered a vote on Keystone as part of Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN's bill on energy efficiency, and we said we would treat it the way MITCH MCCONNELL recommends treating controversial amendments. We offered a 60-vote threshold. Now they come to the floor decrying the fact that we didn't offer a vote, but we did.

Here is the point: Whenever America considers building a major infrastructure project, we make sure there is a process in place, and we have done that since 1968. It is a well-established process, and that process was updated by George W. Bush in 2004. So this unanimous consent request that would approve the pipeline would bypass the entire process we have set up in this country for these kinds of major infrastructure projects that has been in place since 1968.

We need to know whether the building of this pipeline is in the national interest, and it is critical that the process not be circumvented because there are major issues on behalf of America's families. Frankly, the request that is before us would cut short the process that protects our families. So rhetorically I ask, why would anyone want to do that? They talk about a lot of jobs. That is in great dispute. The permanent jobs are like 35. So let's be clear. It is about other things. It is about special interests. That is what it is about. There is a lot of money that follows this pipeline.

Now I want to talk about the human health impacts. Tar sands is one of the filthiest kinds of oil on the planet—filthy dirty oil. That is why Senator WHITEHOUSE and I called on the State Department to conduct a comprehensive health impact study—because the pipeline itself is one thing; it is the type of oil that is going through the pipeline, this dirty, filthy tar sands oil.

If you don't believe me, ask our health professionals. A Gallup Poll found 12 years in a row that the most trusted profession is America's nurses. National Nurses United—the Nation's largest professional association of registered nurses, with 185,000 nurses—also called for a health impact study of Keystone because we know if this pipeline is built, immediately we will see a 45-percent increase in the tar sands coming in. Eventually we will see a 300-percent increase in the filthiest, dirtiest of oils coming into our country. We also know this oil has higher levels of dangerous oil pollutants and carcinogens because we documented that in our own country where they burn tar sands oil.

Mr. INHOFE. A parliamentary inquiry, I ask of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. INHOFE. Our point is, I believe the distinguished Senator from California is reserving the right to object. I would ask her does she object.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, may I complete my remarks before I make a decision on the pending request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. A further parliamentary inquiry: Is the time unlimited to finish remarks before objecting or not objecting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A reservation for the right to object occurs at the suffering of other Senators.

Mrs. BOXER. I didn't understand what the Chair said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no right to reserve the right to object.

Mrs. BOXER. All right. Then I would ask unanimous consent that I complete my remarks—the other side had many minutes—and then object.

And I would also ask the Chair, do we not have time on our side at this point in the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does, but there is a unanimous consent request pending.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. Well, just to allay my friend's concern and his excitement about whether or not I will object, I will absolutely object. I do object because we know that misery——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Misery follows the tar stands from extraction, to transportation, to refining, to waste storage.

We are going to show you some pictures, folks, in case you don't know what it looks like when you refine this oil. We are going to show you photos from Port Arthur, TX.

This is what it looks like. There is a playground where this filthy, dirty stuff is burned. This is not a good place to be. We had people at a press conference with the nurses from Port Arthur, TX, and they brought us these pictures and said this is what it is like when they burn the tar sands.

Now let's talk about the types of cancers that are linked to these toxic chemicals, including leukemia, non-Hodgkin lymphoma.

Why would anyone want to short-circuit a process? Just because the oil companies want it? We have to think about our people. Tar sands oil from the Keystone Pipeline will flow to our gulf refineries, increasing this toxic air pollution that already plagues communities such as Port Arthur, TX. I ask you to meet with some of those kids, meet with some of their parents, meet with some of those health professionals, and they will tell you the asthma rates that are happening, the respiratory illnesses, the skin irritations, the cancer. All they talk about is the pipeline. What about what flows through it? What about the toxins that get burned into our air?

We know a pipeline does burst. We know a pipeline does burst. We have seen many of those incidents, and we know one did burst with tar sands oil in Kalamazoo, MI. They still haven't cleaned up the river—3 years, they still haven't cleaned it up. And we know that the pipeline goes through communities and environmentally sensitive areas in six States.

Why would my friends want to bypass a process that is going to look at the potential damage to the health of our citizens, to the safety of our drinking water, and the effect on kids and asthma and cancer?

And let's not forget the tar sands waste, by the way. Here is a picture of that, in case my friends don't know what it looks like. This is called petcoke, petroleum coke. Already, because we have increased tar sands importation, it is lining up around our cities—in Chicago, in Detroit—massive open piles of tar sands, waste products known as petcoke, billowing black clouds containing heavy metals. There was a story that was told to our committee. Children playing baseball have been forced off the field to seek cover from the clouds of black dust that pelt homes and cars.

So you have problems when you extract, you have problems when you transport, you have problems when you refine, and you have problems when you store the waste. Why do my colleagues want to bypass a process that has been put in place since 1968 so we can look at the impact on our people? Petcoke dust is particulate matter. It is among the most harmful of all air pollutants. When inhaled, these particles can increase the number and severity of asthma attacks, cause or aggravate bronchitis and other lung diseases, and reduce the body's ability to fight infections.

Do you know the Federal Government has said that asthma is a national epidemic? I am quoting. It affects 1 of every 12 people or 26 million Americans. I know if I asked people in this Chamber—which I cannot do because it is against the rules of the Senate—to raise their hands if they have asthma or they know someone who has asthma, I guarantee half of the people in the room would raise their hands.

We don't need more asthma. We have a very important system in place to look at the effects of tar sands oil, and I don't think we should be pushing this project forward. Exposing Americans to pollutants linked to cancer and respiratory illness is not in the national interest.

Lastly I want to talk about the climate change impacts. For those people who are listening to the news, they must be surprised to see how many former Republican Environmental Protection Agency officials have come out and said to their colleagues who are here now: Wake up. Climate change is here, it is real, and human activity is adding to it.

The planet is in trouble. Tar sands oil has at least 17 percent more carbon pollution than domestic oil. The State Department concluded even in their flawed study that the annual carbon pollution from just the daily operation of the pipeline, should it be built, will be the equivalent of adding 300,000 new cars on our roads.

So why do we want to short-circuit a process which has been in place since 1968 and which was then renewed by George W. Bush in 2004 to protect our people from just this kind of a project?

If you walk up to an average American and say ''Should we build the Keystone Pipeline?'' they will say ''Pipeline? A pipeline is a pipeline.'' But when you explain the kind of oil you are putting through the pipeline, that is a different situation because this is the filthiest, dirtiest oil—more carbon intensive. The oil is linked to all kinds of illness.

I stood next to people from Canada, doctors who were so glad I was raising these issues. Even the newspapers in Alberta have called for a much better study on health impact.

So outside of this Chamber more and more Republicans are coming out in support of doing something serious about climate change.

My friend showed a picture of Tom Steyer. Let me thank him from the bottom of my heart. This is someone who is a very successful businessperson who realized he has to step up to the plate and preserve the planet for his kids and his grandkids. Thank you, Tom Steyer.

Just last week four former Republican EPA Administrators who served under Presidents Nixon, Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, and George W. Bush spoke out on the need to address climate change.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE, my subcommittee chair on the committee, who called these four incredible—it was an iconic moment, frankly. Let's see if I remember them all. There was Ruckelshaus, who started off with Nixon. There was Christie Todd Whitman, who worked for George W. Bush. There was William Reilly, who worked for George Herbert Walker Bush. Then there was Mr. Thomas, who worked for Ronald Reagan—Ronald Reagan. There they sat, and there they spoke, and there they said very clearly: Wake up, Republicans. This is a serious matter.

Now today a bipartisan group of former Treasury Secretaries released a report showing that the U.S. economy is already feeling the negative financial impacts of climate change. These respected leaders say climate change is real and we must act.

So why would we want to short-circuit a critical review process when approval of the Keystone Pipeline would be a major step in the wrong direction? It is the equivalent of 300,000 cars added back on our roads after we struggled so hard to clean up carbon pollution.

Another concern that remains to be addressed is the Keystone Pipeline's impact on national security. I met with a former SEAL Team 6 leader, and he was involved in the assessment of the Keystone tar sands pipeline and the risk of that pipeline becoming a high-profile target vulnerable to attack. They concluded it absolutely was a high-profile target, and it would be vulnerable to an attack that could trigger a catastrophic tar sand spill.

As I said, the last tar sand spill 3 years ago in Michigan has still not been cleaned up. This stuff is filthy, dirty oil—the dirtiest. Why on Earth would we want to see an eventual 300-percent increase in the importation? The nurses don't want it and the public health doctors don't want it. They came to the press conference with us. We cannot afford to take a shortcut in the Keystone tar sands pipeline review project when so much is at stake—the health of our communities and the impact on climate change.

Finally, I have a picture that I show a lot these days, and it is a picture of what it looks like when you throw the environment under the bus. This is a picture of a province in China where the people walk out with masks over their faces because everybody says: Who cares? We can just do anything we want. Who cares?

I recently went to China. Over the course of 2 weeks, I never saw the Sun. I did not see the Sun. On one day when we had a little bit of Sun peeking through—I mean barely at all—the people there got so excited. The people who work in our embassy there get hazardous duty pay because it is so dangerous for their families. They can't go out and breathe the air because they can get sick.

We can have economic growth and a clean environment. You know why? We did it in the 1970s when everybody objected to the Clean Air Act. You should have seen the folks come to the Senate floor. You should have heard the Chamber of Commerce railing against the Clean Air Act. You know what happened since then? Tens of millions of jobs have been created. The air is clean. Thousands and millions of lives over time have been saved. Heart attacks, asthma attacks, and cancer have reduced. We can quantify it.

When colleagues come here and try to do something to bypass a procedure to protect human health and the environment, you can count on me standing right here. I am proud to do it.

I can report that California—under the great leadership of our Governor Jerry Brown—is moving to clean energy. We are moving to thousands and millions of new jobs. We have added more jobs over the last couple of reporting periods than any other State. We are balancing our budget. We have a surplus because we are moving to energy efficiency, and that means people are going to work.

I understand that my friend from New Hampshire is interested in making a few remarks, so at this time I wish to say to my Republican friends that it is with great respect and friendship, truly, that we see the world differently, and that is OK. That is what makes this the greatest country on Earth. We can come here and speak out.

I wish to say to the American people today that this rush to build the pipeline before the process is completed is dangerous to the health of people and to the health of the planet and to the importance of our national security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from California giving me an opportunity to respond.

As those of us on the floor probably remember, several weeks ago we were talking about trying to address the Energy Efficiency and Industrial Competitiveness Act, also known as Shaheen-Portman, an effort that Senator PORTMAN and I had worked on for 3½ years to try and put in place a comprehensive energy efficiency strategy for this country. The bill has no mandates in it and no new spending. It has the support of over 260 groups—everybody from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the National Association of Manufacturers to the NRDC to several trade unions, companies from Johnson Controls to Honeywell, the American Chemistry Council. It has the support of a broad coalition of people.

According to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, if the legislation of Senator PORTMAN and myself were to pass this year, by 2030 it would help create 192,000 jobs, save consumers $16.2 billion a year, and it would be the equivalent of taking 22 million cars off the road.

As part of that discussion, we actually had what we thought was an agreement to have a vote on Shaheen-Portman on a date certain that would have a 60-vote threshold and also have another vote on the Keystone Pipeline on a date certain. All the Senators would know when the vote would take place, and again it would have a 60-vote threshold. Sadly, some of the sponsors of that legislation who worked with us to try and get a bill put forward refused to vote to consider the bill, and it went down. It is unfortunate because we could have had a vote on the Keystone Pipeline at that time. It was an agreement I thought we had all agreed made sense.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2262

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2262, the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill; that the motion to commit be withdrawn; that amendment Nos. 3023 and 3025 be withdrawn; that the pending substitute amendment be agreed to; that there be no other amendments, points of order, or motions in order to the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that there be up to 4 hours of debate on the bill equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; that the bill be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that if the bill is passed, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 371, S. 2280, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, but no later than Thursday, July 17, 2014; that there be no amendments, points of order, or motions in order to the bill other than budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; that there be up to 4 hours of debate on the bill equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill; finally, that the bill be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I do reserve the right to object. I have listened carefully to my very good friend from California, and it affects my decision as to whether to object.

The reason the American people are no longer interested in all the hype and all the world coming to an end on global warming is for four reasons. No. 1, according to the IPCC—let's keep in mind, the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is the science that is behind this opinion. They even admit today that there has been no warming in the last 14 years. This is not just a report from the IPCC but Nature magazine.

Mrs. BOXER. Parliamentary inquiry, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state the inquiry.

Mrs. BOXER. My understanding is the Senator is using the time of the Senators on this side of the aisle to make a speech before he objects. Am I correct? Is it our time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask that the Senator object, and then Senator SHAHEEN have the rest of the time because we are running out of time.

Mr. INHOFE. I am reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not have the right to reserve the right to object.

Mr. INHOFE. I recall that a few minutes ago, the distinguished Senator from California reserved the right to object and gave her reasons. Is that incorrect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time was under Democratic control at that time.

Mr. INHOFE. Very well. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I wish to say I am disappointed we can't move forward to address the concern on both voting on the Keystone Pipeline as well as the concern Senator PORTMAN and I have to consider the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill.

Shaheen-Portman is legislation that would go very far to address our energy needs. After all, energy efficiency is the first fuel. It is the cheapest, fastest way to deal with this country's energy needs. It has support from those people who believe in fossil fuels and from those people who support alternatives, such as wind and solar. It is something everybody benefits from, and it is something that would move us in a direction that would help address the pollution we are seeing—not just from carbon but from so many other pollutants that are being thrown into the air. It is a reasonable way to address both our concerns as well as the concerns of those people who support the Keystone Pipeline.

Let's have this vote—up or down—with a 60-vote threshold. I believe we have strong bipartisan support for Shaheen-Portman. We saw that in the motion to proceed when it got more than 70 votes here on the floor. We had strong bipartisan cosponsors on the legislation. I think we could have those votes now, everybody would be happy, and let the votes fall where they may.

I am disappointed to hear the objection. I hope we will have an opportunity to reconsider, and I hope we can all agree that there is a benefit to both sides of the aisle in voting on both of these issues in a way that gives the American people some idea of where we stand.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Happily.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I am obviously not as schooled in the procedures of the Senate, but I want to better understand what happened here. Obviously the Senator moved to bring forward a bill she and Senator PORTMAN worked tirelessly on, which is critical to jobs in America and to energy efficiency, while also agreeing to allow a number of amendments, which included an amendment this Senator would have loved a vote on, the Keystone Pipeline. Obviously I don't believe the Senator and I share the same opinion, but I think it is important to have a discussion about it.

With all of the discussion about how we are not moving legislation forward in the Senate, I am curious as to why someone would object to that consideration and moving that bill forward. It seems as though it is a reasonable and appropriate consequence.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I know my colleague from California wishes to answer, but I will say that I share the Senator's disappointment. I think this was a great opportunity for us to address both energy efficiency in the Shaheen-Portman legislation and to also get a vote on the Keystone Pipeline, which is something we discussed several weeks ago when the energy efficiency legislation came to the floor. I thought we had an agreement where we would vote on the bill and then separately vote on Keystone, and they would both have a 60-vote threshold. Sadly, some of those sponsors of the legislation didn't vote for it when the bill was filibustered, and so it did not pass. I am hopeful we can still bring it back. I am happy to bring it back in a way that allows us to have the same 60-vote threshold for a vote on the Keystone Pipeline.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I wish to say through the Chair, I spoke for quite a while on why I feel it is not good governance to come to the floor and ask unanimous consent to move to a bill and to short circuit a process that is in place and has been in place since 1968. The process was renewed by President George W. Bush to make sure when we build an American infrastructure project that it is safe, that it is in our national security interests, that public health is considered, and all the rest.

I have said all along on an amendment of controversy—I am ready to vote on the Keystone Pipeline, and I support Senator SHAHEEN and Senator PORTMAN's bill. What a great bill. What a win-win. Senator SHAHEEN is willing to take a 60-vote threshold for that, and those of us who worry about the pipeline are willing to vote with a 60-vote threshold. That is the way to go.

The minority leader, the Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL, said it over the years over and over. Whenever there is controversy, if people feel it is controversial, have a 60-vote threshold. He said that I don't know how many times, but I have the quotes. All of a sudden, when it comes to repealing President Obama's Climate Action Plan or Keystone, somehow that doesn't qualify as controversial from his point of view, but the thing about ''controversial'' is it is in the eye of the beholder. I don't think it is controversial to raise the minimum wage. It hasn't been raised in years, but my friends on the other side don't like it. They demand 60 votes. So we had a 60-vote threshold.

That is where we are, and that is why we are in this mess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I applaud the Senate today for voting on the confirmation of Leon Rodriguez to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS. This is a vital leadership position within the Department of Homeland Security, responsible for administering and processing asylum and refugee applications, immigration benefits, and naturalization and visa petitions, including the EB–5 Regional Center Program.

Mr. Rodriguez's confirmation comes at a critical time. Nearly 1 year after the Senate's historic vote on the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act, House Republicans have failed to pass comprehensive immigration reform, and have maintained a status quo that leaves our immigration system in tatters. We are now seeing the human cost of this inaction, as tens of thousands of young, unaccompanied alien children flood our Southwest border. Many of these children fled their homes to escape unimaginable violence, only to endure a harrowing journey and, once here, yet another humanitarian crisis. House Republicans must act to fix our broken immigration system, as we did in the Senate 1 year ago this week. Until then, our borders will be undermanned, our immigration courts overwhelmed, our economy will lag, and millions of people who have lived and worked in our country for years will be left in limbo.

Although he will face these extraordinary challenges, I am confident that Mr. Rodriguez will ably lead USCIS. He currently serves as the Director for the Office for Civil Rights at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. He previously served as the Deputy Assistant Attorney General and Chief of Staff for the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division. Prior to joining the administration, Mr. Rodriguez was the county attorney for Montgomery County, Maryland. Before that he was in private practice here in Washington. He has vast leadership and management experience, spanning both public and private practice, and often intersecting with issues of national origin and immigration status, making him extremely qualified to lead USCIS effectively.

Mr. Rodriguez understands the need for both a comprehensive and compassionate response to the humanitarian crisis facing children seeking refuge in our country. With parents who fled an oppressive regime in Cuba, and grandparents who fled anti-Semitism and poverty in Turkey and Poland before that, Mr. Rodriguez understands the challenges and remarkable potential of immigration, both for the immigrant and for our country. This process begins with the fair, swift adjudication of asylum, refugee, and visa petitions.

Mr. Rodriguez also understands how important the USCIS-administered EB–5 jobs program is to States like Vermont. This important economic program has transformed parts of our State, providing much-needed capital and creating jobs. I have spoken to Mr. Rodriguez about the challenges facing the program, including long application processing delays that have threatened to undermine important projects. He is committed to working with us in Congress to strengthen the program and make it permanent.

He has the strong support of law enforcement, including the Major Cities Chiefs Association, as well as a coalition of 37 Latino organizations from across the country. I too support Mr. Rodriguez. I was proud to advance his nomination through the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the Senate floor. He is uniquely suited to lead this important office, and I look forward to seeing the progress to come at USCIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security?

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rockefeller
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Landrieu	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Casey	Levin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—44

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Pryor
Johanns	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask that the Senate now resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 738.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF CHERYL ANN KRAUSE TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cheryl Ann Krause, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Cheryl Ann Krause, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher A. Coons, Jeff Merkley, Sherrod Brown, Tom Harkin, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Debbie Stabenow, Elizabeth Warren, Amy Klobuchar.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING BISHOP DON DIXON WILLIAMS

Mr. REID. Madam President, today I honor and recognize the career of Bishop Don diXon Williams, a member of the organization Bread for the World and the face of antihunger advocacy for over 25 years. At Bread for the World, Bishop Williams has been the national associate for African-American church engagement and a globally recognized advocate for the poorest among us.

During his tenure at Bread for the World, Bishop Williams traveled across the world confronting the problem of hunger both at home and abroad. Bishop Williams also served as a US delegate to the G8 summit, and he has traveled to Israel and Palestine to help engage Muslim, Jewish, and Christian leaders in discussions about peace.

In addition to his service for Bread for the World, Bishop Williams has been the consummate churchman. He was consecrated a bishop in 2007 for the United Church of Jesus Christ, and he has served in various capacities with other faith-based organizations throughout his career.

On behalf of the Senate, I commend Bishop Don diXon Williams on a lifetime of public service and wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased, although not surprised, with the latest news that Vermont's children rank as the healthiest. Recent data released by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shows that Vermont ranks at the top or near the top of the list on a variety of metrics, including a child's access to health care, and percentage of children who exercise regularly. We all know that healthy habits begin in childhood, and Vermont has worked for years to ensure that all Vermont children have access to healthy beginnings.

Vermont has long been a trailblazer on health care, particularly for children. Recognizing that access to health care for children and pregnant women is critical to a healthy society, Vermont created the Dr. Dynasaur Program in 1989 to help families who could not afford health insurance but could not qualify for Medicaid. The program was such a success, Governor Howard Dean expanded Dr. Dynasaur in 1991 to cover all children and teens. Governor Dean's success with the program and leadership on the issue paved the way for Congress to create the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Vermont has taken other steps as well to ensure all children can grow up healthy. In addition to having one of the lowest rates of uninsured children, Vermont has worked hard to give children access to healthy meals at school. Vermont brings local food into schools and teaches children about healthy eating through the Farm to School Program. And in order to make sure all children have access to school meals, Vermont gives those eligible for reduced-price lunches those meals for free. By working in a coordinated fashion across agencies and with advocacy groups, Vermont reaches out to children in need to help those families receive access to health care, nutrition assistance, and other vital safety net programs.

Unfortunately, there are still some troubling national trends related to children's health of which Vermont is not immune. Larger serving sizes and greater access to junk food combined with sedentary lifestyles have contributed to the steady rise in childhood obesity rates. Additionally, we are seeing a rise in the number of children living in poverty and without consistent access to nutritious food and health care. If we fail to reverse these trends, we are setting our children up for health problems that will last well into adulthood.

We must continue to support the efforts of our States and so many families who are trying to help their children make healthy choices. Instead of working to undermine the efforts we have made to ensure children can eat nutritious meals in school or to repeal the Affordable Care Act, or reducing eligibility in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Program or other nutrition programs, we should be working together to ensure all American children have the chance to succeed.

Vermont has shown tremendous leadership in this area, and I hope we can all learn from its model.

I ask unanimous consent that the following Washington Post article, ''Best state in America: Vermont, for its healthy kids,'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 21, 2014]

BEST STATE IN AMERICA: VERMONT, FOR ITS HEALTHY KIDS

A lifetime of good health starts in childhood. Health insurance, access to health care and regular exercise make for fit kids with long life expectancies. And nowhere in America are kids healthier than in Vermont.

Across a range of metrics, the Green Mountain State excels, according to the latest data collected by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Fewer than one in four Vermont children are overweight or obese. More than 81 percent have access to medical and dental care. Nearly 99 percent have health insurance. And one-third of all Vermont children report exercising at least 20 minutes a day.

Vermont's relatively small and prosperous population makes it easier than in some other states for officials to reach out to potentially vulnerable children, said Cathy Hess, managing director for coverage and access at the National Academy for State Health Policy. What's more, Vermont has been a pioneer in children's health reform.

The state's Dr. Dynasaur program, created in 1989, covered tens of thousands of low-income children long before the federal Children's Health Insurance Program came into being. Congressional authors modeled the federal program in part on Vermont's plan.

Vermont policymakers have also worked for years to build partnerships between public and private institutions to promote children's health. There's the Vermont Child Health Improvement Program, run through the University of Vermont; Children's Integrated Services, run through the state Department for Children and Families, which works to connect low-income families with young children to social services; and the Blueprint for Health, established in 2006 to improve health-care services and control costs.

''They're focusing on the child and the family, and not so much trying to fit the child in different bureaucratic holes,'' Hess said.

Other states can brag about their successes: Children in West Virginia, Missouri, Tennessee and Oklahoma report getting more exercise than their compatriots in Vermont. Kids in Utah and Colorado are less likely to be obese or overweight. And Hawaii and Massachusetts insure a greater proportion of their children.

States with higher percentages of low-income families tend to fall at the less healthy end of the spectrum, especially if those families are minorities with less access to health care. Nearly 40 percent of children in Louisiana and Mississippi are obese or overweight. Only 56 percent of children in Nevada and 59 percent in Idaho have access to medical and dental care. Just 18 percent of Utah children say they get 20 minutes of daily exercise.

Perhaps those states should study Vermont's model. The Green Mountain State is a lap ahead of the rest of the field.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LANCE CORPORAL ADAM WOLFF

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I have the sad task of paying tribute to a fellow Iowan who has given his life in service to his country. LCpl Adam Wolff was killed while supporting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. He was 25 years old. Adam was a native of Eldon, IA, and lived in Cedar Rapids. Eldon is home to the house depicted in Grant Wood's famous painting ''American Gothic,'' which has come to symbolize a certain indomitable American spirit. Certainly there can be no greater representation of the spirit of self-sacrifice that has preserved American liberty through the generations than patriots like Lance Corporal Wolff. We can never repay him for his sacrifice, but we as a country must remember him and all those who have given their lives in defense of freedom. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and friends who are feeling his loss very deeply, particularly his father Nicholas, his mother Deborah, and his siblings. We cannot begin to comprehend their loss, but they should know that Adam's service and sacrifice have earned the gratitude of an entire nation.

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER TWO RANDY L. BILLINGS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I wish to remember the life and sacrifice of a remarkable young man, Army CW2 Randy L. Billings. Randy died December 17, 2013, of injuries he sustained when his helicopter crashed in Zabul Province, Afghanistan, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Randy was born September 1, 1979, in Poteau, OK, and later moved to Heavener, OK. After graduating Heavener High School in 1997, he joined the military and served our country for 16 years.

While attending flight school to Rucker, AL, Randy met his wife Ashley. Bonding through a mutual enjoyment of the outdoors, they were married in 2008.

In September 2009, Randy transferred to the 3rd Assault Helicopter Battalion, 1st Aviation Regiment, 1st Combat Aviation Brigade, and 1st Infantry Division in Fort Riley, KS.

The couple made a home in Manhattan, KS, but they planned to move south after he retired from the military and start a family.

Ashley and her family are suffering their second loss to war. Ashley Billings' brother died in a 2004 helicopter crash in Iraq. ''It's much harder because we've been through this before,'' she said. However, they were comforted by the knowledge that Randy ''loved what he did and was going to do it right.''

On December 17, 2013, Randy tragically died of injuries he sustained when his Black Hawk U–60 helicopter crashed in southern Afghanistan. Five other soldiers on board were killed alongside of Randy.

His uncle Hurschel Billings said, ''He really loved it. Every time he came back, he couldn't wait to go back.'' He served two tours in Iraq and two in Afghanistan. ''He died loving what he does. Serving the country.''

''He was just one of the nicest people you could possibly be around . . . He was the definition of what a hero is. He served his country well,'' said Amanda Morrison, Billings' cousin.

A memorial service was held January 4, 2014, at Cornerstone Baptist Church in Inverness, FL, and he was buried at Florida National Cemetery. Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin ordered flags on State property to fly at half-staff from 3–6 January, 2014.

''He's pushed me to be a better person for myself every single day of my life,'' his wife Ashley said. ''That's the kind of person he was.''

Chief Warrant Officer Billings' wife Ashley Billings resides in Manhattan, KS; mother Eva Cooper in Poteau, OK; and father Robert Billings in Heavener, OK.

Today we remember Army CW2 Randy L. Billings, a young man who loved his family and country and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

COMMENDING TOM CARPER

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, on June 4, 2014, I was proud to participate with the National Energy Resource Organization in bestowing its Distinguished Service Award to Senator TOM CARPER.

NERO has, since 1978, recognized in a nonpartisan manner outstanding achievements in the energy field, particularly in the areas of public awareness regarding energy development, supply, and use.

Senator CARPER was recognized for his long career of honorable public service and his leadership. In the Senate, Senator CARPER has served as a senior member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and as one of the wisest supporters of nuclear power. Senator CARPER is the past chair of the Clean Air and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee. In that role he led the effort to pass the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act with Senator George Voinovich and conducted vigorous oversight of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It has been my privilege to work with him on this committee as his ranking member.

As we all know, Senator CARPER has been willing to work across the aisle on energy issues, and he is simply one of the best people we have in this body. He lives by the Golden Rule and sets the kind of example on a daily basis that we all admire and should seek to emulate. I wanted to share this good news with my colleagues.

COMMENDING JIM INHOFE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I was proud to participate on June 4, 2014, with the National Energy Resource Organization when it presented

its Distinguished Service Award to our colleague, Senator JIM INHOFE.

Since 1978, NERO has recognized in a nonpartisan manner outstanding achievements in the energy field, particularly in the areas of public awareness regarding energy development and use. In addition to working for 30 years in the private sector, JIM is the past mayor of Tulsa, U.S. Congressman, and has represented the State of Oklahoma in the U.S. Senate since 1994.

Senator INHOFE was recognized for his service as the lead Republican on the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee for 10 years, 4 of those years as its chairman. He has been a strong proponent of Oklahoma's energy resources and truly believes in an ''all of the above'' approach to American energy. Through his work on both of his committees, he has demonstrated that energy independence is not just an economic issue but a national security issue.

Senator INHOFE is well respected in the Senate on energy issues, and he has been in the forefront of every energy and environmental issue in the Senate for the last 20 years.

All of us know of Senator INHOFE's dedication to this Nation, his faith, and to a strong energy production. We also know of his giving spirit and his heart for Africa. We are amazed at all he accomplishes. Every day he gives his total and relentless effort towards making America a better place.

I wanted to share this good news with our colleagues.

FOREIGN DUMPING

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I wish to speak about the importance of a level playing field for Minnesotan miners and American steel. My State's iron ore mines and the thousands of Minnesota jobs they support are the backbone of the Iron Range. It started in the days when miners like my grandfather worked in the underground mines with picks and shovels and continues today in open-pit mines with giant electric shovels and haul trucks.

Through the generations, these Minnesotans have earned a reputation for possessing a strong work ethic. They have proven that our miners on the range can compete with anybody in the world on a level playing field. Unfortunately, that fairness is being compromised by foreign trading practices that are putting steelworker jobs in jeopardy.

The U.S. Department of Commerce is currently investigating the trading practices of countries that are dumping steel products in the U.S. market. This flood of foreign oil country tubular—OCTG—goods is causing our Nation's steel industry to lose sales and market to underpriced foreign competitors. An example is South Korea, which is the world's largest steel industry but has no domestic OCTG market. The result is Korean producers exporting more to the United States, creating a drop in the price of steel.

While the U.S. demand for OCTG products is increasing, American producers are not seeing the benefits. In fact, they are losing sales to foreign competitors, with imports of OCTG doubling since 2008 and increased by 61 percent this year compared to the previous year. This is already having an impact in American facilities with reduced hours and the threat of layoffs for workers.

Dumping of steel products has nationwide economic implications. The OCTG steel produced for the U.S. energy market accounts for approximately 10 percent of domestic steel production. U.S. OCTG producers directly employ nearly 8,000 workers across the country, and every one of those jobs in turn supports another 7 jobs in the supply chain. Here in Minnesota, where the steelmaking process begins, there are more than 10,000 high-quality, steel-related jobs.

That is why I recently joined 58 of my colleagues in sending a bipartisan letter to the Secretary of Commerce expressing concern at the antidumping investigation of OCTG imports from South Korea. The letter asks the administration to more closely examine these imports for any misrepresentations in origin and nature of the products and to take action against any unfair dumping practices.

We all know our industries need to be competitive—but they also need to be competing on fair terms. It is critical that our trade laws serve as the last line of defense for American companies and workers. I will continue fighting to ensure that we have a level playing field for this Minnesota industry vital to the economic prosperity of our State.

PENNSYLVANIA'S ACA MARKETPLACE

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I wish to speak about encouraging news from Pennsylvania. A June 17 article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette details how Pennsylvania's health insurance marketplace, established through the Affordable Care Act, is working as intended for enrollees. I would like to enter this article into the RECORD as evidence of how the Affordable Care Act is expanding access to health insurance, in Pennsylvania and throughout our Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, June 17, 2014]

PA. HEALTH MARKETPLACE 'WORKING' FOR ENROLLEES

68% HAD PREMIUMS OF $100 OR LESS: REPORT

(By Steve Twedt)

Pennsylvanians who selected midrange coverage ''silver'' plans in the new private health insurance marketplace created as part of the federal Affordable Care Act paid an average monthly premium of $60 with tax credits, according to a new report by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Overall for all four plans—bronze, silver, gold and platinum—68 percent of enrollees had premiums of $100 or less after factoring in tax credits and 47 percent found plans with premiums of $50 a month or less, the report said.

''What we're finding is that the marketplace is working for Pennsylvanians,'' said HHS Secretary Sylvia Burwell in a release. ''Consumers have more choices, and they're paying less for their premiums.''

More than 300,000 Pennsylvanians have signed up for a marketplace health plan since enrollment began Oct. 1. Nationally, the number of enrollees has surpassed 8 million who HHS says have collectively saved nearly $1.2 billion in premiums from what insurers had originally sought.

The exchanges are an integral part of the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, designed to give people, and particularly the uninsured, access to low-cost health insurance.

The tax credits for lower income enrollees are a major factor in plan affordability, as the HHS report said; Pennsylvanians who were eligible for tax credits saw their monthly premiums decrease by 74 percent, from $330 to $84.

Information about the tax credits, including eligibility requirements, can be found at the IRS website: www.irs.gov/uac/Newsroom/Questions-and-Answers-on-the-Premium-Tax-Credit.

LITTLE LEAGUE INTERNATIONAL ANNIVERSARY

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I wish to recognize Little League International on its 75th anniversary. Little League International was founded in Williamsport, PA, in 1939 by Carl Stotz as a means for area youth to learn the sport at a time when they were considered too young to play organized baseball. The basic goal of Little League was, and remains, to introduce children to a game that teaches its set of values, including courage, character and loyalty, that will guide them throughout their lives. Congress recognized the valuable role Little League has played in America's communities when it unanimously granted Little League a Federal charter on July 16, 1964. That charter was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson the very next day.

Over the course of its 75 years, Little League Baseball has become the world's largest organized youth sports program, growing from 3 teams in 1939 to nearly 200,000 teams located in all 50 States and more than 80 countries worldwide. Each year, more than 2.4 million children participate in Little League Baseball in various divisions, including baseball, softball, and a challenger division for physically and developmentally challenged children. Some notable Little League alumni include former U.S. President George W. Bush, two Vice Presidents, numerous U.S. Senators and Representatives, two Nobel Prize laureates, and a Medal of Honor recipient. Also, several professional athletes and Hall of Fame baseball players began their journey in Little League. In keeping with the tradition of our national pastime, thousands

of games are played throughout the summer months at various levels of competition. These events bring together children from the international community and foster principles that transcend cultural or regional differences.

Since the very first game was played on June 6, 1939, Little League International has made an invaluable contribution to the lives of millions of children across the globe. I wish Little League International all the best as it continues to grow and fulfill its mission by laying a strong foundation for today's youth.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRAULATING SOUTHEAST ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT

• Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to the hard work of the students and faculty of the Southeast Island School District, their local community members, and their Superintendent, Lauren Busch.

In response to high food costs, the school district sought funding and community support to build greenhouses for students at each of its four schools: Thorne Bay, Coffman Cove, Naukati, and Barry Stewart. Students and community members found funding, purchased and constructed greenhouses and are now using locally sourced biomass to heat them.

While building a few greenhouses may not sound like much to those in the lower 48, things are different in Alaska. High transportation costs, high energy costs, the lack of access to raw materials, and sometimes severe weather all combine to make for a high cost of living. This makes this districtwide greenhouse project a tremendous achievement.

A central part of my job is to explain how different Alaska is to my colleagues here and to help them understand these high costs our Alaska communities face. These are the central challenges of our State and, in one project, have been smartly and creatively addressed through the Southeast Island School District greenhouse program. In addition, the program also teaches students many other valuable skills, including entrepreneurship.

I am proud to congratulate these hard-working and resourceful Alaskans and I wish them continued success.•

VAN BUREN COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Van Buren County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $13 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is the success that the Van Buren County Hospital has had in securing funds for wellness activities and facilities expansions through programs I fought for as chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Among the highlights:

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This isn't just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like Bonaparte to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Van Buren County has earned $55,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Van Buren County has received $2,722,823 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Van Buren County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $144,729.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Van Buren County has received more than $5 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Van Buren County's fire departments have received over $2,000,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Van Buren County has recognized this important issue by securing more than $350,000 in grants for community wellness activities.

Disability Rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. However, I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I

have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Van Buren County, both those with and without disabilities, and they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Van Buren County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Van Buren County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

FLOYD COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Floyd County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Floyd County worth over $600,000 and successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $9 million to the local economy.

Of course, one of my favorite memories of working together is their work to combine several issues I care deeply about by renovating a former Carnegie Library to serve the community as the Charles City Art Center, and by making it accessible to people with disabilities.

Among the highlights:

Main Street Iowa: One of the greatest challenges we face—in Iowa and all across America—is preserving the character and vitality of our small towns and rural communities. This isn't just about economics. It is also about maintaining our identity as Iowans. Main Street Iowa helps preserve Iowa's heart and soul by providing funds to revitalize downtown business districts. This program has allowed towns like Charles City and Hampton to use that money to leverage other investments to jumpstart change and renewal. I am so pleased that Floyd County has earned $72,000 through this program. These grants build much more than buildings. They build up the spirit and morale of people in our small towns and local communities.

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Floyd County has received $538,648 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Floyd County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $55,000.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Floyd County has received over $2.8 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Floyd County has received more than $4.8 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Floyd County's fire departments have received over $500,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Floyd County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Floyd County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the

State and local level, including in Floyd County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

LAKE CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, today I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of the founding of Lake City, SD. In 1885, Marshall County separated from Day County and became a separate entity. A man named Stout bought the Lake City area land and divided it into lots to be sold to Lake City settlers. When the railroad came through in 1914, residents voted to split from Eden City and create the township of Lake City in Marshall County. This close-knit community will celebrate its centennial July 4–5, 2014.

Part of a resilient community, the residents of Lake City have overcome several large fires. The largest of these broke out in 1949 and quickly spread to the local pool hall and then throughout the town. After this, and every other fire, the people of Lake City came together and rebuilt their town.

On Friday night the celebration will kick off with a street dance. Festivities will continue the following day with a parade, team watermelon-eating contest, a tug-of-war competition, and many other fun-filled activities. That evening, another street dance will bring the event to a close.

Today, this small town in Marshall County symbolizes what it means to be a South Dakota community. I am proud to honor the successes of Lake City and to offer my congratulations to the residents of the town on this historic milestone.●

EDEN, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish recognize Eden, SD. The town of Eden will be celebrating its centennial on June 27–29, 2014. Eden will host centennial events which include a tractor and car show, school reunion, 5K color run, beard contest, fireworks, and a veteran recognition ceremony.

Located in Marshall County and founded in 1914, Eden was named by its residents based on its beautiful setting. Eden has long been known as a community with deep ties to South Dakota's agriculture economy. Since its beginning 100 years ago, the community of Eden continues to serve as a strong example of South Dakota values and traditions.

I offer my congratulations to the citizens of Eden on its centennial and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

LAKE CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Lake City, SD. The town of Lake City will be celebrating its centennial on July 4–5, 2014. Lake City will host centennial events which include a community history display, bake-off, line dancing, all-school gathering, various tournaments, and a parade.

Located in Marshall County, Lake City was founded in 1914. Lake City has long been known as the location for the annual Fort Sisseton Historical Festival, as well as being a community with deep ties to South Dakota's agriculture economy. Since its beginning 100 years ago, the community of Lake City continues to serve as a strong example of South Dakota values and traditions.

I offer my congratulations to the citizens of Lake City on its centennial and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

WIBAUX COUNTY, MONTANA

● Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I wish to recognize Wibaux County in eastern Montana on the occasion of its 100th birthday. Founded by bold pioneers at the turn of the century, Wibaux is living proof of the strength of the American prairie spirit.

The county was founded in August of 1914 by Pierre Wibaux, a Frenchman who left the family textile business to try to tame the Wild West. When those like Wibaux first settled in eastern Montana, they brought with them a strong work ethic. That resilience became apparent when Wibaux's W-Bar Ranch grew to cover 70,000 acres in Wibaux County. The lively community attracted Theodore Roosevelt, whose famed ranch was nearby across the North Dakota border.

Since its founding, Wibaux County has undergone many changes. Farmers have experienced agricultural booms, and the local schools are known statewide for academic and athletic excellence. The discovery of oil in the region as well as the recent introduction of hydraulic fracking have transformed the local economy and brought the county into the international spotlight. Through it all, the people who call the county home share the core values of service, honesty, and the willingness to help a neighbor in need.

Perhaps the greatest quality of the county is its kind citizens who are always willing to lend a hand to a neighbor. The residents of Wibaux County still exhibit the same generosity, diligence, and drive that Pierre Wibaux and other pioneers brought to the area 100 years ago.

I congratulate Wibaux County on 100 wonderful years. We look forward to the next century being as exciting as the last.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:40 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 316) to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 1044. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

S. 2086. An act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

The message further announced that the House passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 412. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4002. An act to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4092. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy as the lead Federal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local assistance provided to promote the energy retrofitting of schools.

H.R. 4801. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report on the impact of thermal insulation on both energy and water use for potable hot water.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 4:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 1044. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prayed with the United States on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

S. 2086. An act to address current emergency shortages of propane and other home heating fuels and to provide greater flexibility and information for Governors to address such emergencies in the future.

H.R. 316. An act to reinstate and transfer certain hydroelectric licenses and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 412. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of

the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4002. An act to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 4092. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy as the lead Federal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local assistance provided to promote the energy retrofitting of schools; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4801. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report on the impact of thermal insulation on both energy and water use for potable hot water; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–6201. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate'' (Docket No. AMS–FV–14–0002; FV14–932–1 FIR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6202. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of select reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–6203. A communication from the Chairman of the Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Appraisal Subcommittee's 2013 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6204. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Addition of Certain Persons to the Unverified List (UVL) and Making a Correction'' (RIN0694–AG20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6205. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update of Short Supply Export Controls: Unprocessed Western Red Cedar, Crude Oil, and Petroleum Products'' (RIN0694–AG06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–6206. A communication from the Acting Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Estimates of Natural Gas and Oil Reserves, Reserves Growth, and Undiscovered Resources in Federal and State Waters off the Coasts of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–6207. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ninety-Day Waiting Period'' ((RIN0938–AR77) (CMS–9952–F2)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6208. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Member, IRS Oversight Board within the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–6209. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Defense Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6210. A communication from the Acting Inspector General of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–6211. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1, 2014 through March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6212. A communication from the General Counsel, Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6213. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS–2014–0887); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–6214. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean'' (RIN0648–BD55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6215. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emergency Rule To Revise the Recreational Measures and Revise the 2014 Recreational Fishing Season for Red Snapper in the Gulf of Mexico'' (RIN0648–BE18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6216. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer'' (RIN0648–XD298) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6217. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2014 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting'' (RIN0648–BD75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6218. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; ODBA Draggin' on the Waccamaw, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Bucksport, SC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6219. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Drift Gillnet Fishery; Sperm Whale Interaction Restrictions'' (RIN0648–BD57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6220. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2013–2014 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Correction'' (RIN0648–BE14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6221. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Limited Commercial and Recreational Fishing Seasons for Red Snapper in Southern Atlantic States'' (RIN0648–XD307) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6222. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Alleghany River; Pittsburgh, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0157)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6223. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Monongahela River; Pittsburgh, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0231)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6224. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Morehead City, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0155)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6225. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone: Village West Marina 4th of July Fireworks Display, Fourteenmile Slough, Stockton, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0307)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6226. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Cincinnati Reds Fireworks Displays Ohio River, Mile 470.1–470.4; Cincinnati, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0080)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6227. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra Fireworks Displays Ohio River, Mile 460.9–461.3; Cincinnati, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0238)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6228. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone: Petaluma River Closure for Highway Widening, Petaluma River, Petaluma, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0311)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6229. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone: Vallejo 4th of July Fireworks, Mare Island Strait, Vallejo, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0394)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6230. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Pelican Island Causeway, Galveston Channel, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0063)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6231. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; West Pearl River, Pearl River, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2014–0197)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6232. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Terrebonne Bayou, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2014–1072)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6233. A communication from the Acting Deputy Chief Counsel (Regulations and Security Standards), Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustment of Passenger Civil Aviation Security Service Fee'' (RIN1652–AA68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–6234. A communication from the Deputy Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Control of Air Pollution From Motor Vehicles: Tier 3 Motor Vehicle Emission and Fuel Standards'' ((RIN2060–AQ86) (FRL No. 9906–86–OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–258. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to review and support H.R. 3930, the National Commission on the Structure of the Army Act of 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 69

Whereas, H.R. 3930 was introduced on January 27, 2014, and seeks to establish the National Commission on the Structure of the Army to undertake a comprehensive study of the structure of the Army; and

Whereas, the focus of this study is to determine two factors, which include the proper force mixture of the active component and reserve component, and how the structure should be modified to best fulfill mission requirements in a manner that is consistent with available resources; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 also directs the commission to give careful consideration in evaluating a structure that meets current and anticipated requirements of combat commands, achieves a cost-efficient balance between the regular and reserve components with particular focus on fully burdened and lifestyle costs of Army personnel, and ensures that the regular and reserve components possess the capacity needed to support homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 further provides for sufficient numbers of regular members of the Army to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the reserve components could be recruited; maintains a peacetime rotation force to support operational tempo goals of a ratio of one to two for regular members and a ratio of one to five for members of the reserve components; and further maximizes and appropriately balances affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and readiness; and

Whereas, H.R. 3930 further prohibits the use of any funds made available for the 2015 Fiscal Year for the Army to divest, retire, or transfer any aircraft of Army assigned units of the Army National Guard as of January 15, 2014, or to reduce personnel below the authorized end strength levels of three hundred fifty thousand members of the Army National Guard as of September 30, 2014: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to review and support H.R. 3930, which would, if enacted, be known as the National Commission on the Structure of the Army Act of 2014; and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–259. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to ensure proper expenditures and the restoration of the Gulf Coast for the benefit of all the citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 50

Whereas, on April 20, 2010, an explosion occurred on the mobile offshore drilling unit Deepwater Horizon which resulted in the fire that eventually sank the rig, killing eleven crewmen, and destroying Louisiana's delicate coast and industries that rely on the coast with an estimated 4.1 million barrels of oil released over an eighty-seven day period from the Macondo well five thousand feet below on the ocean bottom; and

Whereas, this incident has had a long-lasting impact on the state's natural resources, including land, water, fish, wildlife, fowl, and other biota, and likewise on the livelihoods of Louisiana's citizens living along the coast; and

Whereas, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act also known as the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. 1321, provides for administrative and civil penalties for parties responsible for unauthorized discharge of pollutants into United States waters as occurred during the Deepwater Horizon disaster; and

Whereas, these fines estimated between $5.4 billion and $21.1 billion would ordinarily be deposited into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund pursuant to the Clean Water Act; however, congress passed the Resources and Ecosystems Sustainability, Tourist Opportunities, and Revived Economies of the Gulf Coast States Act of 2012 (RESTORE) that requires eighty percent of the fines to be deposited into the Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund (trust fund) for restoration efforts in the five coastal states damaged by the spill: Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas; and

Whereas, the monies from the trust fund will be principally divided into three funding mechanisms, the Direct Component that evenly distributes thirty-five percent to the five affected states; the Comprehensive Plan Component that directs thirty percent to the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council to implement a comprehensive Gulf Coast wide recovery plan; and the Spill Impact Component that distributes thirty percent to the affected states based upon a formula calculated on the miles of coastline affected by the oil spill, distance from Deepwater Horizon, and the average 2010 population; and

Whereas, unfortunately, Louisiana has recent experience in administering restoration and recovery programs in the wake of disasters such as hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav, and Isaac and has learned the value of real-time audit practices in terms of ensuring proper expenditures, providing guidance to program administrators, and assuring transparency of decisions for the public; and

Whereas, auditing after the fact provides little assistance for parish and county governments with minimal resources to recoup

large sums in the case of improper expenditures; and

Whereas, the RESTORE Act provides for up to three percent for administrative costs; there remains uncertainty whether those funds are only for the cost of the United States Treasury Department administering the RESTORE Act and whether those funds can be utilized by state and local governments for real-time audits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary for the proper allocation of resources on the federal, state, and local level to fund real-time audit practices in developing, planning, constructing, and executing projects funded by the RESTORE Act's Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund to ensure proper expenditures and the restoration of the Gulf Coast for the benefit of all the citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–260. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them by enacting the Social Security Fairness Act of 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has enacted both the Government Pension Offset (GPO), reducing the spousal and survivor Social Security benefit, and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), reducing the earned Social Security benefit for any person who also receives a public pension benefit; and

Whereas, congress enacted these reduction provisions to provide a disincentive for public employees to receive two pensions; and

Whereas, the GPO negatively affects a spouse or survivor receiving a federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit who would also be entitled to a Social Security benefit earned by a spouse; and

Whereas, the GPO formula reduces the spousal or survivor Social Security benefit by two-thirds of the amount of the federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit received by the spouse or survivor, in many cases completely eliminating the Social Security benefit earned by the spouse even though the spouse paid Social Security taxes for many years; and

Whereas, the GPO often reduces spousal benefits so significantly it makes the difference between self-sufficiency and poverty; and

Whereas, the GPO has a harsh effect on thousands of citizens and undermines the original purpose of the Social Security dependent/survivor benefit; and

Whereas, the GPO negatively impacts over thirty thousand Louisianians; and

Whereas, the WEP applies to those persons who have earned federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefits, in addition to working in employment covered under Social Security and paying into the Social Security system; and

Whereas, the WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefit using an averaged indexed monthly earnings formula and may reduce Social Security benefits for affected persons by as much as one-half of the retirement benefit earned as a public servant in employment not covered under Social Security; and

Whereas, the WEP causes hardworking individuals to lose a significant portion of the Social Security benefits that they earn themselves; and

Whereas, the WEP negatively impacts over thirty thousand Louisianans; and

Whereas, in certain circumstances both the WEP and GPO can be applied to a qualifying survivor's benefit, each independently reducing the available benefit and in combination eliminating a large portion of the total Social Security benefit available to the survivor; and

Whereas, the calculation characteristics of the GPO and the WEP have a disproportionately negative effect on employees working in lower-wage government jobs, like policemen, firefighters, teachers, and state employees; and

Whereas, Louisiana is making every effort to improve the quality of life of its citizens and to encourage them to live here lifelong, yet the current GPO and WEP provisions compromise their quality of life; and

Whereas, individuals drastically affected by the GPO or WEP may have no choice but to return to work after retirement in order to make ends meet, but the income earned during this post-retirement employment may cause additional reductions to the Social Security benefits to which the individual is entitled; and

Whereas, retired individuals affected by both GPO and WEP have significantly less money to support their basic needs and sometimes must rely on government assistance programs to bridge the gap; and

Whereas, the GPO and the WEP penalize individuals who have dedicated their lives to public service by taking away benefits they have earned; and

Whereas, our nation should respect, not penalize, public servants; and

Whereas, the number of people affected by the GPO and WEP is growing daily as the baby boomers attain retirement age and advances in health care increase longevity; and

Whereas, the GPO and WEP are established in federal law, and repeal of the GPO and the WEP can only be enacted by congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them by enacting the Social Security Fairness Act of 2013 (S. 896 and H.R. 1795); and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–261. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 33

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has enacted both the Government Pension Offset (GPO), reducing the spousal and survivor Social Security benefit, and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), reducing the earned Social Security benefit for any person who also receives a public pension benefit; and

Whereas, the intent of congress in enacting the GPO and the WEP provisions was to address concerns that a public employee who had worked primarily in federal, state, or local government employment might receive a public pension in addition to the same Social Security benefit as a worker who has worked only in employment covered by Social Security throughout his career; and

Whereas, congress enacted these reduction provisions to provide a disincentive for public employees to receive two pensions; and

Whereas, the GPO negatively affects a spouse or survivor receiving a federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit who would also be entitled to a Social Security benefit earned by a spouse; and

Whereas, the GPO formula reduces the spousal or survivor Social Security benefit by two-thirds of the amount of the federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit received by the spouse or survivor, in many cases completely eliminating the Social Security benefit even though their spouses paid Social Security taxes for many years; and

Whereas, the GPO has a harsh effect on hundreds of thousands of citizens and undermines the original purpose of the Social Security dependent/survivor benefit; and

Whereas, according to the Social Security Administration, in 2013, at least 614,644 individuals nationally were affected by the GPO; and

Whereas, the WEP applies to those persons who have earned federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefits, in addition to working in employment covered under Social Security and paying into the Social Security system; and

Whereas, WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefit using an averaged indexed monthly earnings formula and may reduce Social Security benefits for affected persons by as much as one-half of the retirement benefit earned as a public servant in employment not covered under Social Security; and

Whereas, the WEP causes hardworking individuals to lose a significant portion of the Social Security benefits that they earn themselves; and

Whereas, according to the Social Security Administration, in 2013, at least 1,549,544 individuals nationally were affected by the WEP; and

Whereas, in certain circumstances both the WEP and GPO can be applied to a qualifying survivor's benefit, each independently reducing the available benefit and in combination eliminating a large portion of the total Social Security benefit available to the survivor; and

Whereas, because of the calculation characteristics of the GPO and the WEP, they have a disproportionately negative effect on employees working in lower-wage government jobs, like policemen, firefighters, teachers, and state employees; and

Whereas, Louisiana is making every effort to improve the quality of life of its citizens and to encourage them to live here lifelong, yet the current GPO and WEP provisions compromise their quality of life; and

Whereas, the number of people affected by GPO and WEP is growing every day as more and more people reach retirement age; and

Whereas, individuals drastically affected by the GPO or WEP may have no choice but to return to work after retirement in order to make ends meet, but the earnings accumulated during this return to work can further reduce the Social Security benefits the individual is entitled to; and

Whereas, the GPO and WEP are established in federal law, and repeal of the GPO and the WEP can only be enacted by congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall

Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–262. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana expressing sympathy in support of the families of victims of massacres and atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people in Azerbaijan and requesting that the President of the United States and the Congress exert all available influence on the government of Azerbaijan to cease the falsification of the historical facts and bring to justice those responsible in Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 166

Whereas, the Armenian populated area of Nagorno-Karabakh is located between the Republic of Armenia and the Republic of Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, in 1920 the Soviet Union forcibly established control over the areas of Armenia and Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union created the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast within Azerbaijan in 1923 and this region became a source of dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, in 1988, the Armenians in Nagorno-Karabakh peacefully demonstrated against Azerbaijan for the right of self-determination and individual freedom from repression and discrimination; and

Whereas, in February 1988, in the seaside town of Sumgait in Soviet Azerbaijan a pogrom targeted the Armenian population when mobs composed of largely ethnic Azerbaijans formed groups which attacked and killed hundreds of Armenians on the streets, in their apartments in a situation that was allowed to continue by Soviet and Azerbaijan officials for three days before government forces imposed a state of martial law and curfew bringing the crisis to an end; and

Whereas, the crimes committed against Armenians in Sumgait remain unpunished thereby opening the door for similar atrocities against the Armenian people starting in the capital Baku and spreading to other areas of Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh; and

Whereas, Azerbaijan seeks to avoid responsibility for the violence and atrocities by falsifying historical events and by portraying the involvement of Soviet troops to Baku to restore order on the seventh day of the Armenian atrocities as a crackdown on the alleged independence movement in Azerbaijan; and

Whereas, it is well known that there was no large scale movement for independence in Azerbaijan due to the fact in a March 1991, referendum that more than 94% of the Azerbaijan constituencies favored preserving the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, Azerbaijan continues to distort events of other atrocities, including the events in the village of Khojaly in which Azerbaijan troops fired on their own population and the deportation of Armenian villages in Nagorno-Karabakh: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby express sympathy in support of the families of victims of massacres and atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people in Azerbaijan; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate requests that the President of the United States and the Congress exert all available influence on the government of Azerbaijan to cease the falsification of the historical facts and bring to justice those in Azerbaijan who are responsible for the Armenian massacres in Sumgait, Baku, Kirovabad, Maragha, Nagomo-Karabahk, and of the citizens of Khojaly; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States of America, the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–263. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to raise awareness of human trafficking and sex trafficking to abolish this modern-day slavery and continue to aid Nigeria in the plight of finding the remaining two hundred seventy-six missing girls; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 138

Whereas, on April 14, 2014, three hundred twenty-nine girls were kidnapped from their school in Chibok, Nigeria, by dozens of gunmen who stormed the girls dormitories while they were sleeping; and

Whereas, in a region where only four percent of girls complete secondary schooling, the kidnapped girls were the best and the brightest; looking forward to bright futures as global leaders, teachers, or lawyers; and

Whereas, the girls were abducted by a radical Islamic group called Boko Haram, which in English, means ''Western education is sinful''; and

Whereas, on January 31, 2012, in testimony before United States Congress, the director of national intelligence, James Clapper, included Boko Haram in his worldwide threat assessment, stating, ''There are also fears that Boko Haram, elements of which have engaged al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghreb, is interested in hitting Western targets, such as the United States Embassy and hotels frequented by Westerners''; and

Whereas, the United States has offered a seven million dollar bounty for the group's elusive leader, Abubakar Shekau; and

Whereas, the Department of State designated Boko Haram as a Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013, recognizing the threat posed by the group's large-scale and indiscriminate attacks against civilians, including women and children; and

Whereas, fifty-three girls were able to escape and have described their experiences as extremely distressing; and

Whereas, concern is growing about the safety of those who are still missing; and

Whereas, Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan has accepted offers from the United States of military personnel, law enforcement officials, and other experts; and

Whereas Boko Haram's militant leader, Abubakar Shekau, released a video in which he expresses his abhorrence of Western education, saying that the girls should be married instead of being educated and further claims that he will sell the women as he has been commanded by Allah; and

Whereas, Abubakar Shekau referred to the girls as slaves and stated that he plans to kidnap more girls; and

Whereas, United Nations and the United States have both stressed an absolute prohibition against slavery and sexual slavery in international law, making these actions crimes against humanity; and

Whereas, the White House press secretary has said that appropriate action must be taken to locate and to free these young women before they are trafficked or killed; and

Whereas, Louisiana has taken a most aggressive stand to abolish and condemn slavery among women in Louisiana and worldwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to raise awareness of human trafficking and sex trafficking to abolish this modern-day slavery and continue to aid Nigeria in the plight of finding the remaining two hundred seventy-six missing girl; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–264. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 122

Whereas, the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act would allow Medicare to reimburse retail community pharmacies for delivery of diabetic testing supplies to Medicare recipients' homes; and

Whereas, seniors would be safe from entering hazardous circumstances, risking debilitating falls, or other comparable inconveniences to obtain diabetic testing supplies because of lack of supply delivery; and

Whereas, the cost of delivery of diabetic testing supplies may be equivalent regardless of whether they are delivered same-day by local pharmacies or through the mail; and

Whereas, the integrity of health care access to seniors in need of diabetic testing supply access would be increased; and

Whereas, in July 2013, the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act of 2013 was introduced as H.R. 2845 by United States Representative Peter Welch of Vermont, and

Whereas, in January 2014, Senator John Thune of South Dakota introduced the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act of 2014 as S. 1935; and

Whereas, the percentage of people diagnosed with diabetes from 1980–2011 for those aged sixty-five to seventy-four years increased one hundred forty percent, and one hundred twenty-five percent for those age seventy-five years and older, and the overall prevalence of diagnosed diabetes has risen sharply among all groups for which data is available; and

Whereas, community pharmacies play a pivotal role in affordable and accessible health care within rural and other underserved communities by providing delivery services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Diabetic Testing Supply Access Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–265. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 153

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, mental illness is defined as ''health conditions that are characterized by alterations in thinking, mood, or behavior (or some combination thereof) associated with distress and/or impaired function''; and

Whereas, approximately sixty-one million five hundred thousand Americans experience mental illness in a given year; and

Whereas, approximately thirteen million six hundred thousand Americans live with a serious mental illness such as schizophrenia, major depression, or bipolar disorder; and

Whereas, more than eleven million Americans have severe schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression; and

Whereas, one-half of all chronic mental illness begins by the age of fourteen; and

Whereas, fewer than one-third of adults and one-half of children with a diagnosed mental disorder receive mental health services in a given year; and

Whereas, individuals living with mental health challenges and their families soon discover that the illness affects many aspects of their lives and that they need more than medical help; and

Whereas, many loved ones are left feeling hopeless in receiving effective and appropriate treatment for their family members who suffer from mental illness; and

Whereas, there is a need to better allocate current resources to focus on the most effective services and most severe mental illnesses; and

Whereas, it is prudent to promote stronger interagency coordination, increase data collection on treatment outcomes, and raise efforts to drive evidence-based care; and

Whereas, Congressman Tim Murphy of Pennsylvania has introduced the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 as H.R. 3717; and

Whereas, the bill will create within the Department of Health and Human Services a new assistant secretary for mental health and substance-abuse disorders who would lead federal mental illness efforts, be responsible for promoting the medically oriented models of care adopted by the National Institute of Mental Health, and oversee the grant process while holding community centers accountable by ensuring they are meeting evidence-based standards; and

Whereas, H.R. 3717 would push states to efficiently allocate funds towards modernizing mental illness state laws and raise support for community mental health centers and hospital psychiatric care; and

Whereas, to address issues regarding the shortage of psychiatric professionals, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 would advance medical tools like telepsychiatry which links primary physicians in underserved areas to psychiatric professionals in order to decrease the average span of time between an initial episode of psychosis for a patient and his preliminary evaluation and treatment procedures; and

Whereas, H.R. 3717 would give physicians legal safe harbor to volunteer at understaffed mental health centers; and

Whereas, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013 will adjust the federal privacy law known as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, by allowing mental health professionals and families to share information about loved ones to promote more appropriate and effective treatment procedures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–266. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 or to take such actions as are necessary to require that places of public accommodation and commercial facilities be equipped with seating for persons who are unable to rise from a seated position without assistance; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 95

Whereas, Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12181) requires places of public accommodation and commercial facilities to be designed, constructed, and altered in compliance with the accessibility standards established by federal regulation; and

Whereas, as our population ages and our veterans return home from overseas, there is a growing population who are unable to rise from the seated position without physical hands-on assistance from others, including strangers; and

Whereas, the need to require assistance from others to complete the task of rising from a seated position robs persons of their independence and dignity; and

Whereas, if seating accommodations were to be equipped with raised arms or parts from which a person could push when rising then this would eliminate the need for persons to obtain assistance from others: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12181) or to take such actions as are necessary to require that places of public accommodation and commercial facilities be equipped with seating for persons who are unable to rise from a seated position without assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 2388. To take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–197).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Miranda A. A. Ballentine, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

*Laura Junor, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management).

*Gordon O. Tanner, of Alabama, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

*Debra S. Wada, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Colonel Julian D. Alford and ending with Colonel Joseph F. Shrader, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2014.

Navy nomination of Capt. Shane G. Gahagan, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Raquel C. Bono, to be Rear Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. John F. Thompson, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Mathias W. Winter, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Thomas W. Luscher, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Eric C. Young, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Keith M. Jones, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Janet R. Donovan, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Martha E. G. Herb and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) John F. Weigold, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Althea H. Coetzee and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Valerie K. Huegel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Captain Kevin C. Hayes and ending with Captain Matthew A. Zirkle, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Sean S. Buck and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Joseph E. Tofalo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Francis M. Beaudette and ending with Colonel Brian E. Winski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. David H. Berger, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General Daniel R. Ammerman and ending with Colonel Donna R. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Colonel Leela J. Gray)

Air Force nomination of Col. Warren H. Hurst, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Walter E. Carter, Jr., to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. William J. Bender, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General Bradley A. Becker and ending with Brigadier General Cedric T. Wins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Christine R. Berberick and ending with Deedra L. Zabokrtsky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Troy R. Harting, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of William E. Bundy, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of David V. Eastham, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Ralf C. Beilhardt and ending with Richard L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Michael P. Abel and ending with D001883, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 10, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Robert L. Boyles and ending with Tyler B. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Jeremy J. Bearss and ending with Jodi L. Nicklas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Norman W. Ayotte and ending with D005191, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Dawud A. A. Agbere and ending with Robert K. Walker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Denise K. Askew and ending with Bret G. Witt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Doreene R. Aguayo and ending with George J. Zeckler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Colin Campbell and ending with Jay T. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nomination of Joseph M. Acosta, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with John Bellissimo and ending with Randall J. Wroblewski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Daryl S. Borgquist and ending with John Filostrat, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nomination of David R. Storr, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Billy C. Young, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Mark J. Mouriski, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Phillip H. Burnside and ending with Eric M. Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert Dryman and ending with Jeri L. Oneill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy M. Baker and ending with John E. Sedlock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Chad E. Baker and ending with Chris F. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Scott W. Alexander and ending with James A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014.

Navy nomination of Roger F. Wilbur, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Todd A. Abrahamson and ending with David A. Youtt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy A. Barney and ending with Robert A. Wolf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Douglas S. Belvin and ending with Laura A. Schuessler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jerry L. Alexander, Jr. and ending with Jason L. Webb, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert L. Calhoun, Jr. and ending with Thaddeus O. Walker III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher J. Couch and ending with Nathan D. Schneider, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory S. Ireton and ending with Cynthia V. Morgan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles W. Brown and ending with Scott E. Norr, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey D. Buss and ending with Braulio Paiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael L. Baker and ending with Robert F. Ogden, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Nonito V. Blas and ending with David S. Warner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony T. Butera and ending with Miriam K. Smyth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Bryan E. Braswell and ending with Tyrone L. Ward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Reginald T. King and ending with Kevin L. Steck, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Addie Alkhas and ending with Patrick E. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey G. Ant and ending with Donna M. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul J. Brochu and ending with Gary D. West, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Bradley A. Appleman and ending with Joseph Romero, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey W. Bledsoe and ending with Susan A. Union, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Kristin Acquavella and ending with Jerome R. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher G. Adams and ending with Nicolas D. I. Yamodis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 20, 2014.

Navy nomination of Thor Martinsen, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Christopher S. Mayfield, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert Arias and ending with Bobby L. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Adam L. Albarado and ending with Eric D. Wyatt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Joshua J. Burkholder and ending with Jimmy J. Stork, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Adrian Z. Bejar and ending with Deborah B. Yusko, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles R. Allen and ending with Ricardo A. Trevino, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory R. Adams and ending with David R. Wilcox, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with David A. Benham and ending with James D. Stockman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey A. Brown and ending with Michael D. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffery A. Barrett and ending with Cecily E. Walsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher D. Addington and ending with Kurt A. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Keith Archibald and ending with Mckinnya J.

Williamsrobinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeremiah V. Adams and ending with Charles B. Zuhoski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Katherine E. Boyce and ending with Jon C. Watson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael S. Giles and ending with Marty E. Griffin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert H. Carpenter and ending with Joseph V. Sheldon III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with James F. Croom and ending with Todd L. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy K. Atmajian and ending with Rumei Yuan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Ramesh S. Durvasula and ending with Ben M. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Francis F. Derk and ending with Katherine T. Ormsbee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Thomas P. Belsky and ending with Jeffrey J. Truitt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

Navy nominations beginning with Julio C. Albornoz and ending with Eric L. Peterson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2014.

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Noah Bryson Mamet, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Argentine Republic.

Nominee: Noah Bryson Mamet.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Argentine Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $2,600, 03/24/2013, Ruiz, Raul; $1,000, –11/01/2012, Berkley, Shelley; $500, –11/01/2012, Donnelly, Joe; $500, 11/01/2012, McCaskill, Claire; $250, –11/01/2012, Brown, Sherrod; $250, –11/01/2012, Heitkamp, Heidi; $1,500, –10/29/2012, Tester, Jon; $250, –09/14/2012, Carmona, Richard; $250, –08/24/2012, Cherny, Andrei; $1,000, –07/30/2012, Voices for Progress PAC; $30,000, 07/16/2012, DNC (Obama Victory Fund); $250, –07/05/2012, Duckworth, Tammy; $250, –06/21/2012, Delaney, John; $500, –11/10/2011, Berman, Howard; $500, –06/04/2011, Kaine, Tim; $5,000, –06/02/2011, Obama, Barack (Obama Victory Fund); $30,800, 06/02/2011, DNC (Obama Victory Fund); $1,000, 05/09/2011, Landrieu, Mary; –$500, 05/02/2011, Gillibrand, Kirsten; $350, 11/01/2010, McAdams, Scott; $500, –10/31/2010, –DCCC; $500, –10/28/2010, –Conway, Jack; $250, –10/28/2010, –Markey, Betsy; $250, –10/28/2010, –McNerney, Jerry; $250, –10/28/2010, –Perriello, Tom; $250, –10/28/2010, –Sestak, Joe; $250, –10/28/2010, –Bennet, Michael; $250, –10/27/2010, –Giannoulias, Alexi; $250, –10/15/2010, –McNerney, Jerry; $250, –10/15/2010, –Conway, Jack; $250, –10/15/2010, –Sestak, Joe; $250, –10/15/2010, –McAdams, Scott; $250, –09/24/2010, –Coons, Chris; $500, –09/08/2010, –Reid, Harry (Reid Victory Fund); $250, 09/02/2010, Hall, John; $250, 07/27/2010, Hodes, Paul; $1,000, 04/29/2010 –Bennet, Michael; $1,000, 04/22/2010, Boxer, Barbara; $1,000, 04/22/2010, DNC; $200, 01/13/2010, Coakley, Martha; $250, 06/29/2009, Bennet, Michael.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: None.

4. Parents: Mildred Mamet (Mother): $30 10/08/2012, Obama Victory Fund; $30, 08/29/2012, Obama for America; $90, 07/09/2012, Obama for America; $30, 09/09/2010, Obama for America; $25, 10/20/2010, Obama for America.

5. Grandparents: –None.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sister: Lisa Mamet: $35, 2012, Obama for America.

---

*Mark William Lippert, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

Nominee: Mark William Lippert

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $0.00.

2. Spouse: Robin E. Lippert (Schmidch): $250.00, 6/13/13, Patrick J. Leahy; $282.41, 12/18/12, Earl ''Ben'' Nelson; $2,059.00, 6/30/11, United Health Grp PAC; $250.00, 6/30/10; Patrick J. Leahy; $300.00, 9/30/10, United Health Grp PAC.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: James W Lippert, Susan Lippert: $0.00.

5. Grandparents: N/A—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Amy Lippert: $0.00; Anne Lippert: $0.00; Brandon Collier (spouse): $0.00; Susan Collier (sister): $0.00.

---

*James D. Nealon, of New Hampshire, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras.

Nominee: James D. Nealon.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: Kristin F. Nealon: None.

3. Children and Spouses; Rory P. Nealon—son: None; Katherine G. Nealon—daughter: $50.00, 2008, Barack Obama; Maureen S. Nealon—daughter: None; Liam J. Nealon—son: None.

4. Parents: James D. Nealon—father: Deceased—2000; Barbara H. Nealon—mother: Deceased—1987.

5. Grandparents: George A. Nealon—grandfather: Deceased—1937; Loretta A. Ahearn—grandmother: Deceased—1973; William A. Holland—grandfather: Deceased—1935; Alice P. DeVaney—grandmother: Deceased—1994.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Robert M. Nealon—brother: $120.00, yearly, United Airlines Pilot Pac; Jean Marie Nealon—his wife: None; Thomas R. Nealon—brother: None; Doris Nealon—his wife: None; David E. Nealon—brother: None; Elizabeth Nealon—his wife: None; Patrick J. Nealon—brother: $300.00, yearly, Deloitte Political Action Committee; Susan B. Nealon—his wife: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Suzanne E. Nealon: None; Richard Rodriguez—her husband: None.

---

*Dana Shell Smith, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Qatar.

Nominee: Dana Shell Smith.

Post: Qatar.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: $55, 9-2012, Obama; $20, 7-2012, Obama.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: none.

4. Parents: William Shell, $1000, 4-2012, Romney; Susan Shell, $100, 4-2012, Obama.

5. Grandparents: none.

6. –Brothers and Spouses: Jeff Shell: $500, 10/26/2010, Alexi for Illinois; $200, 9/24/2010, Allen West for Congress; $1250, 11/10/2011, Ben Nelson 2012; $1150, 6/30/2009, Bennet for Colorado; $2400, 1/23/2010, Bennet for Colorado; $1250, 2/10/2009, Bennet for Colorado; $2400, 6/26/2009, Bob Casey for Senate Inc.; $1000, 6/28/2010, Boucher for Congress Committee; $1000, 6/17/2010, Boucher for Congress Committee; $250, 9/4/2010, Buck for Colorado; $500, 6/30/2010, Carney for Congress; $250, 3/9/2010,–Charlie Melancon Campaign Committee Inc.; $1000, 10/22/2010, Chris Coons for Delaware; $500, 1/1/2008, Chris Gregoire for Governor; $500, 2/21/2008, Citizens for Altmire; $2400, 6/30/2009, Citizens for Arlen Specter; $2400, 6/30/2009, Citizens for Arlen Specter; $1000, 10/11/2010, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; $500, 6/7/2010, Fisher for Ohio; $1000, 5/5/2009, Friends for Harry Reid; $1000, 6/30/2010, Friends for Harry Reid; $1000, 10/13/2010, Friends of Blanche Lincoln; $1250, 2/10/2009, Friends of Blanche Lincoln; $1000, 2/6/2008, Friends of Byron Dorgan; $2000, 3/31/2008, Friends of Max Baucus; $225, 9/10/2010, Friends of Sharron Angle; $1000, 3/4/2010, Gillibrand for Senate; $1000, 1/1/2008, Hagan for US Senate; $500, 6/10/2009, Hodes for Senate; $1000, 11/30/2009, Hoffman for Illinois; $750, 4/24/2008, Jeanne Shaheen for Senate; $500, 6/30/2010, Kathy Dahlkemper for Congress; $1500, 3/31/2012, Klobuchar for Minnesota 2012; $250, 3/23/2011, Klobuchar for Minnesota 2012; $2000, 5/10/2010, Leahy for U.S. Senator Committee; $500, 3/5/2008, Levin for Congress; $2400, 6/11/2010, Levin for Congress; $1500, 3/29/2012, McCaskill for Missouri 2012; $250, 3/23/2011, McCaskill for Missouri 2012; $1250, 1/9/2011, Montanans for Tester; $2000, 9/14/2008, Obama for America; $2500, 6/13/2011, Obama for America; $2500, 6/13/2011, Obama for America; $2300, 8/31/2008, Obama for America; $300, 11/3/2008, Obama for America; $1000, 10/4/2010, Onorato for Governor; $4000, 4/9/2010, Onorato for Governor; $2500, 3/15/2012, Patrick Murphy for Attorney General; $700, 4/2/2008, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $2300, 4/2/2008, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $1000, 9/29/2008, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $600, 10/21/2008, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $2400, 6/29/2009, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $1000, 12/22/2009, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $1400, 2/1/2010, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $500, 1/1/2008, Rob McCord for State Treasurer; $900, 6/

29/2009, Robin Carnahan for Senate; $2500, 6/1/2010, Shapiro for Congress; $1500, 1/1/2008, Shapiro for Congress; $1000, 2/5/2010, Trivedi for Congress; $1000, 6/30/2010, Trivedi for Congress; $1000, 10/7/2010, Trivedi for Congress; $750, 4/24/2008, Udall for Us All; $500, 6/23/2009, Wyden for Senate; $5000, 5/9/2011, Cable PAC; $15000, 6/1/2009, COMPAC—USA; $15000, 9/1/2010, COMPAC—USA; $15000, 1/25/2011, COMPAC—USA; $5000, 4/1/2008, COMPAC Federal; $5000, 6/11/2009, COMPAC Federal; $5000, 9/28/2010, COMPAC Federal; $5000, 1/31/2011, COMPAC Federal; $4600, 6/26/2008, DNC Services Corporation; $30800, 6/13/2011, DNC Services Corporation; $5000, 3/31/2012, DSCC; $3200, 9/29/2009, DSCC; $500, 3/14/2011, Minnesota & Missouri Victory Fund; $900, 6/17/2009, Missouri New Hampshire Victory Fund; $2500, 11/3/2011, Montana–Nebraska Victory Fund; $2000, 2/19/2008, NCTA; $2000, 3/20/2008, NCTA; $2000, 3/11/2009, NCTA; $2000, 3/3/2010, NCTA; $5000, 5/13/2011, NCTA; $2,500.00, 3/20/2013, Friends for Harry Reid; $1,000.00, 3/20/2013, The Markey Committee; $2,600.00, 10/2/2013, Mark Udall for Colorado; $2,600.00, 10/2/2013, Udall for All of Us; $32,400.00, 12/3/2013, DSCC—Democratic Senatoral Campaign Committee; $5,000.00, 12/12/2013, NCTA—National Cable & Telecommunications Association; $2,600.00, 3/27/2014, Mark Pryor for US Senate; $2,600.00, 3/27/2014, Alaskans for Begich. Laura Shell: $2400, 6/30/2009, Bennet for Colorado; $2400, 5/26/2010, Bennet for Colorado; $2400, 7/17/2010, Citizens for Arlen Specter; $2400, 6/30/2009, Citizens for Arlen Specter; $2400, 6/30/2009, Citizens for Arlen Specter; $1000, 1/8/2012, Gillibrand for Senate; $1000, 9/22/2008, Hagan Senate Committee Inc.; $2300, 8/31/2008, Obama for America; $200, 6/13/2011, Obama for America; $2500, 6/13/2011, Obama for America; $2300, 9/14/2011, Obama for America; $1200, 2/1/2010, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $2400, 2/1/2010, Patrick Murphy for Congress; $400, 8/25/2010, Sestak for Senate; $1000, 2/22/2008, The Bob Roggio for Congress Committe; $500, 4/21/2008, The Bob Rogglo for Congress Committee; $1000, 9/29/2008, The Bob Roggio for Congress Committee; $500, 3/25/2010, Trivedi for Congress; $1500, 6/30/2010, Trivedi for Congress; $900, 10/7/2010, Trivedi for Congress; $5000, 6/26/2008, DNC Services Corporation; $2700, 9/14/2011, DNC Services Corporation; $5000, 10/20/2010, Pennsylvania Democratic party; $250, 9/29/2008, Republican National Committee; $2,600.00, 10/9/2013, Alison for Kentucky.

7. Sisters and Spouses: none.

---

*Robert Stephen Beecroft, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class Of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Arab Republic of Egypt.

Nominee: Robert Stephen Beecroft.

Post: Cairo, Egypt.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Anne Tisdel Beecroft, none.

3. Children and Spouses; Blythe A. Beecroft, none; Robert Warren Beecroft, none; Sterling S. Beecroft, none; Grace A. Beecroft, none.

4. Parents: Robert L. Beecroft (Deceased), none; Emma Lou Beecroft, none.

5. Grandparents: Irl R. Beecroft (Deceased), none; Ruth V. Beecroft (Deceased), none; John E. Warren (Deceased), none; Emma Warren (Deceased), none.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Warren E. Beecroft: $100, May 2012, Romney; $100, June 2012, Romney; Frances Beecroft, none; Regan E. Beecroft, none; JoAn Stopa Beecroft, none; Collin J. Beecroft, $2,500, March 2012, Romney; Melinda K. Beecroft, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: –Robyn R. Ryskamp, None; Barry Ryskamp, none.

---

*Stuart E. Jones, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq.

Nominee: Stuart E. Jones.

Post: Iraq.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: 0.

2. Spouse: 0.

3. Children and Spouses: 0.

4. Parents: 0.

5. Grandparents: 0.

6. Brothers and Spouses: 0.

7. Sisters and Spouses: 0.

---

*Theodore G. Osius III, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Nominee: Theodore George Osius III.

Post: Vietnam.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:——

1. Self: $250, 2008, Obama for America; $450 (with spouse), 2012, Obama for America/Obama Victory Fund; $185, 2012, Mark Takano campaign; $200, 2014, Mark Takano campaign.

2. Spouse: Clayton A. Bond—no Federal contributions.

3. Children and Spouses: Theodore Alan Bond-Osius—none.

4. Parents: Nancy Osius Zimmerman: $305, 2008, –DNC, DCCC, and Obama for America; $515, 2009, –Democratic National Committee, DCCC, Al Franken; $440, 2010, Democratic National Committee, DCCC Kratovil for Congress; $305, 2011, Democratic National Committee, DCCC, Obama for America; $855, 2012, Obama for America, Elizabeth for Massachusetts, DCCC, Ben Cardin for Senate, Senate Democrats, DSCC; $754, 2013, Al Franken, DCCC, DSCC, Organizing for Action, House Democrats. Frederick Zimmerman—none.

5. Grandparents: deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Margaret E. Osius: $1000, 2009, Rick Lazio; $250, 2010, Rick Lazio; $100, 2011, Mitt Romney; $1500, 2012, Mitt Romney. Alison K. Osius and Michael Benge—none. Lucile L. Osius—none.

---

*Joan A. Polaschik, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.

Nominee: Joan A. Polaschik.

Post: Algeria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

3. Children and Spouses: none.

4. Parents: Marion W. Polaschik, none; John Polaschik (deceased).

5. Grandparents: Nellie Wassel (deceased); John Wassel (deceased); Mary Polaschik (deceased); John Polaschik, Sr. (deceased).

6. Brothers and Spouses: none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Anne M. Barcal, none; Keith B. Barcal, none.

*Karen Kornbluh, of New York, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

*Jonathan Nicholas Stivers, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

*Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2514. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2515. A bill to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries have the opportunity to receive care in a home and community-based setting; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TESTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WALSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REID, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 2516. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and

other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2517. A bill to prohibit bonuses to senior-level IRS executives until all Congressional requests for documents, including electronic communications, related to the investigation of IRS targeting of taxpayers are complete; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 2518. A bill to establish a grant program to incentivize States to implement comprehensive reforms and innovative strategies to significantly improve postsecondary outcomes for low-income and first generation college students, including increasing postsecondary enrollment and graduation rates, to reduce the need of postsecondary students for remedial education, to increase alignment of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education, and to promote innovation in postsecondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 2519. A bill to codify an existing operations center for cybersecurity; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2520. A bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 2521. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 2522. A bill to designate the James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway and the James L. Oberstar National Scenic Byway in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 2523. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2524. A bill to support access to career and technical education programs of study that provide students with education and training combining rigorous academics with technical curricula focused on specific high-skill, high-wage, high-demand and high-growth occupations and industries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. Res. 482. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the area between the intersections of International Drive, Northwest Van Ness Street, Northwest International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, should be designated as ''Liu Xiaobo Plaza''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. Res. 483. A resolution establishing a point of order against legislation selling Federal land in order to reduce the deficit; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 709

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

S. 1049

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to expedite access to certain Federal lands under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary for good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1091, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 1307

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, a bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1534

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1534, a bill to provide a framework establishing the rights, liabilities, and responsibilities of participants in closing procedures for certain types of consumer deposit accounts, to protect individual consumer rights, and for other purposes.

S. 1692

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1692, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 1799

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1799, a bill to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

S. 2141

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2141, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide an alternative process for review of safety and effectiveness of nonprescription sunscreen active ingredients and for other purposes.

S. 2188

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2188, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes.

S. 2472

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2472, a bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBT Peoples.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2496, a bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States.

S. 2502

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2502, a bill to establish in the United States Agency for International Development an entity to be known as the United States Global Development Lab, and for other purposes.

S. 2508

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2508, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries

in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, and for other purposes.

S. 2510

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2510, a bill to establish a temporary limitation on the use of funds to transfer or release individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

S. RES. 447

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 447, a resolution recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority in the efforts of the United States Government to promote democracy and good governance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2515. A bill to ensure that Medicaid beneficiaries have the opportunity to receive care in a home and community-based setting; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being on objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2515

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Community Integration Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Supreme Court's 1999 decision in Olmstead v. L.C., 527 U.S. 581 (1999), held that the unnecessary segregation of individuals with disabilities is a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(2) Under Olmstead, individuals generally have the right to receive their supports and services in home and community-based settings, rather than in institutional settings, if they so choose.

(3) Olmstead envisioned that States would provide appropriate long-term services and supports to individuals with disabilities through home and community-based services and end forced segregation in nursing homes and other institutions.

(4) While there has been progress in rebalancing State spending on individuals with disabilities in institutions as compared to home and community-based settings, more than 75 percent of States continue to spend the majority of their long-term care dollars on nursing homes and other institutional settings, and the number of individuals with disabilities under age 65 in nursing homes increased between 2008 and 2012.

(5) As of June 2013, there were more than 200,000 individuals younger than age 65 in nursing homes – almost 16 percent of the total nursing home population.

(6) Thirty-eight studies published from 2005 to 2012 concluded that providing services in home and community-based settings is less costly than providing care in a nursing home or other institutional setting.

(7) No clear or centralized reporting system exists to compare how effectively States are meeting the Olmstead mandate.

SEC. 3. ENSURING MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES MAY ELECT TO RECEIVE CARE IN A HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SETTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (80), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (81), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (81) the following new paragraph:

''(82) in the case of any individual with respect to whom there has been a determination that the individual requires the level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting—

''(A) provide the individual with the choice and opportunity to receive such care in a home and community-based setting, including rehabilitative services, assistance and support in accomplishing activities of daily living, instrumental activities of daily living, and health-related tasks, and assistance in acquiring, maintaining, or enhancing skills necessary to accomplish such activities, tasks, or services;

''(B) ensure that each such individual has an equal opportunity (when compared to the receipt and availability of nursing facility services) to receive care in a home and community-based setting, if the individual so chooses, by ensuring that the provision of such care in a home and community-based setting is widely available on a statewide basis for all such individuals within the State; and

''(C) meet the requirements of section 1904A (relating to the provision of care in a home and community-based setting).''.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY CARE OPTIONS.—Title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1904 the following new section:

''PROVISIONS RELATED TO HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED CARE

''SEC. 1904A. (a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, section 1902(a)(82), and section 1905(a)(4)(A):

''(1) ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING.—The term 'activities of daily living' includes, but is not limited to, tasks such as eating, toileting, grooming, dressing, bathing, and transferring.

''(2) HEALTH-RELATED TASKS.—The term 'health-related tasks' means specific tasks related to the needs of an individual, including, but not limited to, bowel or bladder care, wound care, use and care of ventilators and feeding tubes, and the administration of medications and injections, which, in the opinion of the individual's physician, can be delegated to be performed by an attendant.

''(3) HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SETTING.—The term 'home and community-based setting' means, with respect to an individual who requires a level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, a setting that—

''(A) includes a house, apartment, townhouse, condominium, or similar public or private housing where the individual resides that—

''(i) is owned or leased by the individual or a member of the individual's family;

''(ii) ensures the individual's privacy, dignity, respect, and freedom from coercion; and

''(iii) maximizes the individual's autonomy and independence;

''(B) is integrated in, and provides access to, the general community in which the setting is located so that the individual has access to the community and opportunities to seek employment and work in competitive integrated settings, participate in community life, control and utilize personal resources, benefit from community services, and participate in the community in an overall manner that is comparable to that available to individuals who are not individuals with disabilities; and

''(C) has the services and supports that the individual needs in order to live as independently as possible.

''(4) INSTRUMENTAL ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING.—The term 'instrumental activities of daily living' means activities related to living independently in the community and includes, but is not limited to, meal planning and preparation, managing finances, shopping for food, clothing, and other items, performing household chores, communicating by phone or other media, and traveling around and participating in the community.

''(5) PUBLIC ENTITY.—The term 'public entity' means a public entity as defined in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 201(1) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROVIDING SERVICES IN HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SETTINGS.—With respect to the availability and provision of services under the State plan under this title, or under any waiver of State plan requirements (subject to section 3(d) of the Community Integration Act of 2014), in a home and community-based setting to any individual who requires a level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, any public entity that receives payment under the State plan or waiver for providing services to such an individual shall not—

''(1) impose or utilize policies, practices, or procedures, such as unnecessary requirements or arbitrary service or cost caps, that limit the availability of services in home and community-based settings to an individual with a disability (including individuals with the most significant disabilities) who need such services;

''(2) impose or utilize policies, practices, or procedures that limit the availability of services in a home and community-based setting (including assistance and support in accomplishing activities of daily living, instrumental activities of daily living, health-related tasks, and rehabilitative services) based on the specific disability of an otherwise eligible individual;

''(3) impose or utilize policies, practices, or procedures that arbitrarily restrict an individual with a disability from full and meaningful participation in community life;

''(4) impose or utilize policies, practices, or procedures that unnecessarily delay or restrict the provision of services in a home and community-based setting to any individual who requires such services;

''(5) fail to establish and utilize adequate payment structures to maintain a sufficient workforce to provide services in home and community-based settings to any individual who requires such services;

''(6) fail to provide information, on an ongoing basis, to help any individual who receives care in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or

other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, understand the individual's right to choose to receive such care in a home and community-based setting; or

''(7) fail to provide information to help any individual that requires the level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, prior to the individual's placement in such a facility or institution, understand the individual's right to choose to receive such care in a home and community-based setting.

''(c) PLAN TO INCREASE AFFORDABLE AND ACCESSIBLE HOUSING.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this section, each State shall develop a statewide plan to increase the availability of affordable and accessible private and public housing stock for individuals with disabilities (including accessible housing for individuals with physical disabilities and those using mobility devices).

''(d) AVAILABILITY OF REMEDIES AND PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The remedies and procedures set forth in sections 203 and 505 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 shall be available to any person aggrieved by the failure of—

''(A) a State to comply with this section or section 1902(a)(82); or

''(B) a public entity (including a State) to comply with the requirements of subsection (b).

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to limit any remedy or right of action that otherwise is available to an aggrieved person under this title.

''(e) ENFORCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may reduce the Federal matching assistance percentage applicable to the State (as determined under section 1905(b)) if the Secretary determines that the State has violated the requirements of subsection (b).

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to limit any remedy or right of action that is otherwise available to the Secretary.

''(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to fiscal year 2016, and for each fiscal year thereafter, each State shall submit to the Administrator of the Administration for Community Living of the Department of Health and Human Services, not later than April 1 of the succeeding fiscal year, a report, in such form and manner as the Secretary shall require, that includes—

''(1) the total number of individuals enrolled in the State plan or under a waiver of the plan during such fiscal year that required the level of care provided in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, disaggregated by the type of facility or setting;

''(2) with respect to the total number described in paragraph (1), the total number of individuals described in that paragraph who received care in a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting, disaggregated by the type of facility or setting; and

''(3) with respect to the total number described in paragraph (2), the total number of individuals described in that paragraph who were transitioned from a nursing facility, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental disease, or other similarly restrictive or institutional setting to a home and community-based setting, disaggregated by the type of home and community-based setting.''.

(c) INCLUSION AS A MANDATORY SERVICE.—Section 1905(a)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(4)(A)) is amended by striking ''other than'' and inserting ''including similar services such as rehabilitative services and assistance and support in accomplishing activities of daily living, instrumental activities of daily living, and health-related tasks, that are provided, at the individual's option, in a home and community-based setting (as defined in section 1904A(a)(3)), but not including''.

(d) APPLICATION TO WAIVERS.—Notwithstanding section 1904A of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (b)), such section, and sections 1902(a)(82), and 1905(a)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), as amended by subsections (a) and (c), respectively, shall not apply to any individuals who are eligible for medical assistance for home and community-based services under a waiver under section 1115 or 1915 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315, 1396n) and who are receiving such services, to the extent such sections (as so added or amended) are inconsistent with any such waiver.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2014.

(2) DELAY PERMITTED IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—In the case of a State plan under section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such section 1902 solely on the basis of the failure of the plan to meet such additional requirements before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the close of the 1st regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TESTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WALSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REID, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 2516. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I join with several Democratic Senators to reintroduce the DISCLOSE Act, renewing—for the third time—our fight to curtail some of the worst abuses resulting from the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United. Republicans mounted filibusters of this commonsense bill when it was first introduced in 2010 and then again when it was reintroduced in 2012. This was the case even though Republicans claim to support disclosure.

Earlier this month, I chaired a hearing on a proposed constitutional amendment to repair the damage done by Citizens United and a series of other flawed Supreme Court decisions that have eviscerated our campaign finance laws. At this hearing, even Floyd Abrams, the noted First Amendment attorney who testified against the proposed amendment argued that he supported greater disclosure. And yet, Republicans have already filibustered this bill twice and are likely to continue filibustering it. I am hoping that Republicans have come to their senses after seeing how Citizens United has allowed unlimited, undisclosed money to pollute our elections.

Since that decision, our elections have been defined by corporations and billionaires spending vast amounts of secret money to influence elections. In the 2012 election cycle, spending from undisclosed sources exceeded $310 million, a massive increase from the $69 million from undisclosed sources in the previous presidential election cycle in 2008. And this number will only increase. No one doubts that.

While states like Vermont and Congress continue their heavy lift of passing a constitutional amendment to address the flawed Supreme Court decisions that have gutted our campaign finance laws, the Senate can take more immediate action today. By passing the DISCLOSE Act, we can restore transparency and accountability to campaign finance laws by ensuring that all Americans know who is paying for campaign ads. This is a crucial step toward restoring the ability of Vermonters and all American voters to be able to speak, be heard and to hear competing voices, and not be drowned out by powerful corporate interests.

We know disclosure laws can work because they do work for individual Americans donating directly to political campaigns. When you or I give money directly to a political candidate, our donation is not hidden. It is publicly disclosed. Yet those who oppose the DISCLOSE Act are standing up for special rights for corporations and wealthy donors that you and I do not have.

Recently, the Washington Post documented a trend whereby politically active organizations manipulate and use

their tax-exempt status to keep its donor lists private even though these organizations are pouring millions of dollars of undisclosed money into our elections. The increase of secret money can only harm our political process. The DISCLOSE Act would fix this problem. This bill would require any organization spending money on political ads, including 501(c)(4)s and Super PACs, to disclose donors who had given $10,000 or more. This is a commonsense transparency measure that everyone should be willing to support.

When the race is on for secret money and election campaigns are won or lost by who can collect the largest amount of unaccountable, secret donations, it puts at risk government of, by and for the people. In a democracy, our ballots should be secret not massive corporate campaign contributions. Disclosure of who is paying for election ads should not be kept secret from the public.

Vermont is a small state. It would not take more than a tiny fraction of the corporate money flooding the airwaves in other states to outspend all of our local candidates combined. I know that the people of Vermont, like all Americans, take seriously their civic duty to choose wisely on Election Day. Like all Vermonters, I cherish the voters' role in the democratic process and am a staunch believer in the First Amendment. The rights of Vermonters and all Americans to speak to each other and to be heard should not be undercut by corporate spending.

I hope that Republicans who have seen the impact of waves of unaccountable corporate campaign spending will join us to take up this important legislation. I hope Republican Senators will let us vote on the DISCLOSE Act and help us take an important step to ensure the ability of every American to be heard and to be able to meaningfully participate in free and fair elections.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2520. A bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, is one of our Nation's most important laws, established to give Americans greater access to their government and protect their ability to hold government accountable. In keeping with my commitment to support this law and expand its mission, today I join with Senator JOHN CORNYN to introduce bipartisan legislation that will improve the implementation of FOIA.

I have sought for decades to make our government more open and transparent. Senator CORNYN has been an important partner in these efforts, and our collaboration has resulted in the enactment of several improvements to FOIA: the OPEN Government Act, the first major reform to FOIA in more than a decade; the OPEN FOIA Act, which increased the transparency of legislative exemptions to FOIA; and the Faster FOIA Act, which responded to the concerns of FOIA requestors and addressed agency delays in processing requests.

The FOIA Improvement Act we are introducing today will make additional improvements to the law. It will enshrine into law the presumption of openness that the President laid out on his first day in office. He said, ''The Freedom of Information Act should be administered with a clear presumption: In the face of doubt, openness prevails.'' Our bipartisan legislation will require that Federal agencies consider the public interest in the disclosure of government information before invoking a FOIA exemption. It will provide additional independence for the Office of Government Information Services, OGIS, created by the OPEN Government Act in 2007, and reduce the overuse of Exemption 5 to withhold information by adding a public interest balancing test.

There has been significant progress in improving the FOIA process over the years, but I am concerned that the growing trend towards relying upon FOIA exemptions to withhold large swaths of government information is hindering the public's right to know. According to the OpenTheGovernment.org 2013 Secrecy Report, Federal agencies used Exemption 5 more than 79,000 times in 2012—an incredible 41 percent increase from the previous year. This does not exemplify the presumption of openness that we expect from our Government, and that is why Senator CORNYN and I are introducing the FOIA Improvement Act today.

Both Democrats and Republicans understand that a commitment to transparency is a commitment to the American values of openness and accountability, and to the public's right to know what their government is doing. I value the strong partnership that I have formed with Senator CORNYN on open government matters. Ensuring an open government should be a nonpartisan issue, and I invite all Members to support the FOIA Improvement Act of 2014.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2520

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''FOIA Improvement Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO FOIA.

Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''for public inspection and copying'' and inserting ''for public inspection in an electronic format'';

(ii) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

''(D) copies of all records, regardless of form or format—

''(i) that have been released to any person under paragraph (3); and

''(ii)(I) that because of the nature of their subject matter, the agency determines have become or are likely to become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records; or

''(II) that have been requested not less than 3 times; and''; and

(iii) in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (E), by striking ''public inspection and copying current'' and inserting ''public inspection in an electronic format, and current'';

(B) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking clause (viii) and inserting the following:

''(viii)(I) Except as provided in subclause (II), an agency shall not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees) under this subparagraph if the agency has failed to comply with any time limit under paragraph (6).

''(II)(aa) If an agency determines that unusual circumstances apply (as the term is defined in paragraph (6)(B)) and the agency provides a timely written notice to the requester in accordance with paragraph (6)(B), a failure described in subclause (I) is excused for an additional 10 days. If the agency fails to comply with the extended time limit, the agency may not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees).

''(bb) If a court determines that exceptional circumstances exist (as that term is defined in paragraph (6)(C)), a failure described in subclause (I) shall be excused for the length of time provided by the court order.'';

(C) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''making such request'' and all that follows through ''determination; and'' and inserting the following: ''making such request of—''

''(I) such determination and the reasons therefore;

''(II) the right of such person to seek assistance from the FOIA Public Liaison of the agency; and

''(III) in the case of an adverse determination—

''(aa) the right of such person to appeal to the head of the agency, within a period determined by the head of the agency that is not less than 90 days after the receipt of such adverse determination; and

''(bb) the right of such person to seek dispute resolution services from the FOIA Public Liaison of the agency or the Office of Government Information Services; and''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''the agency.'' and inserting ''the agency, and notify the requester of the right of the requester to seek dispute resolution services from the Office of Government Information Services.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) An agency—

''(A) shall—

''(i) withhold information under this section only if—

''(I) the agency reasonably foresees that disclosure would harm an interest protected by an exemption described in subsection (b) or other provision of law; or

''(II) disclosure is prohibited by law; and

''(ii)(I) consider whether partial disclosure of information is possible whenever the agency determines that a full disclosure of a requested record is not possible; and

''(II) take reasonable steps necessary to segregate and release nonexempt information; and

''(B) may not—

''(i) withhold information requested under this section merely because the agency can demonstrate, as a technical matter, that the records fall within the scope of an exemption described in subsection (b); or

''(ii) withhold information requested under this section because the information may be embarrassing to the agency or because of speculative or abstract concerns.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

''(5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters that would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency, if—

''(A) in the case of deliberative process privilege or attorney work-product privilege, the agency interest in protecting the records or information is not outweighed by a public interest in disclosure;

''(B) in the case of attorney-client privilege, the agency interest in protecting the records or information is not outweighed by a compelling public interest in disclosure; and

''(C) the requested record or information was created less than 25 years before the date on which the request was made;'';

(3) in subsection (e)

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and to the Director of the Office of Government Information Services'' after ''United States'';

(ii) in subparagraph (N), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (O), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(P) the number of times the agency denied a request for records under subsection (c); and

''(Q) the number of records that were made available for public inspection in an electronic format under subsection (a)(2).'';

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) Each agency shall make each such report available for public inspection in an electronic format. In addition, each agency shall make the raw statistical data used in each report available in a timely manner for public inspection in an electronic format, which shall be made available—

''(A) without charge, license, or registration requirement;

''(B) in an aggregated, searchable format; and

''(C) in a format that may be downloaded in bulk.'';

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''Government Reform and Oversight'' and inserting ''Oversight and Government Reform'';

(ii) by inserting ''Homeland Security and'' before ''Governmental Affairs''; and

(iii) by striking ''April'' and inserting ''March''; and

(D) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(6)(A) The Attorney General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Judiciary of the Senate, and the President a report on or before March 1 of each calendar year, which shall include for the prior calendar year—

''(i) a listing of the number of cases arising under this section;

''(ii) a listing of—

''(I) each subsection, and any exemption, if applicable, involved in each case arising under this section;

''(II) the disposition of each case arising under this section; and

''(III) the cost, fees, and penalties assessed under subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of subsection (a)(4); and

''(iii) a description of the efforts undertaken by the Department of Justice to encourage agency compliance with this section.

''(B) The Attorney General of the United States shall make—

''(i) each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format; and

''(ii) the raw statistical data used in each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format, which shall be made available—

''(I) without charge, license, or registration requirement;

''(II) in an aggregated, searchable format; and

''(III) in a format that may be downloaded in bulk.'';

(4) in subsection (g), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''publicly available upon request'' and inserting ''available for public inspection in an electronic format'';

(5) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: ''The head of the Office shall be the Director of the Office of Government Information Services.'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) identify procedures and methods for improving compliance under this section.'';

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) The Office of Government Information Services shall offer mediation services to resolve disputes between persons making requests under this section and administrative agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation and may issue advisory opinions at the discretion of the Office or upon request of any party to a dispute.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(4)(A) Not less frequently than annually, the Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the President—

''(i) a report on the findings of the information reviewed and identified under paragraph (2);

''(ii) a summary of the activities of the Office of Government Information Services under paragraph (3), including—

''(I) any advisory opinions issued; and

''(II) the number of times each agency engaged in dispute resolution with the assistance of the Office of Government Information Services or the FOIA Public Liaison; and

''(iii) legislative and regulatory recommendations, if any, to improve the administration of this section.

''(B) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall make each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format.

''(C) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall not be required to obtain the prior approval, comment, or review of any officer or agency of the United States, including the Department of Justice, the Archivist of the United States, or the Office of Management and Budget before submitting to the Congress, or any committee or subcommittee thereof, any reports, recommendations, testimony, or comments, if such submissions include a statement indicating that the views expressed therein are those of the Director and do not necessarily represent the views of the President.

''(5) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services may submit additional information to Congress and the President as the Director determines to be appropriate.

''(6) Not less frequently than annually, the Office of Government Information Services shall conduct a meeting that is open to the public on the review and reports by the Office and shall allow interested persons to appear and present oral or written statements at the meeting.''; and

(6) by striking subsections (i), (j), and (k), and inserting the following:

''(i) The Government Accountability Office shall—

''(1) conduct audits of administrative agencies on compliance with and implementation of the requirements of this section and issue reports detailing the results of such audits; and

''(2) catalog the number of exemptions described in subsection (b)(3) and the use of such exemptions by each agency.

''(j)(1) Each agency shall designate a Chief FOIA Officer who shall be a senior official of such agency (at the Assistant Secretary or equivalent level).

''(2) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency shall, subject to the authority of the head of the agency—

''(A) have agency-wide responsibility for efficient and appropriate compliance with this section;

''(B) monitor implementation of this section throughout the agency and keep the head of the agency, the chief legal officer of the agency, and the Attorney General appropriately informed of the agency's performance in implementing this section;

''(C) recommend to the head of the agency such adjustments to agency practices, policies, personnel, and funding as may be necessary to improve its implementation of this section;

''(D) review and report to the Attorney General, through the head of the agency, at such times and in such formats as the Attorney General may direct, on the agency's performance in implementing this section;

''(E) facilitate public understanding of the purposes of the statutory exemptions of this section by including concise descriptions of the exemptions in both the agency's handbook issued under subsection (g), and the agency's annual report on this section, and by providing an overview, where appropriate, of certain general categories of agency records to which those exemptions apply;

''(F) offer training to agency staff regarding their responsibilities under this section;

''(G) serve as the primary agency liaison with the Office of Government Information Services and the Office of Information Policy; and

''(H) designate 1 or more FOIA Public Liaisons.

''(3) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency shall review, not less frequently than annually, all aspects of the administration of this section by the agency to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section, including—

''(A) agency regulations;

''(B) disclosure of records required under paragraphs (2) and (8) of subsection (a);

''(C) assessment of fees and determination of eligibility for fee waivers;

''(D) the timely processing of requests for information under this section;

''(E) the use of exemptions under subsection (b); and

''(F) dispute resolution services with the assistance of the Office of Government Information Services or the FOIA Public Liaison.

''(k)(1) There is established in the executive branch the Chief FOIA Officers Council

(referred to in this subsection as the 'Council').

''(2) The Council shall be comprised of the following members:

''(A) The Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget.

''(B) The Director of the Office of Information Policy at the Department of Justice.

''(C) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services.

''(D) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency.

''(E) Any other officer or employee of the United States as designated by the Co-Chairs.

''(3) The Director of the Office of Information Policy at the Department of Justice and the Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall be the Co-Chairs of the Council.

''(4) The Administrator of General Services shall provide administrative and other support for the Council.

''(5)(A) The duties of the Council shall include the following:

''(i) Develop recommendations for increasing compliance and efficiency under this section.

''(ii) Disseminate information about agency experiences, ideas, best practices, and innovative approaches related to this section.

''(iii) Identify, develop, and coordinate initiatives to increase transparency and compliance with this section.

''(iv) Promote the development and use of common performance measures for agency compliance with this section.

''(B) In performing the duties described in subparagraph (A), the Council shall consult on a regular basis with members of the public who make requests under this section.

''(6)(A) The Council shall meet regularly and such meetings shall be open to the public unless the Council determines to close the meeting for reasons of national security or to discuss information exempt under subsection (b).

''(B) Not less frequently than annually, the Council shall hold a meeting that shall be open to the public and permit interested persons to appear and present oral and written statements to the Council.

''(C) Not later than 10 business days before a meeting of the Council, notice of such meeting shall be published in the Federal Register.

''(D) Except as provided in subsection (b), the records, reports, transcripts, minutes, appendixes, working papers, drafts, studies, agenda, or other documents that were made available to or prepared for or by the Council shall be made publicly available.

''(E) Detailed minutes of each meeting of the Council shall be kept and shall contain a record of the persons present, a complete and accurate description of matters discussed and conclusions reached, and copies of all reports received, issued, or approved by the Council. The minutes shall be redacted as necessary and made publicly available.''.

SEC. 3. REVIEW AND ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency (as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States Code) shall review the regulations of such agency and shall issue regulations on procedures for the disclosure of records under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, in accordance with the amendments made by section 2.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations of each agency shall include procedures for engaging in dispute resolution through the FOIA Public Liaison and the Office of Government Information Services.

SEC. 4. PROACTIVE DISCLOSURE THROUGH RECORDS MANAGEMENT.

Section 3102 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) procedures for identifying records of general interest or use to the public that are appropriate for public disclosure, and for posting such records in a publicly accessible electronic format;''.

SEC. 5. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act or the amendments made by this Act. The requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 482—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE AREA BETWEEN THE INTERSECTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL DRIVE, NORTHWEST VAN NESS STREET, NORTHWEST INTERNATIONAL DRIVE, NORTHWEST AND INTERNATIONAL PLACE, NORTHWEST IN WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AS ''LIU XIAOBO PLAZA''

Mr. CRUZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 482

Whereas June 4, 2014, marked the 25th anniversary of the brutal crackdown on protestors at Tiananmen Square in Beijing;

Whereas Dr. Liu Xiaobo is a Chinese human rights activist and Nobel Laureate who is currently serving an 11-year prison sentence for inciting subversion against the Government of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas in recognition of Dr. Liu Xiaobo's long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights in the People's Republic of China, he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in October 2010; and

Whereas renaming a portion of the street in front of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the District of Columbia after Dr. Liu Xiaobo serves as an expression of solidarity between the people of the United States and the people of the People's Republic of China who are, like Dr. Liu Xiaobo, engaged in a long and non-violent struggle for fundamental human rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the area between the intersections of International Drive, Northwest and Van Ness Street, Northwest and International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, should be known and designated as ''Liu Xiaobo Plaza'', and any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record to that area should be deemed to be a reference to Liu Xiaobo Plaza;

(2) the address of 3505 International Place, Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia, should be redesignated as 1 Liu Xiaobo Plaza, and any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to that address should be deemed to be a reference to 1 Liu Xiaobo Plaza; and

(3) the Administrator of General Services should construct street signs that—

(A) contain the phrase ''Liu Xiaobo Plaza'';

(B) are similar in design to the signs used by Washington, District of Columbia, to designate the location of Metro stations; and

(C) should be placed on—

(i) the parcel Federal property that is closest to 1 Liu Xiaobo Plaza (as described in paragraph (2)); and

(ii) the street corners of International Drive, Northwest and Van Ness Street, Northwest and International Drive, Northwest and International Place, Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia.

SENATE RESOLUTION 483—ESTABLISHING A POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION SELLING FEDERAL LAND IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE DEFICIT

Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 483

Resolved,

SECTION 1. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST SELLING FEDERAL LAND IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE DEFICIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the houses, or conference report that sells any Federal land and uses the proceeds of the sale to reduce the Federal deficit.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the sale of Federal land as part of a program that acquires land in the same State that is of comparable value or contains exceptional resources.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about one of our greatest treasures in this country: our public lands. Growing up in Butte, MT, I woke up every day under the morning shadow of the Continental Divide, part of the Deerlodge National Forest. When I was a kid, my dad would take me fishing on the Big Hole River. On the living room wall in my parents' home, there were pictures of three people: a picture of Jesus, a picture of JFK, and a picture of George Meany. I have carried the values my parents instilled in me to this day.

I grew up in a Catholic home similar to Montana writer Norman Maclean, who wrote in his famous book ''A River Runs Through It'' that his father, a Presbyterian minister, ''told us about Christ's disciples being fishermen, and we were left to assume, as my brother and I did, that all first-class fishermen on the Sea of Galilee were fly fishermen, and that John, the favorite, was a dry-fly fisherman.''

As an adult serving in the Montana National Guard, I would ride my mountain bike almost daily all over trails in

the Helena National Forest that connect our streets in the capital city of Helena. One day my granddaughter Kennedy will fish and bike these same lands and waters. These places all have one thing in common beyond being gorgeous and being in Montana; they belong to you and me. We all own them. They are part of what makes living in Montana and in America so special. Other countries and other States have lost this heritage but not in Montana.

Maintaining and improving access to these lands is one of the most important things we can do. That is why today I submitted legislation to make it harder to sell off this land. My bill will create a budget point of order in the Senate to block attempts to sell off public land to pay for Congress's bills.

There is no question that Washington has a spending problem. Since arriving in the Senate, I have proposed several ways to rein in out-of-control spending. But selling off our kids' and grandkids' heritage is a terrible idea. Jeopardizing the countless jobs that rely on our outdoors is also a terrible idea.

There is a theory circulating in some parts of the West that the Federal Government has a continuing duty to dispose of its lands in Western States. What this really means is handing over our most popular recreation areas to the highest out-of-State bidder. That is good for copper barons and trophy-home developers, but it is bad for us.

This theory is as radical as it is wrong, as court rulings have repeatedly found, but it is getting real traction.

Our colleagues in the House of Representatives have passed a budget that could sell off millions of acres of public land—our land—in Montana.

I want you to know that I will fight any similar attempts in this Chamber. I want my granddaughter Kennedy to grow up in Montana with the same easy access to streams and forests I enjoyed, whether she wants to hunt, hike, fish or bike.

We also need to get our forests healthy and working again, creating good jobs and making our forests more resilient to wildfires.

Like many Montanans, I am frustrated with how long it takes to conduct a timber sale or complete an environmental analysis of potential projects. Even simple projects get tied up in court, and our rural communities and the land itself suffer for it.

But the solution isn't to hand the keys over to special interests and walk away. The solution is to manage the land—from the ground up.

In Montana, tourism is critical to our economy. Outdoor recreation supports 64,000 jobs and generates over $5.8 billion in revenue annually. Cutting off access or selling the land to out-of-State development is a direct threat to jobs in Montana.

Turning over land in the State is just one step away from privatizing. There is no question that private land is the misguided ultimate goal of many who don't understand our outdoor heritage in the West.

In the year 2000 I led the response of the Montana National Guard to the wildfires that consumed over 1 million acres of Montana land. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior have spent about $1.8 billion annually to fight wildfires in the past 5 years. States simply cannot afford that pricetag. One bad wildfire season could bankrupt a State.

I want to share a little more about what is at stake.

Under the Ryan budget in the House of Representatives, with an auction of our public lands, Montana hunters could lose access to elk wallows of the Pioneer Mountains. You might hear elk bugling on Tenderfoot Creek in the Little Belt Mountains, but it could be on private land instead of land protected by the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Montanans could be shut out of the Missouri River Breaks, locked out of putting a canoe in or hunting a mule deer or sheep.

We could lose the Rocky Mountain Front, facing padlocks and orange signs instead of open space and the chance for a bighorn sheep tag.

Under the House plan, anglers in Montana could lose the headwaters of Rock Creek or the Smith River and the chance to sink a perfect fly from a streamside the public owns.

Despite years of effort to secure access, we could be shut out of land around the Three Dollar Bridge south of Bozeman that helped kids like me—growing up, fishing in our own blue-ribbon streams. The same thing could happen to the centennials and swan.

We could lose the best eastern Montana has to offer, from the monster bucks and turkeys in the Custer National Forest to the duck factory of the BLM's prairie potholes.

Under the House plan, we could be facing closed roads, closed trails, and closed land in the Gallatin National Forest that thousands of Montanans worked together 20 years ago to keep open and keep public forever.

Montana is the last best place because we can hunt, fish, hike, and play on the land that we all own. I will fight to keep it that way.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3375. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3376. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3377. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3375. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER FISHERY

SEC. 301. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) GULF STATES.—The term ''Gulf States'' means the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 302. FISHERY MANAGEMENT RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall grant to the Gulf States exclusive fishery management authority over the red snapper fish (lutjanus campechanus) in the Gulf of Mexico in the area located between the coast line of each Gulf State and the point that is 200 miles seaward of the coast line of each Gulf State, consistent with the jurisdictional limit of the exclusive economic zone.

(b) AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The grant of authority under subsection (a) is contingent on the condition that not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary grants the authority, the Governors of each of the Gulf States—

(A) agree on a fishery management plan governing management of the red snapper fish (lutjanus campechanus); and

(B) certify in writing to the Secretary that the Governors have entered into that agreement.

(2) REVERSION.—If the Governors fail to enter into an agreement under paragraph (1), the authority granted to the Governors under subsection (a) shall revert to the Secretary.

SA 3376. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. TRANSPARENCY OF REGIONAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETINGS.

(a) OPEN MEETINGS.—Section 302(i)(2) of the Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''session,'' and inserting ''session that is not subject to paragraph (3)(C),''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) Any member of a Council, committee, or panel who intends to use a document, exhibit, fact, or statistic at an open or closed meeting of the Council, committee, or panel shall provide to all other members of the Council, committee, or panel the source of the document, exhibit, fact, or statistic not less than 48 hours prior to the meeting.''.

(b) CLOSED MEETINGS.—Section 302(i)(3) of the Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Conservation

and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(i)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) For any closed meeting, or portion thereof, of a Council, of the Council coordination committee established under subsection (l), and of the scientific and statistical committees or other committees or advisory panels established under subsection (g) that is closed under this paragraph on the basis that the meeting concerns matters or information that pertains to employment matters, the Council, committee, or panel shall maintain detailed minutes as described in paragraph (2)(E) and complete transcripts. Such minutes and transcripts shall be available to any court of competent jurisdiction.''.

SA 3377. Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1647. ACTIONS TO ADDRESS ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE IN CYBERSPACE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on foreign economic and industrial espionage in cyberspace during the 12-month period preceding the submission of the report that—

(A) identifies—

(i) foreign countries that engage in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons;

(ii) foreign countries identified under clause (i) that the President determines engage in the most egregious economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to such trade secrets or proprietary information (in this section referred to as ''priority foreign countries'');

(iii) technologies or proprietary information developed by United States persons that—

(I) are targeted for economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace; and

(II) to the extent practicable, have been appropriated through such espionage;

(iv) articles manufactured or otherwise produced using technologies or proprietary information described in clause (iii)(II); and

(v) to the extent practicable, services provided using such technologies or proprietary information;

(B) describes the economic or industrial espionage engaged in by the foreign countries identified under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A); and

(C) describes—

(i) actions taken by the President to decrease the prevalence of economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace; and

(ii) the progress made in decreasing the prevalence of such espionage.

(2) DETERMINATION OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES ENGAGING IN ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE IN CYBERSPACE.—For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A), the President shall identify a foreign country as a foreign country that engages in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons if the government of the foreign country—

(A) engages in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons; or

(B) facilitates, supports, fails to prosecute, or otherwise permits such espionage by—

(i) individuals who are citizens or residents of the foreign country; or

(ii) entities that are organized under the laws of the foreign country or are otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the government of the foreign country.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of each person described in paragraph (2), if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—A person described in this paragraph is a foreign person the President determines knowingly requests, engages in, supports, facilitates, or benefits from the significant appropriation, through economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace, of technologies or proprietary information developed by United States persons.

(3) EXCEPTION.—The authority to impose sanctions under paragraph (1) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) CYBERSPACE.—The term ''cyberspace''—

(A) means the interdependent network of information technology infrastructures; and

(B) includes the Internet, telecommunications networks, computer systems, and embedded processors and controllers.

(3) ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE.—The term ''economic or industrial espionage'' means—

(A) stealing a trade secret or proprietary information or appropriating, taking, carrying away, or concealing, or by fraud, artifice, or deception obtaining, a trade secret or proprietary information without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information;

(B) copying, duplicating, downloading, uploading, destroying, transmitting, delivering, sending, communicating, or conveying a trade secret or proprietary information without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information; or

(C) knowingly receiving, buying, or possessing a trade secret or proprietary information that has been stolen or appropriated, obtained, or converted without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information.

(4) KNOWINGLY.—The term ''knowingly'', with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(5) OWN.—The term ''own'', with respect to a trade secret or proprietary information, means to hold rightful legal or equitable title to, or license in, the trade secret or proprietary information.

(6) PERSON.—The term ''person'' means an individual or entity.

(7) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—The term ''proprietary information'' means competitive bid preparations, negotiating strategies, executive emails, internal financial data, strategic business plans, technical designs, manufacturing processes, source code, data derived from research and development investments, and other commercially valuable information that a person has developed or obtained if—

(A) the person has taken reasonable measures to keep the information confidential; and

(B) the information is not generally known or readily ascertainable through proper means by the public.

(8) TECHNOLOGY.—The term ''technology'' has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(9) TRADE SECRET.—The term ''trade secret'' has the meaning given that term in section 1839 of title 18, United States Code.

(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2014, at 10 a.m., in Room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Less Student Debt from the Start: What Role Should the Tax System Play?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2014, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, on June 24, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–106 of the

Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Moving Toward Greater Community Inclusion—Olmstead at 15.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 24, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Judicial Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 24, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The AT&T/DIRECTTV Merger: The Impact on Competition and Consumers in the Video Market and Beyond.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS, HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY, AND GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 24, 2014, at 9:45 a.m., to hold an International Operations and Organizations, Human Rights, Democracy, and Global Women's Issues subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Combating Violence and Discrimination Against Women: A Global Call to Action.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 803

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the previous order with respect to H.R. 803 be modified as follows: that at noon tomorrow, Wednesday, June 25, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 803, with the time until 2:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators FLAKE and LEE controlling 5 minutes each of the Republican's time; that the provisions regarding 10 minutes of debate prior to voting on the amendments listed in the order and on the bill be vitiated; and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 2014

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 25, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the final 30 minutes; and that following morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 803 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, there will be four rollcall votes at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:02 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 25, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

LEON RODRIGUEZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

THE JUDICIARY

PAUL G. BYRON, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

CARLOS EDUARDO MENDOZA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

BETH BLOOM, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

GEOFFREY W. CRAWFORD, OF VERMONT, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING ROBIN LEA HUTTON

HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Robin Lea Hutton, President of Angels Without Wings, Inc., a non-profit corporation dedicated to giving relief to the poor, the distressed and underprivileged, and honoring those people and groups who help others in need.

It is through her leadership and vision that Angels Without Wings has spearheaded the development and dedication of a national memorial monument to the remarkable Korean War hero horse, Sgt. Reckless. This memorial serves to honor all animals that have served our country in times of war—whether as mascots for our servicemembers, or ammunitions carriers, like Sgt. Reckless.

Ms. Hutton has also brought further recognition to these animals by authoring Sgt. Reckless: America's War Horse. This book tells the incredible story of Reckless, who is listed in Life Magazine's "Celebrate our Heroes," as one of our all-time great heroes and whose antics make her a revered part of the history and lore of the United States Marine Corps.

For her patriotic service and exceptional work, Ms. Hutton is being bestowed with the Patriotic Citizen of the Year award and will receive the Silver Patrick Henry medal from the Conejo Valley Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars.

It is my honor to offer my sincere congratulations to Ms. Hutton on this special occasion and to thank her for her dedication to telling the story of America's war horse.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 2014, I was unavoidably absent from the House due to a family emergency involving my elderly mother, and missed rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: roll 339; "aye"; roll 340; "aye."

CONGRATULATING DR. DAVID M. PAIGE

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Dr. David M. Paige for his more than forty years of dedication to patients, students and public health in Maryland and across the country. David is a Professor of Population, Family and Reproductive Health with joint appointments in International Health and Human Nutrition at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health and in Pediatrics at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine. He is a member of the Maryland State WIC Advisory Panel and the Director of the Johns Hopkins WIC Program.

Through his work as a physician, researcher and professor, David has made indelible marks on the state of public health in this nation. In response to a crisis of malnourishment among low-income infants and pregnant women in Baltimore in the 1960s, David created a voucher system for food assistance that served as the prototype for the federal Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children. This program provides essential food assistance to almost 9 million individuals each month and more than 143,000 people in Maryland alone. David remains a vigilant defender of this critical program and has testified more than 20 times before House and Senate committees.

David has also produced significant research on the increasing prevalence of lactose intolerance in children and young adults. His findings have had far-reaching effects on the availability of lactose free foods and prenatal nutrition for lactose-intolerant mothers. He is also the recipient of numerous awards, including the March of Dimes National Agnes Higgins Award for Distinguished Achievement in Maternal-Fetal Nutrition.

On a personal note, it has been my privilege to know David for over twenty years and to benefit from his passionate advocacy on issues of public health. At all times, David's service to his profession and to the broader community have been characterized by a generosity of spirit and a selfless dedication to improving the lives of those too often left behind. I am proud to call David my friend and I commend the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health for recognizing David's long and distinguished record of accomplishment. This tribute could not go to a more deserving person.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 23, 2014, I was absent because of travel delays due to weather related activities.

If I had been present, I would have voted the following on June 23, 2014:

Rollcall 339 on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, S. 1044, the World War II Memorial Prayer Act, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall 340 on the motion to suspend the rules and concur to the Senate amendment, H.R. 316, the Collinsville Renewable Energy Production Act, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 294, I inadvertently voted "yea," I intended to vote "nay."

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MICHAEL FARMER

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Michael Farmer.

Michael Farmer began his advocacy at the young age of 17. He and a group of friends started a Gay-Straight Alliance (GSA) at Apopka High School, a conservative part of Central Florida. While attending Valencia Community College, Michael served as the Valencia College Campus Organizer for the Fairness For All Families (FFAF) Campaign. This campaign aimed to defeat a constitutional amendment to ban marriage equality and civil unions in Florida. He went on to serve as the Orlando Area Field Organizer for FFAF.

In 2009, Michael joined the staff of Equality Florida (EQFL) as the organization's Safe Schools Policy and GSA Network Coordinator. As Equality Florida's GSA Network Coordinator, Michael trained hundreds of students and teachers across the state on best practices for making schools safe for LGBT youth.

From 2010 to 2012, Michael served as EQFL's Statewide Field Coordinator. In this role, Michael helped to increase the organization's pro-equality voter file by more than 20,000 voters. Additionally, he raised EQFL's profile at community events and mobilized members and pro-equality voters to support pro-equality and openly LGBT candidates.

In 2013, Michael transitioned into the role of Statewide Field Director. As Statewide Field Director, Michael led EQFL's field staff on programs related to voter education and mobilization, and increased EQFL's member engagement.

Currently, Michael serves as Equality Florida's Director of Development for Central and North Florida. In this capacity, he leads EQFL's development programs and staff in Orlando, Sarasota, Jacksonville and Tallahassee. Since 2012, Michael and his teams across the state have raised over one million dollars in the pursuit of LGBT equality in Florida.

Through his work at Equality Florida, Michael has been able to play a leadership role in changing the policy landscape for the LGBT community in Florida. Michael also played an

integral role in the passage of Domestic Partner Registries in both the City of Orlando and Orange County. These registries provide critical protections for unmarried couples in times of emergency. To date, more than 1,000 couples have registered. Michael helped pass Orange County's Human Rights Ordinance, which bans discrimination against the LGBT community in housing, public accommodations, and the workplace. He also contributed to the passage of Orange County's Domestic Partner Benefits for county workers, which allow the spouses of county workers to access important health benefits. Additionally, he helped spearhead the passage of Domestic Partner Benefits and a Nondiscrimination Policy at Orange County Public Schools (OCPS)—the nation's ninth largest school district. These policies provide important healthcare benefits to the spouses of OCPS teachers and protect LGBT teachers and students from discrimination.

In 2012, The Advocate nominated Michael as one of "40 under 40" activists in the nation. He regularly represents Equality Florida's initiatives and programs on local TV and print media, and is a member of the Orlando Anti-Discrimination Ordinance Committee.

Michael is a graduate of the University of Central Florida and holds a bachelor's degree in Political Science with a concentration on American Politics and Public Policy.

I am happy to honor Michael Farmer, during LGBT Pride Month, for his work to secure equality for LGBT individuals in Central Florida and throughout the state of Florida.

HONORING SUE MERIMS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the strength of any religious institution comes from the love and devotion of its congregation. For Sue Merims, that love and devotion to Congregation Anshe Shalom is a family tradition. Sue's sister, Carolyn, was the first to join the synagogue, followed by her parents, Muriel and Ely Cohen, who were long-time members. Sue was next to join the Anshe Shalom family and has been a standout member now for over 40 years.

Following a 1996 meeting of the Anshe Shalom Board of Directors, Sue became the synagogue's treasurer, a role she still serves in today. She worked tirelessly to sustain and modernize the synagogue's operations, by computerizing its administrative and accounting systems, coordinating events, organizing the Community Seder, and working on the monthly bulletin. Being part of Anshe Shalom has brought joy and comfort to Sue and she considers her special relationship with Rabbi Weinberger and his beloved wife, Hannah, to be a major blessing.

Beyond her work at the synagogue, Sue taught at Millis High School in Millis, Massachusetts before pursuing new opportunities in the travel and food services industry. After 13 years with ARA Services Inc., Sue took a leap of faith and started her own school food service consulting business. For over 25 years, school districts have sought out Sue's expertise, as she has successfully guided them through upgrading and modernizing their food services environment.

Sue's greatest source of joy however is her family. She is blessed with two loving children and six grand children that she loves dearly.

Anshe Shalom in honoring Sue Merims at their Annual Testimonial Dinner and I can't think of a more deserving honoree. Her dedication to and hard work for the Anshe Shalom community has been an inspiration. It is my great pleasure to congratulate her on receiving this recognition.

HONORING TERRY J. HURNE

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life of Terry J. Hurne, United States Army Specialist, who died on June 9, 2014, at the young age of 34. Terry was an American hero who made the ultimate sacrifice while serving the United States in the Logar Province of Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Spc. Hurne was born to Norman and Shirley Hurne on April 9, 1980. He was raised in Atwater, California. He graduated from Atwater High School in 1998 and joined the military in 2007 after working for Central Valley Electric and various construction jobs.

During his time in the Army, Terry served two tours of duty in Afghanistan. For the past five years he served as a generator mechanic and builder. He was assigned to B Company, 710 Brigade Support Battalion, 10th Mountain Division stationed in Fort Drum, New York.

Terry will undoubtedly be remembered nationwide as a hero who fought for our freedoms. His family and friends will hold memories of Terry in their hearts forever. His smile, laugh, and kindness will never be forgotten. Eight years ago, Terry married the love of his life, Natalie, and they built a beautiful life together. Natalie as well as Terry's father; mother; stepmother; Ruth, three sisters; Cheryl, Christina, and Sam, and brother; Bryon will miss him dearly.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to honor the life of our fallen soldier, Army Specialist Terry Hurne. He was an exemplary individual, and we will always be grateful for his service to our country.

TRIBUTE TO GILES GIOVINAZZI

HON. RICK LARSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Giles F. Giovinazzi, Democratic Staff Director of the Subcommittee on Aviation for the U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. As Ranking Democrat of the Subcommittee, I had the pleasure of working with Giles on many issues that came before the Subcommittee. His hard work and wise counsel over the past 12 years has been invaluable, and I look forward to continuing to work with him as he embarks on a new endeavor.

Giles began his career on Capitol Hill serving as Legislative Counsel for Congressman JAMES MCGOVERN from 1999 to 2002. Since that time, Giles has served on the Subcommittee in various positions including Counsel, Senior Counsel and Staff Director, since 2009.

Giles is a true public servant and his dedication to the country extends beyond the halls of Congress. Giles is a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Navy Reserve where he has served since 2004.

His understanding of complex technical and legal aviation issues, policy and politics, has been an asset to the Committee for over a decade. Giles has been instrumental in drafting significant pieces of legislation including The Airline Safety and Federal Aviation Administration Extension Act of 2010.

Last month, Giles was appointed federal transportation liaison at the California Department of Transportation and the California High-Speed Rail Authority. His expertise and counsel will be truly missed.

I join my colleagues on the Transportation Committee in wishing Giles, his wife Jolynn, and daughter, Kathryn Maribel, all the best.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I did not participate in the vote of S. 1044 on June 23, 2014. Unfortunately, I was traveling back from Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas, and due to inclement weather, I could not get back from my trip in time to vote.

However, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on S. 1044.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $17,529,945,473,040.66. We've added $6,903,068,424,127.58 to our debt in 5 years. This is over $6.9 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 339, I was unable to get to D.C. to make votes due to a personal conflict, a friend's funeral.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TOM DYER

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Tom Dyer. Tom was born in Lancaster, Ohio in 1955. His family moved from Madison, Wisconsin to the Orlando area in 1969. One of his first summer jobs was as a character at Walt Disney World's Magic Kingdom. Tom is a graduate of Winter Park High School, DePauw University and the University of Florida, Levin College of Law.

Tom is the founder and publisher of Watermark, Orlando and Tampa Bay's award-winning LGBT newspaper. Founded in 1994, the newspaper distributes 20,000 newspapers to more than 500 locations every other Thursday. The web site, WatermarkOnline.com, is visited by more than 5,000 users every week. The company donates more than $200,000 annually in free and sponsor advertising to worthy local and national LGBT non-profits.

In 1997 Watermark Media produced Beach Ball at Disney's Typhoon Lagoon, the first large-scale nighttime party associated with Gay Days Weekend. Watermark publishes a glossy guide to Gay Days Weekend, the largest annual LGBT gathering in the nation, as well as programs for St. Pete Pride in June and Orlando's Come Out With Pride in October.

Watermark sought to hang rainbow flags throughout downtown Orlando during Gay Pride Month in 1998. The city reluctantly acquiesced, but the controversy made national news when televangelist, Pat Robertson, predicted Orlando would be beset by hurricanes as punishment.

Tom has interviewed such luminaries as Gloria Steinem, Billie Jean King, Lily Tomlin and Martina Navratilova for Watermark. His recent interview with former governor, and now candidate for governor, Charlie Crist, went viral after it was picked up by HuffPost.com, CNN.com and MSNBC.com.

In addition to publishing Watermark, Tom is a practicing attorney and senior partner in Dyer & Blaisdell, PL. He is a former board member of the Metropolitan Business Association and the Tampa International Gay & Lesbian Film Festival. He currently serves on the advisory board for the Harvey Milk Foundation.

Tom has received the Vice Versa Award for excellence in LGBT journalism, the Spectrum Award for Male Role Model and Equality Florida's Voice for Equality Award. In 2004, the City of Orlando presented Tom with the ''Key to the City'' in honor of Watermark's 10th anniversary. In 2014, he was named a Champion of Equality by the Harvey Milk Foundation.

Tom lives in Winter Park, where he enjoys spending time with nine nieces and nephews and his beloved Welsh corgi, Seamus. He's also working on his downward dog at regular Yoga sessions.

I am happy to honor Tom Dyer, during LGBT Pride Month, for his contributions to the Central Florida LGBT community.

THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 80th anniversary of the Federal Credit Union Act and to use this occasion to honor the contributions that the credit union movement has made to the United States. The Act, which was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1934, permits credit unions to be formed anywhere in the United States. The legislation bolstered the development of credit unions as a way to promote thrift among the American people while setting in place federal oversight of these financial institutions.

Eighty years later, credit unions in the United States claim nearly 100 million members. If the credit unions those members own were a single financial institution, it would be the fifth largest bank in America.

But thankfully, those credit unions are more than 6,600 independent, consumer-owned, volunteer-led, democratically controlled financial institutions, vital to the well-being of their members.

Credit unions are part of the great fabric that makes our country strong.

They are cooperatives—bound together by a common set of business principles and values: voluntary membership; democratic control; economic participation; autonomy and independence; member education; cooperation among cooperatives; and concern for community.

A Canadian, Alphonse Desjardins, brought the idea for credit unions west from Europe in 1900 and by 1909 he had successfully organized the first American credit union in New Hampshire. Two Americans, Pierre Jay, the Massachusetts banking commissioner and Edward Filene, a Boston merchant, took up the cause of promoting credit unions in those early years.

In 1908 a national conference on credit unions was held in Boston that brought together Desjardins, Filene, Jay and others interested in the formative stages of the movement. That conference led to the 1909 draft of legislation in Massachusetts that became the nation's first state credit union act.

The movement developed slowly during the following decade and by 1921 Filene become convinced that federal legislation was needed in addition to existing state legislation. He hired Massachusetts attorney Roy Bergengren to help. The Credit Union National Extension Bureau was formed. Four years later, 15 states had passed credit union enabling laws and 419 credit unions were serving 108,000 consumers.

After the 1934 passage of the Federal Credit Union Act, credit unions recognized their need for stronger national representation and unity. The Credit Union National Association was formed—replacing the Credit Union National Extension Bureau.

Robust credit union growth continued until World War II. Wartime slowed the expansion of the movement considerably. Interest picked up again once the conflict ended and by 1955 there were more than 16,000 credit unions across the United States. By 1969, that number had swelled to nearly 24,000.

The 1970s brought about great change to credit unions as they broadened their services to meet the expanding needs of their members. Legislation permitting mortgage lending by credit unions was passed and the total number of credit union members more than doubled during the decade.

As consumer needs evolved and became more complex, many credit unions merged to increase their ability to pool resources and improve member services. While the total number of actual credit unions decreased with mergers, the number of consumer members of credit unions soared, and is now on the cusp of 100 million across the nation.

Credit unions continue to innovate with new services and tools to help their members build economic security.

The work Congress did 80 years ago in passing the Federal Credit Union Act continues to serve the country well.

In fact, the influence credit unions have on the entire financial system saves all consumers money with generally lower rates for loans and higher rates for savings—no matter where they bank. An impressive $8 billion dollars in savings in 2013 alone is attributed to credit unions.

Today, credit unions are utilized by their members for the convenience, prices, product choice, and financial education they offer.

Credit unions are living up to the promise outlined in their principles. They are institutions that their members and all Americans can choose to be their best financial partner.

RECOGNIZING THE ORANGE COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT ON 60 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24 2014

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) on its 60th anniversary. Since June 30, 1954, the OCSD has provided residents in North and Central Orange County outstanding wastewater collection, treatment and recycling services.

The OCSD services approximately 2.5 million people, 21 cities and has two operating facilities that treat wastewater from residential, commercial and industrial sources. Through innovative technologies, the OCSD has served as a leader and model for communities around the world as they battle to protect public health and the environment from the harms of untreated wastewater.

However, the OCSD does not just simply treat wastewater. In fact, by utilizing all practical and effective means, the OCSD is producing an average of 10,000 kilowatts of electricity per day, monitoring the water quality of local beaches, and recycling 268,000 tons of biosolids per year. Yet, these are only the secondary benefits of its highest achievement.

In a joint venture with the Orange County Water District, the OCSD facilitated the creation of the world's largest water purification system, the Orange County Groundwater Replenishment System (GWRS). Using a three-step advanced treatment process, the GWRS purifies 70 million gallons of high quality potable water per day that would otherwise be unusable. This is the equivalent to the daily

water use of 600,000 people. The GWRS has since received more than 35 awards, including the Stockholm Industry Water Award, which is the highest international honor bestowed upon water projects, and the 2014 U.S. Water Prize Award from the U.S. Water Alliance.

I am proud of the work, dedication, and accomplishments of the Orange County Sanitation District over the past 60 years and wish them further success as they continue to lead the world in effective wastewater collection, treatment and recycling.

RELIABLE HOME HEATING ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: I write concerning S. 2086, the ''Reliable Home Heating Act,'' which passed the Senate on May 21, 2014. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is being done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, and the Committee will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of S. 2086 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2014.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding S. 2086, the Reliable Home Heating Act, which passed the Senate on May 21, 2014. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting the consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this legislation, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction and will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on S. 2086 in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HONORING WARREN EUSAN

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Warren Eusan, an educator and community leader in San Antonio and a member of the legendary Tuskegee Airmen. From Alabama's Tuskegee Institute, this was the famed pursuit squadron who emerged from the Army Air Corps program that trained African-American pilots, navigators, instructors and support staff and who helped secure victory for the allies in World War II.

Mr. Eusan was born and raised in San Antonio in 1920. After graduating from Wiley College in Dallas in 1940 with B.A. Degrees in Sociology and Education, he enlisted in the Army Air Corps. After initial assignment to Tuskegee Army Air Field he was sent to Bryan, Texas where he integrated the Base Instrument Command Flying School. Upon graduation, he returned to Tuskegee where he taught instrument flying until his discharge in 1946.

The heroic exploits of the Tuskegee Airmen are now well-known, having been portrayed in feature films, documentaries, books and newspaper and magazine articles. Because of racism and discriminatory laws the men and women who were part of the ''Tuskegee Experience'' were denied rights in the country of their birth yet rose above injustice. In preserving a freedom that had not yet been extended to them, they displayed courage and a largeness of spirit that helped liberate and save the lives of countless women and men.

In 2007, Mr. Eusan was among the Tuskegee Airmen who received the Congressional Gold Medal from President George W. Bush.

When he returned to San Antonio, Mr. Eusan began a 44-year career in education. He was first a school teacher and then the School Liaison to the Superintendent of the San Antonio Independent School District. During that time he earned his Masters of Education degree from Atlanta University and completed additional post-grad studies at Our Lady of the Lake University, Trinity University and the University of Texas.

Always concerned about his community and its youth, Mr. Eusan was an adjunct faculty member at St. Philip's College and worked for the San Antonio Parks and Recreation Department, San Antonio Neighborhood Youth Organization and the Department of Economic Development of San Antonio. As a member of the San Antonio Chapter of Tuskegee Airmen, Inc. Mr. Eusan had a ubiquitous presence throughout his community, helping to preserve and share the rich legacy of the Tuskegee Airmen. Through the chapter's annual Educational Assistance Awards Banquet he helped provide scholarships to dozens of college-bound students.

Mr. Eusan passed away June 14 at the age of 93. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the life and achievements of a Warren Eusan, a great San Antonian and a great American.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Monday June 23, 2014 I was not present for 2 votes. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been present to vote.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 339, I would have voted ''yea.''

Had I been present for rollcall No. 340, I would have voted ''yea.''

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MARK CHARLES CADY

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Mark Charles Cady.

Born to Lealond H. Cady, Jr. and Jacqueline C. Cady on December 11, 1964 in Jacksonville, Florida, Mark is the youngest of three. Mark had a typical Florida childhood. He played cars and trucks, cops and robbers, swam in local lakes, ran around with dirt on his face, and played in the rain.

At an early age, Mark started to consider the plight of the less fortunate. While his family was by no means wealthy, his faith and upbringing inspired him to do what was in his capacity to help others. Running on a platform of ''Let's help each other,'' he was elected student council president at his high school in 1981.

Immediately after high school, Mark entered the United States Navy and began 12 years of service as a Religious Programs Specialist. While stationed in Okinawa, Japan, Mark coordinated programs to provide food and services to the host Japanese nationals in conjunction with various non-profit organizations. As an accomplished performer, he also performed more than 20 concerts for military members, their families, and the host nationals. His outstanding career in the Navy earned him a Navy Achievement Medal from the Secretary of the Navy and various other awards, commendations, and newspaper and magazine articles highlighting his accomplishments. As a gay man, Mark chose to leave the Navy in protest of ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell'' in 1994. He earned an Honorable Discharge.

Over the years, Mark's career led him into advertising and marketing, but he always maintained his desire to help others and strengthen his Christian faith. In his late 20's, he was ordained a Deacon at Joy Metropolitan Community Church, Orlando. He began serving with various community organizations and continued his career as a singer and entertainer.

At age 34, Mark's father died. He withdrew from community service and began a downward spiral that led him into drug addiction. At age 44, he entered drug rehabilitation with the VA Medical System and got his life back on track.

Since his recovery, he has given back to the community that has provided him with so

much support. He has served as Vice President and President of the Board of Directors for the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual (GLBCC) Community Center, Marketing Chair of the GLBCC Community Center, Secretary of the Board of Directors of Lakeside Behavioral Healthcare, Philanthropic Chair of Aspire Health Partners, Marketing Chair of Come Out With Pride, Chair of the Metropolitan Business Association's Referral Exchange Development Group, and Founder of Out & Proud Veterans of America. He also coordinated the donations for and oversaw the erection of the first LGBT Veterans Memorial in Florida located at the GLBCC and acts as a liaison for the Orlando VA Medical Center for LGBT Veterans and other LGBT service organizations.

In October 2013, Mark was ordained into the Diaconate of the independent Catholic Church and in January 2015 he will be ordained into the Catholic priesthood. Mark is in a committed relationship with his partner Dr. Carlos Archilla.

I am happy to honor Mark Charles Cady, during LGBT Pride Month, for his service to our country and to the Central Florida community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 2014, I was unable to be present for all votes due to an unexpected travel delay due to inclement weather.

If present, I would have voted accordingly on the following votes:

S. 1044, World War II Memorial Prayer Act of 2013—"yea."

H.R. 316, Collinsville Renewable Energy Production Act—"yea."

RECOGNIZING WILLIAM M. GALLOW

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extensive and highly decorated career of a constituent, William "Bill" Gallow. Mr. Gallow has dedicated his life to serving his neighbors throughout the Southern Tier and Finger Lakes regions of New York.

Mr. Gallow served as a Combat Infantryman in the United States Army during World War II, under the command of General George Patton. Upon returning home, Mr. Gallow began working with the Arnold Ambulance Service, a volunteer EMT position that he held for over 25 years. In 1963, he embarked on a remarkable 60-year career with the Van Etten Volunteer Fire Company. During his tenure, Mr. Gallow held the positions of Chief, President, Secretary, Trustee, and Senior Medic. In addition, he passed down his knowledge and expertise to other first responders by teaching courses at academic institutions, training facilities, and the New York State Fire Academy.

Bill Gallow exemplifies selfless service and true leadership. His generosity and willingness to assist anyone in need has earned him the highest level of respect within the Van Etten community and throughout all of Chemung County. He consistently goes above and beyond through his volunteer work and community service. Mr. Gallow has served as a medic at the Special Olympics and the Susan B. Komen "Race for the Cure" on multiple occasions. In recognition of his excellent and selfless service, he was awarded the Southern Tier Regional Emergency Service Award in 1997 and the Richard Habbershaw Community Service Award in 2007.

I commend Mr. Gallow for all the great work he has done at the Van Etten Volunteer Fire Company and throughout his community. He is a selfless and generous individual who has made countless positive contributions to New York's 23rd Congressional District, and I am proud to recognize him today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yesterday and missed roll Nos. 339 and 340. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll Nos. 339 and 340.

BEN WEINDLING CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ben Weindling, a longtime businessman from Pueblo, Colorado. Mr. Weindling, a loving father and husband, not only created a successful men's clothing store, but was also greatly involved in the Pueblo community.

Mr. Weindling created "Burling's Clothing" with his partner Sheldon Burstein. As owner and manager, Mr. Weindling was named "Dress Apparel Retailer of the Year" in 1972. He was equally involved in his community as he was in his business, serving as president of the Pueblo Country Club, participating on many boards and clubs including Pueblo Housing Authority, the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce, and multiple-hospital boards such as Parkview. In 1977, he was appointed to the Colorado Health Facilities Authority by Governor Richard Lamm, where he served until 2013. Additionally, Mr. Weindling worked as a member of the University of Southern Colorado board of trustees and later served a term as president in 1981. He made noteworthy donations to Colorado State University—Pueblo. Above all else, Mr. Weindling found time to care of his wife, children, and grandchildren and was heavily involved in their lives until his death on June 12, 2014.

Mr. Speaker, Ben Weindling gave his family and the Pueblo community all he had to offer and served as a selfless and dedicated public servant throughout his life. I stand with the residents of Pueblo County in giving thanks for his service to the community, and pay tribute to him for a life well lived.

CUSTOMER PROTECTION AND END USER RELIEF ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4413) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end users manage risks to help keep consumer cost low, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I support reauthorizing the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC, and believe a properly resourced CFTC has a critical role to play in promoting fair and transparent markets that effectively serve end users and consumers without putting taxpayers or our financial system at risk. Unfortunately, H.R. 4413 departs from this vital objective in several important ways.

First, Title II of H.R. 4413 imposes onerous new administrative burdens on the CFTC whose practical effect will be to delay the Commission's ongoing Dodd-Frank rulemaking and encourage costly litigation. We need more certainty—not less certainty—when it comes to regulating our derivatives markets, and H.R. 4413 would take us in precisely the opposite direction.

Second, Title III of H.R. 4413 would make it much more difficult for the CFTC to regulate cross-border derivatives transactions that pose a risk to the U.S. economy. The legislation creates this vulnerability by substituting foreign derivatives rules for U.S. law unless the CFTC and the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, jointly determine that a foreign country's regulatory regime is not broadly equivalent to our own. While I support international efforts to harmonize effective rules of the road for derivatives transactions, I do not support presuming an equivalency in this area that does not currently exist. Six years after unregulated derivatives transactions contributed to the sharpest downturn in our economy since the Great Depression, we simply cannot afford to outsource the protection of our financial system to foreign regulators.

Third, neither this legislation—nor the FY 2015 House Agriculture-FDA Appropriations bill, which proposes to slash the CFTC's budget by 22 percent below the President's request—does anything to provide the CFTC with the resources it needs to police fraud and excessive speculation in our derivatives markets on behalf of end users and consumers.

For these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 4413.

RECOGNIZING MR. ALLEN McQUARRIE

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of our constituents. His name is Allen McQuarrie and his contribution to our community has been invaluable. For the past fifteen years, Mr. McQuarrie has served as the Chair of the Bucks County chapter of Pro-Act, a grassroots advocacy and recovery support initiative of The Council of Southeast Pennsylvania. In 2002, Allen chaired a meeting to plan PRO-ACT's first Recovery Walk, an event attended by 125 people. Today the Recovery Walk is attended by more than 20,000 people in public view at Penn's Landing, Philadelphia, making it the nation's largest recovery walk. Furthermore, he organized a coalition to pursue state enforcement of PA Act 106, which mandates insurance coverage for addiction treatments by medical professionals.

Additionally, Mr. McQuarrie assists our veterans as they transition back to civilian life. Sadly, it has been reported that an estimated one-third of returning veterans suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder and/or traumatic brain injury. The medications used to treat these problems can lead to addiction. Without treatment, individuals may self-medicate with drugs or alcohol. PRO-ACT and Mr. McQuarrie have granted veterans a support system that allows them to maintain a healthy life after their service. Mr. McQuarrie is a strong voice for recovery in PA 08, serving as a mentor, trainer, and advocate. I am pleased to honor the achievements of Allen McQuarrie.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MARY ANNE METAXAS

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Pride Month, to recognize Mary Anne Metaxas. Born to William and Mary Jane Metaxas in Columbus, Ohio, she is the youngest of five children. She grew up in New Jersey and spent many of her summers at the Jersey shore. Metaxas enjoyed growing up in a large family and maintains a very close relationship with all of her siblings and their respective families.

Metaxas earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from the Florida State University and is a proud Seminoles football fan. After college, Metaxas entered the video production industry and quickly realized her passion for creating entertaining and effective media.

Metaxas soon joined i.d.e.a.s. at Disney MGM Studios, as a freelance Producer. Through this role, she worked on a variety of projects for Fortune 500 companies, theme parks, the Disney Company, museums, and broadcast television. Metaxas stayed with the company, now known as IDEAS, when it transitioned to private ownership in 2001. She has been an integral part of the IDEAS creative team since its inception, serving as producer, director, post-supervisor, and creative consultant. She currently serves as Vice President of Media Production and leads the creative team on all IDEAS media projects.

Metaxas is both a longtime supporter and volunteer for the Human Rights Campaign. As a Federal Club member, she played an integral role in creating the Orlando HRC community and continues to help nurture its growth. She has served in a volunteer capacity at a variety of local events over the years and attended the HRC National Dinner in Washington, DC with other national leaders.

Metaxas has a special place in her heart for dogs. For many years, she has volunteered for Florida Little Dog Rescue and has fostered too many puppies and dogs to count. She takes great pride in helping to rehabilitate rescued dogs, and feels great joy in seeing them recover and thrive. The care she takes in ensuring her foster dogs are adopted into great homes is commendable. As a sign of gratitude for her commitment, many of the new families keep in touch long after the adoption.

Metaxas can often be seen around Orlando on her vintage-style scooter. She has utilized this passion to help raise money for Libby's Legacy Breast Cancer Foundation's annual "Scooters for Hooters" events. She was named 2010 Fundraising Freak for raising the most donations and has served as captain of the multi-year highest fundraising team. She continues to ride in memory of her beloved mother who passed away in 2001.

Metaxas is an active member of the Orlando community and supports a variety of other local non-profit and political organizations including Hope and Help of Central Florida, Metropolitan Business Association, Planned Parenthood of Greater Orlando, and the Zebra Coalition.

Metaxas resides in Orlando, Florida with her spouse Jennifer Foster. On their 10-year anniversary in 2013, the couple was honored to be able to legally marry. They live happily with their three dogs (Matti, Maci, and Patrick), and two cats (Graci and Kevin).

I am happy to honor Mary Anne Metaxas, during LGBT Pride Month, for her professional and civic contributions to the Central Florida community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 340, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I did not participate in the vote of H.R. 316 on June 23, 2014. Unfortunately, I was traveling back from Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas, and due to inclement weather, I could not get back from my trip in time to vote.

However, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 316.

HONORING PHILMORE GRAHAM

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Philmore Graham, who passed away on June 12, 2014, after 75 remarkable years.

Born in North Carolina, Mr. Graham went on to graduate from Tennessee State University, serve our country in the Air Force and finally, build a career at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard. Notably, he was the first, and to this day remains the only, African American to hold the position of supervisor at Mare Island's Department of Nuclear Energy. Throughout his life, Mr. Graham was steadfastly dedicated to bettering the lives of young people in our community, particularly the lives of young African-American men.

Mr. Graham founded the Continentals of Omega Boys and Girls Club in Vallejo, California, in 1966. What began as six young boys meeting in Mr. Graham's garage has become a thriving organization that enriches the lives of approximately 300 boys and girls today. He mentored scores of young people, offering them support and encouragement and instilling in them the values and principles they needed to succeed. Mr. Graham provided academic support, encouraged involvement in sports and taught young people the importance of perseverance, hard-work and self-respect. Mr. Graham's unwavering passion and dedication to ensuring that our youth had every opportunity to succeed is an inspiration to all. And in turn, Mr. Graham was beloved by all those who were fortunate enough to have known him.

For his good work, Mr. Graham was named the NAACP's Outstanding Citizen of the Year, was awarded the Good Neighbor Award, Salute to America Lifetime Merit Award, Profile of Excellence Award, Martin Luther King Jr. Humanitarian Award, the "Who's Who" among Black Americans and was repeatedly named the Omega Man of the Year and Citizen of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Mr. Graham for his life of service to a grateful community.

SUPPORT OF H.R. 1098, 1281, 3548, 4080, AND 4631

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of five bipartisan public health bills that will help individuals with traumatic brain injuries, newborns, burn patients, and those with autism. The Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health, under the leadership of Rep. JOE PITTS, has been a workhorse that boasts an outstanding record of bipartisan accomplishment on legislation that truly touches people's lives. With a number of bills already

signed into law, and these under consideration this evening, the 113th Congress is shaping up to be known as the public health Congress.

I would like to take this opportunity to highlight each of the five bills before us this evening.

H.R. 1098, the Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act, would address a problem that affects millions of Americans, including both veterans and children. Introduced by Mr. PASCRELL, this bill would assist states in developing and expanding service delivery capacity for individuals with a traumatic brain injury. According to some estimates, the economic burden of such injuries is more than $70 billion, and the physical and emotional toll endured by patients and their families is even more burdensome. This bill would help alleviate the problems associated with this unique and complex health problem, providing peace of mind to families across the country.

H.R. 1281, the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act, introduced by Reps. ROYBAL-ALLARD and SIMPSON, funds grants to allow states to expand their newborn screening programs, educate parents and health care providers, and improve follow-up care for infants diagnosed with a condition. Before the first passage of this bill in 2008, the number and quality of newborn screening tests varied from state to state. Today, with guidelines created by the bill, screenings reach 4 million babies in the United States every year. Reauthorization will continue this important program and encourage more timely efforts to identify diseases, such as Spinal Muscular Atrophy, and ensure best practices. Early screening and diagnosis often means better disease management and better outcomes for these children.

H.R. 3548, the Improving Trauma Care Act, introduced by Energy and Commerce Committee member Rep. BILL JOHNSON, is designed to correct the inconsistencies in the definitions of trauma that have resulted in gaps in care and coverage. This bill will help important trauma centers like Bronson Methodist Hospital's Burn Center in Kalamazoo, Michigan to better care for their patients.

We will also consider H.R. 4080, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization. Introduced by Energy and Commerce Committee members Dr. BURGESS and Rep. GREEN, the bill reauthorizes two programs related to the planning and development of regional emergency care. Both of these programs will improve trauma care so that Americans can promptly receive specialized, life-saving treatment after a traumatic injury.

Finally we will consider H.R. 4631, the Autism CARES Act of 2014, introduced and championed by Reps. CHRIS SMITH and MIKE DOYLE. The sad reality is that in the United States, autism now affects 1 in 68 children and can cost a family approximately $60,000 annually. H.R. 4631 continues autism-related research, early identification and intervention, education, and the activities of the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee. It also asks the Secretary of Health and Human Services to collaborate with other federal agencies to prepare and submit a report concerning young adults with autism spectrum disorder and the challenges related to their transition into adulthood. Finally, the research funded by this legislation also permits diagnosing and intervening earlier and thus help improve the quality of life for children with autism.

This bill is supported by the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Autism Society, and the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, which includes over thirty different organizations including Autism Speaks, the Autism National Committee, and the Council for Learning Disabilities.

We began our day in a bipartisan manner advancing the 21st Century Cures initiative and I am pleased to conclude the day by continuing our efforts to advance legislation to improve the public health. It is through these bills and this initiative that we can truly have an impact on the lives of all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support these bills.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL SUNGLASS DAY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Sunglass Day and to honor the sunglass manufacturers and suppliers throughout my Dallas Congressional District, the State of Texas and around the country. Texas and the Dallas area are home to a variety of optical industry leaders including 24 optical laboratories that manufacture prescription sun wear, 3 lens manufacturers that supply UV filtering lenses, and 6 sun wear frame suppliers. As a physician, I commend the sunglass industry and their trade association The Vision Council (TVC) for ongoing outreach campaigns to educate consumers regarding the damaging effects of ultraviolet (UV) rays to the eye and healthy vision.

In the case of eye protection, what you don't know can hurt you. When it comes to the human eye and the sun's rays, it's what we can't see that matters most. UV radiation that reaches the earth's surface, made up of two types of invisible rays, UVA and UVB, endangers an unprotected eye. The effects of long-term exposure can include cataracts, macular degeneration, abnormal growths on the eye's surface and even cancer of the eye. While everyone should shield their eyes from UV rays, certain risk factors like age and eye color increase an individual's vulnerability to UV related eye disorders. Where you live and travel can also make a big difference in the level of UV exposure. Since UV damage can't be reversed, prevention through protection is key.

Later this summer, sunglass manufacturers and distributors from my home district in Texas and The Vision Council (TVC) will be convening a Capitol Hill briefing on the topic of UV danger and protecting your eye health. I encourage my colleagues to attend and applaud the sunglass community and The Vision Council for their leadership in promoting healthy vision.

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3903–3947

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2514–2524, and S. Res. 482–483. **Pages S3938–39**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 2388, To take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians. (S. Rept. No. 113–197) **Page S3935**

Measures Considered:

Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2363, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting. **Pages S3903–04**

Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the order of Thursday, June 19, 2014 with respect to H.R. 803, to reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century, be modified as follows: that at 12 noon, on Wednesday, June 25, 2014, Senate begin consideration of H.R. 803, with the time until 2:30 p.m., equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees, with Senators Flake and Lee controlling 5 minutes each of the Republicans' time; that the provisions regarding 10 minutes of debate prior to voting on the amendments listed in the order, and on the bill, be vitiated; and that all other provisions of the previous order remain in effect. **Page S3947**

Krause Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Cheryl Ann Krause, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit. **Page S3925**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, June 26, 2014. **Page S3925**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 94 yeas (Vote No. EX. 206), Paul G. Byron, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida. **Pages S3910, S3947**

By a unanimous vote of 94 yeas (Vote No. EX. 207), Carlos Eduardo Mendoza, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida. **Pages S3910–11, S3947**

By a unanimous vote of 95 yeas (Vote No. EX. 208), Beth Bloom, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida. **Pages S3911, S3947**

By a unanimous vote of 95 yeas (Vote No. EX. 209), Geoffrey W. Crawford, of Vermont, to be United States District Judge for the District of Vermont. **Pages S3911, S3947**

By 52 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 211), Leon Rodriguez, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security. **Pages S3911–25, S3947**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 210), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S3912**

Messages from the House: **Page S3930**

Measures Referred: **Pages S3930–31**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3931–32**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S3932–35**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S3935–38**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3939–40**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3940–45**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3928–30**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3945–46**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S3946–47**

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—211) **Pages S3910–12, S3925**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:02 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 25, 2014. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3947.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for Homeland Security for fiscal year 2015.

APPROPRIATIONS: FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government approved for full committee consideration an original bill making appropriations for Financial Services and General Government for fiscal year 2015.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Miranda A. A. Ballentine, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Energy, Laura Junor, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Gordon O. Tanner, of Alabama, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force, and Debra S. Wada, of Hawaii, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, all of the Department of Defense, Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management, and 1,815 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Shaun L. S. Donovan, of New York, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

STUDENT DEBT

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine less student debt from the start, focusing on what role the tax system should play, after receiving testimony from Mark J. Mazur, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy; Jayne Caflin Fonash, Loudoun Academy of Science, Sterling, Virginia; Scott A. Hodge, Tax Foundation, and Dean A. Zerbe, alliantgroup, both of Washington, DC; and Amber Lee, Eugene, Oregon.

COMBATING VIOLENCE AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on International Operations and Organizations, Human Rights, Democracy and Global Women's Issues concluded a hearing to examine combating violence and discrimination against women, focusing on a global call to action, after receiving testimony from Senators Warren, Hirono, Heitkamp, Baldwin, Stabenow, Klobuchar, and Murray; Catherine M. Russell, Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women's Issues, Department of State; Susan Markham, Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, U.S. Agency for International Development; Gary Barker, Promundo-US, and Jacqueline O'Neill, The Institute for Inclusive Security, both of Washington, DC; and Hauwa Ibrahim, Harvard University Radcliffe Institute, Abuja, Nigeria.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

H.R. 3212, to ensure compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by countries with which the United States enjoys reciprocal obligations, to establish procedures for the prompt return of children abducted to other countries, with an amendment;

S. 2508, to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to improve access to and the affordability, reliability, and sustainability of power, with an amendment;

S. 1933, to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, with an amendment;

S. 1104, to measure the progress of recovery and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, with an amendment;

S. Res. 447, recognizing the threats to freedom of the press and expression around the world and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority in the efforts of the United States Government to promote democracy and good governance, with amendments;

S. Res. 462, 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, with an amendment; and

The nominations of Robert Stephen Beecroft, of California, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt, Dana Shell Smith, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the State of Qatar, Stuart E. Jones, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq,

James D. Nealon, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Honduras, Noah Bryson Mamet, of California, to be Ambassador to the Argentine Republic, Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, Mark William Lippert, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Korea, Joan A. Polaschik, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, and Theodore G. Osius III, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, all of the Department of State, Karen Kornbluh, of New York, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and Jonathan Nicholas Stivers, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

OLMSTEAD AT 15

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine moving toward greater community inclusion, focusing on Olmstead at 15, after receiving testimony from Emmanuel Smith, Disability Rights Iowa, Des Moines; Norma Robertson-Dabrowski, Liberty Resources, Inc. (LRI), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Gail Godwin, Shared Support Maryland, Baltimore; Troy R. Justesen, Utah Developmental Disabilities Council, Orangeville; and Ricardo Thornton, and Donna Thornton, both of Washington, DC.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Mikulski and Cardin, Pamela Pepper, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, who was introduced by Senators Baldwin and Johnson (WI), Brenda K. Sannes, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York, who was introduced by Senator Schumer, and Patricia M. McCarthy, of Maryland, and Jeri Kaylene Somers, of Virginia, both to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

AT&T AND DIRECTV MERGER

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine the AT&T and DIRECTV merger, focusing on the impact on competition and consumers in the video market and beyond, after receiving testimony from Randall Stephenson, AT&T Inc., Dallas, Texas; Michael White, DIRECTV, El Segundo, California; Christopher Keyser, Writers Guild of America, West Inc., Los Angeles, California; and Matthew F. Wood, Free Press, Larry Downes, Georgetown University Center for Business and Public Policy, and Ross J. Lieberman, American Cable Association, all of Washington, DC.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 4944–4956; were introduced.

Pages H5723–24

Additional Cosponsors: Page H5725

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 641, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) to lower gasoline prices for the American family by increasing domestic onshore and offshore energy exploration and production, to streamline and improve onshore and offshore energy permitting and administration, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 113–493).

Page H5723

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Thompson (PA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H5643

Recess: The House recessed at 10:37 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Page H5648

Customer Protection and End User Relief Act: The House passed H.R. 4413, to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure

transparency and accountability at the Commission, and to help farmers, ranchers, and end users manage risks to help keep consumer costs low, by a recorded vote of 265 ayes to 144 noes, Roll No. 349. Consideration of the measure began yesterday, June 23rd. **Pages H5659–65**

Rejected the Kuster motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 191 ayes to 220 noes, Roll No. 348. **Pages H5663–65**

Agreed to:

Garrett amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 113–476) that was debated on June 23rd that exempts Registered Investment Companies (RICs) that are currently registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) under the Investment Company Act of 1940 from duplicative registration requirements with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). The SEC will continue to have full regulatory oversight and enforcement authority over RICs. Amendment does not remove the jurisdiction and regulatory authority that the CFTC has over all futures, options and swaps transactions that the RICs invest in on behalf of their customers who are pensioners, retirees, and savers (by a recorded vote of 252 ayes to 158 noes, Roll No. 347). **Pages H5662–63**

Rejected:

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 113–476) that was debated on June 23rd that sought to require a study on entities regulated by the Commodities Futures Trading Commission (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 249 noes, Roll No. 343); **Page H5660**

Waters amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 113–476) that was debated on June 23rd that sought to prohibit judicial review of any consideration by the CFTC of the costs and benefits of its rules and orders (by a recorded vote of 168 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 344); **Pages H5660–61**

Moore amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 113–476) that was debated on June 23rd that sought to strike Section 203, and replace with the Sense of Congress that the Commodities Future Trading Commission is already required by law to consider costs and benefits when promulgating rules and issuing orders, and is held accountable to this requirement by courts (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 345); and **Pages H5661–62**

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 113–476) that was debated on June 23rd that sought to preserve existing law by striking "United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit," and replace with "United States District Court for the District of Columbia or the United States District Court for the district" (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 346). **Page H5662**

H. Res. 629, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to on June 19th.

North American Energy Infrastructure Act: The House passed H.R. 3301, to require approval for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines or electric transmission facilities at the national boundary of the United States for the import or export of oil, natural gas, or electricity to or from Canada or Mexico, by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 173 noes, Roll No. 354. **Pages H5665–88**

Rejected the Schneider motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 353. **Pages H5686–87**

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–49 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. **Page H5672**

Rejected:

Pallone amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–492) that sought to ensure that the complete length of cross-border projects would be subject to full environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 350);

ages H5673–74, H5683–84

Waxman amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–492) that sought to exclude any project with a pending permit application from the new approval requirements in the bill (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 351); and **Pages H5674–75, H5684–85**

Welch amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 113–492) that sought to ensure pipeline modifications receive a thorough environmental review process (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 352). **Pages H5675–76, H5685–86**

H. Res. 636, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6) and (H.R. 3301), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 221 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 342, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 341. **Pages H5652–59**

Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act: The House began consideration of H.R. 6, to provide for expedited approval of exportation of natural gas to World Trade Organization countries. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, June 25th. **Pages H5676–83**

H. Res. 636, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6) and (H.R. 3301), was agreed to by a recorded vote of 221 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 342, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 341. **Pages H5652–59**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Combating Autism Reauthorization Act of 2014: H.R. 4631, amended, to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism; **Pages H5688–93**

Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act: H.R. 4080, amended, to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs; **Pages H5693–95**

Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014: H.R. 3548, amended, to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents; **Pages H5695–96**

Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act: H.R. 1281, amended, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act; **Pages H5696–99**

Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act: H.R. 1098, amended, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research; and **Pages H5699–H5700**

Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014: S. 1681, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. **Pages H5700–12**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and 13 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5658–59, H5659, H5660, H5660–61, H5661–62, H5662, H5662–63, H5664–65, H5665, H5684, H5685, H5685–86, H5687, H5687–88. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill FY 2015. The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

CASE STUDIES IN DOD ACQUISITION: FINDING WHAT WORKS

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Case Studies in DOD Acquisition: Finding What Works''. Testimony was heard from Ronald O'Rourke, Specialist, National Defense, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

FILIPINO VETERANS EQUITY COMPENSATION FUND

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled ''Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund: Examining the Department of Defense and Interagency Process for Verifying Eligibility''. Testimony was heard from Brad Flohr, Senior Advisor, Compensation Service, Department of Veterans Affairs; Scott Levins, Director, National Personnel Records Center, National Archives and Records Administration; Brigadier General David K. ''Mac'' MacEwan, 59th Adjutant General of the Army, Department of the Army; and public witnesses.

WHAT SHOULD WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS EXPECT NEXT FROM THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD; AND MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a meeting to assign recently elected Members to subcommittees. The Committee announced and accepted subcommittee assignments. The Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled ''What Should Workers and Employers Expect Next From the National Labor Relations Board?''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Annual Report of the Financial Stability Oversight Council''. Testimony was heard from Jacob J. Lew, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

THAILAND: A DEMOCRACY IN PERIL

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''Thailand: A Democracy in Peril''. Testimony was heard from Scot

Marciel, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State.

GROWING PROBLEM OF UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN CROSSING THE BORDER

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Dangerous Passage: The Growing Problem of Unaccompanied Children Crossing the Border''. Testimony was heard from Jeh Johnson, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security; W. Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; and Ronald D. Vitiello, Deputy Chief, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

UTILIZING CANINE TEAMS TO DETECT EXPLOSIVES AND MITIGATE THREATS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled ''Utilizing Canine Teams to Detect Explosives and Mitigate Threats''. Testimony was heard from Annmarie Lontz, Division Director, Office of Security Services and Assessments, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; Melanie Harvey, Director, Threat Assessment Division, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; Jenny Grover, Acting Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

PROPOSED MERGER OF AT&T AND DIRECTV

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing entitled ''The Proposed Merger of AT&T and DIRECTV''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROMOTING AND PROTECTING AMERICAN INNOVATION, COMPETITIVENESS AND MARKET ACCESS IN FOREIGN MARKETS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing entitled ''Trade Secrets: Promoting and Protecting American Innovation, Competitiveness and Market Access in Foreign Markets''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AMERICAN ENERGY JOBS: OPPORTUNITIES FOR EDUCATION

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled ''American Energy Jobs: Opportunities for Education''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

NEW FEDERAL SCHEMES TO SOAK UP WATER AUTHORITY: IMPACTS ON STATES, WATER USERS, RECREATION, AND JOBS

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on ''New Federal Schemes to Soak Up Water Authority: Impacts on States, Water Users, Recreation, and Jobs''. Testimony was heard from Tom Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service; Lowell Pimley, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; Patrick Tyrrell, State Engineer, State of Wyoming; and public witnesses.

CHILD PROTECTION AND THE JUSTICE SYSTEM ON THE SPIRIT LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Child Protection and the Justice System on the Spirit Lake Indian Reservation''. Testimony was heard from Michael S. Black, Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Joo Yeum Chang, Associate Commissioner, Children's Bureau, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE'S PLAN TO IMPLEMENT A BAN ON THE COMMERCIAL TRADE IN ELEPHANT IVORY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing entitled ''The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Plan to Implement a Ban on the Commercial Trade in Elephant Ivory''. Testimony was heard from Robert G. Dreher, Associate Director, Fish and Wildlife Service; and public witnesses.

IRS OBSTRUCTION: LOIS LERNER'S MISSING E-MAILS, PART II

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''IRS Obstruction: Lois Lerner's Missing E-mails, Part II''. Testimony was heard from Jennifer O'Connor, Office of the White House Counsel, The White House; and David S. Ferriero, Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration.

LOWERING GASOLINE PRICES TO FUEL AN AMERICA THAT WORKS ACT OF 2014; AND ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT FY 2015

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 4899, the ''Lowering Gasoline Prices to Fuel an America That Works Act of 2014''; and H.R. 4923, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act FY 2015. The

Committee granted by record vote of 9–3 a structured rule for H.R. 4899. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–50 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Additionally, the rule grants a modified-open rule for H.R. 4923. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule provides that after general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment: (1) amendments shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment; and (2) no pro forma amendments shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate. The rule provides that under the rules of the House the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In section 3, the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from June 27, 2014, through July 7, 2014: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. In section 4, the rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3. In section 5, the rule provides for consideration of concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July. In section 6, the rule provides that the Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 3, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015. Testimony was heard from Representatives Simpson, Kaptur, Hastings (WA), Sanford, and Jackson Lee.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4012, the "Secret Science Reform Act of 2014". The bill was ordered reported, without amendment.

Joint Meetings

NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the economic impact of increased natural gas production, after receiving testimony from Daniel Yergin, IHS, Jim Bruce, UPS, Diana Furchtgott-Roth, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, and Elgie Holstein, Environmental Defense Fund, all of Washington, DC; and Charles A. Meloy, Anadarko Petroleum Corporation, The Woodlands, Texas.

VETERANS' ACCESS TO CARE THROUGH CHOICE, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of H.R. 3230, to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to the call.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 2014

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to receive a closed briefing on United States nuclear deterrence policy, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider the nominations of Julian Castro, of Texas, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Laura S. Wertheimer, of the District of

Columbia, to be Inspector General of the Federal Housing Finance Agency; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the Financial Stability Oversight Council annual report to Congress, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on Economic Policy, to hold hearings to examine young workers and recent graduates in the United States economy, 2:30 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security, to hold hearings to examine NextGen, focusing on a review of progress, challenges, and opportunities for improving aviation safety and efficiency, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold hearings to examine S. 1971, to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of D. Nathan Sheets, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary, and Ramin Toloui, of Iowa, to be Deputy Under Secretary, both of the Department of the Treasury, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine trade enforcement, focusing on using trade rules to level the playing field for United States companies and workers, 2 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the future of United States-China relations, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider S. 2449, to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and the nominations of William D. Adams, of Maine, to be Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Robert M. Gordon, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Education for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, and any additional nominations cleared for action, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 2521, Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014, S. 2519, National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center Act of 2014, H.R. 1232, to amend titles 40, 41, and 44, United States Code, to eliminate duplication and waste in information technology acquisition and management, S. 1691, to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the security of the United States border and to provide for reforms and rates of pay for border patrol agents, H.R. 4194, to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements, S. 2061, to prevent conflicts of interest relating to contractors providing background investigation fieldwork services and investigative support services, S. 231, to reauthorize the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp, S. 1214, to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government, S. 2117, to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, S. 1347, to provide transparency, accountability, and limitations of Government sponsored conferences, H.R. 1376, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the "Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building", H.R. 1813, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building", S. 2056, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the "Sergeant Brett E. Gornewicz Memorial Post Office", S. 2057, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 198 Baker Street in Corning, New York, as the "Specialist Ryan P. Jayne Post Office Building", and the nomination of Shaun L. S. Donovan, of New York, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine economic development, focusing on encouraging investment in Indian country, 2:15 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine S. 1945, to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, focusing on updating the "Voting Rights Act" in response to *Shelby County* v. *Holder*, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to hold hearings to examine how early and absentee voting can benefit citizens and administrators, focusing on election administration, 2 p.m., SR–301.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine brain injuries and diseases of aging, 2:15 p.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Livestock, Rural Development, and Credit, hearing on a review of credit availability in rural America, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill FY 2015, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Medicare Program Integrity: Screening Out Errors, Fraud, and Abuse", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Examining Reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank: Corporate Necessity or Corporate Welfare?", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, "Libya at a Crossroads: A Faltering Transition", 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled "Reviewing the Administration's FY 2015 Budget Request for Europe and Eurasia", 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled ''Children Migrating from Central America: Solving a Humanitarian Crisis'', 2 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies; and Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education, joint hearing entitled ''How Data Mining Threatens Student Privacy'', 11 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 186, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to permit candidates for election for Federal office to designate an individual who will be authorized to disburse funds of the authorized campaign committees of the candidate in the event of the death of the candidate, 11 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet, ''Music Licensing Under Title 17 Part Two'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''An Administration Made Disaster: The South Texas Border Surge of Unaccompanied Alien Minors'', 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation, oversight hearing entitled ''Increasing Carbon Soil Sequestration on Public Lands'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Management Failures: Oversight of the EPA'', 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, legislative hearing on H.R. 1869, the ''Biennial Budgeting and Enhanced Oversight Act of 2014'', 10 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Pathways to Exploration: A Review of the Future of Human Space Exploration'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''VBA and VHA Interactions: Ordering and Conducting Medical Examinations'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3393, the ''Student and Family Tax Simplification Act''; and H.R. 4935, the ''Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014'', 9:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12 noon), Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 803, Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act. At approximately 2:30 p.m., Senate will vote on or in relation to Flake amendment, Lee amendment, a managers' amendment, and passage of the bill.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 25

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Complete consideration of H.R. 6—Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Brownley, Julia, Calif., E1057
Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1058, E1062, E1063
Carter, John R., Tex., E1061
Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E1060
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1058
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1058
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1058
Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E1062
Forbes, J. Randy, Va., E1057
Grayson, Alan, Fla., E1057, E1059, E1060, E1062
Harper, Gregg, Miss., E1057
Larsen, Rick, Wash., E1058
Marino, Tom, Pa., E1058, E1062
Miller, George, Calif., E1061
Peters, Gary C., Mich., E1060
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E1061
Roby, Martha, Ala., E1057
Rohrabacher, Dana, Calif., E1059
Royce, Edward R., Calif., E1059
Sarbanes, John P., Md., E1057
Shuster, Bill, Pa., E1060
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1062
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E1061
Upton, Fred, Mich., E1062
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1061

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.